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Faculty Perspectives on Doctoral Student Mentoring: The Mentor’s Odyssey

Carol A. Burg

ABSTRACT

In recent years, mentoring has emerged as a research domain, however, the preponderance of mentoring research has been situated first, in the business or organizational settings and second, in the K-12 educational setting, focusing on protégé experiences, using quantitative survey instruments to collect data. Thus, mentoring research literature includes a paucity of formal studies in the arena of graduate education.

Situated in the higher education setting, this study investigated the perspectives of faculty-mentors who provided mentoring to doctoral students who completed the doctoral degree, employing the qualitative research methodology known as phenomenology, as an orthogonal but complimentary epistemology to previous quantitative studies. Located specifically in the College of Education of a large research university, the study asked 262 College of Education doctoral graduates to nominate College of Education faculty who provided mentoring to them during their degree pursuit. A total of 59 faculty were nominated as mentors. Six of the most frequently nominated mentors participated in two semi-structured interviews (Berg, 2004).

The interviews addressed the mentor’s experience of the mentoring endeavor, seeking to gather a description of their lived experience (Creswell, 1998) of mentoring and the meanings (Cohen & Omery, 1994) they garnered from it. The interviews yielded
several shared perspectives on mentoring, including: a Gratifying Perspective, an Intentional Perspective, an Idiographic Perspective, a Teleological Perspective, and a Dynamic Perspective. Other noteworthy concepts that emerged from the mentors’ data were: values, motivations, symbiotic relationship, and contextual negotiation. Implications for mentoring theory and practice as well as mentor development were described. The study contributed to development of a fuller phenomenological understanding of the perspectives of faculty-mentors in a mentoring relationship with doctoral students.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Introduction

Higher education faculty and graduate students generally view the relationship between a faculty dissertation advisor and doctoral student as an important part of doctoral education. According to research on common practices in doctoral advising, the faculty advisor provides the doctoral student with information on the requirements of the degree, monitors and facilitates the student’s progress through the program, and typically serves as a student’s primary contact point with the institution (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Schlosser & Gelso, 2005; Weil, 2001). In some cases, however, the interaction between a student and faculty member goes beyond simply advising into a mentoring relationship. In fact, one of the most commonly given pieces of advice to beginning graduate students is to find a mentor (Rose, 2003).

Background: Personal Perspective

As a lifelong learner, I have experienced several important mentoring relationships in my academic career, from undergraduate studies through doctoral studies. As an Indiana University School of Music undergraduate majoring in Classical Organ studies, I had the privilege for four years of having a one-hour organ lesson every week
with a world-class concert organist. However, my interaction with my Organ Professor was not confined to just the one-hour music lesson at the organ console. I definitely benefited from a significant amount of mentoring by my Organ Professor that extended to discussions of organ music, theory and career support in other professional venues. After earning my undergraduate degree, I applied the knowledge and experience gained in my mentored apprenticeship by working as a professional musician and church choir director.

My desire for career progress led me to secure employment with a private university, where I worked as an administrator, pursued a graduate degree, and experienced a second mentoring relationship. The master’s degree program I completed in this institution’s college of education was somewhat unusual in that it was a bona fide cohort model. In this curriculum and instruction program, we had one core (primary) instructor throughout the entire 22-month duration of degree pursuit. Partly due to this fact, as well as the fact that my core instructor was also a colleague who nurtured my capabilities in the creative arts, arts-based research, and academic publication, a mentoring relationship developed and continues through the present.

As a third in-depth experience with mentoring, in my doctoral studies, I have experienced six years of mentoring from my previous major professor in my doctoral studies, which led to my gaining advanced competencies as an academic researcher-writer and as a reviewer and associate editor for refereed journals. After reviewing the literature on doctoral student mentoring, I realize that my experiences with mentoring may be unusual. Upon reflection, I found that my three sustained mentoring relationships
at the bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degree levels provided me with more than a decade of experience as a direct participant-observer of the academic mentoring process.

In contrast, I found it surprising to learn recently while reviewing the literature on doctoral student mentoring that it is estimated that only one-half to two-thirds of students report ever being mentored in graduate school (Busch, 1985; Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000; Cronan-Hillex, T., Gensheimer, Cronan-Hillex, W.A., & Davidson, 1986; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Rose, 2003). One study found that 56% of students surveyed reported that finding a mentor was a “moderate to major problem” (Jacobi, 1991, p. 514). With my own multiple experiences as a participant-observer of mentoring, I had been operating under the false impression that mentoring in higher education was de rigueur. The realization that academic mentoring is far from universal led me to a great deal of reflection, from which a cogent question has arisen: Why do some college faculty, such as those who enriched my own career as a student, choose to engage in mentoring? Indeed, mentoring is not specified in faculty contracts. In some institutions, faculty are not paid over the summer, and yet faculty still advise—and in some cases mentor—students over these months. Why do some faculty engage in service “above and beyond the call of duty” (Mullen, 2005b) specified in their contracts? My own experiences with mentoring prompt me to explore this question as a compelling interest in my doctoral studies.

Rationale for This Study

Mentoring has become a more widely researched topic over the past 30 years (Crosby, 1999). Further, Erikson’s (1963) adult life stage of generativity (which includes
an active concern for the next generation that may be expressed through mentoring). Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory (learning through observing and modeling other people), and Levinson’s (1978) study of the stages of adult development (wherein people in the early adult transition phase seek out mentoring) have provided impetus for the study of mentoring. However, the majority of research studies have focused on the business and organization settings, not education (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007). There is a dearth of research literature that focuses on the student-faculty mentoring relationship (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007). As a result of my experience of searching the literature, I concur with this observation. In the context of education, there seems to be an abundance of research on mentoring involving teacher induction and principal induction, but comparatively less at the higher education level. The majority of this research has focused on the perspective and experiences of the teacher- or principal-inductee via quantitative self-report surveys (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983; Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Rose, 2003).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the perspectives on mentoring by selected doctoral faculty who recent doctoral graduates identify as mentors. As a result of illuminating the perspectives of faculty who mentor, it was my hope that a greater understanding of the experiences of faculty who engage in mentoring relationships with students, including their motivations for mentoring and the significance mentoring holds for them, would emerge.
Exploratory Questions

As I discussed above, a significant deficit in the mentoring literature regarding the perspective of the higher education mentor/doctoral advisor is evident: most mentoring studies in Higher Education have focused on the perspective of the student in the mentoring dyad and have used quantitative surveys to gather data from the students (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983; Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Rose, 2003). Research focusing on the perspective of the doctoral advisor is minimal, especially research employing a qualitative approach (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007). Scholars are suggesting further research and more diverse methods to investigate and understand the perspectives and motivations of faculty who mentor (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Rose, 2003; Allen & Eby, 2003).

This leads to my exploratory questions:

1. What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?
2. What variables influence those perspectives?

Research Design

Selection of the most effective research design for an in-depth study of faculty-doctoral candidate mentoring relationships must take into account specific structural and methodological issues identified from my review of the literature (Chapter Two). For example, issues arising out of the previous research designs involving mentoring include:

1. Many studies lack an operational definition of mentoring and do not differentiate between mentoring and advising.
2. A theory base for mentoring is often lacking in prior studies.

3. Prior studies almost exclusively focus on the student perspective.

4. The studies have been largely quantitative, seeking to project and generalize findings rather than to achieve a more in-depth, nuanced understanding of individual faculty perspectives.

These design characteristics found in most preceding studies of faculty-student mentoring relationships create gaps in the literature that my study sought to address. The literature would be enlarged and enriched by a qualitative study that explores the key elements of an operationalized definition of mentoring and that examines the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the faculty-mentor.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions of terms are inductively determined (see Chapter Three) from the discussion of the mentoring literature in Chapter Two:

*Mentoring:* In this study, mentoring refers to a deliberate relationship between a doctoral faculty member and a doctoral student wherein the faculty member provides support that goes beyond the basic duties of advising with the intention of enhancing/promoting/supporting both the career and personal development of the student (Aagaard & Hauer, 2003; Cohen, 1995; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Johnson, 2002; Johnson, 2007a; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Paludi, Waite, Roberson, & Jones, 1988; Rose, 2003).

*Mentor:* In this study, a mentor is a faculty member who has been identified by a student as participating in a relationship that provides support that goes beyond the basic...
duties of advising with the intention of enhancing/promoting/supporting both the career and personal development of the student (Cohen, 1995; Johnson, 2002; Johnson, 2007a; Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Kram, 1985; Paludi, Waite, Roberson, & Jones, 1988).

*Advising:* In this study, advising refers to the basic activities between a faculty member and a doctoral student that include providing information on program and degree requirements, providing technical guidance regarding these requirements, and monitoring the student’s progress through the program (Johnson, 2007a; Weil, 2001).

**Literature Review**

Recognizing that “it is necessary to plan your ‘search strategy’ before searching a database” (*Library Databases Search Strategies*, 2007, ¶ 1), I first began with the concepts and phenomena embedded in my research questions; second, I identified key search terms related to my concepts, operational definitions, and professional focus; third, I grouped and re-grouped key search terms; and, finally, used Boolean logic to structure database searches in World Catalogue, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Dissertation Abstracts International, Psych Info, and the EBSCO Database. I employed this four-part search strategy to assure reasonable coverage of the professional literature and, more importantly, to substantiate the nature and magnitude of the literature gap that I have identified in my preliminary research.

**Delimitations of the Study**

Scholars in the mentoring literature agree that mentoring is influenced by the social context in which it occurs such as business, hard sciences, medicine, nursing,
psychology, or education; Scholars also agree that characteristics of mentorships in various academic disciplines may vary significantly (Green & Bauer 1995; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Knox, Schlosser, Pruitt, & Hill 2006; Schlosser & Gelso, 2005, 2001; Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz & Hill, 2003; O'Neil & Wrightsman, 2001). For example, mentoring for a doctoral student in chemistry or physics may primarily focus on developing clinical laboratory experiments and research skills, whereas mentoring for a doctoral student in education may focus on developing more social science (non-clinical) research and pedagogy skills; therefore, the developmental tasks for doctoral student-protégés may be starkly different between disciplines (Johnson & Huwe, 2003). Because of this contextual variance by profession and discipline, I will limit this study to College of Education faculty at a large, Research I university located in the American southern region, since my own background and mentoring experience highlights non-clinical educational research and pedagogy and thus provides me an initial basis for understanding the lived-experiences of professors of education. For the purposes of anonymity and ease of reading, I will henceforth refer to this institution as “Transition University” or “Transition U.”

*Theoretical Framework*

Scholars of mentoring agree that there is no single comprehensive theoretical framework that unifies the study of mentoring (Mullen, 2005b). Rather, researchers tend to apply theoretical frames from their respective disciplines when studying any particular mentoring context (Mullen, 2005b); for example, researchers in the area of human development might chose a theoretical framework such as generativity (Erikson, 1963),
whereas researchers in a business context might choose a systems theory framework (Senge, 1990). The theoretical framework for this proposed study is the qualitative research paradigm known as phenomenology. Phenomenology “offers accounts of experienced space, time, body, and human relation as we live them” (Van Manen, 2000) and is used to attempt to understand participants’ perspectives and views of social realities (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001) by gleaning the essences (or elements) of experiences into units of meaning (Creswell, 1998; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001; Kvale, 1996.) A phenomenological study investigates the lived experiences (Creswell, 1998) of several people in regard to one concept or phenomenon (in this case mentoring) and seeks to reveal essential understandings (elements) of the participants’ experience of the phenomenon (Creswell, 1998). In Chapter Three, I will discuss in detail the assumptions and bias of the qualitative research paradigm, the theoretical framework of phenomenology, and of my self-as-the-researcher and how these frames serve to define and delimit my study of faculty-mentors.

Interview Method

In order to select faculty who have mentored doctoral students, I obtained from Transition University’s College of Education the contact information for students who have completed their doctorate within the past seven years. I then mailed the graduates a letter asking them to nominate faculty who have provided them with support beyond the scope of advising and have acted as a mentor by supporting their personal and career development. From the nominations, I selected seven faculty-mentors to interview. If faculty from my department were nominated as a mentor they were excluded from
interview selection in order to avoid any possible conflict of interest; likewise, faculty who are members of my committee were excluded from participating in this study as interviewees for the same reason. For a more detailed description of the criteria for inclusion, exclusion, and selection, please see Chapter Three.

I conducted two interviews with each faculty-mentor. Each interview was intended to last approximately one hour in length (although there was some variation to the length of the interviews). The protocol for the first interview, Protocol 1 (see Appendix A) was developed inductively from my review of the mentoring literature, as I will discuss in Chapter Three. The interview protocol for the second interview, Protocol 2 (see Appendix B) was also inductively developed from my review of the literature, as well as from the first interview with each participant.

Usefulness of the Study

The purpose of a phenomenological case study is to “understand the particular in depth” (Merriam, 1995, p. 57). This is a complete departure from the typical purpose of quantitative inquiry that involves randomly selecting a representative sample in order to statistically generalize findings to a population. The study I am proposing is phenomenological, or focused on the perceptions of faculty who doctoral graduates identify as mentors, and might provide user or reader generalizability: “leaving the extent to which a study’s findings apply to other situations up to the people in those situations” (Merriam, 1998, p.211). It was my hope that triangulation of the data from the various sources (interviews of various participants, interviewee’s documentation, field notes, researcher reflective journaling) would yield coherent conclusions that hang
together (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001) for the reader, thus convincing the reader of the “trustworthiness” (Firestone, 1987, p.19) and “apparenCy, verisimilitude, [anD] transferability” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990 p.7) of the understandings reached in this study.

Along with a more clarified description and understanding of the experiences mentors have, it was my aspiration that this study also provide awareness and understanding of what motivates some faculty to engage in mentoring behaviors with their students; greater insight and definitions of “best practices” for faculty who mentor doctoral students; as well as insight into the lived experience of the mentors, the benefits, the perils, the hidden curriculum and the null curriculum (Eisner, 1994) that the faculty-mentors experienced. Ideas on how to reward mentors for this above and beyond the call of duty service to students and thereby provide more motivation to other faculty to mentor was another understanding I hoped to gain from this study.

Limitations

The identification of the faculty-mentors was a possible limitation. I was at the mercy of the graduates to be forthcoming and accurate in their nominations. I was also beholden to the mentors to be forthcoming and accurate in sharing their mentoring experiences with me.

As the researcher, and a main instrument of the research, I am a limitation, as well. With my practice of transparency (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) in discussing the methodology, the analysis of the data, and my reflections it was my hope that I would
provide the readers of the study with enough information to judge the trustworthiness, verisimilitude and transferability of the research as it applies to their own experiences.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the perspectives of the faculty-mentors in the mentoring relationship and their motivations for engaging in this altruistic (Allen, 2003), good organizational citizen behavior (McManus & Russel, 1997; Noe, et al, 2002) of mentoring is a gap in the mentoring literature that merits further study. This study addressed another gap in the literature by taking a qualitative inquiry perspective (Johnson, et al, 2007; Merriam, 1983, Noe et al, 2002) that sought to identify and describe the nature of the faculty world-view, using the phenomenological approach to “walk a mile in the shoes” of the senior members of the faculty-protégé dyads. It was my hope that a greater understanding of the authentic human stories of these mentors would be informative, interesting and inspiring to others. From my own valued experiences of receiving effective mentoring, coupled with the broadly positive research view that sees mentoring as a beneficial factor in guiding doctoral students to successful degree completion, I also aspired to contribute research insights that I hoped would be useful in developing mentors and mentoring programs.

*From my Reflective Journal, May 25, 2007:*

Jackson (pseudonym), a colleague and friend at the office, asked me today how I was doing since the departure of my mentor. He has checked in with me on this topic fairly regularly since my mentor left for another university. Since the start of my doctoral
program, Jackson has typically asked how things are going, and offered constructive advice and encouragement. Besides having a master’s degree in counseling, his nature is caring and compassionate. Jackson is also a scholar and an academic, and I feel comfortable discussing with him the issues of academia, as well as the cascade of events surrounding my mentor’s untimely departure. He seems to have been surreptitiously monitoring my adjustment to doing my dissertation without her mentoring. I updated him on my latest challenges and progress; his feedback was positive and supportive.

Then he said something that completely startled me: “You have extensive experience as a mentee, now it’s time for you to become a mentor. You have been discussing with me some of our master’s degree students who have issues that are in need of professional development. How about choosing one of our students and being a mentor?” I felt a paradigm shift—me the mentor—instead of the mentee—what a concept!!!! What he said rang true like a bell: I have reflected extensively on my experiences as a mentee as an undergraduate, a master’s student, and as a doctoral student. As a result of reflection on my experiences—both triumphs and failures—I feel that I have gleaned a great deal about how to be an excellent, high performing mentee (and about what mistakes not to make). The resonance of the ringing bell resolved into a calm silence, and that silence felt good, it felt right, and I knew he was right: my next task was to become a mentor. But how? I have had such exceptional mentors, how can I learn to be a good mentor like they are, when they are no longer here?
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of my study was to describe and explain the perspectives on mentoring by selected doctoral faculty whom recent doctoral graduates identified as mentors. The exploratory questions addressed in this study were:

1. What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?

2. What variables influence those perspectives?

This literature review gives an overview of the literature pertaining to mentoring in general and then examines the mentoring literature in the milieu of education, and higher education in specific. I highlight in particular three aspects of the literature pertaining to the mentoring of new faculty in higher education; the mentoring of graduate students from the doctoral student’s perspective; and the mentoring of doctoral students from the perspective of the faculty. At this juncture, it is appropriate for me to disclose my criteria for inclusion of the selected literature. There seems to be a disproportionate number of books and articles published about mentoring that are not based on empirical evidence, such as literature reviews, critical literature reviews, literature reviews to propose or build theory, commentary or position papers, “how to” guides, and articles that claim many
assertions about mentoring but are based on anecdotes or opinion, rather than sound data collection, data analysis and research methodology. The literature I have chosen to review is empirically based in scientifically accepted methodologies. I have given particular attention to research that has established or advanced mentoring theory. I have also noted methodological baselines, exceptions and advancements in the reviewed studies, as methodology is inescapably linked to epistemology. For the sake of clarity and to attempt to establish an historical framework for mentoring research, I have also written about the articles in relatively chronological order within each specific topic section.

Mentoring Origins

The modern day term mentor originates from Homer’s (2004) epic The Odyssey. Mentor was the elderly, wise and trusted friend selected by Odysseus to look after the care and education of his son, Thelemachos, while Odysseus sojourned away from home to engage the Trojans in war. From this archetypal story emerged the idea of a mentor being an older, wiser man who assists in the development or learning (acquiring of wisdom) of a younger, less experienced man, and thus is consistent with early operational definitions of mentoring (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978; Merriam, 1983). A seldom-mentioned epilogue to this main origin of the term mentor relates how, later, when Thelemachos is old enough to embark on his own journey, Athena, Greek goddess of wisdom, assumes the familiar form of Mentor to guide and protect Thelemachos on his expedition. This rarely discussed addition to the common monocular origin of the term imbues the original Mentor with parental characteristics of “both male and female qualities” (Johnson & Huwe, 2003, p. 5; Mullen, 2005b), and in fact belies
the androcentric origins of the field of mentoring, in light of the fact that the old man, Mentor, is only mentioned a few times in the beginning of *The Odyssey*, whereas throughout the majority of *The Odyssey* it is in fact the goddess, Athena, disguised as Mentor, who aids and abets both Thelemachos and Odysseus numerous times throughout the 24 books of *The Odyssey* (Vandiver, 1999).

Mentoring as a Research Domain

Mentoring has become a more widely researched topic over the past 40 years (Crosby, 1999; Johnson & Huwe, 2003). One of the earliest impetuses for the study of mentoring was Erikson’s (1963) concept of *generativity* which emerged out of his life-span development research. *Generativity* includes an active concern for the next generation that may be expressed through mentoring. Bandura’s *Social Learning Theory* (1977), which states that learning occurs through observing and modeling other people, is another construct that some researchers also relate to the study of mentoring (Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006; Jacobi, 1991; Noe, 1988), in that mentoring provides ample opportunity for mentors to model behaviors and for protégés to observe and emulate.

One study that provided impetus to the growing domain of mentoring research was Vaillant’s (1977) study of male life-span development, focusing on 95 Harvard graduates. Vaillant’s longitudinal study followed this cohort of men for approximately 40 years, investigating how men adjusted to major stressor events throughout their lives. The participants were interviewed at the beginning, middle and end of the study, with intervening annual or biennial surveys. Vaillant identified 18 adaptive ego mechanisms that the subjects displayed in response to stress, and noted that the men who were most
successful and well-adjusted were those who had engaged in sustained relationships in their personal and professional lives, such as a mentorship. These men also reported engaging in behaviors that could be described as *generativity*—behaviors which Vaillant labeled *altruistic*.

Many current researchers credit the 1978 study done by Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee with promoting the expansion of mentoring as a research domain (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Johnson, 2007a). Levinson’s (1978) landmark study of the stages of adult development involved in-depth interviews with 40 men between the ages of 35 to 45 years old. The subjects were demographically diverse, with occupations ranging from hourly factory workers to business executives. Through their study, Levinson defined three distinct phases of mid-life adult development: the novice phase (early adulthood up to age 32, initiating career and relationships); a settling down phase (ages 32 to 40, building upon career and relationships); and mid-life transition phase (ages 40 to 45, appraising young adulthood and coming to grips with middle and late adulthood). According to the Levinson study, a major task of the novice phase of adulthood is the formation of a “Dream” or life-plan (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 91), as well as a mentoring relationship that supports and facilitates the “realization of the Dream” (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 98). The most successful men interviewed in the Levinson study had been mentored; thus, Levinson concluded that engaging in a mentorship was a crucial developmental task for a young man and that not having a mentoring relationship could prove to be a substantial handicap to psychological and career development. By the end of the settling down phase (age 40), Levinson found that
the subject’s mentoring relationship usually dissolved, and then by the end of the mid-life transition phase (age 45) the former protégé had subsequently become a mentor to another young man. Levinson considered this transitioning from protégé into mentor to be one of the essential developmental achievements of adulthood. Levinson also ties this activity into Erikson’s (1963) concept of generativity; He considers good mentoring to be a positive contribution to society.

Research findings from lifespan development studies such as Vaillant (1977) and Levinson et al. (1978) that prominently discussed mentoring propelled other researchers to investigate the developmental mentoring relationship as a phenomenon in itself. Soon thereafter, O’Neil (1981) postulated a coherent theoretical framework for mentoring in which he describes three parameters of a mentoring relationship: mutuality (reciprocal support, or depth of relationship); comprehensiveness (interaction across several venues, or breadth of relationship); and congruence (corresponding views on the purpose of the mentoring relationship). Set in the context of the training of graduate students in the field of psychology (rather than the business context), O’Neil’s 1981 (see also O’Neil & Wrightsman, 2001) work in mentoring provided conceptual foundations for future empirical studies in mentoring. I included in Interview Protocol 1 question #1 (Can you describe to me how you view your role as a mentor to doctoral students?), question #2 (Typically, what is the mentoring experience like for you?), question #3 (What type of activities do you typically engage in with doctoral students whom you mentor and what do you consider to be your most effective or important mentoring activities?) and questions #5 (How did you learn to be a mentor?) with the thought that it may reveal the
presence or absence of O’Neil’s (1981) concepts of mutuality, and comprehensiveness, in the reported experiences of the mentors in this study.

Kathy Kram produced two research-based studies that have provided some of the basic tenets of mentoring theory to date. Kram’s 1983 study defined the four phases of the mentorship: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. Her landmark 1985 study expanded O’Neil’s (1981) theory that focused on the personal (what Kram labeled psychosocial) dimension of a mentorship to include a vocational component. Kram defined two general domains regarding the functions of a mentor: career and psychosocial. In this study, Kram conducted in-depth interviews of 18 mentor-protégé dyads. The participants were middle and upper level managers from a large northeastern utility company. Her initial random sampling of 4,000 managers only yielded three middle managers who reported being mentored. She then approached the Human Resources managers at the company and asked them to identify people they had observed who were involved in a mentoring relationship in the company.

The specific type of purposive sampling employed in Kram’s 1985 study is known as snowball sampling. In qualitative inquiry a non-probability sampling strategy known as purposive sampling is often employed: the deliberate selection of subjects who are representative of the phenomenon under study (Berg, 2004). Snowball sampling, a specific type of purposive sampling, is typically employed in situations where subjects with the necessary attributes for study are difficult to locate. It involves asking relevant participants (other subjects, etc.) to refer other representative subjects to the researcher (Berg, 2004). Other researchers who study mentoring have noted the difficulty of
obtaining subjects, and have suggested using innovative sampling strategies to locate subjects who have participated in mentoring (Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997). As a result of this sampling strategy, Kram was able to investigate the nature of mentoring as a developmental relationship, the mentoring relationship within an organization, and the influence of organizational context on the mentoring relationship for 18 mentor-protégé dyads. From her grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) data analysis, Kram found that a mentor fulfills the career functions of a mentorship when she or he provides sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments for the protégé. The psychosocial functions of a mentorship are fulfilled when the mentor provides role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling and friendship to the protégé. Kram’s 1985 findings have been replicated numerous times and are considered reliable (Tenebaum, Crosby & Gliner, 2001) and have been empirically confirmed and validated across many different disciplines (Johnson & Huwe, 2003).

Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, (2001) surveyed 189 graduate students and found that their factor analysis confirmed Kram’s 1985 findings of two mentoring functions (career and psychosocial support) and discovered a third mentor function: networking (facilitating connecting with other people in the discipline).

Criticisms of Mentoring Research

Kram’s foundational 1983 and 1985 research might have been inspired as a response to growing criticism from scholars regarding the apparent theoretical and methodological shortcomings of then-current mentoring research. Merriam’s 1983 often-referenced critical review of the mentoring literature in the disciplines of business,
education and adult development names several deficiencies in the research studies on mentoring, such as: absence of or even contradictory operational definitions of mentoring across disciplines; unclear definition of mentoring within studies; positive bias in the extant literature on mentoring; overreliance on anecdotal reports rather than on empirical evidence; the lack of a theoretical base; and the need for more accurate and empirical assessments of the effectiveness of mentoring programs. Interestingly, these criticisms of the state of mentoring research in the 1980’s are still largely the criticism of mentoring scholars in more recent studies (Allen & Eby, 2007; Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Mertz, 2004).

Additionally, the majority of mentoring research studies has focused on business and organization settings, not education (Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001) as is reflected by three of the four landmark cases discussed above. One may also notice in the aforementioned research studies the preponderance of male subjects: Vaillant (1977) and Levinson (1978) used exclusively male subjects; in Kram’s (1985) study 17 of the 18 senior managers were male while 10 of the 18 junior managers were male (Kram, 1978, p. 6), for a total of 78% male subjects. It stands to reason that the focus of mentoring research in the context of business would include more males than females (at least until 1985) given the still somewhat nascent status of the feminist movement and the expansion of women’s work roles into business and positions of leadership. However, the historical deliberate exclusion of female participants in research studies (Kaspar & Ferguson, 2000; Taylor, Klein, Lewis, Gruenewald, Gurung, & Updegraff, 2000) has recently registered concern with scholars who, as a result, are
expanding mentoring studies to include the mentoring of diverse youth (Liang, & Grossman, 2007), and the mentoring of women and people of color in academia (Sedlacek, Benjamin, Schlosser, & Sheu, 2007) and in the workplace (Ragins, 2007).

Regarding the literature on mentoring in general, there is a preponderance of focus on the protégé. In their comprehensive content analysis of mentoring literature, Allen, Eby, O’Brien, & Lentz (2008) found that 80.2% of research studies investigated the perspective of the protégé. This research focus on the experiences of the protégé has a corresponding trend in the educational mentoring literature, as well (Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004; Johnson, 2007b). The majority of the mentoring research that does address the higher education milieu concentrates on the mentoring of undergraduates and junior faculty members (Creighton, Parks, & Creighton, 2008).

Moreover, in contrast to the three early landmark studies discussed above which employed qualitative interview methods, the vast majority of the research on mentoring in the business and educational settings has focused on the perspective and experiences of the protégé via quantitative, self-report surveys (Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983; Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Rose, 2003). Thus, the few extant studies that have addressed mentoring at the doctoral education level have primarily investigated the perspective of the doctoral student-protégé using quantitative, retrospective, self-report surveys.

Comparatively little research has been conducted on the experiences of the doctoral student faculty-mentor (Creighton, Parks, & Creighton, 2008; Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004; Johnson, 2007b), and scholars are calling for this area to be
investigated and better understood (Mullen, 2007b). My study addresses several gaps in the mentoring literature by: a) using in-depth qualitative interviews exploring the perceptions of b) doctoral student faculty-mentors to c) elucidate their experiences as mentors, with the intent of d) better understanding their experiences and motivations for engaging in the extra-contractual activities of mentoring doctoral students.

Mentoring in Education

Among the literature on mentoring in the educational setting, the research on the student-faculty mentoring relationship remains “sparse” (Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007, p.50; Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987). This is consistent with the experience I had in searching the literature: I searched World Cat, ERIC, Dissertation Abstracts International, Psych Info, and EBSCO using various combinations of the descriptors mentoring, education, higher education, students, and faculty. There appeared to be a good deal more research on mentoring in the educational setting revolving around teacher induction and assistant principal and principal induction than research addressing the higher education level. This seems logical, considering the student-teaching component of undergraduate teacher training, and that mentoring is often used by school districts as a mandatory part of teacher induction, as well as the sheer number of primary and secondary schools (needing teachers and leaders) versus the number of post-secondary institutions in America. This observation is verified by scholars who report that two-thirds of the mentoring literature in the context of education focuses on teacher induction or teacher practice (Erich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004) and that formal mentoring programs in the K-12 arena are currently on the rise (Bearman, Blake-Beard, Hunt, &
For example, in 2006, the State of Florida, by statute, mandated continuing support of candidates for assistant principal and principal positions, as well as first-year administrators in these positions (Florida Statute 1012.986 William Cecil Golden Professional Development Program for School Leaders, 2006). Mentoring is one of these support mechanisms.

One early study done in the K-12 educational environment by Noe (1988) served to advance mentoring theory. Noe surveyed 139 protégés (K-12 teachers) and 43 mentors in nine different school districts across America about several aspects of their assigned (formal) mentorships, focusing on protégé characteristics such as job involvement, locus of control, career planning, relationship importance, gender composition of the mentoring dyad, and the quality and amount of time the protégé spent with the mentor. Noe found that the participants were inclined to have an internal locus of control, to exhibit high levels of job involvement and career planning, and to value relationships with peers and supervisors in their school. The protégés reported receiving significantly more psychosocial benefits than career benefits, and mixed-gender dyads were more effective than same-gender dyads.

Factor analysis of the data Noe (1988) collected confirmed that mentor functions do seem to fall into career and psychosocial domains, as reported by Kram (1985); more importantly, Noe’s 1988 research developed and validated a Mentoring Functions Scale (with sub-scales that align with Kram’s theory) that has been replicated and referenced often in the mentoring literature.
Mentoring in Higher Education

Considering undergraduate and graduate education as large-scale spheres for mentoring, the prevalence of mentoring is largely unknown (Campbell, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Merriam, 1983). The few studies that have noted the prevalence of mentoring in higher education have tended to be small in scope and specific to certain institutions, departments, or disciplines, with the preponderance of studies produced in the field of psychology (Johnson & Huwe, 2003). Reports on the frequency of mentoring range from 33% for undergraduate students (Jacobi, 1991), to 66% for doctoral students in clinical psychology programs (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000).

Jacobi (1991) noted that mentoring appears to be somewhat more common at the graduate level than at the undergraduate level. This begs the question: why, then, are there more studies done on mentoring at the undergraduate level than at the graduate level? Perhaps one reason for this is the prevalence of mentoring studies involving teacher education and induction (Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004). In 1978, Levinson et al. leveled a criticism against American higher education, stating, "our system of higher education, though officially committed to fostering the intellectual and personal development of students, provides mentoring that is generally limited in quantity and poor in quality" (p. 334). The same sentiment is echoed today by scholars such as Mullen (2007b), who maintains that even though mentoring is gaining exposure, there is still not enough of it being done in higher education, and when it is attempted, quality may be lacking.
Mentoring of New Faculty in Higher Education

Along with the mentoring of undergraduate students, a common research area for mentoring in higher education is the mentoring of new or junior faculty (Creighton, Parks, & Creighton, 2008). And yet, the empirical research on faculty to faculty research is described as “sparse and ambiguous” (Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987, p. 207; Mullen, 2008). Some of the benefits found to accrue to those junior faculty who had mentoring (as opposed to those who did not have mentoring) are: a higher level of career development, achievement of more success, publishing more books, acquiring more grants, and achieving more leadership positions outside of academe (Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987).

In their 1991 quantitative survey, Sands, Parsona, & Duane found four mentor functions that comprised faculty-to-faculty mentoring: Friend, Career Guide, Information Source, and Intellectual Guide. Scholars offer the low success rate of tenure-earning faculty as an indication of greater need for mentoring support for new and junior faculty (Johnson, 2008; Mullen, 2008); mentoring is especially indicated to support junior faculty from minority backgrounds (Espinoza-Herold & Gonzalez, 2007).

assembled a committee of mentors who had mentored junior faculty at Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing with the intent to develop an instrument to evaluate these mentorships and provide feedback for supporting their endeavor for promotion and tenure. The committee of mentors obtained consensus on a context-specific definition of mentoring as well as concrete, measurable responsibilities for academic-nursing mentors. A second team of researchers developed these items into two scales to measure specific outcomes of mentoring, producing two psychometrically sound and valid surveys for the protégés (junior Nursing faculty) that measure mentoring outcomes in the context of academic nursing.

Many mentoring scholars have noted—even criticized—the multifarious definitions of mentoring that occur between disciplines. Perhaps this proclivity many researchers seem to have for large-scale generalization of one monolithic operational definition of mentoring is a vestige of quantitative research based on statistically inferring qualities of a sample to that of a population. Given the idiosyncratic nature of disciplines, there are many aspects of phenomena that may not lend themselves to this type of inferential statistics study. In light of such a paradigm shift, the course of action taken by Berk, Berg, Mortimer, Walton-Moss,& Yeo, (2005) in order to study academic nursing mentoring seems exemplary: develop an operational definition of mentoring and indicators that are valid for a specific context, and proceed with sound research methodology.
**Mentoring from the Doctoral Student’s Perspective**

The quantity of extant research on the mentoring of doctoral students is considered limited (Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Mullen, 2007a; Wilde & Schau, 1991). Most doctoral students view their relationship with their dissertation advisor as the "most important aspect" of their doctoral program (Ignash, 2007, p. 217; Katz & Hartnett, 1976). Luna & Cullen (1998) surveyed 109 graduate students at a large comprehensive university and found that 90% of the students felt that having a mentor was not only important, but considered their relationship with faculty to be the most important determinant of quality in their graduate program. Many scholars agree that the mentoring relationship between a doctoral student and her or his mentor is an essential and important element in doctoral education (Bennouna, 2003; Green & Bauer, 1995; Kelly & Schweitzer, 1999; Phillips & Pugh, 1993; Rose, 2005; Stripling, 2004, Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997). Furthermore, the quality of doctoral student advising and mentoring can be crucial in the production of researchers (Tenebaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchins, 2008).

Mentoring is perceived to be instrumental in the successful completion of the doctoral program and dissertation (Cohen, 1995; Mullen, 2007b) and yet, mentoring for the doctoral student is frequently absent (Johnson, 2007a; Mullen, 2008). Supporting the efficacy of graduate-level mentoring, Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney (1997) surveyed 145 graduate students from 12 universities and found mentoring can be crucial to the success and advancement of doctoral students. The non-completion rate for doctoral students has been estimated at approximately 50% (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, &

In 1991, Judith Busch Wilde and Candace Schau followed up on Busch’s 1985 survey of faculty-mentors with a quantitative survey of doctoral student-protégés that also included two open-ended questions. Wilde & Schau (1991) asked faculty-mentors in colleges of education across the United States to identify doctoral student-protégés. From their national sample of protégés, 177 doctoral student-protégés responded to their survey. The 1991 survey was based on O’Neil’s (1981) theories regarding mentoring mutuality, comprehensiveness and congruence (as was Busch, 1985), as well as Kram’s 1985 career component. The purpose of this 1991 survey was to investigate the presence and importance of these four elements from the protégé’s perspective, and to see if gender and age as variables revealed any significant correlation. Their results confirmed the presence of O’Neil’s 1981 concepts of mutuality and comprehensiveness and Kram’s 1985 concepts of psychosocial and career support from the protégé’s perspective. The protégé’s also reported that they thought their mentoring relationship to be “very important” (Wilde & Schau, 1991, p. 176), as did the mentors in Busch’s 1985 study.

Not only do many graduate students consider getting mentored to be important, they can experience finding a mentor to be troublesome. Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney (1997) surveyed 145 graduate students in a variety of disciplines from 12 universities. Their survey included both scaled and open-ended responses. Besides revealing a demographic profile of the protégés and their mentors, overall, students
reported that they perceived their attempts to initiate a mentoring relationship with a professor to be “especially difficult” (Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997, p. 104). The researchers developed a typology of strategies used by graduate students to attempt to initiate mentoring, with the most frequently used strategy identified as “ensure contact with target [professor]” (Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997, p. 99). However, once a mentorship was established, the students reported a high level of satisfaction with the relationship, describing it as a pleasant, productive, meaningful, close friendship. Students also reported receiving more psychosocial mentoring support than career support.

Who Gets Mentored and How. Green & Bauer (1995) replicated Noe’s (1988) scale based on Kram’s (1985) theory, and measured the career and psychosocial functions that protégés report receiving from mentors. Noe’s scale was developed from 139 protégés (teachers) in the K-12 setting; however Green & Bauer collected data in the graduate school setting—in this case, 233 newly entering doctoral students in hard sciences and engineering at 24 Midwestern universities. Their study was unusual in that it was longitudinal (occurring over two years) and collected data when the doctoral students entered their Ph.D. programs, and at the end of their first and second years in their programs. At the entrance of the students into the doctoral program, Green & Bauer gathered the doctoral student’s verbal and quantitative GRE scores, their amount of prior research experience, as well as the students’ affective commitment to their graduate program and commitment to a career in research—all used in this study as indicators of student potential. Green & Bauer found that in the doctoral education setting there was a
stronger support for both the career and psychosocial mentoring functions than in Noe’s
1988 study of K-12 teachers, which might also be viewed as support for the importance
of mentoring in the doctoral education setting. More significantly, this study revealed
clear empirical data showing that students with higher GRE verbal scores, higher
commitment scores and more prior research experience reported more mentoring at the
end of their first year of their doctoral program. Other scholars have also noted (Johnson,
2007a) that there seems to be a tendency in graduate schools for the “best” students to
receive the most mentoring. This topic, as well as the idea of compensatory mentoring for
graduate students who may not be the “best” students, seems like it might be fertile
ground for more research. I included in Interview Protocol 1question #4 (What motivates
you to engage in these mentoring activities?) and Interview Protocol 1questions #6 (Can
you describe how you decide to be someone’s mentor?) in an attempt to elicit comments
from the mentors in my study addressing the apparent proficiency levels of the selected
protégés.

Most mentoring relationships are initiated by the protégé (Johnson & Huwe,
2003; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997). Rose (2003) contributed a significant
advancement to mentoring theory with her development of the Ideal Mentor Scale, an
investigation of the qualities protégé’s prefer in a mentor. Rose surveyed 712 doctoral
students from three large Midwestern Research I universities to develop a
psychometrically sound instrument that students may use to identify the qualities they
consider to be most important in a mentor. Rose’s analysis of the student responses
indicated that almost every student agreed on two universal qualities that defined a
mentor: communication skills and provision of feedback. Rose also found three individual dimensions of a mentor were important to the students: integrity, guidance, and development of a personal relationship with the protégé. The Ideal Mentor Scale might be helpful for graduate students to clarify the needs they have in a mentorship, and may be helpful in selecting congruent student-professor dyads for mentoring. The qualities mentors are looking for in the ideal protégé might be a productive focus for an empirical investigation, as well. In Interview Protocol 1 I included a follow-up probe to question #7 (Are there some general qualities of a protégé that you look for?) that may reveal some findings in this area.

**Benefits Students Receive from Mentoring.** The benefits that students receive from mentoring are often assumed in the literature; scholars have indicated the need for more empirical studies to confirm what is taken for granted (Merriam, 1983; Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987; Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001). Additionally, as previously discussed, most mentoring research has been done in the business setting. Benefits that protégés experience in the business setting were investigated by Eby & Lockwood (2005) who interviewed 39 protégés who participated in a formal mentoring program in a corporate business setting. The benefits the protégés reported included benefits noted by Kram (1985), as well as a few other benefits. Protégés reported benefiting in the assigned mentorship by or from: learning, friendship, acceptance, confirmation, counseling, coaching, exposure & visibility in the organization, modeling of key behaviors, career planning, networking opportunities, work role clarification, enhanced job performance, and pride in being selected.
In an early investigation of how students might benefit from mentoring relationships, Kelly & Schweitzer (1999) surveyed 670 graduate students from one large Midwestern university and found that students who were mentored earned better grades and received more fellowships. The students also had a significantly better perception of the academic climate in the university; this was especially true for non-Caucasian graduate students.

Luna & Cullen (1998) surveyed 109 graduate students enrolled at a large comprehensive university using a survey based on Kram’s (1985) theory of mentoring. The vast majority of the students (83%) indicated that it is important for graduate students to have mentors. Students were asked to identify who their mentor was and were asked to choose from: “Professor”, “Advisor”, “Friend”, “Employer”, “Spouse”, and other relatives. The largest responses occurred for “Advisor” (21%) and “Professor” (16%). In their article, Luna & Cullen do not indicate that they included any definition for “mentor” or “mentoring” in their survey. They also do not define “Advisor”—does this mean academic advisor, or dissertation advisor? This could explain why only 37% of the students indicated their mentor was an advisor or professor. Luna & Cullen did give a brief description of Kram’s five career functions (Sponsorship, Coaching, Protection, Exposure, and Challenging Work) and the four psychosocial functions (Role Modeling, Counseling, Acceptance and Confirmation, and Friendship), however the response rates the students gave for the presence of these functions only ranged from 5 to 13%. This low response rate may reflect the lack of an operational definition of a term such as “mentor” in the survey. Kram’s mentoring functions have been replicated and found in numerous
business and academic settings; a mentorship between spouses, family members or friends might provide other functions besides Sponsorship, Exposure, Challenging Work, et cetera, and may well be worth investigating.

In a survey of 205 faculty or staff mentors and 182 undergraduate protégés participating in a mentoring for retention and academic completion program at a large West Coast metropolitan university, Campbell & Campbell (2000) found that the undergraduate protégés evaluated the mentorship more positively than did the faculty/staff mentors. The protégés were also not aware that the mentor might enter the mentoring relationship to receive benefits as well. Gafney (2005) found a 50% overlap in the perceptions of the responsibilities of the mentor between undergraduate and graduate protégés and their research mentor. The research involving the perceptions of the graduate students indicates that graduate students do seem to be aware of the reciprocal nature of the mentorship whereby the mentor also benefits (Sorensen, 1995). Possible reasons why undergraduate protégés in the Campbell & Campbell (2000) study were unaware of benefits to the mentor might be a result of the students being involved in a formal mentoring program designed for their support and degree completion with assigned mentoring dyads (as opposed to an informal voluntary mentoring agreement between a graduate student and a professor), or even developmental differences between the demographics of undergraduates and graduates; this might be a fruitful area for more investigation.

The idea that graduate students benefit from mentoring has largely been assumed in the literature. In 2001, Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner endeavored to empirically verify
the accuracy of this assumption. Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner’s (2001) quantitative, self-report survey of 189 graduate students from nine departments ranging from the humanities to social & natural sciences (graduate students in Education were not included) at one large metropolitan university measured the graduate student’s perceptions of mentoring functions provided by their mentor, their satisfaction with their mentor and their working relationship, and the student’s scholarly productivity. Until Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner’s study, Kram’s (1985) two domains of mentor functions (career and psychosocial) remained a theoretical cornerstone of mentoring research; Tenebaum et al. found that a third mentoring function existed: networking (providing professional connections). They also found that career and network mentoring predicted the protégé’s scholarly activity, while psychosocial mentoring predicted greater satisfaction with the mentor and the working relationship. This study is one of the few that took a rigorous empirical look into the domain of academic mentoring, providing empirical support that students do benefit from academic mentoring.

*Mentoring From the Doctoral Faculty-Mentor’s Perspective.*

There is a paucity of extant research that gathers data directly from mentors regarding the costs and benefits of mentoring; scholars indicate more research on the outcomes for mentors is needed (Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Lentz & Allen, 2007). Most of the existing research studies on the benefits to the mentor are set in the business milieu; consequently scholars suggest there may be qualitative differences between mentorships that occur in the academic setting between students and faculty (Eby, Durley, Evans, & Ragins, 2008). Benefits for the mentor that Kram (1985) found in
the business setting included: psychosocial and technical support from loyal employees, personal satisfaction from passing on knowledge and help to the next generation, and recognition by peers for talent development.

An early exploration of the faculty-mentor’s experiences of mentoring was conducted by Judith W. Busch in 1985. Busch developed a survey based on O’Neil’s (1981) theories of mentoring, and distributed the survey to 1,088 professors at Research I universities (all of which had doctoral programs in Education) in 40 different states. The survey, designed to collect data on the faculty-mentor, was returned by 463 mentors (response rate: 42.5%). Busch’s findings generally supported O’Neil’s theory regarding the mentoring parameters of mutuality and comprehensiveness. Busch also suspected, like Kram (1985), a career component to be present in the typical mentoring relationship. Busch’s study revealed statistically significant relationships between variables such as age of the mentor (younger mentors reported more mutuality in their mentorships, while older mentors reported more comprehensiveness). Busch also found that professor’s who were themselves mentored as students were significantly more likely to have protégés.

Aside from the statistical results of Busch’s 1985 survey, some professors included comments that begin to address the perceptions of the mentors, and are therefore relevant to my study: mentors felt that mentoring was important to their protégés, and to themselves; mentors felt they gained personal satisfaction from witnessing the progress of the protégé; and mentors felt that mentoring stimulated themselves professionally to remain on top of their discipline. Some negatives mentioned by the mentors were: the time needed to sustain a mentorship, and protégés becoming too dependent on the
Although these comments were not systematically captured and analyzed using explicit qualitative methodology, Busch considered them remarkable enough to report them in the discussion of her study. These sentiments continued to be anecdotally reported in the literature over the years. What is needed is more data collected via sound methodology (Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987; Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997). In my study I endeavored to expand on Busch’s 1985 survey by methodically collecting and analyzing qualitative data that specifically address the perceptions of the faculty-mentors.

One landmark study that augmented the theoretical foundations of mentoring was Norman Cohen’s (1993) study in which he developed the *Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale*. Cohen developed the initial scale items for *The Principles of Adult Mentoring* (PAM) *Scale* from an extensive review of the extant literature on mentoring, adult education and counseling. He then executed a five-stage review process involving national scholars in mentoring, educators who had published or presented nationally in the field of mentoring, and mentors from a large urban community college mentoring program to validate the construct and content validity of the scale. The scale also proved to be statistically reliable.

Cohen sampled 123 professors from business, social & behavioral sciences, counseling & human services, humanities, life sciences/health, and physical sciences/math, as well as administrators in student services, and academic counselors at the Community College of Philadelphia. From his review of the literature and validation from experts, he found that the behavioral functions that mentors provide to their
protégés fall into six categories (sub-scales), which he labeled: 1) relationship emphasis, 2) information emphasis, 3) facilitative focus, 4) confrontive focus, 5) mentor model, and 6) student vision. Cohen’s *Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale* provided a valid and reliable way for mentors to assess their skills and competencies for mentoring adult students. One indication for future research recommended by Cohen (1993) himself was the area of dissertation mentors. My study supplements Cohen’s (1993) study by qualitatively examining the perceptions of College of Education mentor-professors in their experiences of mentoring doctoral degree completers. The interview protocols used in my study may further explore the mentors’ perceptions and experiences regarding: their relationship with the protégé, the information provided and exchanged with the protégé, facilitating or confronting the protégé’s potentials and challenges, modeling mentoring, and building the protégé’s self-vision.

**Benefits to the Mentor from Mentoring.** Benefits that purport to accrue to mentors in higher education are based largely on anecdotal reports; substantiation of benefits to higher education mentors that is based in empirical evidence is sorely lacking (Johnson, 2007b). Most of the extant research on benefits to mentors is from the business setting. Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs (1997) interviewed 27 mentors from municipal government; health care; and financial, communications, and manufacturing businesses who had been involved in an informal mentorship. They found that 92.5% of the mentors had themselves been mentored, and that benefits for mentoring as reported by the mentors grouped into two broad categories they labeled as: *other-focused benefits* (benefits to protégé’s job) and *self-focused benefits* (building of a support network, self-satisfaction, self-confidence, personal growth, increased social networks, recognition of personal contributions, personal development, renewed enthusiasm for work, self-motivation, greater job satisfaction, and professional growth).
and benefits to the mentor's job). Mentors also reported some negative outcomes from the mentorship: the amount of time investment needed in order to mentor; favoritism shown to the protégé can create animosity among other workers in the organization; occasional exploitation of the relationship by the protégé; and feelings of failure as a mentor. In my study I endeavored to gather similar information from a different population: faculty-mentors in the higher education setting who have engaged in mentoring with students who have completed their doctoral degree.

Eby & Lockwood (2005) interviewed 24 mentors & 39 protégés who participated in a formal mentoring program in the corporate setting (telecommunications and healthcare). Their findings agreed with and expanded some of Kram’s (1985) benefits to mentors in business organizations. Mentors reported their benefits from their assigned mentorship to be: personal learning, gaining new insights on the organization, developing a rewarding friendship, personal gratification, enhanced managerial skills, reflection on their own career, and a feeling of generativity. Angeliadias (2007) investigated elementary school special education teachers, and found that they also reported the benefit of learning from their mentorships. In this study I also sought to explore what professor-mentors report as benefits from their voluntary mentoring of doctoral students in a higher education context. I included Interview Protocol 1 question #2 (Typically, what is the mentoring experience like for you?), and question #4 (What motivates you to engage in these [mentoring] activities?) in an attempt to gather specific data on what mentors perceive to be benefits of the mentorship.
Motivations of the Mentor. Research that empirically verifies the motivations of mentors is limited and scholars are calling for further examination of mentor motivations in the higher education setting (Lentz & Allen, 2007). Again, most of the extant research on mentor motivations is in the business setting. Allen (2003) surveyed 239 female mentors who were members of professional business associations with an intention to reveal any possible correlations between certain prosocial personality traits (such as empathy and helpfulness) and the inclination to engage in mentoring. Allen’s study was significant in that it used a number of predictors based on various theories of personality and mentoring, it compared the traits of mentors with non-mentors, and it empirically revealed that some dispositional traits have predictive power even when factors derived from career (Kram, 1985) and life stage (Erikson, 1963; Levinson et al., 1978) theories are controlled. Specifically, Allen found that mentors who exhibited the self-enhancement motive showed a significant correlation with providing career mentoring; the implication here is that mentors may derive enhancement of their own professional reputation when their protégés’ excel in their careers. Mentors who exhibited intrinsic satisfaction showed a significant correlation with providing psycho-social mentoring; this seems to support the idea that mentors with intrinsic motivation tend to develop the personal and relational aspects of a mentorship. And the motive to benefit others correlated with both career and psychosocial mentoring provided.

Lima (2004) also investigated the personality and motivational characteristics (e.g., intrinsic satisfaction, career enhancement, benefit to others) of mentors and also found, like Allen (2003) did, that the self-enhancement and the benefit-others motivation
was related to providing career mentoring, while the intrinsic satisfaction motive was significantly related to mentor and protégé’s reports of psychosocial mentoring provided. Lima (2004) also found (unlike Allen) a relationship between the mentor’s intrinsic satisfaction motive and career mentoring. Lima’s study was unusual in that it was a quasi-experimental design wherein 91 undergraduate student-mentors were paired with student-protégé’s at a large metropolitan university: Students were paid to participate in a four-week mentoring program (experiment) and were randomly assigned to mentoring pairs. Lima collected pre- and post-test data, as well as weekly interval data (after the mentoring sessions) from multiple perspectives: from the mentor, the protégé, and a peer reviewer. Mentoring scholars have often called for a larger variety of mentoring studies such as quasi-experimental and experimental designs (Jacobi, 1991; Merriam, Thomas, & Zeph, 1987; Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001); however, the use of paid undergraduate subjects who are randomly assigned to mandatory mentoring dyads may be experimental conditions that limit the replication and generalizability of results to the context of adults who mentor voluntarily in the business and higher education settings, at least in regards to motivations for mentoring.

Personality variables relating to motivation to mentor were also investigated by Lentz (2007). Lentz surveyed 93 mentoring dyads via online survey, with most of the subjects employed in various types of government jobs, and found a positive correlation between mentors who scored high on self-efficacy measures and the providing of career mentoring. Mentors who had a higher learning goal orientation (i.e., who are predisposed to seek out new learning opportunities) also reported investing more effort and
involvement in the mentorship, and reported more benefits such as personal learning, mentorship learning (learning about being a mentor) and mentorship quality.

My study also endeavored to explore mentor’s motivations for mentoring (Interview Protocol 1 question #4 (What motivates you to engage in these [mentoring] activities?)), however through inductive qualitative interviews (rather than quantitative surveys and personality instruments) and focused on mentor-professors in the higher education context, rather than on mentors in various business professions. By directly inquiring about professors motivations to mentor and having the opportunity for follow-up and clarifying questions, I hoped that insight would be gained as to why these professors engage in extra-contractual mentoring responsibilities with their protégés.

Perceptions of the Mentor. The perceptions of the faculty-mentors—their experiences of voluntarily mentoring doctoral students—is the centerpiece of my study. Most mentoring studies that are situated in the education context examine the perceptions of the protégés, rather than the mentor (Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004). What follows here is a review of selected salient literature addressing the perspective of the mentor.

In 1995, Sorensen conducted a retrospective survey of 36 pairs of doctoral students and their mentor-professors in a college of education at one large research university. She found a positive correlation between the perceptions of the protégés and mentors: both parties reported significant agreement that psychosocial and career mentoring had occurred in their mentorships. One significant finding was that the lower the mentors scored on a satisfaction with life survey, the higher the students rated their
satisfaction with the quality of the mentoring they received. Apparently, mentors who perceived themselves as less satisfied with their life situation tended to engage in more psychosocial and career mentoring activities with their students.

Conversely, in a survey of 205 faculty or staff mentors and 182 undergraduate protégés participating in a mentoring for retention and academic completion program at a large West Coast metropolitan university, Campbell & Campbell (2000) found a lack of congruence between the perceptions of the faculty and the protégés, in that the faculty-mentors evaluated the mentorship less positively than did the undergraduate protégés, citing time availability and lack of student commitment as problematic. This may possibly be explained by the assigned mentoring situation in this study, and developmental differences between undergraduate and doctoral students.

In one significant empirical study investigating mentors’ positive mentoring experiences, Allen & Eby (2003) surveyed 392 mentors who were accountants and engineers in the business setting specifically regarding their perceptions of their own learning and quality of the mentorship. A key finding was that when the mentor perceived similarity between his/her interests, values and personality and the protégé’s, mentors consistently reported satisfaction with their own learning and the quality of the mentorship. (However, gender similarity revealed no significant correlation.) This is similar to the cloning effect noted by Kram (1985): the propensity for mentors (in the business sector) to select protégés they perceive to be similar to themselves. I was curious to see if my interviews of professor-mentors would reveal whether or not professors are likewise motivated by apparent similarity, or the desire to clone themselves.
In an effort to discover how student affairs professionals might compliment support services to graduate students without duplicating efforts, Bair, Haworth, & Sandfort (2004) interviewed 128 doctoral faculty, doctoral students, administrators, alumni, and alumni-employers seeking consensus on what the faculty roles seem to be in doctoral student education. Using purposive sampling and a semi-structured interview protocol to gather their interview data, this team of researchers concluded through the constant comparative method of analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) a congruence of four major thematic categories that describe the responsibilities and roles of doctoral faculty: selection and retention of students, defining and shaping of program culture, supporting the student’s scholarly activity and research productivity, and advising and mentoring students. In the interviews, faculty reported feeling a responsibility to develop the next generation of leaders in their disciplines, and to support the student’s development as individuals—a responsibility that clearly goes beyond basic academic advising into the realm of mentoring. My study extended this prior study by focusing on a clearly defined concept of mentoring (vs. advising) to describe and thereby expand the understandings of faculty who engage in mentoring.

Angeliadias (2007) interviewed six elementary school special education teachers and found that mentoring imparted to them perceptions of their own growth as a mentor, efficacy as an educator and mentor, enhanced commitment to education, increased job satisfaction, and enhanced teaching skills and sense of professionalism. The mentors in her study had all participated in a school district mentor training program. Since mentor training in higher education is notoriously absent (Cohen, 1995; Eby, Rhodes, & Allen,
2007; Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004; Galbraith & Cohen, 1995), I was interested to see if the responses of the faculty-mentors in my study differed significantly on some of these perceptions.

Eby, Durley, Evans, & Ragins (2008) contributed to mentoring theory development by developing a valid and reliable instrument to conceptualize and measure mentors’ negative mentoring perceptions. Eby et al. surveyed 80 mentoring dyads involved in higher education administration or academia and found 12 types of negative experiences for mentors that generally fell into three genres: protégé performance problems, interpersonal problems, and destructive relational patterns. They found negative experiences for both the mentor and the protégé to be inversely related to perceptions of relationship quality and fair exchange, and directly related to thoughts of exiting the relationship. The authors note, however, that even in good mentoring relationships, some negative exchanges may occur. In my study, I included a follow-up probe to Interview Protocol 1, question #2 (Were there any negative experiences for you as a mentor?) to see if any substantive data arose in this area.

Conclusion

Thus, the empirical literature regarding the domain of mentoring in general and mentoring in higher education in particular may largely be characterized as research that is generally quantitative in nature, relying predominantly on self-report surveys that investigate the perspectives of the protégé. The gap in the research literature that my study endeavored to address is the experiences of the doctoral student faculty-mentor
from a qualitative perspective, with the intent to understand the personal experiences and perspectives of the mentor from a phenomenological viewpoint.

Those scholars who have experienced mentoring doctoral students often consider the mentoring of students to be a moral obligation (Weil, 2001) as well as a privilege (Johnson, 2008; Mullen, 2008). Higher education reformers are calling for increased and better mentoring of doctoral students (Mullen, 2008; Nyquist & Woodford, 2000; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchins, 2008). In response, my study endeavored to systematically collect and analyze data on the experiences of faculty-mentors in an effort to understand their perceptions of their positive and negative mentoring experiences and motivations to engage in mentoring. It is my hope that increased understanding of this phenomenon may illuminate the benefits, disadvantages and motivations that faculty-mentors encounter, and thereby inform development of other faculty who might also endeavor to effectively mentor doctoral students to degree completion. Better understanding and support of faculty who engage in mentoring may also lead to increased number of doctoral-degree completers (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchins, 2008).

_From my Reflective Journal, October 29, 2007:_

Perhaps my mentor’s departure was essential for my next stage of growth. Perhaps it is necessary that I strike out on my own to accomplish my dissertation, in spite of how terrifying that situation initially appears to me. Perhaps it is a crucible for the penultimate formation of my own scholarly identity.
How could it *possibly* be necessary that she leave in order for me to learn how to become a mentor? That seems like the hard way to learn how to be a mentor. There must be clues, there must be tools she has left me along the way; I must search and re-search and search again to find them. One thing I do know: I have always been able to find a guru—a mentor—in books at least, if nowhere else. This student is ready: according to the Zen proverb, when the student is ready the teacher (mentor) appears. I’m ready! If my next task is to become a mentor, does that mean that the final stage of my grieving the loss of my mentor is now concluded? I’m ready!

I'm ready
Ready for the laughing gas
I'm ready
Ready for what's next
Ready to duck
Ready to dive
Ready to say
I'm glad to be alive
I'm ready
Ready for the push

In the cool of the night
In the warmth of the breeze
I'll be crawling around
On my hands and knees

She's just down the line ... Zoo Station
Got to make it on time ... Zoo Station

I'm ready
Ready for the gridlock
I'm ready
To take it to the street
Ready for the shuffle
Ready for the deal
Ready to let go
Of the steering wheel
I'm ready
Ready for the crush
Alright, alright, alright, alright
It's alright ... it's alright ... it's alright ... it's alright
Hey baby ... hey baby ... hey baby ... hey baby ...
It's alright
It's alright

Time is a train
Makes the future the past
Leaves you standing in the station
Your face pressed up against the glass

. . . I'm gonna be there ... Zoo Station
Tracing the line ... Zoo Station
I'm gonna make it on time ... make it on time ... Zoo Station
Just two stops down the line ... Zoo Station
Just a stop down the line ... Zoo Station

“Zoo Station” by U2 from the Zoo TV Tour Live From Australia.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Introduction

In this chapter, I describe the methods I used to collect and analyze data pertaining to the experiences faculty-mentors have when they mentor doctoral students who complete their degrees. I also explicate the reasons supporting my choice of method; choice of operational definition of mentoring; selection of participants; as well as the study’s design for data collection, storage, and analysis. This explication includes an exploration of the epistemological underpinnings of research paradigms and a suggestion that the qualitative research paradigm, as an orthogonal complement to quantitative studies, provides an opportunity to address a gap in the literature by focusing on the untapped resource of faculty-mentor perceptions of essential elements in the phenomenon of mentoring. Consideration of phenomenology as a theoretical framework further expands my explanation of this study’s research structure. Finally, this chapter addresses framing topics arising from the methodological context of the study, including research aspects related to validity, reliability, trustworthiness and ethics.

Exploratory Questions

As I illustrated in previous chapters, there is a dearth of mentoring literature regarding the perspective of the higher education faculty-mentor: The majority of mentoring studies in Higher Education have focused on the perspective of the student in the mentorship and have employed a quantitative methodological approach (usually
surveys) to collect data from the students (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983; Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Rose, 2003). The viewpoint of the faculty-mentor is only minimally represented in the research literature; research that utilizes qualitative approaches is also underrepresented in the research literature (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007). Additional exploration of the perspectives and motivations of faculty, especially research using diverse methods (non-quantitative methods), would expand the current knowledge base is this area (Allen, 2003; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Mullen, 2007b; Rose, 2003). This leads to my exploratory questions:

1. What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?

2. What variables influence those perspectives?

Qualitative Research

In this study I sought to describe and understand the experiences of participants who engage in the complex social phenomenon of mentoring (Berg, 2004; Creswell, 1998; Janesick, 2004). This is a noteworthy departure from the purposes of quantitative research which typically includes correlation, prediction, or proof of cause and effect (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). In fact, quantitative and qualitative research are considered to be diverse paradigms. The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2009) defines paradigm as: “a philosophical and theoretical framework of a scientific school or discipline within which theories, laws and generalizations and the experiments performed in the support of them are formulated”—a definition that seems to describe a quantitative perspective. From a qualitative perspective, Creswell (1998) defines paradigm as “a basic set of
beliefs or assumptions that guide … inquiries” (p.74). Moreover, Creswell states that these assumptions address:

- The nature of reality (the ontological)
- The relationship of the researcher to that being researched (the epistemological)
- The role of values in a study (the axiological)
- The process of the research (the methodological) (p. 74)

From the aforementioned diverse approaches to the concept of paradigm, we can begin to appreciate how quantitative and qualitative approaches to research might be orthogonal, disparate, and complementary to each other. What follows is a discussion of a few of these differences.

The Process (Method) of the Research

Methodology may be defined as: “a body of methods, rules, and postulates employed by a discipline: a particular procedure or set of procedures” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2009). Given the diverse nature of differing paradigms, we can expect that methodologies between research paradigms might also be varied. Quantitative research attempts to employ random selection of representative subjects in order to extrapolate findings to a larger population (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001); In qualitative research, purposive sampling is used to deliberately select subjects who are known to have experience with a particular phenomenon under study, and the findings may only ‘generalize’ to people who engage in the same or a similar phenomenon. In quantitative research designs, variables may be controlled—perhaps in a rigorous clinical setting—in order to see if a treatment variable causes any effect (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001); qualitative
studies may be done in a more naturalistic, uncontrolled setting where variables may emerge and their significance is understood through various inductive techniques (such as triangulation) and interpreted vis-à-vis the context of the phenomenon and the participants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003).

The Relationship of the Researcher to That Being Researched / The Nature of Reality

The idea that significant meanings or understandings may emerge from interpretation of data is an indication that qualitative inquiry may be a dynamic process involving both the researcher and the interviewee (Janesick, 2004; Kvale, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 1995)—another significant departure from the quantitative approach to epistemology. The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2009) defines epistemology as: “The study or a theory of the nature and grounds of knowledge especially with reference to its limits and validity”. Simply stated, epistemology concerns what knowledge is, and how it is produced. This is one reason why transparency of myself-as-researcher is relevant in this study. Instead of the idea that knowledge is some external Platonic fact (reality) to be proven or disproven through positivistic experiments (as in the quantitative paradigm), the qualitative research and phenomenology paradigms view knowledge (reality) as something that is created—or understood—by the participants (Berg, 2004; Kvale, 1996). In the qualitative paradigm, it is accepted that the researcher is an integral part of the research, and that all research (and researchers) are value-laden (Berg, 2004; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Therefore, it is standard in social science and qualitative research practice that as the researcher, I disclose my beliefs and biases as part of keeping them in check in the research process (Janesick, 1999).
The Role of Values in a Study

In the quantitative paradigm, research is thought to be objective and value-free: the researcher does not influence the experiment in any way, and the experiment is isolated from intervening variables in the environment. This is consistent with the principles Isaac Newton suggested in his 1687 treatise *The Principia: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* (in Cohen, Whitman & Budenz, 1999) wherein he postulated immutable, mechanistic laws void of influence by the observer regarding the movements of objects in motion (colloquially known as the ‘clockwork universe’, or ‘billiard ball’ laws of mechanics). However, when an object approaches the speed of light, Newton’s laws of classical physics are not accurate and the laws of special relativity take effect as postulated by Albert Einstein (Einstein, 1916 /2005); Furthermore, Werner Hiesenberg (1927) proposed in his ‘Copenhagen Interpretation’ of quantum mechanics that the presence of the researcher does influence the measurement of either the velocity or the location of an electron. These accepted scientific theories seem to contradict the laws of classical physics: suddenly the context of the phenomenon (e.g., acceleration to the speed of light) and the participant (e.g., the researcher) affect the experiment. The tenets of Relativity and Quantum Mechanics are not more ‘correct’ than the laws of classical Newtonian physics; rather quantum physics and classical physics are different paradigms wherein each empirical approach is ‘correct’ when applied to the respective domain of knowledge and knowledge production (epistemology). Furthermore, Kuhn (1970) described paradigms as *incommensurable*, meaning there is no basis for direct comparison between paradigms and therefore it is meaningless to evaluate one paradigm as better than another.
The same is true regarding quantitative inquiry versus qualitative inquiry: neither paradigm is more correct than the other, but rather, appropriate for producing the respective type of knowledge (epistemology). Qualitative inquiry seeks to describe or understand complex phenomenon (Berg, 2004; Creswell, 1998; Janesick, 2004); interviewing is one accepted methodology in this paradigm (Berg, 2004; Creswell, 1998; Janesick, 2004). The aim of my study was to utilize the interview method to increase the current understanding of the lived-experiences of professors who mentor doctoral students. By employing a qualitative approach I intended to provide a facet that is orthogonal—yet complimentary—to the largely quantitative research base on mentoring.

Theoretical Framework - Phenomenology

Phenomenology was first posited as a philosophy of science and a research method by Edmund Husserl in 1913. Husserl was originally trained in the positivist tradition as a mathematician, but, after the death of his son in World War I, offered phenomenology as a reform to the prevailing scientific thought of the day which he thought “needed a philosophy that would restore its contact with deeper human concerns” (Cohen & Omery, 1994, p.138). Husserl thought that phenomenology could “help even objective scientists clarify and critique their unclarified fundamental concepts and assumptions” (Cohen & Omery, 1994, p.137). This clarity of scientific assumptions is the first of Husserl’s four basic constants of phenomenology known as the ideal of rigorous science. The second constant of Husserl’s phenomenology is the concept of philosophic radicalism, the concept that “human experience contains a meaningful structure” (Cohen & Omery, 1994, p.137). The third constant is known as the ethos of radical autonomy, and signifies the idea that humans are “responsible for themselves, and for their culture”
(Cohen & Omery, 1994, p.138). The fourth constant is the respect for wonders, which refers to the uniquely human characteristic of ego and the quality of the ego being aware of itself and other beings; in Husserl’s words: “The wonder of all wonders is the pure ego and pure subjectivity” (in Cohen & Omery, 1994, p.138).

Since Husserl’s first conception of phenomenology in 1913, three major schools of thought have developed with slightly different research goals associated with each. Husserl’s application of phenomenology has come to be known as the eidetic, or descriptive school, wherein the goal of the research is the description of the meaning of an experience from the viewpoint of the experiencer that reveals the essential structures of the experience. When the experiences of several people all reduce to the same structures, then a case can be made that these structures are common to the experience.

In 1927 Martin Heidegger expanded Husserl’s original concept of phenomenology, which focused on the meaning made by individuals who engage in a certain experience, to include the larger context of the experiencer in the world. Hiedegger’s school of thought is referred to as hermeneutic, or interpretive, phenomenology and posits that the “subject under investigation possesses its meaning because of the context we supply for it” (Cohen & Omery, 1994, p.149). The hermeneutic school, therefore, enlarges the scope of interpretation to include such things as the culture of the experiencer. A third school of phenomenology is called the Dutch or Utrecht school, which combines features of both descriptive and interpretive phenomenology. Since I intended to both describe the meanings faculty-mentors seem to make from their experiences as well as interpret the meaning of the interviews in the
specific context of higher education in America, this third orientation toward interpretation seemed applicable for this study.

Method of Data Collection

To explore my exploratory questions, I selected a qualitative research design drawing from established phenomenological models, beginning with a brief request (see Appendix C) to recent doctoral gradates from Transition University’s College of Education to identify any faculty members who have served as a mentor during his or her doctoral studies. After obtaining informed consent from the nominated faculty-mentors, I conducted one pilot interview with a Transition U. College of Education faculty member whom a member of my dissertation committee identified as being a mentor, in order to pretest Interview Protocol 1 in terms of time feasibility and richness of data-gathering. I then proceeded to interview six more nominated faculty-mentors. I conducted a second round of interviews with the faculty-mentors with Interview Protocol 2 (see Appendix B), which also included any clarifying questions arising from my analysis of the data from the individual faculty-mentor’s first interview (Janesick, 2004; Kvale, 1996). This provided an opportunity for me to follow up with any comment that needed further clarification, (Janesick, 2004).

Operational Definition of Mentoring

This study also endeavored to address some of the previously described gaps and issues in the mentoring literature. One gap that is evident in the mentoring literature pertains to the operational definition of mentoring: this is often not well addressed or is missing completely in previously published studies (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983). In order to operationalise the definition of mentoring, as well as
differentiate between an “advisor” and a “mentor”, I analyzed the mentoring literature from several scholars paying particular attention to the qualities of mentoring versus advising relationships. These qualities are summarized in Table 1.

Thus, for use in this proposed study, **advising** was used to refer to the basic transactions between a faculty member and a doctoral student that include providing information on program and degree requirements, providing technical guidance regarding these requirements, and monitoring the student’s progress though the program (Johnson, 2007a; Weil, 2001) and **mentoring** was used to refer to a deliberate relationship between a doctoral faculty member and a doctoral student wherein the faculty member provides support that goes beyond the basic duties of advising with the intention of enhancing/promoting/supporting both the career and personal development of the student (Cohen, 1995; Johnson, 2007a; Kram, 1985).

This heightened awareness of advising versus mentoring activities was used to guide the development of Interview Protocol 1 (see Appendix A), to guide any probing questions, as well as my analysis of the interviews. It was my intention that the experience of faculty who engage in these types of mentoring behaviors listed in Table 1 (as opposed to purely advising behaviors) would be described in a richer, deeper, more nuanced manner in this study. Advising activities do not involve a close relationship (Johnson, 2007a). It is clear on Table 1 that, in contrast to the commonly understood academic function of *advising*, mentoring activities are concerned with creating an intentional, comprehensive, enduring *relationship*. This clarification from the literature between *advising* and *mentoring* served to guide the interviews and concomitant
Table 1
Advising vs. Mentoring Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising Activities</th>
<th>Mentoring Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor provides information on the program and degree requirements. (Johnson, 2007a; Weil, 2001).</td>
<td>Mentor provides social and emotional support. (Cohen, 1995; Johnson, 2007a; Kram, 1985; Paludi, Waite, Roberson, &amp; Jones, 1988).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising vs. Mentoring Activities</th>
<th>Offers a safe environment for self-expression.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor monitors advisee’s progress</td>
<td>(Johnson, 2007a; Weil, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor facilitates the student’s progress through the program.</td>
<td>Mentor provides a range of crucial career and relational functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor serves as the student’s primary contact point with the large faculty.</td>
<td>Mentor has deliberate intent to shape and develop the protégé’s career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interactions may be negative, neutral, insignificant or positive.</td>
<td>The mentorship generally produces positive career and personal outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

analysis with the intention of elucidating the difference between the two activities, and was consistent with my operational definition of mentoring.

Participant Selection

In order to identify faculty-mentors in the Transition University College of Education, I obtained a mailing list of doctoral students who graduated within the past seven years, mailed them a brief letter explaining my study and asked them to nominate any faculty member they have had in the Transition University College of Education who
had mentored them. This letter included a nomination form and postage paid return envelope addressed to me. On the nomination form, I asked the graduates if I may inform the faculty members of the name of the student who has nominated them as mentors. If the graduates agreed, this would allow me to concretize the interview questions for the faculty-mentors by informing them of the protégés who have identified them as mentors, thus providing more focused and specific reflections on the interview questions. Johnson, Rose & Schlosser (2007) suggest this methodological approach as an improvement over previous methods employed in mentoring studies.

Nomination Response Rate

The mailing list which I obtained from Transition University College of Education included the names and addresses of 308 doctoral graduates from the previous seven years, ranging from 2002 thru 2008. Of these 308 nomination requests to graduates which I mailed out, 46 were returned via postal mail as “undeliverable” with no forwarding address. (If a nomination letter was returned with a forwarding address, I resent the nomination letter to the graduate’s new address.) Therefore, the total number of doctoral graduates who had the opportunity to participate in the nomination process was 262. Graduates were allowed to indicate on the nomination form if no faculty member had mentored them during their doctoral studies at Transition University College of Education. The total number of returned nominations (including no-mentor) was 86, yielding a participation response rate of 32.82%. Graduates were allowed to nominate more than one mentor; as a result, the total number of nominations of mentors (with duplications) was 122. From these total responses, 59 discrete (unduplicated) mentors
were nominated. There were eight graduates who indicated that they had no mentor while at Transition University College of Education.

The 59 nominated mentors represented eight departments from Transition University College of Education, as well as three non-classifiable units (e.g., Graduate Studies, etc.). These departments, as well as the number of mentors nominated, are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Number of Mentors Nominated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological &amp; Social Foundations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Education and Literacy Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult, Career &amp; Higher Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Measurement &amp; Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassifiable Departments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominees No Longer At The Institution</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


terms for inclusion, exclusion and selection of the nominated faculty-mentors

A total of 59 discrete mentors were nominated; however, not all of the 59 mentors were eligible for participation in my study. In order to avoid any conflict of interest, I incorporated other criteria (Creswell, 1998) for my purposeful selection of faculty-
mentors. I excluded any nominee who was a member of my major and cognate departments (Adult, Career and Higher Education; and Educational Leadership, respectively), as well any nominee who was on my dissertation committee. I also excluded nominees who were no longer at Transition University College of Education (either due to retirement or job change), as well as nominees who were at satellite campuses, as this would have necessitated approval of a multi-site research study. I did not apply for a multi-site study on my application to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and therefore, I could not include these nominees as part of my study.

In order to select the (eligible) mentors whom I would ask to participate in my study, I listed the nominees in order of number of nominations (greatest to least) and sent the Explanatory Letter to Interviewees (see Appendix D) to the six mentors who received the highest numbers of nominations. The rationale for this is that triangulation of multiple nominations would seem to indicate a greater probability that the faculty-mentor is indeed participating in mentoring activities with doctoral students. Seeing as there was no dramatic difference between the number of female (31) versus male (28) mentors nominated out of the grand total (59) nominees, I selected the three female and three male eligible nominees with the highest number of nominations to send my first requests to allow me to interview them (for two 45-60 minute interviews) regarding their experiences as a faculty-mentor. My goal was to obtain a minimum of at least five faculty-mentors to participate in my study.

All six of the top-nominated mentors agreed to participate in my study. However, one of the male professors was not available for the second round of interviews, and thereby attritioned out of my study. As a consequence of this, I included the pilot
interviewee in the second round of interviews. This kept the number of participants at six, however it altered the gender mix to two male and four female faculty-mentors. Table 3 summarizes the department and gender of the final six participants, in the order of most nominations.

Table 3

Selected Faculty Mentors’ Departments and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor’s Department</th>
<th>Mentor’s Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Education and Literacy Studies</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Education and Literacy Studies</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Measurement &amp; Research</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological &amp; Social Foundations</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Education and Literacy Studies</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interview Format*

The first interview I conducted was with a faculty-mentor designated by a member of my committee and was a practice or pilot interview (Janesick, 2004; Kvale, 1996); as it turned out, she was also a mentor nominated by the graduates. A pilot interview helps to determine the length I can expect the interview to take, as well as ascertain that my interview protocol is providing sufficiently rich data.

After conducting the pilot interview, I uploaded the digital voice file to the transcription service and paid extra for a 24-hour turnaround on the interview transcript. When I received the transcript the next day, I read the transcript while at the same time
listening to the digital voice file (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). This verification process assures that the transcriptionist has correctly transcribed the interview data. I found only a few, very minor corrections to be made to the transcription. I repeated this data verification process with every interview transcription (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009), and was pleased to find very few corrections were needed. For example: instead of the name of the Hungarian psychologist, “Csikszentmihalyi”, the transcriptionist wrote “chicks in the hives”, which I corrected in the transcription.

Since this was my pilot interview, I then examined my data-transcript to see if my interview Protocol 1 (see appendix A) or interview process needed any alteration or revision (Janesick, 2004; Kvale, 1996). As I was listening to the digital voice file and verifying the accuracy of the transcription (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009), I copied and pasted phrases from the transcript into my researcher reflective journal. I then examined the key phrases I extracted from the data and noted several mentoring concepts and theories, as well as other theories (educational and psychological) that were present in the interviewee’s responses. As a result of my analysis, I concluded that my interview protocol was sufficient to address the purpose of my research and research questions, and that a 60-minute interview would be adequate to collect rich data.

I then proceeded to schedule the rest of the first round of interviews with the six nominated faculty-mentors. My rationale for interviewing six faculty-mentors was to provide triangulation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Janesick, 2003; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001; Merriam, 1998, Mullen, 2005a; Stake, 2003) of findings between participants to address validation issues for qualitative studies of this nature. Triangulation is the use of “multiple and different [data] sources, methods, investigators and theories to provide
corroborating evidence” (Creswell, 1998, p. 202). In this study, I collected data (interviews) from six data sources (six different mentors). If multiple data sources respectively report a certain theme, then evidence for a common element in the phenomenon of mentoring may be supported via triangulation of this data. Thus, triangulation may use any or several combinations of different “methodological practices, empirical materials, perspectives, and observers” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 8). I also asked participants for any documentation of their activities with their mentees (e.g., a copy of their curriculum vitae with student co-authored papers and presentations highlighted), which, along with my researcher reflective journal and field notes, are other data sources that might provide triangulation.

To support the validity of the inquiry, I followed a (semi-structured Berg, 2004) or semi-standard (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) interview protocol (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) or schedule (Berg, 2004):

Interview Protocol 1 (see also Appendix A)

1. [Name of doctoral student] has nominated you as a mentor. Can you describe to me how you view your role as a mentor to [name of student?] Or, if permission was not given to use the student’s name: Can you describe to me how you view your role as a mentor to doctoral students? (This question arises from the mentoring literature, which states that mentors make a deliberate decision to engage in a mentoring relationship: Aagaard & Hauer, 2003; Cohen, 1995; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Johnson, 2002; Johnson, 2007a; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Paludi, Waite, Roberson, & Jones, 1988; Rose, 2003. It is also a typical
phenomenological question to elicit *description* of the phenomenon of being a mentor: Creswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996; Janesick, 2004.)

2. When you were a mentor to *[name of student]*, what was the mentoring experience like for you? Or, if permission was not given to use the student’s name: Typically, what is the mentoring experience like for you? (This question is a representative phenomenological question providing *description* of the experience of mentoring: Creswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996; Janesick, 2004.)
   a. Follow-up probing question: Were there any negative experiences for you as a mentor?

3. *[Name of doctoral student]* has nominated you as a mentor. (Or, if permission was not given to use the student’s name: Think of a specific mentoring relationship that you felt worked well.) What type of activities do you typically engage in with *[name of student]* (or: doctoral students) whom you mentored and what do you consider to be your most effective or important mentoring activities? (This question arises from the literature referenced in this paper, which states that mentors make a deliberate decision to engage in a mentoring relationship: Aagaard & Hauer, 2003; Cohen, 1995; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Johnson, 2002; Johnson, 2007a; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Paludi, Waite, Roberson, & Jones, 1988; Rose, 2003. It is a phenomenological question that seeks to describe *the experience* of the participant: Creswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996; Janesick, 2004. It is also an *experience/example question* intended to elucidate facets of the mentoring experience for the mentor: Janesick, 2004.)

66
4. What motivated you to engage in these activities [with name of student, if permission is given to use the name]? (This question arises from the literature referenced in this paper, which states that the motivations for faculty to engage in mentoring are not yet well known or understood: Allen, 2003; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007. It is a phenomenological question that seeks to describe the experience of the participant: Creswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996; Janesick, 2004. It is also a structural/paradigmatic question that seeks to describe the experience of mentoring: Janesick, 2004.)

5. How did you learn to mentor? (This question has implications for the training of mentors in higher education. It is a phenomenological question that seeks to describe the experience of the participant: Creswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996; Janesick, 2004. It is also a structural/paradigmatic question that seeks to describe the experience of mentoring: Janesick, 2004.)

6. Can you describe how you decided to be [name of student’s mentor?] / to be someone’s mentor? (This question arises from the literature referenced in this paper, which states that mentors make a deliberate decision to engage in a mentoring relationship: Aagaard & Hauer, 2003; Cohen, 1995; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Johnson, 2002; Johnson, 2007a; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Paludi, Waite, Roberson, & Jones, 1988; Rose, 2003. It is a phenomenological question that seeks to describe the experience of the participant: Creswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996; Janesick, 2004. It is also a structural/paradigmatic question that seeks to describe the experience of mentoring: Janesick, 2004.)
a. Follow-up probing question: Are there some general qualities of a protégé that you look for?

b. Do you have any documents or artifacts from your mentoring relationships that you can share with me?

7. Is there anything else you want to tell me at this time? (This question is a standard interview and phenomenological question: Creswell, 1998; Kvale, 1996; Janesick, 2004.)

I followed up with probing questions when appropriate, for example, to provide clarification or to ask for an example to illustrate what the interviewee was saying (Berg, 2004; Kvale, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). I had all the first-round interviews transcribed, as in the aforementioned description of the pilot interview process, except that I did not pay extra for a 24-hour turn-around on the transcripts ($2.00 per minute), as this was too cost prohibitive. I collected the first round of interviews over a period of 11 weeks, partly due to the time needed for the pilot testing procedure of my Interview Protocol 1, as well as the peripatetic summer schedules of the 10-month contracted faculty-mentors. For most of the transcriptions I paid the “budget” price ($1.00 per minute) that provides approximately a 2-week turnaround on the transcription; however as the end of the scheduled interviews drew near, I paid the intermediary price for a “6-day” turnaround ($1.50 per minute) on the last few interview transcripts, as I was anxious to have all the first-round interview data on hand in order to begin the second round of data collection.

I proceeded with an intermediate examination of the data from the first round of interviews, noting in my researcher reflective journal any mentoring and theoretical
themes that emerged (as previously described for the pilot interview), as well as any areas that I felt needed further detail or clarification from the interviewees (Janesick, 2004.) I found the second round of interviews to be an essential opportunity to gather further description and clarify a few comments by the interviewees in the first round of interviews, as well as verify that I understood certain meanings I felt the mentors were expressing. If I needed to clarify any comments from the second interview, I sent a brief email to the mentor asking for clarification and included the appropriate section of the transcription. I included clarifying follow-up questions to the interviewee’s first interview under the respective Protocol 2 question listed here:

    Interview Protocol 2 (see Appendix B)

1. In revisiting our first interview is there anything you wish to add to your statements on mentoring?

2. How would you define the term "mentor"?

3. In the ideal, what would help insure excellent mentoring?

4. When you think about your life as a mentor, what can you tell future mentors?

Questions # 1 and # 4 in Interview Protocol 2 are standard qualitative and phenomenological second interview follow-up questions (Janesick, 2004) aimed at gleaning any summative perceptions the participants might have of the phenomenon of mentoring. I included question # 2 (“What is your personal definition of mentoring?”) in order to afford the interviewee a chance to step back for a moment and provide a contrasting deductive reflective aspect to the inductive interview process. I included Question # 3 (“In the ideal, what would help insure excellent mentoring?”) to address the phenomenological perceptions that the interviewees might have (Kvale, 1996) regarding
current issues in the mentoring of doctoral students (Johnson, 2007a). Prior to the second interview (as with the first interview), I emailed the faculty-mentor a copy of Interview Protocol 2 for their perusal before the interview, in case they felt inclined to preview it. I competed the second round of interviews in four weeks (during the month of September), largely due to the fact that the faculty-mentors had resumed their regular academic schedules and therefore were more easily contacted for an interview appointment. Also, by the conclusion of the second interview, I made sure to obtain a copy of their curriculum vitae as another possible data source, and asked them to highlight any publications or presentations in which they have collaborated with their students.

Analysis / Description / Interpretation

I began the analysis process with reflective journaling on my own experience of the phenomenon of mentoring in general, and my own experience of each of the interviews in particular (Creswell, 1998). This provides transparency for my self-as-researcher (Creswell, 1998; Eisner, 1991; Janesick, 2004; Kvale, 1996; Merriam, 1998; Piantanida & Garman, 1999) and allows for bracketing—a revelation and setting aside—of my own personal prejudgments (Creswell, 1998) as a way of monitoring researcher bias.

I analyzed each pair of interview transcripts (first and second round interviews for each faculty-mentor) together as a single case, in order to first build a phenomenological description and understanding of each of the six participants (cases). In regards to the specific method I used to analyze the data, I chose the method described by Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) in their book Inter Views (second edition). To make Kvale &
Brinkmann’s description as clear as possible for the reader, I have inserted my own enumeration of the steps and the topic of my own inquiry into the following passage:

Five steps are involved in this empirical phenomenological analysis. First (1) the whole interview is read through to get a sense of the whole. Then (2) the natural ‘meaning units’ of the text, as they are expressed by the subjects, are determined by the researcher. Third (3), the theme that dominates a natural meaning unit is restated by the researcher as simply as possible, thematizing the statements from the subject’s viewpoint as understood by the researcher. The fourth (4) step consists of interrogating the meaning units in terms of the specific purpose of the study. [The guiding questions of this study are ‘What elements constitute the perspectives on mentoring by selected doctoral faculty-mentors?’ and ‘What variables influence those perspectives?’]. In the fifth (5) step, the essential, nonredundant themes of the entire interview [are] tied together into a descriptive statement. (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, pages 205-207)

As Kvale stated in the first edition of Inter Views (1996), ‘The method thus involves a condensation of the expressed meanings into more and more essential meanings of the experience [of mentoring]’ (Kvale, 1996, page 194). This is consistent with Creswell (1998) and many other scholars who have written regarding inductive data analysis in qualitative research (Janesick, 2003; Merriam, 1998; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). Figure 1 summarizes the steps I used in the phenomenological analysis for each faculty-mentor.
I then analyzed the interviews for recurring themes within and between participants and synthesized the data into appropriate composite conclusions regarding the description and understanding of the experiences of the faculty-mentors. I also made note of mentor’s experiences that were not completely common among all participants and analyzed these for any meaning that might be added to the study (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Kvale, 1996).
Member-Check

After my analysis of both interviews for each participant, I emailed my phenomenological analysis and descriptive statement to each faculty-mentor, along with transcripts of their respective interviews. In the descriptive statement, I presented each participant with the essential meanings that emerged from my analysis of their interviews, and ask them to confirm these essential meanings. This is known as a member-check (Janesick, 2004) and is one method used to validate my analysis of the data. I also asked each interviewee to respond with any comments they might have, thus providing an opportunity to add further comments as a form of data-gathering and triangulation.

Researcher Field Notes and Reflective Journal

As the researcher, and a main instrument of the research (Janesick, 2004; Kvale, 1996; Merriam, 1998), I kept a journal of my thoughts, feelings and observations in the fieldwork throughout the study. During the interviews I also wrote “notes to myself” in my interview notes (Janesick, 2004). “Notes to myself” are field notes made in the side-bar of the interview notes and typically include body language and facial expressions that are not captured on the tape recording of the interview. Notes to myself, field notes and reflective journaling on the interviews and interaction with participants in general may provide affective data that is not captured by the digital voice recorder. It may also reveal any bias I may have as the researcher.

Janesick (1999) offers these recommendations of how researchers can benefit from the use of reflective journaling:
1. Journal writing allows for the refining the understanding of the role of the researchers through reflection and writing, much like an artist might do. (p. 506)

2. Journal writing allows for deepening knowledge of whatever subject matter the researcher takes part in. (p. 523)

3. Journal writing allows participants in a research project an active voice. (p. 523)

4. Journal writing provides an additional data set to outline, describe, and explain the exact role of the researcher in any given project. (p. 523)

It is in the practice of reflective journaling that a researcher may explore and verbalize her research assumptions, express and set aside (bracket) her own personal beliefs, and begin the data analysis process (Janesick, 1999: Janesick, 2004).

Role of the Researcher

In a qualitative phenomenological study, the researcher is typically viewed as a main instrument of inquiry (Creswell, 1998; Eisner, 1991; Janesick, 2004; Kvale, 1996; Merriam, 1998; Piantanida & Garman, 1999). The researcher as the main research instrument is quite a departure from the assumptions of quantitative inquiry, wherein the researcher is viewed as a neutral and detached observer. Rather, in qualitative investigations the researcher is “an interpretive inquirer, much like a tuning fork, [who] resonates with exquisite sensitivity to the subtle vibrations of encountered experiences” (Piantanida & Garman, 1999, p. 140). As I have already discussed in the Background: Personal Perspective section above, I identify myself as a doctoral student, a lifelong learner, and a protégé who has experienced several years of mentoring at the
undergraduate and graduate level. This is the researcher-self I bring to this study that provided a basis for my engagement and sense-making in the study. In general, reflective journaling and field notes may provide self-understanding and self-disclosure (Piantanida & Garman, 1999) which might further elucidate my self-as-the-researcher along the journey of the inquiry. Reflective journaling may also provide recollection, introspection and conceptual reflection (Piantanida & Garman, 1999) vis-à-vis the collected interview data. My transparency (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) in discussing my self-as-the-researcher and my reflections are part of what provides “unique, personal insight into the experience under study” (Eisner, 1991, p.33). Any bias that surfaced from my field notes and reflections was disclosed and discussed within the study. I attempted to give rich descriptions of the interviewees in the hopes of providing a very humanistic description of the mentors and mentoring activities.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical practice of research became a prominent issue in the Nuremberg war crimes trials of 1946 wherein concentration camp physicians and administrators were prosecuted for conducting experiments on prisoners without their consent. Since then, there have been numerous iterations of ethical protocols for conducting research studies. *The Belmont Report* (1979) is a landmark statement in the area of research ethics, and broadly summarizes the current issues that researches must be aware of when conducting research involving human subjects. Table 4 summarizes the tenets of *The Belmont Report*:
### Table 4

#### The Belmont Report – Main Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Application to Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect for Persons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals should be treated as autonomous agents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Persons with diminished autonomy are entitled to protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subjects, to the degree that they are capable, must be given the opportunity to choose what shall or shall not happen to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The consent process must include three elements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o information,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o comprehension, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o voluntariness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human subjects should not be harmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research should maximize possible benefits and minimize possible harms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The nature and scope of risks and benefits must be assessed in a systematic manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The benefits and risks of research must be distributed fairly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There must be fair procedures and outcomes in the selection of research subjects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their *Ethical Principles for Research Involving Human Participants* (n.d.) the University of Plymouth (UK) further elucidates the three major principles from *The Belmont Report*. Table 5 itemizes issues that are typically also present in qualitative studies.

**Table 5**

Summary of *Ethical Principles for Research Involving Human Participants*

1. **Informed Consent**: The researcher should, where possible, inform potential participants in advance of any features of the research that might reasonably be expected to influence their willingness to take part in the study.

2. **Openness and Honesty**: So far as possible, researchers should be open and honest about the research, its purpose and application.

3. **Right to Withdraw**: Where possible, participants should be informed at the outset of the study that they have the right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

4. **Protection from Harm**: Researchers must endeavour to protect participants from physical and psychological harm at all times during the investigation.

5. **Debriefing**: Researchers should, where possible, provide an account of the purpose of the study as well as its procedures. If this is not possible at the outset, then ideally it should be provided on completion of the study.

6. **Confidentiality**: Except with the consent of the participant, researchers are required to ensure confidentiality of the participant’s identity and data throughout the conduct and reporting of the research.
7. Ethical Principles of Professional Bodies: This set of principles is generic and not exhaustive of considerations which apply in all disciplines. Where relevant professional bodies have published their own guidelines and principles, these must be followed and the current principles interpreted and extended as necessary in this context.


Beyond the purview of the actual data collection in a research study, the American Educational Research Association (AERA) describes ethical procedures for researchers, in general. The following is a list of excerpts from the AREA’s Ethical Standards (n.d.) that are specific to a research study:

- Educational researchers must not fabricate, falsify, or misrepresent authorship, evidence, data, findings, or conclusions.

- Educational researchers should attempt to report their findings to all relevant stakeholders, and should refrain from keeping secret or selectively communicating their findings.

- Educational researchers should report research conceptions, procedures, results, and analyses accurately and sufficiently in detail to allow knowledgeable, trained researchers to understand and interpret them.

- Educational researchers’ reports to the public should be written straightforwardly to communicate the practical significance for policy, including limits in effectiveness and in generalizability to situations, problems, and contexts. In writing for or communicating with non-researchers, educational researchers must
take care not to misrepresent the practical or policy implications of their research or the research of others.

As the researcher, I endeavored to conduct the research in an ethical manner, being respectful of the participants in the study. Kvale (1996) designates three general areas for consideration when conducting a study involving interviews: informed consent, confidentiality, and consequences. What follows is a brief discussion of each of these issues, as it relates to my study.

_Informed Consent:_ As part of my research design, I applied to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for permission to conduct this research. Besides participating in mandatory research ethics training, I was required to provide an informed consent letter to each of the graduates and faculty-mentors I asked to participate in my study. This informed consent letter explained the overall purpose and design of my investigation, as well described any possible risks or benefits to subjects as a result of their participation. It also explained that their participation in the study was voluntary, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time, should they wish to, with no repercussions. Since the subjects in this study were neither minors, nor did they belong to any vulnerable populations, each participant was asked to sign and return the informed consent statement to me as a requirement for participation in the interviews.

_Confidentiality:_ As an ethical consideration, the names of the institution and the mentors interviewed remained confidential and anonymous. The names of the graduates also remained confidential, unless they agreed on the informed consent statement to allow me to notify the faculty-mentor of their name. In my research report, I provide enough basic demographic information about the institution and the mentors, but not
enough information as to make identification of the institution and participants possible. Under the protection of confidentiality and anonymity, it was my hope that the mentors would feel safe disclosing any negative experiences they may have had as mentors, thus further illustrating their experiences as mentors. If a mentor did discuss a negative experience I reacted in a non-judgmental way in an effort to build trust and create an environment of security so that the mentor would feel safe discussing something that may be a very important aspect to the mentoring experience. Regarding the transcribing of the interview recording, I also made sure that pseudonyms of the interviewees were used in the interview, thereby further protecting confidentiality.

Consequences: This refers to the notion that participation in an investigation should not only have minimal-to-no risk of harm to the subject, but that participation should also provide some sort of benefit to the participant. Various benefits that a researcher may offer an interviewee are: a copy of the interview tape and transcript, a copy of the final research report, or even a modest gift after the completion of the interviews (Janesick, 2004), such as a $10.00 gift certificate to a local coffee shop. I offered all these benefits to the faculty-mentors who participated in this study.

Assumptions

In reference to the domain of research, Leedy & Ormrod (2001) define an assumption as: “a condition that is taken for granted, without which the research project would be pointless” (p. 7). For example, within the quantitative paradigm the concept that reality is a fixed singularity that exists apart from the existence of the researcher/subject is so self-evident to quantitative researchers that we rarely find any statement of the nature of reality in quantitative research reports (that is, excluding quantum physics).
However, qualitative researchers approach research from a different worldview that may be described as a different perspective—a perpendicular or orthogonal perspective—and therefore presume very different (perpendicular or orthogonal) assumptions. Since assumptions influence methodology (how evidence is gathered) and epistemology (what is knowledge and how it is created), a discussion of the assumptions of qualitative inquiry is in order.

Assumptions of the Qualitative Paradigm

Creswell (1998) describes five philosophical assumptions that undergird the qualitative research paradigm. In the section above labeled Qualitative Research I have discussed four of these assumptions: the ontological, the epistemological, the axiological and the methodological. Creswell labels the fifth assumption of the qualitative paradigm the rhetorical; this indicates that the style of language and the research terminology may differ and are particular to each paradigm. Since I have already discussed these assumptions, in Table 6, I provide Creswell’s (1998, p. 75) chart as a review and summary.

The philosophical underpinnings (assumptions) of a paradigm ultimately delimits the type of research questions formulated, how evidence is gathered and analyzed, and what may be concluded as knowledge, or, as Eisner (1994) states, it “biases the evidence one is able to take into account” (p. 97). Therefore it is important that researchers be aware of the assumptions and limitations of their research paradigm. When researchers understand the delimitations of one research paradigm, then the utility and importance of having another research paradigm is evident as another complimentary or orthogonal
Table 6
Philosophical Assumptions of the Qualitative Paradigm with Implications for Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Implications for Practice (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontological</td>
<td>What is the nature of reality?</td>
<td>Reality is subjective and multiple, as seen by participants in the study.</td>
<td>Researcher uses quotes and themes in words of participants and provides evidence of different perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the relationship between the researcher and that being researched?</td>
<td>Researcher attempts to lessen distance between himself or herself and that being researched.</td>
<td>Researcher collaborates, spends time in the field with participants, and becomes an “insider”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axiological</td>
<td>What is the role of values?</td>
<td>Researcher acknowledges that research is value laden and that biases are present.</td>
<td>Researcher openly discusses values that shape the narrative and includes own interpretation in conjunction with interpretations of participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Philosophical Assumptions of the Qualitative Paradigm with Implications for Practice (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical</th>
<th>What is the language of research?</th>
<th>Researcher writes in a literary, informal style using the personal voice and uses qualitative terms and limited definitions.</th>
<th>Researcher uses an engaging style of narrative, may use first-person pronoun, and employs the language of qualitative research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodological</td>
<td>What is the process of research?</td>
<td>Researcher uses inductive logic, studies the topic within its context, and uses an emerging design.</td>
<td>Researcher works with particulars (details) before generalizations, describes in detail the context of the study, and continually revises questions from experience in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


perspective for gaining knowledge, as it addresses different research questions, evidence, and understandings.

Assumptions of Phenomenology

Since phenomenology is a subset of the qualitative paradigm, the aforementioned assumptions of qualitative research are also assumptions of phenomenology.

Additionally, phenomenology assumes that human experiences contain meaning and that
within the multifarious details of the daily lived-experience of, for example, a mentor, lies essential elements (meanings, experiences or structures) that are common between all mentors (Merriam & Associates, 2002). Thus, the aim of this phenomenological study is to identify the basic elements (essences or structures) of the experience of being a faculty-mentor that are common among faculty-mentors, thereby rendering a description of the experience and the meaning faculty-mentors make of the experience (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001).

**Personal Assumptions of the Researcher**

In previous sections of this chapter I have explored various perspectives on the importance of uncovering assumptions and consciously examining how assumptions frame the worldview of the researcher. Concerning my own presence in the study in the formal role of self-as-researcher, I concur with the aforementioned assumptions of the qualitative and phenomenological research perspectives. I have also reflected upon my own assumptions regarding mentoring, which are based on 12 years of experience in various higher education academic mentorships. What follows here are my personal assumptions based on this experience. Since I have never been a mentor, but rather always the protégé, my personal assumptions about mentoring are informed by the experiences of a protégé.

1. Mentoring is a developmental relationship wherein the protégé seeks guidance and support from the mentor, to assist in actualizing certain professional academic goals.

2. Since mentoring is a developmental relationship, the protégé typically experiences personal growth along with professional growth. I believe this
is facilitated due to an unspecified minimum degree of quality of interaction and quantity of contact time that is shared. The degree of quality and quantity of contact time may be highly variable, and yet still constitute a quality mentorship.

3. A developmental relationship indicates that the protégé will be gaining new experience and knowledge that is guided by the mentor’s expert experience and knowledge. As such, undoubtedly the protégé will make mistakes. The mentor may make mistakes, as well, as relationships contain the opportunity for miscommunications and misunderstandings. Both parties would benefit from overt articulation of a mutual understanding to the effect that innocent mistakes might occur and will be forgiven in the interest of preserving a positive and productive working relationship.

4. A mentorship is like any other relationship: the longer it continues, the more opportunity there is to discover things about each other that can potentially lead to interpersonal conflict or divergent perspectives. This is normal. If a protégé trait or behavior needs correction, a mentor may try to address the issue in the most proactive, positive and constructive way possible; the protégé should remain open and responsive to positive, constructive criticism.

5. Relationships require time and effort, which at times may be in short supply. Both protégés and mentors would benefit from mutually respectful planning conversations where each is apprised of the other’s time commitments beyond the dissertation project and each contributes to a
mutual understanding of realistic expectations about work aspects such as time estimates for document production and turnaround times for feedback.

6. The mentor and protégé have similar goals: the development of a student into a professional colleague. The protégé should be happy to serve the mentor, just as the mentor serves the protégé.

7. The obvious beneficiary of a mentorship is the protégé; however, mentors can and should benefit from the mentorship, as well.

As an experienced protégé, I found that the reflective exercise of articulating my personal assumptions provided me with an informed context for the investigation of the phenomenon of being a mentor; I am very curious about what it might be like to “walk a mile in the mentors’ shoes” and to gain insight into their world.

Reliability, Validity, Generalizability, Bias

As might be expected, just as the qualitative paradigm addresses research questions, methods and assumptions that differ from the quantitative paradigm, the qualitative research approach to criteria for evaluating a study also differs from the quantitative approach (validity and reliability). In the quantitative paradigm, reliability refers to consistent results from multiple trials of the same experiment (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001); however, in the qualitative paradigm, exact replication of results is not expected between cases (Merriam & Associates, 2002). Rather, reliability is regarded as other researchers “concurring that given the data collected, the results make sense—they are consistent and dependable” (Merriam & Associates, 2002, p. 27) with the design and execution of the study. In the qualitative paradigm, then, reliability addresses each and every component part of the research design (research question, methods, analysis,
interpretation, and conclusion) as each part builds upon the next in an appropriate and logical manner. Ultimately, the researcher must provide ample evidence to convince the reader that a “logic of justification” (Piantanida & Garman, 1999, p. 105) has been demonstrated throughout the inquiry.

*External validity* is the term that is used in the quantitative paradigm to describe *generalizeability*, which is the ability to infer that the results of an experiment done on a randomly selected, small, but representative sample of subjects is also true for the larger population out of which the sample was drawn (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Since participants in qualitative studies are usually not randomly selected, in the qualitative paradigm it is more appropriate to expect *reader or user generalizeability*. In this case, readers or users of the research, or persons who participate in a situation similar to the phenomenon under investigation, determine to what extent and degree the research findings apply to their own situation (Merriam & Associates, 2002). In this study, findings might generalize to other professors who mentor doctoral students, master’s students, or even undergraduate students, or mentors involved in adult education in general.

In the quantitative paradigm, *internal validity* refers to the condition where the experiment is designed well enough (variables are controlled and appropriate instruments are used to measure variables) to actually measure what is claimed to be measured so that conclusions regarding cause-and-effect may be accurate (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Although qualitative researchers do not use the term internal validity, there are numerous criteria for evaluating the efficacy of a qualitative study. First, I present here in Table 7 several criteria used to evaluate qualitative research; then I will discuss the ones that
apply to this study. Creswell (1998) recommends that qualitative researchers engage in at least two of these procedures of verification in a qualitative study.

Table 7

Criteria for Evaluating Qualitative Research

| **Purposefulness**: The research question drives the methods used to collect and analyze data, rather than the other way around. |
|**Explicitness of assumptions and biases**: The researcher identifies and communicates any assumptions, beliefs, values and biases [See also: Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Merriam & Associates, 2002] that may influence data collection and interpretation. |
|**Rigor**: The researcher uses rigorous, precise, and thorough methods to collect, record, and analyze data (see also *audit trail*: Creswell, 1998; Merriam & Associates, 2002). The researcher also takes steps to remain as objective as possible throughout the project. |
|**Completeness**: The researcher depicts the object of the study in all its complexity….and gives readers a total, multifaceted picture of the phenomenon (i.e., *thick description*: See also: Creswell, 1998; Merriam & Associates, 2002). |
|**Coherence**: The data yield consistent findings, such that the researchers can present a portrait the “hangs together.” Multiple data sources converge onto consistent conclusions (*triangulation*: See also: Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Merriam & Associates, 2002), and any contradictions within the data are reconciled (See also: Creswell, 1998). |
|**Persuasiveness**: The researcher presents logical arguments, and the weight of the evidence suggests one interpretation to the exclusion of others. |
Table 7

Criteria for Evaluating Qualitative Research (continued).

Consensus: Other individuals, including the participants in the study (member checks: See also: Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Merriam & Associates, 2002) and other scholars in the discipline (inter-rater reliability / peer review See also: Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Merriam & Associates, 2002), agree with the researcher’s interpretations and explanations.

Usefulness: The project yields conclusions that promote better understanding of the phenomenon, enable more accurate predictions about future events, or lead to interventions that enhance the quality of life.


Specific Techniques of Verification Within This Study

I have explicitly discussed my assumptions and biases in the aforementioned respective sections. As discussed earlier, in the qualitative paradigm the researcher’s biases are explicitly stated and monitored throughout the research process (Creswell, 1998). I engaged in ongoing monitoring of my bias throughout the study by means of my researcher reflective journaling, as well as the process of bracketing (revealing and setting aside of my personal prejudgments) as part of the phenomenological analysis process. In order to achieve consensus of findings, I engaged in member checks with the interviewees after each interview, including transparency of my analysis findings with each participant. As a further validity check, a peer reviewer reviewed the transcripts and my concomitant analysis of the pilot interview and we then ascertained our consensus.
Additionally, I rigorously used transparent and established methods to collect and analyze the data, and report a thorough portrayal of the mentors. I applied *triangulation* between data sources to arrive at *coherent* and *persuasive* conclusions. I constructed a research design that is *purposeful* and appropriate for the investigation of the research questions; if greater understanding of the experience of being a mentor is gained, this should prove *useful* in designing better support for mentors, better mentor training programs, and better mentoring incentives. Figure 2 summarizes all the steps in my data collection, analysis, and verification procedures.

**Hardware and Software**

The recording device I used to record the interviews is an Olympus Digital Voice Recorder (DVR) model WS-300M. I acquired this particular model three years ago, after discussing interview data collection in our Qualitative Research Methods class. This DVR has 35 hours of recording time in the highest sound quality mode and can store up to 995 digital voice files. The small, handheld device plugs directly into a computer USB port so I can easily download the files and email the interview file to the transcriber for transcription. I have made it a point to practice using the DVR in order to familiarize myself with the processes of recording, saving and storing different audio files. I also carried back-up batteries to every interview, just in case one was needed (Janesick, 2004). For ease of data management, I used the computer program *ATLAS.ti* (qualitative analysis software) after I identified the initial meaning units from the transcripts in my phenomenological analysis. This allowed for the efficient extraction of any theme within and between respondents.
Figure 2. Summary of Data Collection, Analysis, and Verification Procedures

Estimated Dissertation Timeline, Expenses, and Funding

With the intention of successful execution of my inquiry, I estimated a timeline for completion. Being a person who likes to set high goals and strive to reach them, my first aspiration was to complete this study by December 2009. After searching both the Graduate School and Dissertation Handbook websites, I became aware of various deadlines I must take into account. Additionally, I realized that some faculty may not be available for interviews over the summer months, so this is a contingency which I also took into consideration. In light of these constraints, and also allowing adequate time for qualitative analysis (Janesick, 2004), in Table 8 is a timeline for completing this study that I felt was both realistic and attainable.

While researching institutional dissertation deadlines, I also discovered a few dissertation costs of which I was not aware. These costs are included in Estimated
Table 8

Carol A. Burg – Proposed Dissertation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Proposal Hearing and Approval</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Approval</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations of Faculty-Mentors (Letters to Graduates)</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to Participate and Selection of Faculty-Mentors</td>
<td>April-May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Round of Interviews, Transcription and Analysis</td>
<td>April - July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Round of Interviews, Transcription and Analysis</td>
<td>August - October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 Presentation of Data</td>
<td>October 2009 – January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 Analysis and Summary</td>
<td>January – February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review Reliability Check</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Defense</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Copy Completed</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMI Registration</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissertation Expenses (see Appendix E). I assumed that other incidental expenses would arise over the course of the study, however, the estimate I have included here tends toward the more generous, rather than the more parsimonious, in an effort to include a little extra budget funds for unforeseen expenses. This approximation of expenses is commensurate with other estimates of the cost of qualitative dissertations (Janesick, 2004).
In the interest of securing external funding to support my dissertation, I explored several websites pertaining to grants and scholarships. It has been an experience involving successive winnowing, as the opportunities for scholarships dwindled when I applied my personal parameters to the scholarship and grant pool. Since student loans are very generous at the graduate level, the majority of grants and scholarships now focus on the undergraduate student. There are some grants, fellowships and scholarships available for graduate / doctoral students, however many of them require the student to be a full time student, or that the student not currently have full-time employment: I failed to meet all these criteria.

I inquired at my place of employment regarding professional development funds; however, due to the current budget climate, these funds have been frozen and were unavailable for the rest of this academic year. I explored a few personal measures to supply funding for my dissertation. First, I re-examined my budget and applied constraints where possible. Second, I contacted an accountant for advice on how to adjust my federal withholding taxes in my paycheck. Previously I have received a generous tax refund every April; now I have a minimal tax refund with more take-home cash each month. Third, I acknowledged the possibility that I might need to tap into my modest savings account to bridge any remaining funding gap. As a last resort, I could apply for student loan funding.

As a cost saving measure, I could have transcribed the interviews myself. However, I currently have tendonitis in my forearms, so I was unable to do the transcription myself.
Summary

This numbered list summarizes what my study included:

1. Dissertation Committee approval of this study.
2. Institutional Review Board approval of this study.
3. A mailed explanatory letter (based on Janesick, 2004) and mentor nomination form to “Transition U. College of Education” doctoral graduates (see Appendix C).
4. Mailed explanatory letter (based on Janesick, 2004) to selected nominated faculty (see Appendix D), asking for consent and participation in the study (see Appendix F).
5. One pilot/practice interview with a designated faculty-mentor.
6. First and second rounds of interviews with nominated mentors. (See Appendix A for Interview Protocol 1 and Appendix B for Interview Protocol 2.) At the conclusion of the second interview, I provided them with a printed copy of their C.V. and asked each professor to highlight any activities (publications, presentations, etc.) they have participated in with doctoral students.
7. Compilation of qualitative data with the appropriate analysis (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).
8. A member-check (based on Janesick, 2004) form (see Appendix G) and copy of my phenomenological analysis and summary sent to each interviewee.
9. Peer review check (see Appendix H) of my data analysis and findings (based on Janesick, 2004).
10. Reported insights and results, significance, and conclusions
Conclusion

In this chapter I have addressed, both theoretically and procedurally, several methodological issues underpinning the successful execution of an investigation exploring the phenomenon of being a faculty-mentor to doctoral students. The methodological component of this proposal addressed topics in four areas of endeavor. First, I described the development of my theoretically grounded exploratory questions and provided operational definitions of mentoring and associated key terms. Second, I sought to explain in detail the actual process of the research, with emphasis on data collection, analysis, description, and interpretation within accepted research practices for a qualitative study. Third, I fulfilled a need to explicate the study’s theoretical framework (phenomenology) and qualitative research paradigms with attendant ethical considerations. Finally, I addressed the study’s assumptions from the perspectives of the qualitative paradigm and the phenomenological perspective, as well as my own personal assumptions underpinning the mentor-protégé relationship. I endeavored that this study would provide a meaningful and productive contribution to the research literature of higher education, specifically enlarging the field’s description and understanding of the perceptions of the faculty-mentor who exceeds contractual obligations and engages in mentoring activities with doctoral students.

From my Reflective Journal, September 23, 2008:

I have successfully reorganized my dissertation committee with faculty who have either a familiarity with mentoring via a previous dissertation study conducted at Transition University College of Education, or with qualitative inquiry. I feel comfortable with each of them individually, and as a synergistic group. I have confidence in their
scholarship and professionalism from previous interactions with them over the years of my coursework. I feel I am gaining a momentum now in my progress on my dissertation proposal, and that is a huge relief after my hiatus due to the recent unexpected death of my sister. I have many fond memories of her nurturing and companionship, since she frequently was my care-giver when I was young. She never stopped being a big sister through our adult lives, as well. For me, it feels like the loss of another mentor.

*From my Reflective Journal, March 10, 2009:*

My dissertation proposal defense was successful—what a relief! I was nervous, but not as nervous as I thought I might be. I was quite sufficiently challenged by the insightful but probing questions my committee members asked. I could immediately see the merits of some of their questions / suggestions, and agreed to incorporate those on the spot. Now that I have had time to relax and reflect, I can see merit in some other suggestions that I argued against. I will use a few of those ideas, as well. I have heard descriptions of the defense process that sounded adversarial (the student vs. the committee). I did not expect my defense meeting today to be adversarial—probably because I had trust in my committee members. However, just simply not knowing what would happen and how I would rise to the challenges did produce anxiety for me. It feels like I have just emerged from a dense jungle, the trees are thinning, and I can faintly see the horizon again: the first glimmer of a light at the end of my odyssey.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF THE INTERVIEW DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the perspectives on mentoring by selected doctoral faculty who recent doctoral graduates identified as mentors. The exploratory questions that guided the study were:

1. What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?

2. What variables influence those perspectives?

As I discussed in Chapter 3, the strategies I used to collect data from the purposively selected faculty-mentors were semi-structured interviews (transcribed), researcher field notes (interview notes to self), researcher’s reflective journal, and documents collected from the participants (their curriculum vita and personal communications).

This chapter includes descriptions of the setting, Transition University’s College of Education, and of the mentors that include details that are relevant to this study but that are not revealing enough to contravene confidentiality, as well as phenomenological descriptions of the lived experience of mentoring for each interviewee, drawing on various data sources (as described).

The Setting

All of the six mentors who participated in this study are faculty in the College of Education at Transition University, a large, regionally accredited university located in the
southern region of the United States. For the sake of confidentiality, I provide only general relevant information regarding this institution, and use the pseudonym “Transition University”. The university was founded as a regional service institution circa 1950, however approximately 10 years ago it was awarded Research I standing, and is currently categorized as a comprehensive doctoral research (RU/VH) institution according to the Carnegie Classification system (The Carnegie Foundation, 2009)—one of only three top tier research universities in the state. The university has over 1,800 instructional faculty for the current academic year, with 182 of these residing in the College of Education providing instruction for 43 doctoral programs (in addition to Master’s and Bachelor’s programs). The total enrollment at the university exceeds 47,000 students for the current academic year, including over 5,000 students enrolled in the College of Education, with over 2,200 of these students enrolled in the graduate division of the College of Education. (All of these statistics were gathered from the institution’s website on November 14, 2009, which, for the sake of confidentiality, I do not reference in this manuscript.)

For The Reader: Regarding Transcript Presentation Conventions

Before we embark on the Mentors’ odyssey, I feel a few comments are in order to facilitate for the reader the clarity of the quotes from the mentors. First, all shorter quotes by the mentors reported in this manuscript are framed with double quote marks such as: “this”; however, lengthy block quotes are not framed with quotation marks, but rather are indented from the left margin. Second, sometimes within the mentors’ lengthier block quotes, they quote themselves or other people. These quotes within their quotes are framed with double quote marks such as: “this”. Third, when the mentor emphasizes a
word, it will appear in *italics*; all emphases in the mentors’ quotes are the emphasis heard in their own voice, as I noted from my review of the interview digital voice files. Fourth, I have inserted any body language and pauses in speech into the quotes with brackets, such as: [smiles] and [pauses]. Fifth, occasionally I have inserted a word or phrase in order to promote for the reader the understanding of the mentor’s quote; my insertions also appear in brackets, such as: “. . . and I made sure that she got a couple publications [from her dissertation].” And finally, spoken speech is rarely ever as precise and concise as is written speech; most people when they speak typically include several extra *umm*’s, *uhh*’s, and *like*’s, and stray from the main point of their statement into tangential references. In order to make the comprehension of the mentors’ quotes clearer and less arduous for the reader, I have retained a few verbal idiosyncrasies (such as *like*’s) to preserve the voice of the mentors, but omitted excessively repeated words and tangential phrases that are simply obfuscatory and laborious to wade through. I have applied ellipses in accordance with the American Psychological Association’s publication guidelines to denote these omissions (American Psychological Association, 2001), that is: if I deleted a word or phrase within a sentence, I indicate that with three ellipses, such as . . .this. If I deleted a phrase between sentences, I indicate that with four ellipses, such as. . . .this.

Additionally, I will present each mentor’s case with a prologue based on my researcher reflective journal, continue with excerpts from each mentor’s transcripts to narrate their story and a visual representation of what the mentor’s perspective is indicating, and end with an epilogue form my researcher reflective journal. All of the mentors’ names are pseudonyms, to ensure confidentiality.
The Mentors

In order to introduce the mentors to the reader, I begin with some basic demographic data about the mentors (summarized in Table 9), such as gender, approximate age, ethnicity, number of years as a professor, number of years as a professor at Transition University, how their mentorships with students are initiated (assigned or selected), and whether or not they had a mentor themselves as a doctoral student. These data were either reported in the interviews, or collected from their curriculum vita or personal communications to me. It is interesting to note that half of the mentors in this study did not have a mentor themselves; this is consistent with other research reporting that approximately only half of all graduate students receive mentoring (Cronan-Hillex, et al, 1986; Jacobi, 1990).

Next, I present individual descriptions of each of the six faculty-mentors who participated in my study. In each description, I present data that describes each mentor’s perspectives on mentoring—how they experience mentoring and what meanings they seem to derive from the activity. Some of the data presented will be passages from my Researcher Reflective Journal, and will be thus noted. Regarding the notes I took during the interviews (field notes / notes to myself), these largely consisted of details regarding the setting of the interview and details regarding facial and body language of the participants, which I added into the appropriate place in each respective interview transcript for each mentor. In general, I observed body language that was consistent with the language and emotion each mentor was communicating at the time, which therefore
Table 9

Description of the Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor:</th>
<th>Jade</th>
<th>Jacob</th>
<th>Hanna</th>
<th>Reeba</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Donna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>Early 60’s</td>
<td>Late 50’s</td>
<td>Early 60’s</td>
<td>Late 40’s</td>
<td>Mid 50’s</td>
<td>Mid 40’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as a Professor:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at University:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the mentor have a mentor?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the Mentorships are Initiated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

contributed to increased trust in the authenticity of what each mentor related to me.

As I engaged in the process of phenomenological analysis of the data, I remained vigilant for description and meaning, asking myself: “What is it like for this person to be a mentor? What meaning does mentoring seem to have for this person, or, how is mentoring meaningful to this person?” The elements and variables that emerged from my data analysis for each mentor coherently coalesced into the following areas: 1) how they
view their “Self as Mentor”, 2) their “Experience of Mentoring”, 3) their “Benefits from Mentoring”, 5) what “Mentoring Means for Them”, 6) their perceived “Negatives of Mentoring”, 7) their perceived purposes of mentoring: their “Teleology of Mentoring”, 6) their “Motivation to Mentor”, and 7) their “Values as a Mentor”. In Chapter Five, I will present the results of my cross-case analysis of the experiences of these faculty mentors, noting unity and significant differences in the elements and variables, as well as connections to and implications for the practice and theory of mentoring.

The First Case: Professor Jade Enjoyable

Prologue to Professor Jade Enjoyable—From My Reflective Journal, October 18, 2009

The first step in phenomenological analysis is to read the interview transcripts completely thru to “get a sense of the whole” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 205). Since I had not yet verified the second interview, I read the second transcript while listening to the audio file at the same time. I found minor word-corrections to be made to the transcription, and added in any gestures or laughter or body language noted in my field notes / notes to myself that were not captured in the transcript; I also changed names stated in the interview to initials, in order to provide confidentiality to people Professor Jade mentioned during the conversation. I decided that instead of just reading the first transcript thru (in preparation for phenomenological analysis) I would also listen to that audio file as I read thru the first transcript. This takes more time than just reading the transcript, but I thought it would provide an even better “sense of the whole” than just reading the transcript, and also be beneficial to the bracketing process.

So, I have just closely listened to (while reading the transcripts of) both interviews with Professor Jade, and re-read my post-interview notes in my reflective journal. Now, I
will write down my thoughts and feelings about my two conversations with Professor Jade, and set them aside—bracket them—as a way of clearing my head and heart before analyzing the data.

In reading my reflective journal, I began with some negative feelings about Professor Jade. First, after setting the appointment for the first interview, she rescheduled it the night before it was to take place. Then, as we walked back to her office to start the first interview (a week later), she informed me that she only had 30 minutes for the interview, instead of the 60 minutes I had explicitly requested. I was immediately concerned about having enough time to collect data—after all, this was my pilot interview, and was rather important in the scheme of my data collection. I would be making some important decisions based on the data I collected in this interview. I considered asking to reschedule the interview, but decided that, after years of interviewing people, I had ample experience interviewing, and that I could accomplish the task at hand while managing a 30 minute time frame.

My second concern was that so far, Professor Jade had not demonstrated a ‘student-centered consideration’ (my own term) of the student (me) by first rescheduling the interview, and then not having the amount of time for the interview that I requested. These behaviors are not what I considered to be consistent with that of a ‘good’ mentor. A negative thought regarding ‘faculty who don’t care about students’ ran through my mind as we were walking back to her office for the interview. I was worried that perhaps my purposive selection method had fallen short of selecting a good mentor, in this case. However, my method of selection was **not** targeted on finding a ‘good’ mentor, but rather, simply someone who had engaged in mentoring. I quickly decided to focus on the
task at hand—data collection. At that moment, my gut told me that I was making the right
decision to forge ahead with the interview, and let the data reveal whether or not it was a
good interview. All these thoughts ran through my head in the 60 seconds it took us to
walk to her office. . . . (continued)

Professor Jade Enjoyable – Introduction

Professor Jade is a Caucasian female, in her early 60’s. She is on the tall side, for
a woman, and wears yellow-blond hair in a semi-short, spunky cut coiffed into a playful
style. For both of our interviews, she arrived in comfortable attire sporting vividly
colorful artistic accents and sat in the chair behind her desk with aplomb. During the
interviews she seemed intent on responding to my questions, and yet conveyed a relaxed
sense of enjoyment and happiness, smiling and laughing frequently, beginning the first
interview with, “This is interesting” and closing with, “Thank you. It was fun.” Her office
shelves were crammed with books; her desk held some minor clutter, amidst personal
mementos—all in all, appearing like a typical professor’s office. During the first
interview her phone rang; she picked up the receiver and dispatched the caller with
alacrity (in less than 10 seconds), and then returned her full attention to me, giving the
impression that she is used to juggling many things in the air at once, with all earnestness.

[From my Reflective Journal and field notes, April 27, 2009 and September 11, 2009.]

Professor Jade – Her Self as Mentor

Professor Jade is a veteran educator of approximately 35 years (as I gleaned from
her curriculum vitae), with varying teaching experience that ranges from the kindergarten
and elementary levels through the university classroom. Although she has spent the last
25 years of her educational career as a university professor, she often referred to herself
as a teacher during our interviews (e.g., “That's the kind of teacher I am,” and “See, I can’t stop teaching.”) Professor Jade still continues to see part of her higher education identity to be a “teacher”, as when she described how her career as a professor has reached the pinnacle of achievement, and yet she concluded: “You know, I'm still a teacher, although I've added research and whatever.” As a mentor, among Professor Jade’s main foci are teaching and learning, as illustrated by her comment: “I say teachers are learning helpers, so are mentors: learning helpers.”

During the course of our two interview conversations, I asked Professor Jade, “How would you define the term ‘mentor’?” She replied: “Helper, facilitator, teacher, guide, listener, doer, mother / sister—depending, grandmother—depending.” These utterances are some of the motifs that appeared woven throughout the approximately two hours of interview dialogue that Professor Jade graciously shared with me.

The very first synonym she offered for the term “mentor” was “helper”. The concepts of “helper” and “helping” ran as a recursive current throughout Professor Jade’s discussion with me regarding mentoring. Professor Jade strongly identifies her mentoring-self as a helper, as when she stated: “I am a helper.” Helping her protégés is an activity that is seamlessly integrated into her mentoring of students, as she described:

I was doing some of my own research today and I came across this article … on constant comparative methods, and it just was written so beautifully. I thought of two of my doctoral students that I would have to write right away to let them know about this, because I thought, “Well, this may help them.”

Mentoring, for Professor Jade, does not only happen with current students; she also engages in mentoring with junior faculty, and newly graduated doctoral candidates. In
this passage, she described mentoring a new graduate:

With respect to J., I knew that she needed mentoring because of specifics. She had already finished her doctorate, but she needed help in writing and I made sure that she got a couple publications [from her dissertation]. Then she needed help in finding a job. I didn't find her a job, but I offered support and gave her some directions.

Professor Jade strongly identifies her mentor-self as a teacher and a helper, and she extends her mentoring not only to students, but to colleagues and junior faculty as well. She concluded this particular mentoring account by stating, “It gives me such great pleasure and a good feeling about myself to be able to be of help to others at this stage in my life.” “Pleasure” and “good feeling” are also themes that recur throughout Professor Jade’s narrative of her mentoring.

Professor Jade – Her Experience of Mentoring

When I asked her what the experience of mentoring is like for her, Professor Jade remarked that she “certainly enjoys” mentoring. She continued with: “For me, the experience is fantastic. I absolutely adore it. I love it so much that I started an advanced graduate roundtable writing group the first year I came here.” The fact that Professor Jade voluntarily exceeded the requirements of her contract and implemented an on-going writing support group for doctoral students is remarkable. Obviously, Professor Jade enjoys mentoring; I endeavored to find out more details regarding that. What, exactly, did she find so enjoyable about mentoring?

One aspect of mentoring that Professor Jade finds so enjoyable are the protégés:

“I like the doctoral students, and I like to interact with them. I like to see them at
conferences and go out with them at night for dinner. I just like the camaraderie.” In general, Professor Jade finds it pleasant and enjoyable to interact with doctoral students. She stated, “I'm a social being, so I just love being with the people whom I'm mentoring. We have a lot of fun too. We laugh.” Helping, for Professor Jade, is not only part of her identity, it is also part of what she enjoys about mentoring: “To see [protégés] grow and change, it gives me a wonderful feeling of being in a helping . . . capacity.”

In addition to finding mentoring to be enjoyable and pleasant, Professor Jade also experiences mentoring as relatively easy to do, as she reports: “I don't find it difficult. I certainly don't find it difficult at all. I just find it enjoyable and pleasant and I love to be helpful, so it is great. It just gives me a good feeling.” Mentoring makes Professor Jade feel good in general, and good about herself in particular. She continued: “I don't find it tedious or that I can't fit it in or something like that.” In sum, she finds mentoring to be overwhelmingly a pleasant experience and easy to fit into her schedule and she enjoys interacting with the protégés.

**Professor Jade - Benefits from Mentoring**

During the course of our conversation, I asked Professor Jade what benefits she thought she gained from mentoring. One of the benefits she mentioned was learning from her protégés, which fell into two variations: learning about herself, and learning from students how to help other students—that is, learning how to be a better mentor. She related that from her students she learned: “Determination. I've learned to bring that on to others. If this doctoral student can do it, you can do it also, OK? And then from S., another doctoral student, too: to be softer, maybe.” From this we can see that Professor Jade enriches her mentoring skills repertoire by observing her protégés and consciously
applying what she learns. We also see that she is self-aware of her mentoring style, and open to receiving insight from her students on how she can grow and improve, and be a more effective mentor.

In the previous section I listed several quotes where she maintains it makes her “feel good” about herself, for example: “It gives me such great pleasure and a good feeling about myself to be able to be of help to others at this stage in my life.” She also stated: “It just makes me feel that I can do this and I have achieved something at this stage. . .” Engaging in mentoring appears to give Professor Jade a feeling of efficacy about herself, the sense that she is effective with her efforts. Efficacy about herself as a mentor, helper, and teacher seems to be another benefit she encounters while mentoring; and this is also undoubtedly a pleasant occurrence for her.

Another benefit Professor Jade gets from mentoring is receiving. She related a story concerning one of her current doctoral students:

One of my doc students cannot work with me this summer at the community center where I have this camp, because she's going to be writing. But, she just wrote to me, and said, “But, the first four weeks I'll help you at night, because you've given me so much.” I didn't ask her to do that, and I thought, “Gee, that was awfully nice of her.” So you see, you get things back from mentoring.

Professor Jade recognizes that she “gets things back” as a result of her various mentoring efforts. It is not that she expects mentoring to be a transactional activity—like some sort of quid pro quo. Rather, the serendipity of this event is apparent: Professor Jade was pleasantly surprised that one of her protégés volunteered to give back to her by helping her.
In fact, a pleasant affect was Professor Jade’s first response to my query about the benefits of mentoring: “Well, other than feeling good and sharing, [smile] and I think sharing is the most wonderful thing you can do, that’s what I get out of [mentoring].” One benefit Professor Jade derives from mentoring is “feeling good” or as she stated: “It gives me such great pleasure and a good feeling about myself . . . ” For Professor Jade, mentoring creates happiness (pleasure). In order to understand what “sharing” meant to Professor Jade, I attempted to draw out more details on this concept. Professor Jade responded with:

When I was a classroom teacher, I used to say, “I always give my ideas away, because then more come. I've emptied my head and more come.” You know how some people don't want to give or share? It never bothered me, sharing. Sharing, for Professor Jade, encompasses giving and receiving; she feels that this is a benefit she derives from mentoring, and she enjoys the sharing (giving and receiving).

Professor Jade feels that she receives benefits from mentoring, however, these seem to be intangible or internal rewards. When I asked her about external or tangible rewards she replied: “No one gives me more pay. That is for sure. [laughs] That would be good. . . . I think that I am recognized in the department for my mentoring abilities.” Professor Jade feels she reaps benefits from her mentoring activities such as: learning from her protégés, a good feeling, a good feeling about herself (efficacy), pleasant serendipitous reciprocal help, a pleasant exchange of helpful ideas or other resources (sharing), and recognition from colleagues. She also finds this recognition to be rewarding.
For Professor Jade, mentoring is an endeavor comprised of a mosaic of facets. Part of mentoring for Professor Jade includes support for the protégé in the areas of career and psycho-social development. In the area of career support, as mentioned earlier, Professor Jade shared stories about how she initiated a writing support group for her students and helped a new doctoral graduate publish an article from her dissertation and find a job. In general, she sees career support to include assisting protégés with their research writing, publication and job procurement.

In the area of psycho-social support, Professor Jade relates that “there is a lot of emotional support.” When I asked her for details she said:

[Students] need freedom from worry and anxiety. They need to have someone that they can trust. . . . A lot of them come to my house and say what it is that they are really concerned about. Then they'll know that I will help them in any way that I can. One showed up with a gorgeous bottle of wine on a Friday. [smile] She's not in this department, but I was on her committee. . . . and she needed some help. . . . We just sat there, and that's just what she needed. She had some problems. She was pregnant. She's married. She was living alone because her husband has his business in Colorado. She's trying to finish the dissertation. Blah, blah, blah. She just needed to chit-chat and say ‘what about this and what about that?’ and that sort of thing. . . . and you can't just discount that.

Professor Jade sees it appropriate to address the life issues of her students if they arise, and considers it to be part of her psycho-social support system for them. Her responsive mentoring style is also demonstrated via email: “If they email me, they know I'll email
them back right away because - I hate to say it - I'm quick.” She makes her accessibility known to her students, and they ask when they are in need of help. Professor Jade reports that this is “very rarely abused; very rarely.” She concluded with: “There is support at all levels.”

Career and psycho-social support for protégés is an integral part of mentoring for Professor Jade. However, mentoring means much more than that to her. First of all, for Professor Jade, mentoring is a relationship: “It's the whole relationship. . . .It is a wonderful negotiation. It is a complex relationship. It's very complex. All human relationships are complex. It's give and take, give and take.” She sees mentoring as a reciprocal give and take —a negotiation—between herself and the protégé. In her definition of mentor, she used familial terms (mother, sister, grandmother) which also indicate relationship. This relationship of reciprocal negotiation, for Prof, Jade, also includes collaboration, as illustrated on her curriculum vitae, which lists numerous publications and presentations that she co-authored with her protégés. As she highlighted the copious collaborations with students on her C.V., she said, “I just love to collaborate!”

For Professor Jade, mentoring is also intentional; it’s something that she deliberately does. In the course of her daily interactions with people, it is common for her to think: “How can I help this person? In that way it is intentional. It just doesn't happen. . . . I find myself mentoring in many different ways as opportunities arise. I recognize these opportunities.” The opportunity for mentoring may serendipitously arise, however, Professor Jade recognizes the opportunity for mentoring, and then deliberately acts on it. This seems to happen naturally and easily for her in her daily routine.
Besides being intentional Professor Jade experiences mentoring to be individual: “It is whatever the doctoral student or even a new assistant professor needs, and their needs vary considerably.” For her, mentoring is not homogeneous, but rather, *idiographic* (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009), or concerned with the particular. To further explicate, she related:

It depends upon the individual. Maybe that's why I'm a successful mentor.

Everybody's different. As good teachers, we all know that differentiation of instruction is so important. Well, treating people differently according to their needs is important too. So, I think whatever they need, that's what I am there to give.

Since mentoring is individual, Professor Jade sees this as affecting her role as the mentor:

“[Mentoring is] depending upon the role. So, that depends upon the person. So, that's why I mentioned sister, mother, grandmother, that sort of thing. It all depends who I am with.” For her, mentoring addresses the particulars of the individual protégé, and therefore she adjusts her approach as she perceives necessary.

Professor Jade sees mentoring as idiographic because it varies according to each person’s particular needs. She sees part of her role as a mentor to be meeting the individual’s needs. She continued: “And I also have a good sense, I think, at this point in my life as a professional, a former teacher, about what people need and how far I can go with that, with pushing them too.” In short, when I asked her to describe what good mentors do, she replied: “Meet their needs.”

Mentoring, for Professor Jade, is also a *dynamic* process: “You have to know what's your role, and it changes. You can't just say, ‘I have these set things I'm going to
say to this person’. Not at all.” Professor Jade is aware of a dynamic of development in
her students, and views her mentoring as dynamic as well:

It's always different because, we're talking about doctoral students now, they're
growing. So, as they grow, they're changing. Hopefully, we all are. So, when they
start out here and their concerns, frustrations, anxieties, needs are here. Why the
very next week, it might be something else, and that's a good thing because you
can't just be static.

She seems to be perfectly comfortable with this dynamic of changing needs of the
protégé, and sees that she changes as a mentor, as well.

Professor Jade also sees mentoring as integrated—into her daily routines, as well
as into her mentor-identity: “[Mentoring is] not separate and apart from [my everyday]….I didn't realize how much I was doing, and how much I integrate it into my professional
life.” She sees mentoring and her identity as a mentor to be holistic: “My mentoring
occurs everywhere - informally, semi-formally, formally. That’s the gestalt – it is me as a
mentor – a full circle.” The time needed for mentoring is often cited as problematic by
mentors; when I asked her about her perception of the time she invested into mentoring,
she responded:

My time, I haven't even thought of that. It's all one big picture. . . . It's just part of
my work; it's just part of me. I don't even think like, “Oh, I have to give so much
time to so-and-so.” . . .But mentoring, I don't even think of it as extra, it's just a
part of my professional life. I've never even thought of it in amount of time. Not
at all.
Professor Jade does not see her time investment into mentoring to be problematic; in fact, she is hardly aware of how much mentoring she does, because it fits seamlessly into her daily activities. It also fits seamlessly into her self-identity, as when she states:

... I would not [consider it as not being a part of my job]. I'd feel divorced from my life's work. [smiles] I couldn't and I would never consider it. But I don't say to myself, “Now when I come here, I'm going to start out mentoring, blah, blah, blah.” It doesn't happen that way. You just slide into things and you do it. And you're doing it well so you do it more.

For Professor Jade, mentoring is essential to her self-concept as a professor. Perhaps one reason why Professor Jade seamlessly integrates mentioning into her quotidian activities is that mentoring is also effortless for her, as when she states:

It's easy. It's easy. Maybe it shouldn't be easy. Maybe sometimes it's going to be hard. But, not often because so many people go through the same thing with doctoral students. They're worried, they're concerned, their anxious. Otherwise, they wouldn't be speaking to me.

For Professor Jade, mentoring is easily and naturally integrated into her activities as a teacher and mentor; she cannot envisage mentoring as being separate from her life as a professor, a mentor or a person. It seems to be an essential component of her self-image and work.

Professor Jade – Her Negatives in Mentoring

I could see what Professor Jade meant when she said, “I tend to be a very happy person always anyway;” she certainly was very positive and happy about her mentoring.
When I asked her if she had any negatives experiences as a mentor, she paused for a moment to reflect, and then stated: “I cannot think of one. I really can't. Nope. Not one. Every one has been great.” However, a short while later she did relate one situation that she found negative:

The only negative thing is if someone asks me to help them and I am not on their committee at all, I can't do it because that is going beyond my boundaries. You can't do that. These people always look embarrassed and upset. You know how it would be. And I have to tell them no, I am not on their committee. I can't help them.

For Professor Jade, not being in a position to help a student is a somewhat unpleasant experience. Additionally, my query caused her to reflect, and in our second interview she related two negative mentoring experiences. One involved a protégé who no longer communicates with her since the mentorship dissolved. Professor Jade expressed some sadness that this relationship did not continue and evolve into a new phase of collegiality. Her second negative mentoring experience revolved around a junior faculty member who was denied tenure due to lack of publications; Professor Jade felt bad for the faculty member, but also sad that the institution lost a professor that had much potential. She concluded these accounts with:

I am now mentoring her. . . . She's written back to me a lot. I've sent her stuff that I'm working on. . . . I said ‘Sally’, I'm going to put this in this piece with your name. . . . Not all mentoring stories turn out OK, and those are two instances where I feel that I could have done more. If she didn't accept it then, at least I would have tried. So, now I'm trying.
Negative mentoring experiences, for Professor Jade, involve not being able to help someone, or the fracturing of a relationship—a mentorship that does not transition into a new phase of collegiality. Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, (1997) also found an occurrence of feelings of failure by the mentor as a negative experience. Another common negative reported by mentors is the lack of adequate time for mentoring; as I have already discussed, this is not an issue for Professor Jade.

Professor Jade – Her Teleology of Mentoring

Professor Jade experiences mentoring to be teleological—it is purposeful. For her, mentoring may be a daily part of her self-concept and routine, but it also has a purpose, or a goal. Beyond the immediate goal of helping an individual with their particular need at the moment, she also sees the goal of mentoring as producing “the very best that that student can achieve and at the end achieve, so that they get a great job and that they are a good professor.” For her, the purpose of mentoring is to facilitate the protégé’s achievement to their highest potential, to become a competent professor, and to attain employment after graduation.

Professor Jade – Her Motivations to Mentor

Mentoring does take time, and effort. Sometimes, there are negative experiences that emerge in a mentoring relationship. Faculty are not required to mentor doctoral students, and if fact, receive no remuneration from the institution for doing so. Why, then, do faculty volunteer to exceed their job requirements? I asked Professor Jade what motivated her to mentor. She replied:

Why I do it is because they genuinely need help. I'm back to that. Therefore, I am a helper. I also have a degree in guidance and counseling, so I think that might
help. I think I'm a good listener, a good paraphraser. I use Rogerian counseling techniques.

She continued with:

I do know my stuff with my work here. I think that's so I can share it. I can give it away. I enjoy it very much. . . . I like the doctoral students, and I like to interact with them. . . . I think we owe it to our fields, our discipline, to contribute back as much as we possibly can, in the ways that we can, I really do. . . . That whole idea of academe has been so good to me. I mean, I love this place. I was recruited to come here. . . . so I want to give back to it.

Professor Jade’s motivations for mentoring include the desire to help people and to contribute back to her profession, the enjoyment of sharing (giving and receiving), and her overall happiness with her job.

Professor Jade – Her Values as a Mentor

I asked Professor Jade if she felt that mentoring was a job duty, or, was it expected in any way, even if it was not included in a professor’s compensation. She replied:

I think more in a broader sense, for me, in the sense of community of our discipline - whatever our discipline - we are at a University, we're higher education, but if I were in high school or whatever, it would be the same.

For Professor Jade, “community” is a value. The term ‘value’ has several connotations, ranging from religion to ethics to economics. Simply, the term ‘value’ may be thought of as a “core belief” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 378) that guides your daily actions. For
Professor Jade, collegiality is also a value, as when she related the story of a colleague who was denied tenure:

It just worried me [that she was not publishing enough]. What she did was beautiful, beautiful work. It wasn't enough. Because she had to take charge of her department and la, la, la, it was too much. And she had a lot of family issues and whatever. So, it happened. She's gone. So, that disturbs me terribly and many people in [her] department . . . . I wonder if I should have said more then, like: “Don't be passive. I'll help you. Do this. Do that.” But I didn't because, you know, all those thoughts go in your head: “Oh, it's not your place.” She was not mentored by anybody in [her] department. So, that happened. Why I am concerned about it is because she was worthy of [being tenured] here.

‘Community’ is another form of ‘relationship’, which also includes familial relationships, as when Professor Jade defined a mentor as, “mother / sister—depending, grandmother—depending”. ‘Collegiality’ is another type of relationship that Professor Jade is concerned with, as evidenced by her sadness over two failed mentoring relationships (previously discussed). She also sees “nurturing and caring very much so” as part of these relationships.

It seems clear that helping, sharing, and giving back to her profession are also part of her values:

Here I am sitting with you; I came in specially to meet you because I care about this. You see, that's another thing. And I care about people who are getting their Ph.D.’s and so I wanted to do this for whoever you were, and that's a form of mentoring in itself.
It is evident that Professor Jade values community (both formal and informal), collegiality with faculty and protégés, helping, sharing, and giving back to her profession and that she incorporates her values into her practice of mentoring.

**Professor Jade – Summary**

To summarize: Professor Jade sees mentoring as a spectrum of relationships with characteristics that at times seem community-like, collegial, or familial; this relationship includes reciprocal exchanges of help as well as negotiation and collaboration. She sees career and psycho-social support as part of her mentoring gestalt. When she mentors, it is often intentional (deliberate). She sees her mentoring as idiographic (particular to an individual and their needs), and dynamic (changing and growing). Her mentoring is holistically and effortlessly integrated into her personal and professional life, psyche and activities, and is an essential part of her personal and professional self-concept—that is, a fundamental element that she would not removed. Additionally, mentoring for her is teleological (has a purpose): to help people, to facilitate the growth potential of the protégé to be the best they can be, to assist in developing a good professor, and to ultimately help the protégé secure employment.

Professor Jade sees herself as a teacher and a helper, and enjoys helping people. She is motivated to mentor by: her desire to help, her desire to meet protégé’s needs, her enjoyment of sharing (giving and receiving) with protégés, her enjoyment of mentoring, and her sense of fulfillment and happiness in her profession. If all this weren’t enough motivation for Professor Jade to mentor, add one more thing: she feels a responsibility to contribute back to her field which has been “so good” to her. But, for Professor Jade, it is evident that this responsibility is primarily a labor of love or joy. As a mentor, she values:
community, collegiality, helping, sharing, and giving back to her profession. Figure 3 summarizes these aspects of Professor Jade’s mentoring-self.

Figure 3. Professor Jade: Her Mentor-Self

Professor Jade has encountered very few negative experiences in her mentoring. The few negative experiences that she did encounter involved either not being able to take the role of a mentor for a student, or a fractured relationship wherein a mentorship did not transition into a new phase of professional collegiality, but rather, disintegrated. Overall, she experiences mentoring as an immensely positive, enjoyable and rewarding experience that is easily accomplished. She enjoys interacting with protégés, including doctoral students. She feels that she gleans several benefits from mentoring, such as: enjoyment, learning, a sense of efficacy, recognition as a mentor by her peers, an overall
positive affect (good feeling), and sharing (giving and receiving). She feels efficacious in her field, and she likes to share her expertise with others. She likes sharing, and in fact enjoys it, and she specifically enjoys sharing with doctoral students. Professor Jade self-identifies as a “very happy person”, and she “loves” her job. She also identifies the numerous pleasant aspects to mentoring as creating happiness and enjoyment in her professional life.

*Epilogue to Professor Jade—From My Reflective Journal, October 18, 2009. Bracketing: What Do I Think and How Do I Feel About Professor Jade?*

(Continued from previous). . . After both interviews with Professor Jade, I was satisfied: I had gathered very solid data. And, I could tell that she was an engaged and dedicated mentor. Both of these conclusions I drew from the interview data (my reflective journaling, my interview notes, and later, the transcripts), as well as my gut feeling as an experienced protégé and interviewer. Additionally, she came in to the Transition University College of Education just for my second interview, and talked more than an hour (making up for the short first interview).

I like much – but not every single idea – of what she said; our philosophical approaches to education and mentoring are compatible. I do wonder about the rescheduling difficulty, though; perhaps she is random that way. If I were her protégé and that happened frequently to our appointments, I would find it negative and stressful. It would be a challenge to me to work with someone who had that style.

But, since I have not had the experience of being her protégé, I do not know if that is indeed her style. And I will never know, so I must set that idea aside—out of my mind. A few details of what she talked about are inconsistent with my own ideas about
mentoring, but that is OK, too: I can approach these ideas with a spirit of genuine
curiosity, and investigate them from different perspectives to gain insight into how she
finds them to be good ideas. I can learn and benefit from dialogue on disagreements.

So, the data are what they are. That is the beauty of it, and my reprieve; I can only
offer the evidence that is there, and debate it in a fair-minded way. And with my
transparency, the reader can decide for herself to agree with my conclusions, or not. Let
the analysis begin!

The Second Case: Professor Jacob Transactional

*Prologue to Professor Jacob Transactional—From My Reflective Journal, September 2, 2009.*

My second interview with Professor Jacob was just a rich as the first interview.
This time instead of meeting in his office, we met in a small conference room at the end
of the hall of office suites. He was working on ginning up some video casts for his online
class he is teaching. He talked about how that was a new learning curve for him—the
technology. This time he mentioned how time pressured he was with the start up of the
new semester, new classes, and new technology. This was very different from our first
interview that took place over the summer break—at that time he acted like he had all the
time in the world. I thanked him for making the time to fit me into his schedule; he was
very gracious about it. He again talked with me for over an hour. He still acted like he
had all the time in the world to speak with me today, although he had communicated that
he really didn’t.

Again, I got the feeling that he was a very warm and nurturing person. I think that
was due just as much to the way he would talk with me as to what he actually said. He
made excellent eye contact and his body language was completely relaxed and comfortable. More than that, his body language communicated that he was giving me his full attention. This is notable, considering how stressed he was over getting his video casts made for his class that day. As I reflect on this now (after the interview), I am gathering language to describe how I was experiencing the conversation with Professor Jacob, and that is: in every respect in our exchange today he was totally present in the conversation and completely engaged in the exchange of ideas with me, which felt like a validation of me, a nascent researcher.

*Professor Jacob Transactional – Introduction*

I was 10 minutes early for my first interview with Professor Jacob, as I am with all my interviews. I waited in the department office, pacing nervously along the walls, reading whatever was posted. Professor Jacob came to the front office to guide me back to his office. As we walked back to his office, he excitedly stated, “I am very much looking forward to talking with you about this! Your invitation to be interviewed has caused me to reflect on my mentoring, and it’s been a good experience! I feel like I have some things to talk about!”

Professor Jacob is a Caucasian male in his late 50’s. He is tall and slender, with grey hair and glasses. Our first interview transpired in his office, which was packed to the gills with books, like many other professor’s offices. I noticed something unusual, though; he had a few antique illustrations from children’s books framed on one of the walls. He sat comfortably behind his desk, exuding warmth and smiling often. His voice was soft-spoken and conversational, and seemed in slight contrast to breadth of his
responses, which included a scholarly lexicon that he employed with a natural ease.

[From my Reflective Journal, May 20, 2009.]

Professor Jacob – His Self as Mentor

Professor Jacob’s history as an educator spans 35 years (as noted on his curriculum vitae), with teaching experiences that run the gamut from the elementary through the university levels. Although he has spent the last 29 years as a professor at the university level, he referred to himself as a teacher during our interviews, stating:

“I am a teacher. I have always been a teacher, and I think that things that I learned teaching first graders are things that still apply. You know that is a surprising admission, because we spend so much time around this new University, jacking ourselves up to be the research institution, and our productivity as researchers. I am really a teacher.”

In addition to being a teacher, Professor Jacob also sees himself as a helper, as when he describes his relationship to his protégés: “Ultimately I'm the one that's helping them create themselves.” He further described this helping rapport with protégés, as when he offers to his students: “I can help you shape what you've brought to the [research] table,” and “I’m going to help you be more sophisticated or smoother—or whatever the metaphor is—in your knowing.” When I asked Professor Jacob to define the term ‘mentor’, he replied: “Well, I think a mentor is a knowledgeable other.” Teaching and helping students learn are motifs that Professor Jacob reiterated through both interviews.
Professor Jacob – His Experience of Mentoring

When I asked Professor Jacob what the mentoring experience was like for him, he replied, “From my perspective, my life is just huge now.” I asked what he meant by “huge”, and he explained that, upon reflection, he realized that it has been in the past few years that his mentoring has really developed:

This is only recent. I've been [a doctoral mentor] for, what…about 26 years. So I'm finally getting it….It is the most wonderful feeling!... It's kind of like one of those. . . ‘new lease on life.’ So my life is bigger…. I get this. It's really great!

He further described his experience of mentoring: “It's ludic, it's like Csikszentmihalyi’s notion of ‘flow’ that when you're in the moment of it, there's nothing better.” Professor Jacob feels like he has become proficient at mentoring, and enjoys immersing himself in the activity; and when he is immersed in mentoring, it can seem “ludic”—like play.

Currently, Professor Jacob is getting more enjoyment from mentoring than he did in the past. I wondered exactly what it is about mentoring that he found enjoyable, and he related:

I love coming here because I get to work with these really smart people…. Doctoral students are a lot of fun. They're real clever. They've sacrificed a lot, and they want it to matter….You know, they've given up their work. They're taking peanuts for salary. So it should matter. They should have sacrificed for some big reason. So they're ready to have fun. I mean, they're ready to be important and have important things happen to them. It's great.
I inquired if he thought mentoring was easy, he responded with, “I do not find mentoring to be an effort. I do not think that it is easy though. It is thoughtful, takes time, and is important.” Professor Jacob experiences mentoring to be pleasant, enjoyable, and largely effortless.

Professor Jacob - Benefits from Mentoring

When I asked Professor Jacob what benefits he felt he received from mentoring, his first response involved learning from his protégés: “I've really become more aware of my own field, and the importance of persons of stature, and those things… so I've gotten to learn a lot of new content because of my doctoral students.” Besides gaining new knowledge from his protégés, Professor Jacob also finds it stimulating to refresh some of his prior content knowledge for his students, as he describes: “So I'm getting to learn stuff, or relearn it. You know that adage about you don't really learn it till you teach it? It's really true.”

Another benefit Professor Jacob feels he get as a result of mentoring is prestige: “It gives me a lot of prestige and I'm grateful that it's valued. But I also know that it's just teaching, it's just good teaching. . . . So I'm glad that it's valued, and I'm glad that it gives me prestige.” He goes on to describe the recognition he gets from his peers in his own program and department:

I was lucky enough to have a department chair who recognized that mentoring is time-consuming and labor-intensive work and rewarded me for that work. He is consistently telling me that he appreciates the work that I do with the doctoral students and that he knows what that involves…. he recognizes that and it feels great.
Professor Jacob gets recognition by colleagues for his mentoring, and that makes him “feel great”. He feels that this recognition comes in part from the quality of work that his protégé’s produce: “My students do beautiful work. And that's them, but I think I've got part of that. I ‘get’ part of what they do.” This recognition from colleagues and pride in his students’ accomplishments undoubtedly is part of what makes him “feel great”, and helps him to feel like an efficacious mentor.

Besides imparting good feelings, mentoring also seems to create happiness for Professor Jacob, as he described:

You know, I've got 11 more years. If it could just stay like this for 11 years, I would retire a happy man. Stuff always happens in higher ed. There's no stasis. I think [mentoring] is one of the things that I want to try to hang onto. I can let a lot of stuff come and go. Deans come and go. Faculty come and go. I've learned that. But this is something that I've come to that I really would like to keep, so I'll do a lot to keep that…. I love it. It's not like work, you know?

Professor Jacob “loves” mentoring, and he attributes his professional happiness, at least in some part, and apparently no small part, to his involvement in his mentoring relationships with his students. He further stated: “I like my life a lot, and I think that a lot of the reasons that I'm a happy person is my involvement with students. . . . I don't want to be schmaltzy about it, but it's true.”

Professor Jacob also spoke about the personal benefits he thought he gained from mentoring. Mentoring meets his needs for things such as friendship:

I had a colleague who did a national study on doctoral mentoring….What I learned from that study was how dry and how unsatisfying my mentoring is.
When I compared what I did to what D. did with her doctoral students—they went to dinner together, they had parties together, they became friends—I said: “I want that!” I wanted that kind of a pay-off. That's an emotional response, a needs-based response on my part. “I want them to be my friends!” The more rational thing was: it's not appropriate; it's not what you're supposed to do. There are boundaries that you're crossing that are going to cost you. I decided to take the risk and cross them… And it has been wonderful.

However, he remains mindful of a delicate balance of being a mentor and being a friend, and adds: “I think the challenge is: while we are friends, it's not a friendship of equality.”

Professor Jacob spoke candidly about how mentoring meets his needs, as he described some technology support that he got from a protégé:

I think [mentoring is] needs based, and the needs work both ways. We exchange expertise. I wouldn't have gotten this on this laptop without J. He's right across the hall from me. He's tutoring me along with the vodcasting part of it. So it's nice in that regard.

This reciprocal exchange of support, which may also be thought of as a transaction, or giving and receiving (sharing), is a theme that recurred in his conversations. In regard to other new challenges he was facing this semester, he indicated that he hoped to get support from his students, and stated: “I'm taking on a lot of new work this semester that has a huge learning curve . . . . I don't know what to do with that stuff. I can go to my students and hope to have them mentor me.” Meeting the needs of students also imparts feeling of professional efficacy for Professor Jacob, as he stated: “I feel very competent, I feel valued. I'm needed by these people in ways that I've never been needed.” Learning
from protégés, prestige and recognition by peers, receiving positive feedback that reinforces efficacy, friendship, and reciprocal support for needs all certainly facilitate the creation of happiness and “feeling good” for Professor Jacob.

Professor Jacob - What Mentoring Means for Him

For Professor Jacob, mentoring is partly about career and psycho-social support for the protégé. There are competencies that he intentionally scaffolds for his protégés, such as:

They have to know how to read and critique research. They have to know how to put a proposal together. They have to know how to get grants. They have to know how to teach. And, I'm upping [the ante] that they have to co-teach doctoral seminars so that on their own they're in front of doctoral students and they're handling research. And, they have to present at conferences. And, they have to make professional contacts. . . . So, I mean, there's little pieces that I check off in my head. So, that's skills based.

Professor Jacob makes sure that his protégés encounter certain career-building activities as part of his mentoring. He described psycho-social support as: “It's the student and then the relationship and then how will we negotiate these competencies. And, you know, it's: how many kids [does the student] have? It's: how supportive is [the student’s] husband?”

His psycho-social support for the protégé includes “acknowledg[ing] the student’s life complexities, personality, and so forth” in order to help the student successfully navigate developmental milestones.

Relationship is a key attribute of mentoring for Professor Jacob; I have previously described how he sees friendship as part of his mentoring. He also affirmed that his
mentoring relationships are complex, as when he stated: “I think that the [mentoring] relationship exists and it contextualizes everything. Like any relationship, these are multifaceted.” Professor Jacob sees that at times the mentoring relationship is more like friendship, but at other times it is certainly more pedagogical: “First of all, I think that it's parental in terms of how I as a mentor set up space, set up routines, and set up expectations. Those, of course, are negotiated, but I am the heavy in those.” Professor Jacob described how he balances the parental aspect with “being seen as the nurturer and making opportunity structure available. . . . to create learning space for people's self-development.” He further described his relational view of mentoring with: “It's all of the positive things about bonding socially in a productive way to make product. And we're very productive and the quality is incredible.”

Negotiation is another facet to the mentoring relationship for Professor Jacob. He further described his mentoring style:

I'm her mentor. But I also have to be able to talk with her as two people who are negotiating a professional and impersonal kind of space together. . . . All this is honest communication about [how] you're learning new stuff. I want to know those things. You need to educate me. Let's negotiate, because I've got stuff and I can help you shape what you've brought to the table.

Negotiation involves a give and take, similar to sharing, and Professor Jacob sees reciprocity as an important aspect to mentoring, as well, and stated: “sharing implies a transaction and a reciprocal nature. . . . I think in real productive mentoring it needs to be reciprocal.” He further explicated his vision of reciprocity:
I think everybody is selfish. I know I am selfish. I want it for me, me, me, me. I am a critical theorist and I am cynical, in intellectual ways not in daily ways, although that is probably true, too. I think that everything I do that appears selfless means that I get rewards back, or I would not do it. . . . I know that if I care about somebody, I get care back, and if I don't I am out of there. . . . I don't want to be presumed to care because I am a teacher. Screw that. When I care, it is effort and it is work and I want something for that work. Hmm, I better start a tally sheet [laughter].

I previously described how Professor Jacob benefited from an “exchange of expertise” when a protégé helped him create a video for his class. In our second interview he described the arrival of some new protégés to his doctoral student research group, and commented:

I am not sure what their gifts are yet. What are they bringing to the table that I'm going to learn? Because I do think that it needs to be reciprocal. I think that everybody does something to get something and my personal belief is that it's best when everybody wins. That we should all have a take-away. . . . The thing that I trust most is “transactional” and “everybody-wins” situations.

Reciprocal learning and support are part of the negotiated mentoring relationship for Professor Jacob.

Collaboration with protégés is another feature to the mentoring relationship that Professor Jacob believes is vital, as he related:

We do things together. We co-present. We co-write. We co-research. . . . That is, let's learn this stuff together. My students become experts. I lead them along. We
find an area together where they're interested and where their passion lies. Once
we locate that and I set up some parameters about what research is, what methods
are, what's credible sourcing, that kind of thing, then it becomes a matter of they
outstrip my learning. That is, they become the leader and they teach me what they
learn. . . .When your student’s [article] gets rejected you can say “Yeah, isn't it a
bitch? We just have figure out how we're going to get over this, and get on with
submitting it to somewhere else. It's terrible, it hurts, let's get busy.”
Professor Jacob feels that collaborating is an “important strategy” in his mentoring of
doctoral students.

Mentoring, for Professor Jacob, is also holistically integrated into his work day, as
he explained,

I spend a lot of time thinking about [mentoring]. I see it as the major thing that I
do here. It's really an undocumented kind of an experience. I guess to feel sure
about what I do, I do think about it a lot. . . . I integrate mentoring into my daily
routine. I think that's an accurate description because it happens every day. It
happens all day, and it happens sporadically through the day.

He continued: “It's just part of the work. It is the day. It is the day. I mean, that's how I
see myself.” Professor Jacob sees mentoring as integrated into his daily professional life,
as well as his professional self-image. He also sees his mentoring as essential to his
holistic image of his work and self, as when he stated, “I don't know what I'd be if I didn't
[mentor]. I can't imagine it. It's just so much of my reward structure for being here is
bound up in my interactions with students.” Professor Jacob can’t imagine his job or job
role without mentoring as part of the whole.
Professor Jacob also sees mentoring as dynamic relationship that changes over time, as when he stated: “But the huge part is the actual involvement in relationships that make change. We're changing each other. We're supporting each other, we're developing each others' interests and passions.” Part of what makes mentoring dynamic for Professor Jacob is that it is idiographic—particular to the student’s needs as the protégé develops: “I believe that there are competencies and that there are expectations, but all those are kind of like free floating signifiers and they become situated or instantiated on an individual case.” He sees his mentoring changing to meet the student’s needs, and concluded: “So, absolutely true. I know that's true because it's even at the level of performative aspects like confidence and independence.” Professor Jacob is concerned with his protégés’ professional and personal skills development, which vary between individuals.

Meeting the individual student’s developmental needs is also part of what makes mentoring intentional for Professor Jacob, who related:

So yes, I'm putting myself in front of [the protégé] to teach [the protégé] something right now. So that is intentional. . . . We both agree to acquiesce to this kind of a position. I'm going to teach you, and the mentee says I'm going to learn. We sit in those postures for that moment, but then it just dissolves out and we are into the relationship again. I know that it is intentional, but my decision to set myself up as a teacher is automatic.

Professor Jacob is aware when an opportunity for protégé development arises and deliberately engages in mentoring in a way that feels organic to the relationship—automatic, even effortless.
Professor Jacob – His Teleology of Mentoring

For Professor Jacob, mentoring is also teleological—it is purposeful. The purpose for mentoring is clear to Professor Jacob:

I am very, very clear that my job and my first loyalty is to that student. . . . I want them to grow and develop and there's a goal at the end. When they leave here, I want them to be a functioning professor. They have to develop and they have to leave here ready to drop in to an assistant professor role.

Professor Jacob’s purpose for mentoring is the development of the protégé into a new professor. He sees both professional and personal aspects to this, as he explained: “I'm interested in mentoring this total professor package thing. . . . to scaffold other peoples' acquisition of [knowledge]. And ultimately, you take away the scaffold and they are an independent scholar and they are going to be a successful professor.” He further explicated:

I want this person to be me, my progeny in the field. . . . We have to replace ourselves. If I believe in my field and the importance of my field, then putting the next professors in place is what the job is about. If I don't, then somebody else's ideas and somebody else's policies and somebody else's ways of doing this stuff is going to be producing the next professor that will train the next teachers and that will train the next professors. So yeah, it's inexorably part of the job.

Professor Jacob sees mentoring as not only part of his job and a continuation of his discipline, but also a promulgation of his particular approach to his discipline.

Another purpose that Professor Jacob sees in his mentoring is to assist his protégés with job placement:
I have upped to my responsibility in the profession, and I have increased my visibility and my productivity, in terms of papers, and in terms of conferences, and in terms of professional interactions. I have a very specific reason for doing it. It provides opportunity structure for my students, they have to be placed eventually. . . . My colleagues in the field need to be aware that we have a good factory here, and that we are producing a good product, and that they would consider my students as potential colleagues eventually. So, my new visibility is about getting my students jobs. . . . What I figured out is that if I am not at a conference, then my name is not associated with my student, and I can't use that leverage to get them an interview. Once they are in, it is their job [to follow through].

Professor Jacob clearly sees mentoring as providing opportunities for potential employment for his protégés.

Professor Jacob – His Negatives in Mentoring

In our first interview Professor Jacob noted that a potential negative aspect to mentoring that might arise is the time-investment needed for mentoring; however on that day he did not seem to be experiencing any particular difficulty with that, as he stated:

Probably the only negative that I can be aware of is that it's very time intensive. The contact time is incredible and the access is broader. D. and J., the two students in that research group . . . can call me anytime, call my cell phone. It's larger access than I am accustomed to. And that so far hasn't been negative. But I'm aware of the fact that it does take more time out of my life right now. And so far that’s OK.
During the course of the second interview he was time pressured with the start-up of a new semester and new course load, and experienced the time investment for mentoring as somewhat negative:

   Today is a particularly bad day. My life is being consumed right now with work, and I love it. I absolutely thrive on it, but it is causing a lot of anxiety. . . . And a large part of that is my mentoring commitments. And it's not just my students. I mean, we got a new faculty writing group that I participate in that I'm not delivering on. It's too much. It's consuming me right now.

However, when I asked him if there were other times when mentoring was just part of his daily routine; he replied, “Yeah. And it's ludic, it's like Csikszentmihalyi’s notion of ‘flow’ that when you're in the moment of it, there's nothing better.” Usually, Professor Jacob experienced mentoring as fun and enjoyable, but occasionally there are times when his daily schedule gets overloaded. Nonetheless, he asserted the importance of mentoring and his commitment to it by affirming: “I think you have the time you have, and you decide how you're going to use it. And if mentoring is something that is important to you, you make the time.”

Another negative aspect to mentoring in general, according to Professor Jacob, is bad mentors—professors who seem to be inept at mentoring. He stated: “I've become aware that some of our faculty actually don't mentor in the ways that I would support . . . and are perhaps less able to make it happen for students.” His advice to bad mentors is: “You really shouldn't work with doctoral students. You're a wonderful teacher. Stay with teaching. Don't do research because you don't get it.” And after lots of attempts of trying to include, and you know, bring them along on the journey, it's
not working. And maybe some people... maybe we're different in what we are good at.

Professor Jacob admitted that it seems to be a “paradoxical” situation: how can a person become good at mentoring without experience at mentoring? He disclosed, “I feel bad that some of my colleagues aren't good at this. I feel worse that there are major professors or students who are not being developed in a way that I support.” He went on to say that “on several occasions” he advised students to avoid working with professors that did not seem able to engage in positive student development, and concluded, “My ultimate responsibility is to my students. If I see them making choices that I think are unproductive for their intellectual development, they are going to hear about it, and so be it.”

Professor Jacob – His Motivations to Mentor

When I asked Professor Jacob what motivated him to mentor, he first talked about recognition by his peers: “I get a lot of kudos for it. I think I'm revered for it. So, I think it's the reputation and the honor and the recognition. Those are very important to me.” Professor Jacob enjoys the positive reinforcement he receives for mentoring. This appears to be the only “external” reward professors get for mentoring, as he explained: “You know, we don't get paid for working with doctoral students. We don't get a dime.”

If the external rewards for mentoring are sparse, perhaps the motivations to mentor are more internal, as Professor Jacob continued:

But then, there's also the internal states. It's gratifying. I feel needed. I do it because I really like it. And, I don't know what I'd be if I didn't do it. It makes me special. It makes me needed. I feel proficient. It's all about me again.
As I previously discussed, Professor Jacob finds that one benefit to mentoring is that some of his needs get met. Professor Jacob explained how he enjoys helping protégés because he gets many things back in return: learning, “good feelings” such as efficacy, happiness, job satisfaction, pride and recognition. Apparently, this is also a motivation for him to mentor. For example, mentoring makes him feel efficacious or proficient. Feeling “special” and “needed” seems to meet some relational needs for Professor Jacob.

Additionally, Professor Jacob mentors because he enjoys it, and it gives him gratification or satisfaction. Mentoring also enhances his job satisfaction, as he explained:

You know, I come to work every day. And I don't need to... I teach online, for God's sake. I like coming here again and there were many years when I really didn't. Before this interview I knew I was changing in terms of mentoring. I knew that I was coming to work more but I hadn't connected those two events and it's pretty cool.

Another motivation Professor Jacob related for mentoring relates to his own joy for learning and teaching

You know, it's really something when you see somebody take off. I know it's that kindergarten teacher kind of thing: why do you teach? And they say, “I just love to see the light bulb go off in their head.” Well, it's no different. I mean, it's human interaction over a learning project. That's the biggest gig in the world.

And, the payoff from that, at any level, is so intense that it keeps you coming back.

Besides the joy of learning, Professor Jacob also finds the learning transaction, the “payoff”, motivating. Additionally, pride in the protégé’s accomplishments is another
motivating factor, as he described, “I'm really, really proud to hood them. I wouldn't miss that for the world. You know, I'm a sucker for that stuff, that recognition and the [metaphorical] pat on the head. . . . It makes me feel good.” All these positive affective transactions—intangible “payoffs”—that he receives from mentoring undoubtedly feed into the “good feeling” he gets from mentoring.

Furthermore, Professor Jacob stated that he “believe(s) in my field and the importance of my field,” and he feels it imperative “to replace ourselves” by creating new professors. Contributing to his profession by producing the next generation of professors is another motivation for him to mentor: “This is just something we do. It's part of the mission of the program. . . . It's just part of the work.”

Professor Jacob – His Values as a Mentor

Community, or relationship, is something that Professor Jacob values as part of his mentoring gestalt. He described his role as “parental” and his protégés as his “progeny”—terms that denote a type of community, in this case, a familial type of relationship. A large part of his recent enjoyment of his job and of mentoring he ascribed to his new approach to mentoring relationships:

Up until about three years ago I kept my mentoring very site-specific and very professional. I didn't have relationships with my students outside of the academic relationship. I think a lot of that had to do with my own fears and not being particularly good at relationships, that kind of stuff. He described how he decided to “take the risk and cross some boundaries” and expand his mentoring to include more friendship, and that the payoff from that has been “wonderful.”
Reciprocity is also something that Professor Jacob values as part of his mentoring gestalt. He believes that the “payoffs” in the mentoring relationship need to flow both ways: “This unconditional love that they have for their mentor. Well, you don't take that for granted. That's a gift and what does it mean and how do you use that is productive for both parties.” Reciprocity is similar to sharing (giving and receiving), at the heart of which is an exchange or a transaction. He also talked candidly about how he gets some of his needs met through mentoring, such as technology support from his protégés and friendship. He also values helping his students develop because he feels it is imperative to give back to the profession and sustain his discipline with future professors and teachers.

Professor Jacob also values collegiality, and includes doctoral students in his worldview of who a colleague is:

Mentors keep appointments, and it's really been hard lately. [laughs] That one is a tough one to admit. But mentors don't jerk their mentees around. You don't make an appointment and break it; you figure a way to make the appointment . . . You know, there are manners about it. If you say you're going to do something, you do it. You turn a paper around in a timely way. You don't lose stuff, that housekeeping sort of thing.

Professor Jacob sees that collegiality can also be relational and transactional, as he described one of his mentorships:

She was a college swimmer. And she was also the one that insisted I meet her kids, because they were such a wonderful part of her life. Yeah. It's good stuff.
So, I get to meet families and things like that … Furthermore, she helped me with my swim stroke -- I help her write, she helps me get my triathlon training down.

**Professor Jacob – Summary**

To summarize: Professor Jacob sees mentoring as an important relationship in his professional and personal life, with collegial and familial aspects that build a sense of community for him; this relationship includes several types of reciprocal transactions or collaborations that are negotiated and produce mutual benefits. He sees career and psycho-social support as a foundational part of his mentoring gestalt. When he mentors, it is intentional (deliberate, “thoughtful”). He sees his mentoring as idiographic (particular to an individual and their needs), and dynamic (changing and growing). His mentoring is holistically integrated into his personal and professional life and activities, and is an essential part of his personal and professional self-concept—that is, a fundamental element that he can’t imagine being removed. Additionally, mentoring for him is teleological (has a purpose): to facilitate the growth potential of the protégé to be the best they can be, to assist in developing a good professor, and to ultimately help the protégé secure employment.

Professor Jacob sees himself as a teacher and a helper and finds teaching, learning and helping people to be enjoyable. He is motivated to mentor by his enjoyment of mentoring and by his desire to contribute back to his field by perpetuating his discipline and producing new professors. Part of his motivation to mentor includes meeting some of his own needs, such as recognition and gratification, and his enjoyment of various transactions or sharing (giving and receiving) with protégés. He also mentors because it is
a large part of what makes his job enjoyable, and it provides him recognition and
gratification. As a mentor, he values: relationship / community, collegiality, helping,  
reciprocity (transactions), and giving back to his profession. Figure 4 summarizes these
aspects of Professor Jacob’s mentoring-self.

![Figure 4. Professor Jacob: His Mentor-Self](image)

Professor Jacob rarely encounters negative experiences in his mentoring.
Occasionally mentoring can become too time-consuming which can produce some stress
and anxiety for Professor Jacob. He also finds it negative when “bad” mentors engage in
mentorships that are “deleterious to [students’] development”. By and large, he
experiences mentoring as a greatly positive and enjoyable experience that is not difficult
to accomplish. He enjoys interacting with protégés and doctoral students. He feels that he garners several benefits from mentoring, such as: learning, a sense of efficacy, recognition as a mentor by his peers and an overall positive affect (good feeling).

Mentoring also meets some of his needs, and therefore he receives benefits from various transactions (sharing—giving and receiving) that are part of the mentoring relationship, such as collaboration and friendship. Professor Jacob recognizes that his proficiency at mentoring has increased his job satisfaction and overall happiness.

Epilogue to Professor Jacob—From My Reflective Journal, November 21, 2009.

After reading about bracketing in several phenomenological sources and finding only vague generalities about it, I felt like I had no specific idea about what it was or how to do it. However, all of the very brief descriptions said to read through the transcripts and then journal about your feelings and thoughts, so that is how I am proceeding.

Bracketing: What Do I Think and How Do I Feel About Professor Jacob?

I can now see how this bracketing process is beneficial. I have just listened to both interview audio files (while verifying the transcriptions) and reread my reflective journal entries that I wrote after my two interviews with Professor Jacob. My impressions of Professor Jacob during and right after those interviews were very warm and fuzzy. As I listened to our conversations, I could recall my experience of them—how I felt drawn into the conversation by his authenticity and warmth. During the second interview in particular, he started revealing some personal philosophies that, at the time, seemed somewhat callous to me. They seemed incongruous to how I was experiencing him in our two interviews. At one point during the interview, I actually said to him, “I would argue
with you on that,” and proceeded to attempt to disabuse him of the raw honesty of his self-depiction.

Now, however, as I reflect on my re-living of the interviews via listening to them, I can see that I was experiencing some transference during the interviews, and actually defending something about him that appeared a little negative to me at the time. Now I hear his self-disclosure and think: ‘OK, he just laid some unvarnished personal truth on the table that seems a little too coarse to fit into my schema of him. Let’s unpack that. How does it fit into his presented persona as a whole? What does it mean in the context of Professor Jacob, the Mentor? And, are there any connections to the mentoring literature?’ It is through following this process of bracketing that I am able to view the interview transactions from a more analytical perspective and uncover patterns of communications and interactions, enabling me to reflect critically on them, rather than be immersed in the human moment of them. Let the analysis begin!

The Third Case: Professor Hanna Contextual

*Prologue to Professor Hanna Contextual—From My Reflective Journal, December 5, 2009.*

I have just finished listening to and verifying both interviews with Professor Hanna. She also projects a warm and caring persona, just as the first two faculty-mentors. She also enjoyed our conversation (as did the first two mentors), and thanked me during both interviews for the opportunity to reflect on her mentoring and discuss it.

She described herself as a faculty person who was typically present in the department and available to students, and as the one who “provided the Kleenex” for students who had an unhappy meeting with the department head: “As a matter of fact he
[the department head] suggested [to the students], ‘Now if you want a shoulder to cry on, go over next door see Dr. Hanna’.”

In reviewing Professor Jacob’s data on psycho-social support, he does not mention dealing with students’ emotionality, whereas (so far) the two female professors do, explicitly: Professor Enjoyable stated that she tried to alleviate students “worry and anxiety”, and Professor Hanna talked about offering support to students crying in her office. Some possible questions arise from this that might merit investigation: Does the primarily female student population prefer to cry less/express emotionality less with male professors than female professors? Do male mentors report dealing with emotional students less than female mentors do? If so, what factors influence that? Does Professor Enjoyable’s Rogerian counseling training and Professor Hanna’s natural counseling style facilitate this type of emotional sharing for students? Would some sort of basic training in a counseling technique (such as Rogerian counseling) help faculty who do not mentor, or who feel uncomfortable with mentoring, to have more confidence and inclination to mentor?

Bracketing: What Do I Think and How Do I Feel About Professor Hanna Contextual?

I think Professor Hanna is a skilled and dedicated mentor. I think she would be very empathic with all types of students, and would be especially good at providing psycho-social support for any student who had to juggle family issues (either children or aging parents) with professional academic issues, especially women, since she herself successfully navigated that path as a professor. I feel grateful that she shared over two hours of her busy day with me and I appreciate the mentoring knowledge she shared with me. I personally gained insight into what it is like to be a mentor, and I find that insight to
be very valuable, even if there are one or two little details of her mentoring style that I
don’t agree with and would probably do differently. Conclusion: I’m not having ‘mentor
envy’, and that is a very good thing. In other words, I am not having any transference
such as ‘Gee, I wish she could be my mentor!’ I feel like I received some valuable
mentoring on how to be a mentor; when I use Professor Hanna’s mentoring ideas, I will
remember her fondly. Let the analysis begin!

Professor Hanna Contextual – Introduction

Professor Hanna is a Caucasian female, in her early 60’s. She is slightly petite for
a woman, with blond hair coiffed in a simple, semi-short style. For both of our
interviews, she arrived in comfortable attire that included an over-blouse with a logo
from the university where she earned her doctoral degree, and sat comfortably in the
chair behind her desk. During the interviews she seemed interested in our discussion, and
frequently paused to reflect before responding to my questions. She smiled often, and had
a witty sense of humor which instigated occasional laughter into our conversations. Her
office was “small but nice” (as she described), and filled with books, like a typical
professor’s office. During the first (and second) interview her cell phone rang; she
quickly apologized and explained that she had elderly parents who might have an issue
and that she needed to see if they were calling. I immediately replied that it was not a
problem — my mother is elderly, too, and I answer all of her calls as well. If it was a
family member calling, she would handle the issue with expediency, and then apologize
for the interruption and return her full attention to my questions, answering in her soft-
spoken and thoughtful style. [From my reflective journal: June 10, 2009 and September
9, 2009]
When I asked Professor Hanna for her definition of ‘mentor’, she replied: “A mentor is someone who provides support.” Professor Hanna sees her self-as-mentor as providing support and scaffolding (a helper) to doctoral students, as she proceeded to explain:

I think that once we have students who have jumped through all the necessary hoops to get into the program that part of our job as the professor is to do the appropriate support and scaffolding. And as with any scaffolding, the tricky part is knowing how much to provide and when to pull back.

She explained that the more “intense” mentoring usually begins when the doctoral student gets to “the point of having to think about both the qualifying exam and dissertation and graduate assistantships,” and that prior to that point mentoring is more intermittent, mostly whenever the student drops in for help. She stated: “If I am on their committee then I'm their mentor. If I'm their major professor to me that is / slash / mentor. That's a given.”

Scaffolding and support is a theme that Professor Hanna mentioned several times in our conversations. She related to me how the ideas of Marié Clay, a prominent reading recovery researcher, guide her mentoring style:

[Marié Clay] said, first of all, when a student is having a problem always look to yourself first. What have I done? What haven't I done? What can I do? And then the second thing is don't ever do for a student what they can do for themselves. Those are my two biggies.
She then explicated how she applies Marié Clay’s concepts to mentoring doctoral students:

So one: if a student is not doing well at the doctoral level, if there's a problem, is it something that I could have helped them with before or should help them with now? And [second], am I becoming . . . enabling? Is this somebody who should be being more independent and I'm really doing things for them that I should not be doing?

Professor Hanna sees her mentoring-self as providing help to the doctoral student through supporting and scaffolding and “pulling back” in a delicate balance that facilitates the student’s development.

Professor Hanna – Her Experience of Mentoring

Mentoring for Professor Hanna is a generally pleasant and enjoyable experience, as she described:

Ninety percent of the time I love [mentoring], it’s like being a mom. It's feeling good about the fact that you have given advice that is well received. Most doctoral students are so anxious for advice, just plain old advice.

Professor Hanna gets a “good feeling” from providing support and mentoring to students, and she feels that students appreciate her help. She continued to explain:

I've been here at Transition U. for 32 years. I’m on my last drop year. And I haven’t been taking new students. But I’m so glad that I have a few left because it is one of the things that I will very, very, very much miss.

Professor Hanna obviously enjoys doctoral students, and enjoys working with them, as she further described:
I do like [doctoral students]! Yeah, it was fun role while I was in it, and it is fun to see them...to see the excitement. It really is like a second childhood of sorts, if things are going well...the thrill of discovery...and I love working with doctoral students.

Part of what she enjoys is providing support and scaffolding, as she stated, “Some of the reason that I enjoy mentoring is because it makes me feel like I've been helpful and that I've fixed things.” She concluded with “[mentoring] is the part of the professional life that I love.” Professor Hanna experiences mentoring as largely pleasant and enjoyable, she enjoys (“loves”) doctoral students, and she “loves” mentoring—“90% of the time”. I will present the other “ten percent” momentarily.

Professor Hanna - Benefits from Mentoring

When I asked Professor Hanna what benefits she felt she gleaned from mentoring, she described several types of learning. The first learning she discussed was learning about mentoring, as when she described:

[I] step back and evaluate whether I got where I thought I was going to go. And that is always a learning experience. And did my words convey what I thought they were conveying. And I would judge that by whether the actions of the mentee went in the direction that was beneficial for them.

Professor Hanna self-evaluates her mentoring style and strategies, and concludes by their outcomes whether or not her mentoring was effective for that person.

Another type of learning Professor Hanna related involved a doctoral student who wanted to do her dissertation on a topic that, not only did Professor Hanna have little interest in, but it was also a topic that Professor Hanna felt would not “bear fruit”, in that...
initially it seemed to differ from the current conventional knowledge in the field of reading, as she related:

And it's perfectly fine to differ in that, that wasn't the issue. But how was I going to mentor her? Should I be saying to her [laughing] “You're not going to get anything out of that?” How could I deal with that situation? My greatest growth occurred from trying to find ways to support her and let her do the study she wanted to do and to find ways to still help her, even though it was an area that I would have put about 77th on my list of interest areas.

Professor Hanna decided to take a risk and allow the student to pursue her idea. The results were excellent, as Professor Hanna described:

Her dissertation made a huge impact on the field and taught me that well, one, that I had been right to let her [do that topic]. But also to not think I knew so much. Because, look, it turned out way better than I ever would have hoped. So it was a really big learning experience for me. . . . what it taught me was that [laughs] I guess I don't know as much as I think, and certainly, we're all growing and learning, so be open. . . . So it was big.

Professor Hanna felt that she gained both professional learning as a professor of reading as well as personal growth as a teacher by being open to new learning and growing. She mentioned another example of her professional learning from her students:

Chapter Two is always my favorite. If I don't learn something from a student's review of literature, they haven't done a good job. And if that sounded [laughs] like putting it back on them, it is. . . .it's going to teach me something.

Professor Hanna finds both professional and personal learning to be one benefit she
receives from mentoring. She also considers reciprocal sharing and learning to be a benefit from mentoring, as she related:

I think in terms of being a mentor, I've been a mentor in many other situations before I got to be a major professor for doctoral students. But I don't think that any of them were as rewarding as the doctoral student mentoring situation. And I even can tell you why, as I'm thinking about it now. Because it doesn't just provide for personal growth both ways, but intellectual growth because of what they're teaching me when they get to . . . their dissertation phase.

She further emphasized her reciprocal view of mentoring with:

I would make sure that [mentees] know that I feel anyway, that it really is mutual in terms of, yes, I've learned from my mentees. Did I learn from every single one of them? Probably. Could I tell you what I learned from each one? No. But be open to the process there's growth for you too.

Another benefit Professor Hanna receives from mentoring is recognition from peers and students for her mentoring, as she described when:

A doctoral student comes to me and says, "Do you have a couple of minutes, because so-and-so said you would be a good person to bounce this off of?" And that makes me feel like I was successful with the previous person, or this person wouldn't be here. Since everyone knows, I haven't been taking on new doctoral students for two years, and yet that's still happening, so that makes me feel like I've done a good job.

Continuing recognition from “both students and colleagues” also gives Professor Hanna a feeling of efficacy that she has been effective and successful as a mentor to previous
students. And, undoubtedly, personal and professional learning and growth, recognition 
by peers and students, and a feeling of efficacy are positive affective states for Professor 
Hanna, thereby contributing to her “good feeling” from mentoring.

**Professor Hanna - What Mentoring Means for Her**

As I have discussed, Professor Hanna sees her role as a mentor as providing support and scaffolding to students that includes both career and psychosocial support, as she further explicated:

I think a mentor is someone who provides support and within . . . the realm of 
support you could certainly do a continuum. In the best of all possible worlds the 
support is like a scaffold, whether it is personal, professional, goal setting, 
whatever, and as this student progresses in our program you are able to move 
away more and more and more and more [scaffold].

As I gleaned from her curriculum vita, Professor Hanna has engaged in numerous 
mentoring activities to provide her protégés with career support, such as: hiring them to 
work on numerous very large research grants she was awarded, co-presenting at 
conferences, and co-authoring articles, books, and technical reports. Additionally, she 
described other activities she provides for her protégés, in conjunction with a colleague in 
her department, such as mock interviews for the students:

With my colleague, J. K., we were just the best ever at doing mock interviews. 
When students had reached the stage where they were in fact applying for 
positions, or, if they were at least in the dissertation process, they would be 
invited to attend, they didn't have to. I think every single student that we did that 
with got their positions: The University of Wisconsin, Fresno State, and I think it
was NYU. . . . It helped students a great deal. They all told us that when they went. We have a student who went to Clemson and she said the interview there was almost exactly what we had asked. She felt so confident going in because of that.

Another professional development activity that Professor Hanna engaged in with her colleague, J.K., was designed to help the student prepare for proposal and dissertation defenses. She described their strategy as thus:

Also, J.K. and I have co-chaired with several students. We play good cop/bad cop very, very well to the student's benefit. It's very comfortable when ‘mommy’ and ‘daddy’ agree. When it appears that mommy and daddy don't agree, then the student has to come up with their rationale for…[whatever]. They don't want to upset mommy, and they don't want to upset daddy. We make sure that we start this off with both of us in the room. We don't tell them until later that it was staged.

The former example of career support is rarely mentioned in the mentoring literature. The latter example is not one that I have ever encountered before in either the mentoring literature, or anecdotally. From the perspective of a doctoral student, I appreciate the creativity of these career support approaches.

Psycho-social support is also a mainstay of Professor Hanna’s mentoring worldview, as she related: “when [students] say it's too much. . . I can't handle all this, my response always is, if that's how you're feeling, you're absolutely right, let's talk about how we can alleviate some of that stress.” One aspect to this emotional support is the propinquity Professor Hanna maintained in the department, as she described:
For the most part I was a faculty member who was here, I wanted to be here. Some of [the students who nominated me] - I was just on the committee, I wasn't their major professor - and some not even on the committee. But I tried to always be here to give advice, for them to cry. It's not always a happy experience in terms of what students are going through.

She explained that when she was Advanced Graduate Department Coordinator in her early years at Transition U. her role was “being the person with the tissues. As they walked out of [the department head's] office, the students were coming to my office to sit and cry over whatever it was that he was telling them.” She further described her mentoring style: “My style is also, I think my students would say, less structured and more laid back even if there is a real problem. I kind of have students stop and take three deep breaths and we'll work on it.”

Mentoring, for Professor Hanna, is also about relationships, as she stated: “[Mentoring] is about the people. It's about your colleagues and it's about your doctoral students. And it's about your students, but especially doctoral students.” At times, the mentoring relationship takes on familial tones, as when she stated that being a mentor was like “being a mom”, and when she described the “mommy and daddy” aspects to her “good cop/bad cop” dissertation defense practices.

Professor Hanna sees negotiating as an integral part of her mentoring relationships, as she explained in the following example where a doctoral student comes to her with a problem with her major professor:

This was when I was still the advanced graduate coordinator so that sticking my nose in was not an unreasonable thing to do. And so, in terms of the mentoring
role, I didn't want to take over anything. I wanted to give the doc student the
tportunity to tell me her perception of the problem so that I could mentor her
into ways of resolving it. Because I don't care if you are in my position, in your
position, and all the positions in between: negotiation and compromise are part of
your work life. In this case the student felt that the major professor was taking on
too strong of a role in determining some things within the dissertation process.
And I wasn't saying that she was or she wasn't, because that's very personal thing,
too. What I was saying is here's how you go about dealing with this.

Furthermore, she elucidated: “I kind of called it in my mind, contextual negotiating.
I definitely want to do the negotiating in their context of whatever it is, life and
profession.”

Professor Hanna sees contextual negotiating as a fundamental aspect to her
mentoring, and when the context becomes dynamic and changes, she goes back to the
drawing table to renegotiate with the protégé, as she stated: “And when things happen,
because they will, you go back to redrawing.” Even without any intervening event,
Professor Hanna sees mentoring as dynamic, as she stated, “As I get to know them, I
think the mentoring changes.” One contextual change that occurred were “changes in the
university structure” that occurred when Transition U. “took a different path” and became
a research university. Professor Hanna described how that “impacted” her mentoring
process:

Because we are one of the few departments that have an educational specialist
program, there were some students that I probably would have provided lots of
support and gotten them through the doctoral dissertation process, but it would
have taken much longer. Instead, I would now funnel [them] into the EDS program.

Part of what makes mentoring dynamic for Professor Hanna is that she fully expects the student to grow and change throughout the doctoral program, are she related:

One of the things that would almost always come up in the intake interview of new doctoral students was - here's this person that has not had day one of a course towards their doctoral program. They say, "For my dissertation I want to do bah-bah-bah-bah." I pretty much always say, "You might end up doing that. Most people as they go through the process and learn more, they take on new interests. So while I would encourage you to look further into that as you take your courses, you shouldn't keep your mind set on any one thing”. . . In my years here I've only had one student who did their dissertation topic on the topic that they thought they would do it on when they walked through the door to start off.

She concluded this example with: “We actually think they're going to learn and grow during at least the two years of coursework and so what they maybe want to do, they need to leave it open.”

Professor Hanna also sees mentoring as idiographic, or particular to the protégé’s needs, including when the student’s needs change with the context. She explained: “What a student needs to be a successful professional—that really does vary by the individual. . . . It is so different with every student.”

She further clarified her meaning:

Because some people. . . start off so self-contained and so strong in what they are doing. They need a very minimum amount of mentoring. For others it's a stronger
amount. And that's the individual part. But certainly mentoring is support and the
support is given along a continuum with need. . . . So that as they go to their new
position, wherever it is, I feel comfortable that I have provided the support in the
amount that they needed.

Professor Hanna shared the story of a protégé who lived two hours from the main
campus, and who was to begin residency and graduate assistant teaching. Professor
Hanna described the contextual negotiation she engaged in with the student to attempt to
meet her individual needs, and yet provide some of the benefits of contact with the main
campus:

So we talked a lot. We talked probably more than in many other situations
because neither one of us wanted to cheat her of an experience that was going to
help her as a professional, while still making sure that the decisions we were
making were also productive for her personal life. And that's very tough. And so
sometimes my role was, “Well, what do I think is best for you? Flat out, what's
the best thing for you to do? Forget I know anything about your personal life;
what's the best for you as a professional, as my student?” And then what else we
could put in there to make it the best possible experience for her, while making
dents into her [home] life, but not hurting it irrevocably.

Through this process of contextual negotiation, both the protégé and Professor Hanna
were pleased with the solution they devised:

So this was not an easy decision and we worked on it for months. And what we
worked out was that she would teach there, but she would do research with me as
part of her assistantship, so that she would be coming up here once a week during
that time and working with me, attending a seminar that we had with other
doctoral students, also graduate assistants. . . .And so it was a unique solution for
[the protégé] that we both felt . . . really facilitated her being able to finish in a
more reasonable timeframe for her, and for both of us to feel good about the
experience.

As you can see from her previous examples where she negotiated solutions to
protégé’s specific needs and challenges, or guided the new doctoral student to be open to
new ideas for the dissertation, there are many times when mentoring, for Professor
Hanna, was also deliberate, or intentional. She explicated:

I'm going to say that at least 50 percent of the time [mentoring is] intentional.
Mentoring is also done on the run at the point of need. As so many things are. At
the point of need, running in the hall, a phone call, an email, quickly there's a
problem and how to solve it without being the solver of the problem, but of
mentoring the person to solve the problem. . . . But if I'm looking over a
dissertation or thinking about the personalities on someone's committee and how I
can mentor the doctoral student to broaden their scope to include all of the
wonderful depth and breadth that is on their committee, that would be intentional.

For Professor Hanna, another aspect to intentional mentoring is recognition that not every
doctoral student intends to become a professor, as she stated:

It's one of the issues that has been discussed in this department many, many,
many, many times that we don't want to have our efforts at trying to bring in more
national candidates, we don't want that to be at the expense of the people we get
locally who in fact are going to stay here. . . . A lot of them stay either in the
classroom or in the district. And as we say, there's really not anything wrong with that for them.

Professor Hanna keeps the professional goals of the protégés’ in mind and tailors her mentoring approach to their individual goals.

Mentoring, for Professor Hanna, also includes collaboration with the protégés, as she described:

We do research together, we present at meetings. Especially when I have my grants and my foundations so I can pay their way. We write together. I always make sure, and this was taught to me by my major professor, that the doc student's name goes first [on the publication].

Professor Hanna apparently enjoys collaborating with doctoral students, as she further explained:

When I was first going up for tenure, the rules at the time you had to have a certain percentage of your publications had to be single authored. . . . And then, with collaboration, a certain number of times that you were first author. So I really hated that. I'm social. It was much more fun when I was collaborating. So if you look at my vita now, you will see all most everything is done with somebody else.

As I mentioned previously, Professor Hanna’s vita indeed shows collaboration with doctoral students on numerous research grants, co-presentations at conferences, and co-authored articles, books, and technical reports.

Professor Hanna also views mentoring as holistic, first, by addressing the whole student in his or her context:
And I think also, like a mom, when [mentoring is] working, there is a certain amount of involvement with the whole person. And, obviously, I don't shy away from that. The doctoral experience in our department and, certainly my own doctoral experience, it doesn't take place in a vacuum. So you can't totally isolate it from your personal life.

She continued with an example:

Also, sometimes for better or worse, the student's personal life is involved. I had a doctoral student whose husband was going through the school psych program at the same time that she was going through here. There were times when she was surpassing him in a variety of ways. That was causing problems for her that caused problems for her professional path, and so we would talk about that.

Professor Hanna recognizes that many personal aspects to a protégé’s context are important, and can impact the student’s doctoral pursuit, and addresses those in her mentoring as appropriate: “There is a very high divorce rate during dissertations especially, for doctoral students. And I do keep that in mind to make sure that if that's a problem, there is a way that we're working with it.”

For Professor Hanna, mentoring is also holistic, in the sense that it usually seems routine, and is integrated into her daily habits, as she described: “So, it is integrated into my day because I'd like to think I never miss an opportunity.” She added, “I guess you've made me realize that it's been a bigger part of my professional life than I think I would have realized without your questions, so thank you.” Professor Hanna views mentoring as part of her professional gestalt, as she explained:
The opportunity to talk about this with you, both this time and last time, has allowed me to realize how much of my professional life it is, and how much I truly enjoy it. It's probably the best part. . . most of the time, it's the part of the professional life that I love. And until you said, “Does it happen daily?” I would never have thought that it happens daily. But pretty much, yeah, it happens almost every day when I am here, and sometimes I get calls at home. So, yeah, it's, I couldn't separate it out now.

Mentoring is an essential part of Professor Hanna’s professional gestalt and if she had to, she could not “separate out” mentoring from her daily routine. She concluded with, “[Mentoring] is very meaningful and worthwhile. Those are junky words, but my experience as a professional would not have been anywhere near as rewarding without it.”

Professor Hanna – Her Negatives in Mentoring

Professor Hanna stated that “90 per cent of the time” she “loved” mentoring. However, there were a few situations she encountered that were negative, such as when students fail and have to leave the program. She stated:

The thing I found the most difficult was when a student had not done well. If the student was failing their qualifying exam, that was probably the worst . . . . In my 32 years here I have had two students who took the qualifying exams twice and failed twice, which means you're gone. And, talking to them afterwards was probably one of the most difficult experiences. When students have a problem that I can help them fix that’s the joy and when the hole is too deep for a whole variety of reasons, that's the worst of it.
Another negative mentoring experience Professor Hanna had was when a student plagiarized, as she related:

The only other negative experiences are that there are some students who just don't do the work. It's very rare. There was a doctoral student, who was not mine, but I was the advance graduate coordinator. She was in a class of mine, she plagiarized big time, big time. I had just recently read the article that she was not at all citing... Not only was it not cited, she lifted two pages solid. I wanted her out of the program. Her major professor wanted her to stay in the program. It was a very negative experience. I'm not usually on that side of not being supportive. There were a lot of meetings... It took a lot of time and I resented it. There were so many ramifications of that, that were angst producing... That was my worst. That and the two students who couldn't continue in the program because they failed their qualifying exam twice.

I asked Professor Hanna if she ever perceived her time investment into mentoring to be a burden. She replied:

It is rarely a burden. But I would say 10 to 15% of the students, over the years, there are students who are problematic. Most of them don't finish. And meeting with them, being the bearer of bad news...[when students fail the qualifying exam twice] it's a burden to tell them, and you don't look forward to that. Students, who, because of times and problems in their life, you know, aren't going to make it, and they want to come see you because they think you can make magic happen: [that’s] a burden.
Professor Hanna rarely finds her time investment into mentoring to be a burden. Rather, what feels burdensome to her is when students’ have an unrealistic expectation that she “make magic happen” to solve a problem, and when she has to inform students that they must leave the program.

**Professor Hanna – Her Teleology of Mentoring**

Mentoring, for Professor Hanna, is teleological—it has a purpose. Sometimes, the purpose for her mentoring is very general—like providing support:

There is always a purpose to my mentoring even if it's just the very broad: “I'm experienced. This is a doctoral student who is inexperienced in a realm that I am aware of, and so I am going to offer assistance that will take the form of mentoring.” To me, if I tell you what to do, that is not necessarily mentoring. It is giving you direction. I guess some people might consider that mentoring. If I talk to you about what you're thinking about and what the possibilities are, to me that is mentoring.

However, for Professor Hanna, part of the purpose of mentoring is determined by the individual goals of the protégé:

I definitely do not preset a goal. I mean I could do, “Oh, I want them to be the best professional they can be.” And that's the truth, but everybody comes into the program at a different level. When the student graduates and leaves, they are very well prepared. In fact they can become solid professionals who then can mentor, whether it's in a district office, in their classroom, or the university.

Professor Hanna has a general purpose to mentor the protégé “to be the best professional they can be”, and recognizes that the context of the protégé such as their own career goals
(working at the school district level, versus staying in the classroom, versus becoming a professor) helps to determine the specific purpose of her mentoring.

**Professor Hanna – Her Motivations to Mentor**

When I queried Professor Hanna on what motivated her to mentor, her reply was quite illuminating:

You get so much back from it when you have the little baby bird fly, fly. Especially when they just even outshine me, when they just really do such great work and you're so proud and you know that it's them. I mean, come on, mentoring is nice but it's the person they are that allows them to be successful.

But it . . . makes me feel good to know that I was part of that. And students make their first national presentation and they were afraid to have put into AERA and IRA and we'll work together but then I want them to do most of the presentation. Or we'll start it off and then turn it over to them. And they fly, that’s such a great feeling. And we always do a recap afterwards and go through what might you have done differently and what did you think really worked . . . and that's as they move from being the protégé to being a peer, that's what it's about.

Professor Hanna is motivated to mentor doctoral students because she “gets so much back from it”. For her, mentoring is a reciprocal transaction, a giving and receiving, and this is part of what motivates her to mentor. Pride in her protégés’ accomplishments also motivates her to mentor, and to be a part of her students’ blossoming creates a positive affective state that makes her “feel good”. For Professor Hanna, facilitating a mentee’s progression from protégé to peer is “what [mentoring] is all about.”
Gratification, according to Merriam-Webster (2009) is a “reward or recompense” as well as “a source of satisfaction or pleasure”. To further describe her experience of mentoring, Professor Hanna stated:

There is the satisfaction of producing, of being part of—because no one does it by themselves—part of the birthing process, of phenomenal professors who leave here and go all around the United States . . . and I was part of that.

The gratification of “birthing phenomenal professors” is another motivation for Professor Hanna to mentor.

I inquired about anything else that might motivate Professor Hanna to mentor. She responded with:

I suppose there's some of that “to help the profession,” but I think I'm good and I'm going to retire and I want—oh, if I say part of me lives on that's really hokey, but because I've been successful at my profession, I've been successful training teachers, I've been successful publishing, I've been successful doing research, I've been successful providing service, I enjoy mentoring others—to at least take some of that pattern, make the changes they need to make but to have some of that pattern. So, I guess I do it because it's part of what makes me happy with my profession that I am giving back and passing on, passing on in a good way.

Professor Hanna is also motivated by her enjoyment of mentoring, and by a desire to pass on some of her well-garnered knowledge to the next generation of professors and reading teachers so that her knowledge may live on and that they may use it and build upon it.

Mentoring also creates happiness for Professor Hanna: it is “part of what makes [her] happy with [her] profession” and that undoubtedly also motivates her to mentor.
I wondered what Professor Hanna meant by “to help the profession”; I asked her to expound on her comment. She responded with:

When I used to teach undergraduates, which I haven't for a while but which I did for a good twenty-something years, it really was about making them realize the importance of what they were entrusted with, just teaching reading to kids. I think that since most of my doctoral students are going to go the university route, or maybe the school district route where they can have a whole lot of influence too, I think that the kids will benefit when my students have at their heart helping the profession to help kids read at all levels.

I commented to Professor Hanna that she seemed very passionate about literacy and reading. She replied: “I am. I am. I really am. It's really the most important thing.” Part of what motivates Professor Hanna to mentor is her passion for helping people become literate, and she recognizes that does not only mean mentoring doctoral students to become professors, as she explained:

[Protégés] don’t have to want to become a professor. They have to want to help the profession. S. N., who is on that list [of students who nominated me as a mentor], she is in one of the surrounding counties and she is a curriculum/reading person at the district level. She has made some phenomenal decisions that have really made a difference for both teachers, reading coaches and kids that you don't get to make when you are a professor. She always wanted to stay at the district level. That was always her goal. So it is not about being at the university, it is about wanting to help . . . . with literacy and reading.
The desire to help new professors advance the field of literacy, and to help teachers help students with their literacy and reading is also a motivation for Professor Hanna to mentor. Additionally, Professor Hanna is very happy in her job, as she stated, “It's the best job in the world. . . . The reason it's the best job in the world is because you have the opportunity to reinvent yourself every year . . . And, I love working with doctoral students.”

*Professor Hanna – Her Values as a Mentor*

As I have previously illustrated via her comments, Professor Hanna finds one benefit of mentoring to be learning—learning from her protégés’ about new literature in the field ("Chapter Two…it's going to teach me something") and learning about herself personally, professionally and as a mentor. Many educators today associate “learning” with “growth”, perhaps as a result of the seminal writings of educational philosopher John Dewey (1859-1952), who stated, “Since growth is the characteristic of life, education is all one with growing.” (Dewey, 1916, p.62). I have previously listed several quotes from Professor Hanna in which it is evident that, for her, learning is synonymous with growth; to reiterate, here is another such quote from Professor Hanna: “I've learned from my mentees. Did I learn from every single one of them? Probably. Could I tell you what I learned from each one? No. But be open to the process, there's growth for you too.”

One value that is part of Professor Hanna’s mentoring gestalt is that of growth. I have already stated one of her stories regarding mentoring new doctoral students who think they know their dissertation topic already on the first day of their doctoral studies. Here is Professor Hanna’s summative statement regarding these new doctoral students:
Students who haven't taken their first day of coursework will say, “I know what I'm going to do my dissertation on.” Getting them to understand that we actually think they're going to learn and grow during at least the two years of coursework and so what they maybe want to do, they need to leave it open because we are hoping that something else is going to come in there.”

Professor Hanna also offered two accounts of doctoral students who wanted (initially) to do their dissertation in an area in which they already had several publications and national presentations. For the sake of brevity, I include the more detailed episode here:

I had a student who . . . . knew so much about an area of great interest to me . . . and she had all this early intervention knowledge because she had been through all of [Marié Clay’s] levels of training. When she started talking about dissertation topics, all of them had to do with stuff that not only she already knew but that she had a better grasp of than I did. I told her that what I thought she should do in order to have growth is pick something that she needed to learn about instead of something that was within her comfort zone. I did not have to go further, but I was prepared to tell her she needed to get another major professor if she wanted to take the safe road and not have growth. I considered growth because if a dissertation doesn't open you up, there is something wrong with the whole process. But she got it right away and actually ended up taking what she knew about early intervention and doing a full year study at a middle school with struggling readers to see what she could apply and what she couldn't. She came up with a program. Really, she did a great job. It was a wonderful dissertation. Even she said that this was definitely the right thing to do, to “take my base and go
somewhere where I had not been before.”

Professor Hanna required that another student engage in the same growth process: choose a dissertation topic that moved him out of his “comfort zone” and into new growth and learning. Growth is evidently a value for Professor Hanna.

Community, or relationship, is also something that Professor Hanna values as part of her mentoring gestalt. She used familial relationship/community terms to describe her mentoring role as being “like a mom” as well as “being a part of the birthing process of phenomenal professors.” Professor Hanna also stated:

[Mentoring is] very much like being a mom. The outcome that you want is happy, healthy, self-sufficient, productive children. The same thing would be true for when your doctoral student graduates and goes on with the rest of their career.

For Professor Hanna, her relationships with colleagues and students is a vital part of her professional and mentoring identity, as she stated: “[Mentoring] is about the people. It's about your colleagues and it's about your doctoral students. And it's about your students, but especially doctoral students.”

Reciprocity or sharing (giving and receiving) is also something that Professor Hanna values as part of her mentoring gestalt. She believes that the learning in the mentoring relationship needs to flow both ways: “I would make sure that [mentees] know that I feel anyway, that it really is mutual.” Reciprocal sharing is something Professor Hanna enjoys, as she explained: “I enjoy talking and sharing with others. I hope in both directions. . . . I teach with stories. And that means sharing.”

For Professor Hanna, helping (supporting and scaffolding) is also a core value in her mentoring gestalt. She enjoys helping protégés, as she stated: “some of the reason that
I enjoy mentoring is because it makes me feel like I've been helpful and that I've fixed things.” In order to help students, Professor Hanna realized that she needed to be present at the campus and accessible to students, as she explained: “For the most part I was a faculty member who was here, I wanted to be here. . . . I tried to always be here to give advice, for them to cry.” Professor Hanna also values giving back to her profession by helping to sustain the field of literacy and reading, both by creating new professors and supporting school district literacy personnel: “It is not about being at the university - it is about wanting to help. . . . with literacy and reading.”

Regarding collegiality, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) describes collegiality as “collaboration and constructive cooperation” (AAUP, 1999, ¶ 3). The AAUP further states: “Collegiality is . . . a quality whose value is expressed in the successful execution of these three functions [teaching, scholarship, and service].” (American Association of University Professors, 1999, ¶ 4). Professor Hanna also values Collegiality and includes constructive collaboration in her mentoring of doctoral students: “We do research together, we present at meetings. . . . we write together.”

Professor Hanna – Summary

To summarize: Professor Hanna sees mentoring as a relationship in her professional life, with collegial and familial aspects that extend to doctoral students; this relationship includes reciprocal sharing or collaborations that are contextually negotiated and produce mutual benefits. She sees career and psycho-social support and scaffolding as a basic part of her mentoring gestalt. When she mentors, it is intentional (deliberate) at least 50% percent of the time. She sees her mentoring as idiographic (particular to an
individual’s context and needs), and dynamic (changing and growing with the protégé’s needs). Her mentoring is holistically integrated into her professional life and activities, and is an essential part of her professional self-concept—that is, a fundamental element that she can’t “separate out”. Additionally, mentoring for her is teleological (has a purpose): to help, support and scaffold the growth of the protégé into a new professor, and to help students achieve their best, be that “phenomenal professors” or school district literacy leaders.

Professor Hanna sees herself as a helper and finds supporting and scaffolding (helping) the development of students to be enjoyable. She is motivated to mentor by her enjoyment of mentoring and by her desire to contribute back to the field of literacy by producing new professors and school district literacy professionals, and by her desire to pass along some of her best accumulated wisdom to literacy professionals who can use and expand upon it. Part of her motivation to mentor includes enjoyment of sharing (giving and receiving) with protégés and the fact that she finds mentoring gratifying (satisfying and pleasurable). She also mentors because it is an integral part of what makes her job enjoyable, and she thinks she has “the best job in the world”. As a mentor, she values: growth, relationship / community, collegiality, helping, reciprocity (sharing), and giving back to her profession. Figure 5 summarizes these aspects of Professor Hanna’s mentoring-self.

Professor Hanna seldom encounters negative experiences in her mentoring. Only “rarely” does she find that mentoring is too time-consuming. Some of her “rare” negative mentoring experiences include when students are in too deep of a dilemma and she is
Figure 5. Professor Hanna: Her Mentor-Self

unable to help them extricate themselves; when students fail out of the program and she has to deliver the bad news; when students have unreasonable expectations that she can “work magic” to help them; and when students plagiarize. By and large, (90% of the time) she experiences mentoring as a greatly pleasant, enjoyable and rewarding experience. She enjoys interacting with protégés and doctoral students. She feels that she receives several benefits from mentoring, such as: learning, reciprocal sharing and learning, a sense of efficacy, recognition as a mentor by peers and students, gratification and an overall positive affect (good feeling). Professor Hanna recognizes that mentoring is an essential part of her overall job satisfaction.

It is interesting that Professor Hanna actually cited a theorist as a direct influence on her mentoring style (Marié Clay). She gave very clear examples of how she applied Clay’s theories to assist protégés with acquiring academic and career skills. Professor Enjoyable also cited a theorist (Carl Rogers) who provided her with skills for psycho-social mentoring. Professor Jacob mentioned a mentoring researcher (Donna Alvermann) whose research influenced him to alter his mentoring style. I was not expecting this—but it’s an interesting finding! I expected that when I asked people how they learned to mentor that they would talk about a specific person or persons in their life that modeled some mentoring for them. But some of the mentors I interviewed said they did not have a mentor. One mentor’s initial response (after admitting that she did not have a mentor) was “I don’t know how I learned to mentor.” She then described how she learned how not to mentor from her major professor by noticing support she needed but that he did not provide for her. I think this attests to the complexity of mentoring: generally it is not something that is simple and quickly learned. Since there are different facets to mentoring (scholarly expertise in a discipline, career support, psycho-social support, networking) a person might find mentoring modeled in various personifications.

The Fourth Case: Professor Reeba Intentional

Prologue to Professor Reeba Intentional—From My Reflective Journal, June 1, 2009.

I arrived at the departmental office early (as usual) for my first interview with Professor Reeba. The administrative assistant at the reception desk informed me that Professor Reeba would be with me in a moment. I did my usual pacing back and forth in the main office, reading everything on the walls, until Professor Reeba emerged from the
department offices, greeted me and guided me back to her office in the faculty office suite. Since it was the middle of the summer term, we did not encounter anyone else in the faculty suite. I left the door ajar (since there would seem to be no ambient noise in the hallway) and began to set up the recorder and microphones for the interview as Professor Reeba pleasantly chatted with me.

Her office is consistent with the offices of the other faculty-mentors I interviewed so far: a somewhat small room with windows across the top of the outside wall providing ambient light; green metal book shelves over the desk crammed with books; the usual moderate amount of clutter across the desktop and filing cabinets. However, on the one wall that was not lined with cabinets or desk, there were numerous colorful children’s drawings taped to the wall—in fact they lined the whole wall beginning at approximately two and a half feet from the floor and extending up the wall to nearly six feet. I asked her if these oeuvres were done by her children; her answer was partly what I expected and partly a surprise. She replied that some of them were done by her children but that some of them were done by her children’s playmates, and that when she would come to her office on Saturdays to work she would often have her children bring friends because it would help to keep her children more contentedly occupied while she did some office work. I thought that was a smart idea, and a bit courageous—bringing along more children. I’m glad that strategy works for her and allows her to accomplish her work!


Now that I have just listened to both interviews with Professor Reeba and reread my reflective journaling after her interviews, I prepare myself for analysis by asking
myself these bracketing questions. Professor Reeba is closer to me in age than the first
three mentors. I wonder if this does not make me identify more with her than the other
mentors. My answer to that is: not really. She is married, has children, and already has
several years of experience as a professor; these dissimilarities to my situation lead me to
not thoroughly identify her as a peer. I admire her for engaging in so many life-roles at
once (professor, wife, mother, mentor). I think she is a dedicated and engaged mentor. I
agree with most of her opinions on mentoring, but not every one of them. Conclusion: I
seem to be feeling likewise about the other mentors—finding many similarities in our
approaches to mentoring, but not total agreement. I believe that this speaks to the variety
of individual approaches to mentoring—even within the same field of teacher education.
There seems to be a common core of mentoring approaches, but always room for
diversity. Perhaps that will be an overarching emergent theme in this study: diversity
within unity. Let the analysis begin!

Professor Reeba Intentional – Introduction

Professor Reeba is a Latina in her late 40’s. She is slender and of average height
for a woman, with dark locks of hair that flow past the tops of her shoulders. The
apparent absence of any gray in her hair led me to think that she was younger than she
actually is. For both of our interviews, she dressed in business casual attire and sat in the
chair behind her desk. During the interviews she seemed fully engaged and interested in
our discussion and frequently leaned forward when telling a story or making a point. She
smiled often, and commonly punctuated her narrative with gesticulations. During the
first interview her office phone rang; she completely ignored the ringing phone as if it did
not exist, and remained completely focused on our conversation without batting an eye.
[From my Reflective Journal and field notes, June 1, 2009, September 3, 2009 and December 31, 2009; and from a personal communication with Professor Reeba, December 31, 2009.]

As I gleaned from her curriculum vita, Professor Reeba’s career in education spans 26 years beginning as a social studies teacher in the high school and vocational-technical educational setting, with the last 19 of these years as a professor of social science education involving teacher education at all levels (pre-service bachelors, masters, and doctoral).

Professor Reeba – Her Self as Mentor

When I asked Professor Reeba for her definition of the term ‘mentor’, she paused a moment to think and then stated:

I guess the first word, if I'm doing a free association test, that comes up would be the word ‘guide’ because that's really all you can do. And in some cases, a mentorship experience will present itself, where it's new territory for you. It's not like you're always going back on your personal experiences and using those experiences to inform or to provide guidance or advice for the mentee. All you can do is guide. Some of it is based on your own personal experience. Some of it is based on your understanding of a field. It's taking opportunities and shuttling it people's way.

She further explicated her role of guide: “I don't have a problem with [the student] not taking advice, or with challenging [what I advise], or saying ‘No, that's not what I need or want right now’. I'm good with all of that.” Professor Reeba sees her role as a mentor as offering guidance to the protégé, and respects the student’s autonomy to decide what is
best for him/herself. She added: “So it's looking for opportunities, making the opportunities happen and extending the invitation to people. Not that you can force them and I don't want to do that, but making it available.”

Professor Reeba also sees her role as a mentor as being a conduit of opportunities for the protégé, as she proceeded to explain: “It is making opportunities available . . . and you know . . . just making those opportunities available I think is very important.” One area that Professor Reeba acts as a conduit of opportunities for protégés is publishing, as she described passing along an opportunity she received from a colleague who was guest-editing an issue of a journal:

She is going to be guest editor for Social Education in our field. . . . So she sent me an email saying would I contribute an article to the journal? And I said, “Well, maybe I could but, any problem with my forwarding this call for papers to my doctoral students?” She says, “Oh, no, not at all. Great.” So I did. I forwarded it to all of our doctoral students and then several of them submitted - developed a prospectus for her. . . so I got a few of them on board on that.

Professor Reeba related another instance where she was a guest editor for a journal and disseminated that opportunity to students: “Here is that Special Issue on Humanities in Latin American Studies. I gave that opportunity to write -- for the doctoral students to contribute to that.” Professor Reeba also passes along other information and opportunities, as she described:

I was contacted yesterday by the Ophelia Project - it's that project where they have that girl empowerment - they just started one for boys. Now apparently there's a post high school program that's for 18 to 24 year olds and I thought that
that would be a great leadership opportunity for a lot of our undergrads. I got the applications, I got the emails and I sent it through Blackboard to all my undergrads but I also to all our GA's, TA's and professors in our program so that they could shuttle it too. So my point being that it’s sometimes being a conduit of information and just giving these opportunities that would not otherwise be available.

As a mentor, Professor Reeba remains vigilant to pass along all types of opportunities that might assist protégés with their professional development.

Another aspect to Professor Reeba’s view of her self-as-mentor is that of helper; she commonly helps her protégés by editing their manuscripts for publication and giving feedback, as she described:

Then one of the doctoral students last night said, “Here's the manuscript. Before I send it to Dr. K., any chance that you could take a look at this and give me feedback and edit or whatever?” So, of course. Of course. There is no question. Professor Reeba continues to help her protégés in this regard, even after they have graduated and moved into their own university teaching positions, as she related:

One of my former students who I think is one of the ones who nominated me for this project, J. O. who's at Alabama, he sent me an email about two days ago saying, “I've got a manuscript that I want to submit to such and such journal. I know you're really busy, do you mind looking it over?” I wrote back, “You never have to ask that question. You always send it.” So he did. I went to bed that night but it was bugging me so I got up at two o'clock in the morning, started the computer, did the tracking changes and sent it back.
If protégés are not keeping up with a writing schedule, Professor Reeba has a habit of helping them get back on track, as she illustrated:

I'm old school, so I still do this kind of calendar. And, I had it here for last Friday:

“Email Frank” [a student]. . . . I will not go to sleep that day until I have done this, and it could be a thirty second email: “Hey Frank, how's it going? How's the writing this week?” So, he wrote back to me, “I've been at a wedding all week long and. . . I let my dissertation management this week get cold.” I wrote back and I said, “That wedding did not take seven days. You cannot tell me that when you are on that airplane you couldn't be reading an article toward that.

Another way the Professor Reeba helps students is by facilitating other resources, such as part-time jobs with tuition assistance, as she related in this episode where a talented master’s student was considering doctoral study:

He asked, “How am I going to pay for it?” [The University] didn't have any money for fellowships, and I said, “Let me see what I can do about getting you a teaching job here.” Well, as you know, when you teach at the university you also got a tuition stipend so that was actually more important [than the salary]. It wasn't so much he was going to be paid for the class, which he did, but he was going to get this tuition voucher to pay for the doctoral level classes. So, I was able to facilitate that.

In the following passage, Professor Reeba described other ways in which she helps, supports and scaffolds protégés’ professional growth throughout a mentoring relationship:
You know, really encouraging people to become members of the professional organizations, finding funding for them to actually go to the annual conferences, then, having them shadow me at a presentation, so that they could see what it would be like, before I co-wrote a proposal with them, to then having them submit one on their own, to then sitting in the audience while they presented. I mean, that's an evolution, you know, it's a gradual progression.

Another facet to Professor International’s self-as-mentors is that of model; Professor Reeba sees herself as modeling several professional goals and behaviors for her protégés, as she explicated:

And you have to remember, that . . . just like with your kids, when you say, “Do as I say, not as I do,” and it doesn't work - it doesn't work with mentoring either. You have to walk the walk and not just talk the talk. You really have to conduct yourself in an exemplary way. And I don't mean exemplary outstanding, I mean exemplary like by example. They need to be able to see you doing the things that you say you value, you know, and be true, in that way.

She continued: “I started reflecting back on what my mentors did for me, and then I started to emulate that. The most prime example, prime example, were professional conferences.” Professor Reeba shared a detailed explanation (listed above) of the steps she takes to model a successful conference proposals and presentations for her protégés. Professor Reeba also models commitment and reliability for her students, as she related in this passage:

My point is that I have a commitment to him. When I ask ‘Frank’ to send me his outline, I told him “I want to see your Table of Contents. Just let me see your
Table of Contents. How do you plan to outline this?” If he doesn't send that to me, or send me an email saying he couldn’t get to it, he is in deep doo-doo because I am not going to be happy, because he can count on me to do that. I try to model that for them that if I promise them something, it's going to happen, you know? Or, an email explaining why I can't.

Professor Reeba made it clear that it was OK if Frank didn’t have his writing ready on schedule, but that she still expected a follow-up communication on schedule. This responsive communication style is also something she models for her students, as she described:

They also know that if I'm gone, whether I'm gone for the summer, or over Christmas break, or on a trip or whatever and they get an out of office reply, they know that ‘out of office reply’ does not impact them because I will scan through for my doctoral students and their name pops out, I will check that and get back to them. They know that it will never be more than 48 hours that they will get a response from me on something. Now, that means that then there's a burden on them. So if I write to them and I ask them for whatever, they know that it's got to be a two way street. But I never try to ask them for more than I would ask for myself because, you have to lead by example, I think. So, [smiles] I could be a pain in the ass.

She added, “My personal philosophy is one that I shared with our GA's is that I check email a minimum of three times a day.” Professor Reeba summarized her modeling philosophy with, “That's where I was saying about walking the walk. You know, you have to embody it, and you have to exemplify it.”
Professor Reeba – Her Experience of Mentoring

By and large, the mentoring experience for Professor Reeba is pleasant, and she enjoys working with doctoral students, as she described:

For the most part, every single one of the students I have worked with have been just a delight to get to know and see evolve, to see develop. They haven't always taken the path that I would have taken for them, but as long as they are happy and they are achieving what they want, I'm good with that.

Once again, Professor Reeba acknowledged in her narrative that sometimes the protégé takes a different path than Professor Reeba envisioned, but that is acceptable to her. She added: “Most of the students that I've worked with are just very appreciative, very thankful, understand that this is a growing and learning opportunity for them, and 99.9% of everyone I've ever worked with has been that way.”

Although Professor Reeba is aware that mentoring does require a time investment, for the most part it is not onerous, and she largely finds mentoring to be easy, as she stated: “It takes only a little bit of effort to keep your eyes open for information [and opportunities] and pass them through.” She described how mentoring fits easily into her daily routine:

So it is a daily thing. It is a daily thing. It is a daily thing. And it really doesn't take a whole lot of time because I think that is what sometimes makes faculty members shy away from this. They think that it is a very time consuming thing. It is part of what you normally do. But it has to be conscious. You have to be aware that this ...you have to internalize this as one of your jobs, if you will, one of your duties. …. I have that kind of consciousness, that that's part of what I do, as part
of my job. It happens. It takes place.

Mentoring, for Professor Reeba, is also rewarding. The rewards are primarily intangible, personal, or internal, as she expressed:

It is very rewarding. It is a feeling like - well, it is a lovely thing to see people achieve, grow and develop and go on to do the things that they are capable of doing. So it is very rewarding to see that.

Her partaking of this “lovely thing” undoubtedly also contributes to her pleasant and enjoyable experience of mentoring.

Professor Reeba - Benefits from Mentoring

One benefit that Professor Reeba feels she receives from mentoring is learning about how to be a better mentor, as she explained:

I think I learned from my mentees, because they were not shy most of the time, telling me what it is that they needed, in some cases. In other cases, when something worked well they gave me their profuse thanks and appreciation. And, that kind of validated what I was doing to begin with. I think that also helped to teach me.

Professor Reeba also finds keeping in touch with the reality of the K-12 classroom via her protégés to be a benefit, as she related, “Doctoral students by and large are much more well versed in what's going on out there than we are . . . so, learning from them in that regard.” Professor Reeba also garners professional learning from her protégés, as she explicated:

When I read their dissertation proposals and their dissertations in general, their papers in class, and all that kind of stuff, they help me to keep up with the
research, because they're the ones that are researching. They're the ones that are, you know, looking at the freshest literature in the field, so that's one real obvious way, that I keep up with the literature in the field that way. Methodology is another one. When I took my statistics and methods courses in the late '80s, things have changed. I mean, I remember sitting with little computer punch cards [laughs], and feeding them in, that kind of thing. All of that has really changed, and students today are so much more sophisticated in analyses, both quantitative and qualitative. And every time I read a Chapter Three from a dissertation, you know, the Methodology portion, I always learn something new. So I learn about Methodology from them.

Professor Reeba finds that, “Just keeping abreast of developments in the field, learning about research methods and things like that,” to be a benefit she gains from mentoring.

Another benefit that Professor Reeba receives from mentoring is a good feeling, as she described:

Being able to see them grow and develop and establish roots of their own elsewhere is incredibly rewarding. So, knowing that they're happy and they're healthy and they’ve transplanted into a new situation and they're loving it is a fantastic feeling, really.

Pride in her protégés’ success is another benefit Professor Reeba gets from mentoring, as she related:

Doctoral students, who are incredible human beings, who love their discipline, or their field so much, that they want to deepen that, and extend that knowledge, and in many cases they want to go on to an institution of higher ed., and, you know,
it's almost like, when somebody has a kid, and they go on to do something, it's like an extension of you. So I love all of that.

Pride in the protégé’s accomplishments is gratifying to Professor Reeba, and obviously adds to the positive affect mentoring creates for Professor Reeba, as she further explained:

So by the time he [the protégé] graduated from here, he had a number of publications under his belt. He had started to craft his research agenda. He did a beautiful job in his defense. It was wonderful going to commencement and hooding him. He is an amazing person.

Efficacy is another benefit Professor Reeba feels she derives from mentoring, as she described:

You know, most of the benefits [from mentoring] have been of an interpersonal nature, feeling like you've had a positive impact in people's lives. Feeling like, at least, a little corner of their success is dependent on something that you did for them.

Being able to “positively impact people’s lives” is another benefit Professor Reeba derives from mentoring.

*Professor Reeba - What Mentoring Means for Her*

Part of mentoring, for Professor Reeba, is developing core competencies that ultimately provide career support for protégés, such as writing for publication and conference presentations. She stated:

I think publication opportunities are very important if you want a job in academia.

I've done co-authored pieces with a lot of my doctoral students. I think
presentations are very important. It could be really overwhelming for students to go to conferences and present for the first time. So sometimes I have them come and observe first. I am doing that right now with an undergraduate student of mine that I just got into our Master's program.

I asked Professor Reeba to highlight all the entries on her curriculum vita that included co-publishing and co-presenting with protégés; there were numerous co-authored entries.

Additionally, Professor Reeba sees assisting protégés’ networking and potential job placement to be part of her mentoring. She described a special event that she and her colleagues initiate every two to three years for current and former students:

The National Council for the Social Studies is the main professional organization and conference that we have on a yearly basis. Every two or three years we host a reception for all of our students. All of my colleagues and I . . . we do enough fundraising that we can host a reception and that reception typically costs two to three thousand dollars, because we'll buy food and drink. And we will invite the cognoscenti of Social Studies to this thing. . . . we're going to invite the Social Studies department chairs of the main universities in the country who are really active. . . . The editors of the main social studies publications are going to be invited to this. Anybody who has a job advertisement this fall is going to get an invitation to this. And then we invite all of our doctoral students, past and present.

She concluded with, “So, I think that facilitating job opportunities and making those networking connections are really important.”
Professor Reeba also sees providing psycho-social support to protégés as an integral part of her mentoring, as she described another support activity she initiates for protégés:

There are times where you do absolutely put the career stuff aside and you have to talk about bringing balance to your life.... I just mentioned my wonderful colleagues; they all happen to be men. OK, so one of the things I started to note is that all of the women doctoral students, whether I was on their committee or not, would be coming to me wanting to chat about any number of issues. Which was completely fine. So I started hosting some breakfasts and some brunches at my house where I would have just the women folk come. And we would talk about those issues specific to women and being doctoral students and being career women and you know.

Professor Reeba also described other varieties of emotional support that she provides to protégés:

We had the unfortunate double whammy of having two of our doctoral students lose their husbands during their doctoral program to an illness. . . . Can you imagine? And so there were issues. First of all, there were grieving issues. . . . The mommy guilt is [also] a huge issue. I happen to have children myself and so I think that sometimes, you know, it's important to just talk as a mother, to just talk as a wife, to just talk as a partner, talk as a friend and just kind of say, “Look I'm not saying what I did was right, but let me share with you what I did and what helped me to focus in this case” . . . . I have a very personal knowledge of what it's like to be in the throes of doctoral research and writing, and trying to somehow
get it together enough. So that has helped me to help other people, who are going through different situations like that.

Sometimes, in Professor Reeba’s worldview, psycho-social support also includes helping a protégé in a financial pinch, as she described:

Some of it a lot of times has to do with financial. . . . I can tell you that I have lent students money. . . . It has always been paid back. . . . So some people might say, “Where are you crossing the line?” to be truthful with you, but it's just the right thing to do. I can't imagine not knowing if somebody can make their rent or can buy a bag of groceries, I just can't imagine that.

At other times, helping a student get to the next student loan disbursement can be as simple for Professor Reeba as: “So my husband went and picked him up, brought him back to our house. We had dinner, and then I just made sure that I made so much food that he had to take some leftovers.”

For Professor Reeba, relationship is another prominent concept in her mentoring gestalt. She stated:

As you know, Carol, from being in a doctoral program, it's one of the most intense experiences you will ever go through in your life. Intense in terms of your relationship with your faculty, with your peers, your family has to be behind you. You've got another life, too. It's just a lot going on, and you can't just throw people into the deep end of the pool and think that they're going to make it OK . . . I think it's an embarrassment if we have a very high recruitment rate, but our retention rate and our graduation rate are low. So, we have to see it through. We have to see it through, and to my mind the 'seeing it through' is not when they
graduate. The 'seeing it through' is life-long. Now, the mentor-mentee relationship will morph and it will change, but it's all the way through.

For Professor Reeba, mentoring relationships seem to endure beyond graduation, as she talked about how her second mentor had called her “the other day,” and that “I still keep very much in touch with all of those folks [who nominated me for this study]. I'd say, at least, weekly contacts.” For Professor Reeba, the mentoring relationship also has familial characteristics to it, as she explained:

You know, you're a professional and you're certainly on that kind of academic intellectual level, definitely. But, other times [mentoring] is nurturing. It is caring. It is parental. You have to encourage in some cases. In some cases people just need to hear: yes, I can do this. Yes, I have the smarts to do this. Yes, my writing skills are strong enough for this, whatever it is. That's the caring and the kind of support that you have to show.

She further described her familial approach to mentoring;

And I think that, to a certain extent, oftentimes a mentor/mentee relationship almost has paternal overtones or maternal overtones to it. . . . to a certain extent you do create a surrogate family. And that really speaks to the emotional bonds, not just the academic or intellectual or professional . . . but that there are some very deep emotional, sustaining, familial almost, bonds that get established in good relationships. How do you quantify that? How do you articulate that? How do you find that? I don't know. But they're palpable, it's there.

For Professor Reeba, mentoring also involves negotiation. I have previously included statements she made describing how she felt comfortable giving protégés the
latitude to follow her advice, or not. In this passage she further describes her negotiation style:

That give and take is really healthy and I think really good. A very sad situation would be if a mentee doesn't feel like they can challenge or do something different or whatever. I think that would be a very sad, sad thing. So I think that is great. I think that's very healthy. I think that those are all important learning things.

Negotiation is also part of her collaborative style with protégés, as she stated: “There's also negotiation that has to be done when you collaborate with people. You have to negotiate all kinds of things. You know, your roles, the amount of time, the contributions, who's going to do what.”

Reciprocity is also a central element in Professor Reeba’s mentoring style. Previously I described how she expected a reciprocal commitment from students regarding accountability and communications; here is another example of how mentoring for her is a “two way street”:

Especially in the case of colleges of education, so many of our doctoral students are practitioners. And so many of my students were teaching at the same time, and they would . . . show me stuff that they did, so I would always learn from them. So, the idea that it's a two way street.

For Professor Reeba, collaboration is another important aspect to her approach to mentoring. She described in detail her collaborative style for writing for publication with one of her protégés:

So we set up a very tight calendar timeframe of weekly check in points. He would
do this. I would do that. We would trade and I had him watch how I wrote. I commented on his. Let him comment on mine. So we were able to publish this and I think it was really exciting for him to see his name in print in a fairly high profile publication. In fact, when he went to interview at the U. of A., that was definitely one of the key selling points to the committee is that he was able to participate in that kind of a project.

She added, “We also put together proposals for the national conferences to present. . . . so we were able to get several pieces out of this and present at conferences.”

When I first contacted Professor Reeba asking her to be a participant in this study, she responded, agreeing to participate. Along with sending me her curriculum vita, she also included a chapter she had written for a book about mentoring (Professor Reeba, personal communication, May 14, 2009). This is the chapter she refers to in her response to my interview question regarding how she views her role as a mentor:

As I was doing the research for that chapter, I came across the term ‘intentional mentoring’. That is a term, I think, that really kind of embraces my philosophy on mentoring. It is intentional. It is conscious. Now, there are many, many things that happen in a mentoring relationship that you don't necessarily think about very consciously. It is serendipity. It is something that happens in a hallway. It is something that happens in passing conversation. But, I would classify my particular view of it as intentional mentoring. I try to make very sure that when I see opportunities that come through, I think, “Which of my doctoral students would benefit from this? Who could contribute to this? How can I position them for a job later on?”
Professor Reeba feels that much of her mentoring is an intentional, conscious or deliberate act. And yet, there are components to mentoring that take place ‘on the fly’, so to speak, something that “happens in the hallway” or in a “passing conversation.” Professor Reeba’s description of this dual nature of mentoring succinctly captures the previous similar sentiments of the mentors in this study (e.g., Professor Hanna reported that mentoring was “50% intentional”). Professor Reeba’s detailed description (previously stated) of how she scaffolds a protégé’s conference presentations skills from the ground up is another example of the intentional and deliberate mentoring activities that Professor Reeba provides for her students.

Professor Reeba continued to describe how her mentoring is intentional, and also idiographic, or tailored to meet a protégé’s specific needs:

What does this person need that this person may not need as much of? You know, whether it is exposure at a conference. Whether it is a writing opportunity. Whatever it is. So it is intentional. I really try to take stock of who the doctoral students are; what their strengths are; what their needs are; and then I try to fashion the opportunities that I make available and how I interact with them - a very conscious choice.

Professor Reeba deliberately acts as a conduit, intentionally channeling activities and opportunities to promote protégés’ specific (idiographic) developmental needs. At the same time, she sees that some mentoring activities can be done in a group. In the following passage she described a group mentoring activity she participates in with her departmental colleagues:

In some cases we do some group mentoring of our doctoral students, for example.
The semester before our doctoral students start to teach [as our TA’s] at the university level, we oftentimes have a Saturday morning closed door workshop on teaching at the university level. . . . that's a mentoring experience because it's much more than just how you construct a syllabus order. It's the behind the scenes kind of thing. We do that in a group forum because they all need to hear that. . . . But then the following semester they start to teach, and then their own teaching personalities come into play. So it might be that one individual is just much gentler and more soft spoken and is being taken advantage of or whatever. That kind of individual is going to need a different kind of a mentorship experience in terms of his or her teaching than someone else who, for whatever reason, is having a different experience in the classroom.

Although there may be some mentoring activities that can effectively be initiated in a group setting, the return to the idiographic needs of the protégé appears to be the inevitable subsequent chapter in the mentoring odyssey, as Professor Reeba again illustrates in the following narrative:

Then there are the personal situations. I have a doctoral student right now who is maybe the strongest writer in our program that we've ever had since we started admitting in 2000, and she's not graduated yet. She's had a number of personal issues. She requires a different kind of mentorship than someone who hasn't gone through all of that. So, yes, I think that there are some mentorship experiences that can be more group level, and then beyond that you have to do it more on an individual basis.

For Professor Reeba, mentoring is also something that is holistically integrated
into her daily academic activities and routines, as she described:

Daily. [Mentoring] is a daily occurrence. That is exactly right. It can be an article when I am doing my own lit review for a piece that I am working on. I'll come across something. And it is nothing to take an extra minute maybe to download an article, save it on your desktop, open up an email, and then forward it and attach it to send it to somebody. That is a very classic thing. I have that kind of consciousness, that that's part of what I do, as part of my job. It happens. It takes place.

Professor Reeba sees mentoring as part of her professional “consciousness”, holistically integrated into her professional gestalt—“part of what she does” on a daily basis.

Mentoring, for Professor Reeba, is also essential as she described:

It's definitely a part of my job, I feel, as an education professor. I just can't envision doing my job without doing that, especially once you have a doctoral program. You have to. I just don't know how else to do that.

She added, “I'm going to do it, no matter what. Because . . . it's a very important part of what I do.”

Mentoring, for Professor Reeba, is also a dynamic process; as protégés grow or as their life context changes, she adapts her mentoring strategy, as she explained:

As we were saying, life happens and any of a number of issues can happen over the course of a student's doctoral study. Unfortunately, in our particular program we have had a number of spousal deaths, you know, untimely deaths. We had a suicide. We had a brain tumor that came out of nowhere. We had Hepatitis A that came from a blood transfusion. . . . We had a couple of domestic abuse situations.
We certainly had births, and we had job layoffs and we had all the kinds of crises that occurred in people's lives. What other word can you use there but caring? You have to care for the person as a human being and find out what's going on and figure out how you can adjust what’s going on in the program to meet these new personal challenges. Sometimes, it's independent studies. Sometimes, it's extensions on assignments. Sometimes, it's incompletes. Sometimes, it's trying to find some funding for them. I don't know, but you definitely have to do that.

Professor Reeba views her mentoring as adapting to meet the student’s idiographic needs as their life situation changes.

_Professor Reeba – Her Negatives in Mentoring_

When I asked Professor Reeba if she had encountered any negative mentoring experiences, her first response was, “You know, overwhelmingly, every single experience that I've had has been very, very positive.” However, she reflected for a moment and then explained:

I have had a student or two in the past that relied on me almost too much. And first of all it can become draining, you know in terms of your time and your energy. Like, for example, my students sometimes call me the APA Nazi, OK, [smiles] which is a horrible, horrible thing to call me. But what that means is that for whatever reason when I am looking through a dissertation or manuscript or whatever, every single little irregularity pops out. I'm a great proofreader . . . .so sometimes students are not as scrupulous in doing their work before they give it to me knowing that "Oh, Professor Reeba will just take care of it." [laughs] Ninety-nine percent of students have done [their own proof reading]. I have had . . . two
students who are terrible in this regard. And, so that has been tough. So, this last time I might have read maybe, I don't know, five to ten pages and it was just terrible, the number of misspellings and you know, citation problems. And, so I just stopped . . . And I just returned it to her and I said to her “You've got to take this back and you’ve got to do it. I hope that you see this as a positive learning opportunity because I'm just trying to be a good mentor for you.” Because she wants to get a university job. So, you can't do this. And, that's hard. That's a hard conversation to have.

Primarily, Professor Reeba experiences mentoring as a positive event; occasionally a student is over reliant on her for APA format editing, and that can produce a negative experience for her. The time intensive nature of mentoring is not an issue for Professor Reeba, although she did acknowledge that “[mentoring is] time-consuming, but incredibly rewarding.” Apparently, for Professor Reeba, the rewards for mentoring outweigh the cost of the time investment.

*Professor Reeba – Her Teleology of Mentoring*

Professor Reeba also views her mentoring as teleological, or having a purpose. She described her overall purpose in mentoring as, “My goal was to just get my students to progress through the program, to do well in it, and to graduate. And so, whatever those activities were that I needed to do to facilitate that, that's what I did.” She then proceeded to describe how, from her perspective, the teleology of mentoring interacted with her intentionality and the protégé’s idiographic needs:

When you have a teleological view of the world, there was a purpose, there was a design in mind when it was created, or whatever. . . . I think it gets back to that
intentionality issue. I do think that a good mentor thinks ahead about the goal of the mentorship experience. And here's where that individuality should come into play, because I think that it depends on the student. So, for example, some of our doctoral students want to get their PhD because they want to go into leadership positions in the school system. They have no thought about going into higher ed. They really want to be more applied in their work. Those folks really need a different mentorship experience, and in that case I might push more professional development opportunities, leadership development opportunities, that kind of thing, as opposed to other people who really definitely have their sights set on an institution of post secondary ed where they're going to be a professor. I want them to learn about the ‘publish or perish’ mentality right away, and I get them to start publishing right away. So, yes, I would say that it definitely has a purpose, there's a design and that it's individualized depending on what the final goal should be.

According to Professor Reeba, the purpose of her mentoring is to help protégés progress and successfully achieve their degree, and to help create the best educational professional that they can be—either as a school district leader or as a college professor.

*Professor Reeba – Her Motivations to Mentor*

When I asked Professor Reeba what motivated her to mentor, she reflected for a moment and then responded:

There are absolutely no external motivations or rewards for this work the way I see it. . . . If I were to show you what our faculty assignment looks like, in terms of what I am supposed to do with my time, nowhere on there is there anything to do with mentoring. . . . I choose to look at ‘other instructional effort’ as code for
mentoring. That's not what it is, but I choose to interpret it that way. So I make sure that in my narrative every year I point that out that way. . . . Everybody has so many projects going on and so many different things happening that they really have to believe in it, they really have to think that it is an important thing.

One motivation that provides Professor Reeba with impetus to mentor is the fact that she “believes” in mentoring, and thinks that it is important. She continued to reflect on her motivations:

Some of it is what I see as a professional ethical duty. I see the professional and ethical kind of intertwined, so I can't really separate them. I just think it's a professional ethical duty to mentor people through the process, of the actual academic process while you're in school through if you want to get a job in academia . . . We're kind of thrown together in this kind of family, it's like a pseudo family in many ways. So I just think that it's just the right thing to do.

Another motivation for Professor Reeba to mentor is that she feels a professional duty and an ethical duty to guide protégés through the doctoral process, in general. She also sees it as a job duty and a duty to her discipline, in particular:

“Is it a duty that is part of my discipline? Yes, I do believe it is, as well as a job duty. I think that in social studies education we are constantly trying to look for people who are leaders, who are curriculum developers, who can effect positive change. Every single year there's a new survey that's done with high school students which asked them what is the most boring subject in school, and social studies is always number one, even over math . . . . So obviously we need to prepare people for this field to affect some change.
Professor Reeba is motivated to affect change in her discipline by mentoring her students to be better social science teachers and curriculum developers.

She continued to reflect on her motivations and shared some stories of how she arrived in kindergarten in the American school system as an English language learner, and how challenging that was:

I had a bunch of really rotten teachers, especially in the 1960s. When I was going through school, bilingual education still hadn't really caught on. People definitely believed in the ‘sink or swim’ method. I went to a school that there were no other English language learners, it was tough. I also had some incredibly kind, thoughtful, wonderful teachers, who made a huge impact and made a huge difference in my life. . . . So, that is the power of a teacher. That is the power of a teacher. So I think that those experiences certainly shape who I am as an educator, and they give me the impetus to pave the way for other people, encourage them, make this world a better place, as hokey and as cheesy as that sounds.

Part of what motivates Professor Reeba to mentor is her desire to help people and help improve the world through education and teacher education. She also feels grateful for the mentoring she received at the hands of her mentors, and wants to return the benefit: “In other cases, it's because I feel like I have a payback duty. I feel like I benefited myself from very important and strategic mentoring opportunities, and so I need to give back in that regard.” Additionally, Professor Reeba enjoys mentoring, as she stated, “For the most part, every single one of the students I have worked with have been just a delight to get to know and see evolve, to see develop. . . . it’s a fantastic feeling” and she “loves her job”, as she described:
I do love my job. There are aspects of it that I love more than others. [laughs] I wish that there were aspects of it that were more valued than others, as we were saying, but I do. My husband and I talk about this all the time. We cannot imagine doing something else. . . . It's a great job. . . . I cannot imagine waking up every day and doing work that was meaningless - that at the end of the day, you earn money for your family, which is certainly meaningful but that you don't really feel like you affected any kind of change in this world. I feel like I do.

Overall, Professor Reeba is happy with her job, and “loves” it because she feels that it gives her the opportunity to affect meaningful change in the world.

Professor Reeba – Her Values as a Mentor

One of Professor Reeba’s values as a mentor is that of relationship, as evidenced by the numerous quotes I have included wherein she talks about mentoring being a relationship that is somewhat “parental,” with “paternal or maternal overtones” and “familial bonds” to it; and “it's like a pseudo family in many ways.” Perhaps Professor Reeba’s perspective on the mentoring relationship may be summarized by her comment: “If you really want to take this on as a relationship, your needs come after the student's, the mentee's, they have to.”

As an extension of relationship, Professor Reeba also values community and collegiality, of which she considers doctoral students to be an integral part of, as she stated:

I can tell you though, that being on tenure and promotion review committees, it's a red flag if someone only has solo authored pieces, professional presentations, articles. That shows a lack of collegiality in my mind. . . . It's a shame because it's
very narcissistic. You really don't get to grow at all as a human being [if you don’t collaborate]. Every time that I collaborate and I mean every time, I learn something new from a colleague. And I'm counting doctoral students in that. I've learned something new from a colleague.

Professor Reeba also values growth and collaboration, as can be seen by this passage, and several other quotes I have included, describing her collaboration style, and focus on the growth of her protégés. Perhaps Professor Reeba’s perspective on how she values collaboration may be summarized by her comment:

You know, I think that certainly my research, publication, grant, even teaching record [shows] a lot of collaboration. There's a lot of collaboration. I find that... Oh, I forgot who the name of the French of the philosopher is... Montaigne, who said: “It is good to rub our brains against that of others.” There's something about that rubbing of the brains that just sparks more stuff.

And for Professor Reeba, her value of collaboration includes reciprocity or sharing (giving and receiving) as she related in this passage:

Most students are grateful - to know that there's somebody that wants to assist and be supportive, and almost like, share secrets of the trade. . . . We did a Saturday morning brunch for all of our Doctoral students. It was optional to come, although I tell you, 99 percent of them came. We met in a conference room, [my colleague, Professor Sam,] closed the door, and he says, “OK. I am going to now share with you all the stuff that nobody else will tell you.” And [Professor Sam] proceeded to outline all of these ... tricks of the trade, secrets of academia, and I don't know, he had a number of things. I think the students were just so thrilled that someone
took the time to first of all put this together . . . took the time to host this brunch, and then trust them with this insider knowledge, if you will. I think to a certain extent, mentorship is about that, isn't it? Isn't it insider knowledge and sharing that worldview?

Helping is another value that is evident throughout Professor Reeba’s narrative. Perhaps Professor Reeba’s perspective on how she values sharing and helping may be summarized by her comment:

I don't know if it's a karma thing or what. When you share you often times get back. I like to share because I know that it makes other people's lives a little bit easier. If you want to do some deep psychological analysis, in some cases I didn't have the benefit of other people sharing with me sometimes when I was starting off in my profession. In other cases I was the direct beneficiary of a lot of sharing. So I like to emulate that. And it's just the right thing to do. Yes, you just do. And it comes back. It really does. Like I said, I don't know if it's a karmic thing or what but it just comes back.

As I have already illustrated, Professor Reeba talked in detail about how she felt mentoring was a duty—a job duty, a duty to her profession, and a duty to her discipline to influence new and current social science teachers to affect positive change both at the school district and university level; giving back to her profession is another value that Professor Reeba engenders in her mentoring.

Professor Reeba also values mentoring, and believes it is important. Here is another passage where Professor Reeba expressed this sentiment:
There is no financial remuneration for [mentoring], certainly. There is no one telling me to do it. It's not external, and that's one of the hardest things with mentoring relationships is that people really have to believe in it, and take it on, in order to make it happen.

She continued with:

A lot of people just take it for granted or don't give it much thought. I don't know what the story is, but it's really important in our field. . . . I would say that if it was really a valued thing it would be supported, either with time or money or something along those lines, and I don't see those support structures in place. So, really, it has to be something that wells up in the person, and the person feels like “This is an important part of what I do, let me do this.” Otherwise, it's a time drain.

She concluded with:

Also, I also read whenever I see mentoring articles that come out. For example, the very latest issue of *The Advocate* . . . is a special issue on multiple mentors and I find that very interesting . . . . So, my point is, whenever I see stuff like that, I stop and I take a moment to read it. You know, I learn something new every time. So, I think that it's a duty to stay abreast of this and keep informing ourselves.

Professor Reeba values mentoring, and makes an effort to read about mentoring and continue growing as a mentor.
**Professor Reeba – Summary**

To summarize: Professor Reeba sees mentoring as relationships that are important and easily integrated into her professional life, with collegial and familial aspects that extend to doctoral students; this relationship includes reciprocal sharing or collaborations that are negotiated and produce mutual benefits for herself and her protégés. She sees career and psycho-social support and help as a basic part of her mentoring gestalt. When she mentors, it is frequently intentional. She sees her mentoring as idiographic (particular to a protégé’s context and needs), and dynamic (changing with the protégé’s growth and needs). Her mentoring is holistically integrated into her professional life and activities, and is an essential part of her professional-self—that is, a fundamental element that she “can’t envision doing her job without”, and Professor Reeba “loves” her job. Additionally, mentoring for her is teleological (has a purpose): to help people, to help protégés achieve their best, and to support their growth into school district social science leaders or a social science professors.

Professor Reeba sees herself as a helper, guide, model, and conduit of opportunities, and finds helping and supporting the development of students to be pleasant, enjoyable, easy and rewarding. She is motivated to mentor by her feeling that is it a professional and ethical duty and a duty to the discipline to contribute back to the field of social science by producing new professors and school district social science professionals. She also feels a duty to “payback” all the good mentoring that she received as a student and help others. Part of her motivation to mentor is the fact that she believes passionately in mentoring and its importance. She also mentors because it is an integral part of what makes her job enjoyable. As a mentor, she values: mentoring, growth,
relationship / community, collegiality, helping, reciprocity (sharing), and giving back to her profession. Figure 6 summarizes these aspects of Professor Reeba’s mentoring-self.

**Figure 6. Professor Reeba: Her Mentor-Self**

Professor Reeba seldom encounters negative experiences in her mentoring and does not perceive that mentoring is too time-consuming. Some of her rare negative mentoring experiences include when students become overly reliant on her for APA editing. By and large, she experiences mentoring as a positive and enjoyable experience. She enjoys interacting with protégés and doctoral students. She feels that she receives several benefits from mentoring, such as: learning, reciprocal learning and sharing, a sense of efficacy, gratification (satisfaction and pleasure) and pride in the protégé’s accomplishments and an overall positive affect (good feeling). Professor Reeba
recognizes that mentoring is an essential part of her overall job satisfaction.

*Epilogue to Professor Reeba—From My Reflective Journal, January 3, 2010.*

There are several spectrums of perspectives that seem to be emerging from the mentors’ responses to my interview questions. One is the spectrum between intentional mentoring and serendipitous mentoring. Professors Jade, Hanna and Reeba have given some detailed examples of each end of this dichotomous continuum, as they have all described mentoring that happens “while passing in the hallway” as well as premeditated events or activities that they arrange for their protégés.

Another spectrum of perspective that arises from the data is that mentoring is time intensive, but largely is not perceived as onerous or negative. Each mentor has reported a few negative experiences, and yet at the same time they all affirm that mentoring is mostly enjoyable, and that they would not want mentoring to be excluded from their daily work.

Group mentoring vs. individual (idiographic) mentoring is another spectrum of mentoring activities that is emerging from the data, that is, some mentoring support may be common to most students, but then individual needs and goals rule the course of the mentoring. I am finding the description of these co-mentoring/group activities that mentors engage in either with another faculty-mentor or with several colleagues in the department to be very intriguing, as my mentoring experiences have been one-on-one with my mentor. Reflecting on this, I can see how departmental synergy (or the lack thereof) could play a decisive role in producing group mentoring activities for students.

Another emergent spectrum involves purposeful (teleological) mentoring. Elements of this spectrum include the mentor’s goals which, according to the mentors’
reports, are influenced by the student’s goals. Additionally, the student’s goals can change or evolve over the course of doctoral study (i.e., are dynamic); can be moderated by intervening life issues which can also introduce more changes; and are mitigated by the protégé’s individual (idiographic) needs. I am interested to see how the data for the last two mentors will be similar or different to the first four mentors.

The Fifth Case: Professor Jack Overscheduled

*Prologue to Professor Jack Overscheduled —From My Reflective Journal, July 2, 2009.*

I nervously paced back and forth in the department, awaiting the arrival of Professor Jack. This office suite was different from the previous office suites in that the department receptionist’s counter was not in a separate room from the faculty offices. I ambled between the receptionist’s counter and the wall, peering down the hallway for the appearance of Professor Jack, who was late to our interview. I wasn’t worried that he would make me late for anything after our interview; I was worried that he might have another commitment that would make him truncate our conversation time. He arrived a little more than five minutes late, apologetic for his tardiness. I was relieved that we could get started without further delay.


I have just listened to, while verifying, both transcripts for Professor Jack. Professor Jack is clearly a very busy man with a very busy schedule. He described his workday as “overscheduled,” in large part due to the quantity of university, college and department committees and duties he has, not the least of which is providing the statistical expertise for several million-dollar grant proposals. The fact that he was a little
late to our interview gives me no negative impression of him; rather, I am grateful that he took the time to meet with me—a student he has never met before—to assist with my data collection. I feel that Professor Jack is a dedicated and engaged mentor, and I wish that his schedule afforded him the opportunity to have more positive and synergistic experiences with his protégés, as the other mentors have described. His data will reveal his story; let the analysis begin!

Professor Jack Overscheduled – Introduction

Professor Jack is a tall, slender man with a few wisps of gray sprinkled amidst his medium-brown hair. For our first meeting his hair was a little long and wild, reminiscent of Albert Einstein’s coiffure. At our second interview, his hair was cut in a typical short business style. For both interviews he arrived in business casual attire, sporting a tie. One of his ties was blue and covered with a print of what appeared to be yellow golden retrievers. I thought, “Cool: I’m a dog lover, too.” During our first interview he mentioned that he had sent one of his protégés to present solo at the American Educational Research Association conference, even though they had collaborated on the paper, because he felt that his dog was “too old to leave”; I had recently made the same schedule accommodations for my old dog, so I related to that completely. Both interviews took place in his office, which had a similar physical construction as the other mentors’ offices: a desk (with a little more clutter than the other mentors), bookshelves stacked with books, and a window providing ambient natural light. For both interviews he sat behind his desk and responded in a soft-spoken and thoughtful, deliberative style to my questions. During the first interview, a student entered his office to return a test he had been working on; Professor Jack accepted the test paper with a smile and a nod,
without missing a beat of his conversation with me, lending me the impression that Professor Jack was used to multitasking. (From my Reflective Journal, July 2, 2009; and September 23, 2009.)

Professor Jack – His Self as Mentor

Professor Jack is an accomplished educator with 20 years of experience as a professor at the university level, as I gleaned from his curriculum vita. The fact that no experience working in the K-12 school setting is reflected on his C.V. is one detail that makes Professor Jack unique from the other five faculty-mentors in this study.

In order to provide context to Professor Jack, I want to mention two other details that I feel are relevant to ultimately understanding his particular case, as the details of his story unfold. First, it appears that there is a much lesser degree of voluntary choice in the process whereby Professor Jack is paired with his protégés, in comparison to the other five mentors in this study. In my Interview Protocol 1 (see Appendix A), I asked each mentor to describe how they became a student’s mentor. The other five faculty-mentors all reported that they had first gotten to know the students because the students had taken one of their classes and then asked them to be their mentor, asked them to be on their committee or to be their major professor, in which case the mentor interpreted that as the student asking them to be their mentor. The faculty-mentors assented, provided they felt they could contribute to the student’s area of study. There were only a few slight variations on that process, as reported by the mentors; the point is, the process was voluntary, consensual and mutual. The process whereby students are assigned to major professors in Professor Jack’s department seems to afford much less choice, as he described in the following passage:
I'm on the Admissions Committee. So once we admit students, we have a department meeting, and we vote to admit a student and then we decide. So we sit around the room, and there's probably two factors that pop-up, the student's interest and the faculty's availability. So, let's say we're admitting four measurement students or four students who have an interest in measurement. It's likely that they won't all be paired up with me, because I won't be able to handle four new students. So there would be some sharing, but let's say there were four students and one was more measurement, I might get that person. The statistics [student] might go to either J. or J. F. The evaluation [student] would go to L. The more specialized measurement [student] might go to Dr. C. So that's how the sorting goes, and then so much of our program is set that we have an orientation for all of our students. Then we meet with the students individually, and just sort of develop the program of study and provide that guidance all along.

Professor Jack did report that within his department it was a common occurrence that students might work on a research project with faculty other than their major professor. A mentoring relationship might certainly arise from one of those situations. However, the assignment of a major professor—who then typically becomes a student’s primary dissertation advisor—involves a protracted interaction between the faculty and the student that may extend over several years until the student finishes the degree, and is usually considered to be the foremost opportunity for a mentoring relationship in doctoral study, given the amount of time and interaction required to complete the program. As he described, Professor Jack is paired with his students via a “sorting” process based on
limited information about the students, whereas for the other mentors, it is more a process of mutual consent informed by at least one semester of acquaintanceship.

This “sorting” assignment process would logically seem to set the context for another detail that makes Professor Jack different from the other mentors. In explaining his role as a mentor, Professor Jack was the only mentor who made a clear distinction between his role as an adviser—as the student progresses through coursework—versus his role as a mentor—when his students begin the dissertation process:

So at that point [through coursework], I wouldn't really consider myself a mentor. I'd consider myself more as an adviser. But there's that point where the student then decides that they want to continue on and do research in a particular area, and if I'm the Major Professor, then my role changes from an adviser to providing these other roles. . . .

Professor Jack then continued to describe how he sees his role as a mentor to his protégés:

“ . . . And those roles are guiding them in the research and trying to communicate to them expectations and standards, communicate to them where I see how this research may fit into their future life. So it becomes teaching and guidance in the research, thinking about when they finish with the degree. What could they do with the degree. What do they need to do to make sure that they're employable.

Part of Professor Jack’s mentor-self is that of being a guide, as reflected in his conclusion to his description of his mentoring role: “And just trying to see them through the entire process until they finish.” When I asked Professor Jack to define the term ‘mentor’, he replied, “Well, I think the words that are used, the guide and someone who
provides that personal support, along with the skills, are some of the characteristics of a mentor.” For Professor Jack, the mentoring typically begins at the dissertation stage, and he sees his role partly as providing support/help and guiding the student’s development as a researcher: “A lot of students just can't really, they're just not at that point where they can craft ideas and move forward. There's a little more guidance that's needed. And it's similar to teaching.”

Another aspect to Professor Jack’s mentor-self is that of a teacher, as he described his mentoring role:

Part of it is that as the role of a mentor, it's not as efficient for sure, but there are a lot of benefits to get students introduced to how do you put together ideas, even [article] rejections... You can learn a lot from when an article is being rejected. It gives us time to do teaching moments outside the classroom, so I think there are a lot of benefits to it.

The themes of “teacher” and “teaching” are ones that appeared in several other responses by Professor Jack.

Professor Jack – His Experience of Mentoring

Primarily, Professor Jack finds mentoring to be a pleasant and enjoyable experience, as he described:

I think I've always enjoyed [mentoring], and probably even in my undergraduate where I went to a liberal arts college, and so our relationships with faculty were probably closer than in some places. I just enjoy the whole aspect of learning and developing, and continuing to grow. I mean, I think it's probably a lifelong developmental process of continuing to grow.
Additionally, Professor Jack generally finds interacting with his protégés to be a pleasant experience, as he stated, “I enjoy working with students.” He related a mentoring occasion he specifically enjoyed that involved a student whose major was interdisciplinary studies, rather than measurement; however, the student’s dissertation had a measurement focus:

He was very energetic and eager to learn. And he committed himself to the dissertation process. . . . It was a very positive experience for me because he learned a lot about measurement. I could see him developing and just being so open to learning. He was just a very easy person to work with. That is, there wasn't resistance.

He concluded with, “I would say there's a lot more positives than frustrations.” I found it significant that Professor Jack summarized his enjoyment of mentoring in this fashion, because the frustrations and the negatives he reported in relation to mentoring were greater in quantity and category than those reported by the other mentors in this study, as I will presently discuss.

Professor Jack also finds mentoring to be a rewarding experience, as he explained, “I think that it is rewarding . . . I would say that you get [rewarded] through the students, they'll come back and they'll really appreciate this and that, so I think you do get that.”

Professor Jack - Benefits from Mentoring

When I asked Professor Jack about the benefits he felt he received from mentoring, his first response described learning from his protégés:
Whether it's lit reviews for dissertations or even papers that I read. A lot of times I'll even write down some of the references that I might not have seen because a lot of times they're writing in a lot of different areas.

He offered another example of how he learns from his protégés. The student he refers to in the following passage is a former protégé who recently attained his first faculty position. The former protégé had contacted Professor Jack, asking for input on his first grant proposal:

There are certain things that students will bring to my attention, certain things. And even this guy up in North Carolina, he was in the instructional technology program. The guy is so wired with technology, and he is always sharing different techniques. And his study, which I need to read that tonight, is on gaming, using games in education. So I know I'm going to benefit from reading his [grant] proposal.

Professor Jack considers reciprocal learning and sharing to be a benefit form mentoring, as he stated, “Really sharing out with students and working with students that I've learned from them.” Professor Jack continued to describe professional stimulation and renewal the he felt he gained a result of mentoring:

With the number of students that I've been involved with, they seem to have different strengths, they'll pick up something and they'll bring that in whether it be a new statistical skill. Some of them have been better at online instruction; some of them have tips on that. It really cuts across a lot of different areas: Research skills, interpersonal skills.

I asked him to elaborate on what he meant by “interpersonal skills”, and he replied:
I think I pick up all sorts of things from them, just some of the quirkiness that they bring and learning about different people and how some of them are very different from myself in terms of how they view the world and their work styles and all that.

As a self-described introvert, Professor Jack feels that the opportunity to interact with his doctoral students is also an inter-personal benefit.

The other benefit that Professor Jack reported from mentoring was enjoyment and “feeling good” both from mentoring and from seeing the people he has mentored succeed:

I do enjoy it, and there are those moments where you say, “Boy, this is working the way it should be, and it feels good, and there's been some success.” So yes, seeing people... Even this new faculty member who got this large grant, I felt very instrumental in helping her shape the ideas, and she's ecstatic that she got this grant. She feels like a superstar. I didn't tell her that once you have the grant, you then have to do it, and it becomes a big pain in the neck. But that initial rush of being recognized nationally for a grant is a real big plus.

A feeling of efficacy is also a benefit Professor Jack derives from mentoring, as he described, “I do enjoy [mentoring]. I think the combination of feeling that I can do it, and I enjoy doing it, and I get some feedback on it [from the students].”

Professor Jack - What Mentoring Means for Him

Professor Jack sees career support as an intrinsic part of his mentoring, as he previously described part of his role as mentor as “thinking about when they finish with the degree. What could they do with the degree. What do they need to do to make sure
that they're employable.” He further explicated:

That's from day one . . . . When they come in we are providing a huge program of studies. “You need to do this” and “this would be a good thing to get involved in this research.” Sometimes if we have a search committee we might invite a student to be a part of that so that they get some experience.

He offered other examples of the career support he provides to his protégés:

Well, certainly the career part. All of these students that are applying to these jobs now, they email me or call me up as far as they ask for advice. They often don't go with my advice. But, they'll ask me about, “Here's this University. They've offered me a job. Do you think that would be a good place for me?” So, career advice is something I do on a fairly regular basis.

For Professor Jack, the career support is present from the beginning of the mentoring relationship, and often continues after the protégé graduates, as he described;

And then right now . . . . probably D., since he's been in the job market, I've been writing letters for him and talking to people who are thinking of employing him. And then others that... Yesterday I had a reference check. So it really continues on until they get a job and even past that point if they want to continue to do research. There have been some students that I have published with. After they have graduated, some of them have done post docs and I have continued to do research with them.

Psycho-social support is also a central element of Professor Jack’s mentoring style, as he stated:

Sometimes it's a matter of... Students go through all sorts of challenges - divorces
and job losses and... So part of it is listening to them on that and making sure that I'm at least aware of it and at least being aware that it might be impacting their progress and their degree.

He further described the integral nature of his psycho-social mentoring support for his students:

The psycho-social [support], it occurs throughout the entire process. We have students who are at the point where they're over the limit. The Graduate school has sent out letters that they might not be, they are no longer in the program, they have to be readmitted. So, they're coming in trying to see, “Can I do it?” Just trying to make a plan for them and trying to get them from point A to point B. Sometimes it’s a matter of trying to boost their confidence a little bit.

He concluded his thoughts on psycho-social support with, “Some of our students are from other countries. I always worry, do they have enough support here that they can make adjustments.” Professor Jack makes an effort to listen to and be aware of his student’s psycho-social needs and issues, and provides appropriate support.

Professor Jack also views mentoring as part of the learning process, has he described in the following passage:

There's just another opportunity to teach. When you write with each other you spend time thinking, discussing, analyzing, and rewriting. So, I think it's just another opportunity to continue the learning process. It's also a learning opportunity because a lot of times things come back and they're rejected. One student . . . J. F. and I work with him and he got two articles that came back and they were each rejected. Well, that's part of the game. So, we're going to continue
to work with him and try to use that as an opportunity. These things happen. You have to read the feedback, try to make the changes, and try again.

For Professor Jack, mentoring is another opportunity to teach—an opportunity that frequently arises outside of normal classroom activities.

For Professor Jack, mentoring is also about relationship, as he described:

Well, my dissertation was on mentoring. And I think mentoring is a form of education, teaching. It is the full package. It builds on relationships. I have always been interested in relationships. I have studied parent, mom-infant relationships and couple relationships. Mentoring is just another one of those relationships. To me they have always been key in learning. I very much buy into the way you learn—especially research—is through this close relationship, that the subtleties of research are best learned working closely with someone. That is what I said in my dissertation. That is what I believe. I think that is what the research does point out, that especially at the doctoral level, the courses are only a part of the whole process. So it is the working closely with students.

Professor Jack sees mentoring as a relationship in general, and a learning relationship, in particular. He offered further illumination to his perspective on doctoral student mentoring:

Tenure and promotion is mainly now more about research and grants and teaching, but teaching defined very narrowly as teaching in a classroom or teaching online. It doesn't really include the mentoring. It seems odd, because doctoral education was supposed to be more on this individual mentoring relationship.
Professor Jack sees the mentoring relationship as a learning relationship that is key to the protégé’s development as a professional and as a researcher. Professor Jack also sees some parental aspects to the mentoring relationship, as he described:

Being a parent of a 20 year old now, there are the similar frustrations of trying to encourage certain values and ways of doing things, and people making choices that go contrary to that. And it can be a little frustrating. Sometimes people come around and they decide to do it their own way, and it comes back, and maybe that wasn't the best way. So there's some learning from those mistakes, and being accepting of them even when they're having some struggles.

Mentoring, for Professor Jack, is also an intentional endeavor, as he related in the following passage:

I would say it is intentional. I am sensitive to that role that I play. It is very much right there in my head when I'm meeting with students. Or even, as I've thought about this mentoring and working on grants, that we have a lot of faculty that are newer that I've spent time with and trying to share some of the things that I've learned.

Part of what makes mentoring intentional for Professor Jack is his realization that mentoring is also idiographic, or individual to the specific needs of the protégé, as he stated his philosophy, “Doctoral education was supposed to be more on this individual mentoring relationship.” He further explicated his idiographic approach to mentoring:

Well I was thinking about . . . the first question about my role as a mentor. As I look across the variety of students—and I think because I am sort of thinking more about recent ones, but if I went back in time—that there are very different
roles and functions depending on the student. . . . I think the stories are different for different students, and I'm giving you multiple stories that reflect multiple students, and certainly at multiple periods in my career.

Professor Jack is cognizant of how his role as a mentor changes with the specific (idiographic) needs of the student.

Another aspect to the mentoring relationship that Professor Jack is mindful of is that is it dynamic, “It evolves.” Sometimes the evolution is driven from within the protégé, as he described: “We have a lot of variability as far as career orientation, age, their skills, what they are interested in, how steady and firm that is. Some students come in with a very clear interest and with others it fluctuates.” Professor Jack sees that students grow and evolve through the doctoral study process, and that can create new interests that instigate change for the students. Other times, a change-dynamic can have an external origin, as he stated:

Students go through all sorts of challenges - divorces and job losses and... So part of it is listening to them on that and making sure that I'm at least aware of it and at least being aware that it might be impacting their progress and their degree.

Professor Jack understands that external forces can impose a change into the student’s current trajectory. Professor Jack also sees mentoring as essential, as he stated, “I probably came to the realization that I enjoy this part of what I do, and I would not want to be in an environment where I wasn't working with students.”

For Professor Jack, mentoring is also a reciprocal process. I have previously related several passages in which Professor Jack describes the reciprocal learning that he feels he benefits from as a result of partaking in a mentorship with his protégés. The
previous mentors have also described “sharing” as part of their mentoring experience. In
the following passage, Professor Jack describes his approach to sharing:

I think our students, and the junior faculty, and others do want some substance,
whether it's our expertise in design, or statistics, or measurement. I think that's
critical. Without something to give or share, the relationship wouldn't be
complete. But just having the technical and expertise isn't enough, because
sometimes you have to be a good listener, and try to understand where they're
coming from, and what they need, and how to support their development. I think
it's having expertise along with those interpersonal skills would be critical.

For Professor Jack, mentoring is not a one way transaction wherein he delivers directives
or deposits knowledge into the protégés. Rather, he is sensitive to the indications from the
students on how to meet their needs and assist their growth. He further explicated is
reciprocal mentoring style:

Well, I'm certainly getting a lot of feedback from students either through words or
what they're producing to either adjust or make some changes. Sometimes, you
have some information that you think a student can do X, Y and Z. Then, you find
out that they really can't. So, there's some movement backwards in trying to figure
out where they're at. I think I've gotten a little bit better at, maybe, withholding
judgment because sometimes students come in and there's an appearance of some
abilities that don't show up. I'm assuming less and trying to use a period of time
where we can get a little bit more data to really help move them in certain
directions. But, before, I think I assumed a little bit too much and then acted on
those assumptions and they weren't always accurate assumptions.
Remember, Professor Jack is assigned his protégés at the beginning of their doctoral studies, whereas the other mentors reported that they had first experienced their protégés as students in one of their classes, and then entered into the mentoring relationship consensually. This context would seem to indicate that Professor Jack has a little bit more basic groundwork to cover in his reciprocal exchanges and negotiations with his protégés as compared to the other mentors, at least, initially.

Another facet to Professor Jack’s reciprocal approach to mentoring involves collaborating with protégés. He shared an interesting perspective on collaboration:

“It’s part of the values in our department, that one of the things that when we were looking at the type of indicators that we wanted to be evaluated by, because care and collaboration is one part of the college, that we thought that should be reflected in our work with students.

In addition to collaboration being part of the values of his department and the College of Education, Professor Jack also embraces collaboration as part of his role as a mentor, as he described co-writing a paper for publication with a protégé: “Part of it is that as the role of a mentor; it's not as efficient for sure, but there are a lot of benefits to get students introduced to, how do you put together ideas, even rejections.” I asked him if he enjoyed collaborating; he replied:

I do, for the most part. And I do a lot of it. . . . I know you wanted to take a look at my vita, but you can see that whether its collaboration, faculty-faculty, faculty-students, faculty within our department, faculty outside of our department, faculty in our department outside, and students outside the department... I mean, there's probably every combination on that list.
Upon inspection of his curriculum vita, I did indeed find numerous examples of Professor Jack collaborating with doctoral students on publications and presentations.

Professor Jack – His Negatives in Mentoring

Professor Jack reported a few areas of negative mentoring experiences. The first area of negativity he described revolved around values. For Professor Jack, it can be a negative experience when there is a disconnect between a student’s values and his values, as he described:

Well, since the PhD is primarily a research degree, and it doesn't happen so much in our department, but if a student comes in saying, “Well, I really don't want to do research,” it is sort of a hard place to start from because that is sort of what we are all about. Now that can change, but I think there have been some students who really, they maybe want an administrative position and the PhD was needed. So they didn't have that orientation. So it probably . . . has made the relationship not as much fun.

Professor Jack values research. Another disconnect in values that Professor Jack experiences as negative revolves around the concept of quality, as he related:

From a negative side, when I think of some students I have worked with, there can be a resistance or an orientation. The orientation that drives me crazy will be something like, “Well, I am going to finish this in a year. And nobody is going to read my dissertation, so it doesn't matter if it is not that good. I just want to be finished.” That orientation usually leads into trouble with the quality of the document. And because I am associated with it, it is not something that I feel comfortable with.
Professor Jack clarified what he meant by quality. For him, quality is not the same thing as perfection, as he explained:

And it's really the values . . . when there's some orientation of thinking that nobody's going to read my dissertation, therefore, it's OK to do work that you know is not good. There's one thing when you do the best you can, and maybe it's got problems versus you know that it's not good and your rationale is: “Well, nobody's going to read it.” That's just not a value that I think we want from any of our students, and I certainly don't want from any of my students.

Professor Jack went on to explain that he finds it enjoyable to share in the developmental journey when a protégé commits to the quality endeavor, however:

… and the opposite is [it’s not enjoyable] when our values are in conflict. The idea of quality is pretty important, I think. Our department, overall, really aims to be the best, and we want to set high standards for our students. I mean, the dissertations are not perfect, but you really want to try to make it the best you can.

Yeah, I would say that that's a big one.

A disconnect or a conflict in values can create a negative mentoring experience for Professor Jack.

Another condition that seems to magnify the negativity of a disconnect in values is the number of students that are admitted to Professor Jack’s department, as he detailed:

The dilemma is that the College of Education tends to admit way too many students for the faculty that we have. And some of the students that we admit, even within our program, may not have the orientations that are aligned with what we are all about. So there can be a little bit of a disconnect.
Professor Jack sees the number of students who are admitted to his department as an additional factor that can facilitate the occurrence of negative mentoring experiences. He explained, however, how the source of that factor is institutional:

And that negative on mentoring [admitting too many students] is really not a function of students. But one of the things that I think has changed with my views of mentoring over time versus when I did my own dissertation on mentoring is the number of... I mean, you could see I came in today . . . I had students that I was going to meet with at 10 to get them set up for an exam . . . but everything got delayed because I got on the phone with . . . someone else that I'm trying to get her moving forward. So it's just too many students, just the numbers of students that we're trying to juggle. You can't do the type of mentoring that you want to do. There are just people that fall through the cracks.

It is not just the disconnect in values between himself and protégés that can create negativity for Professor Jack; he feels that the number of students also precludes him from providing the quality of mentoring that he would prefer to do, and that is also a negative experience for him. He continued to describe the enrollment expectation for his department:

I do think there is a numbers game here. We've had this discussion within our department - how many students can reasonably be here where you have a fairly good idea of where they're at, what are their needs, and how can we support those. The university might like us to bring in ten students a year, but with four faculty and you don't want the newer faculty to have too many students. We were thinking that maybe it shouldn't be ten maybe it should be four and maybe it
should be two so that every other year you might be gaining one or two students.

To me, that's the most critical part because you can only keep track of so many things and there's only so many hours in the day.

In addition to the number of students admitted yearly to the department, Professor Jack also described the effect of a departmental colleague leaving on sabbatical:

It's like when you're in a 7-Eleven and you pull out a soda, another drops in. So just when you think you're going to have some time to really maybe get back into a more comfortable meeting schedule or a pattern that you feel better about, something else drops in, whether it's J. being on sabbatical this year or someone else going on sabbatical, so that the pace has picked up a lot at the university. . . .

Talking to students, maybe they feel like they're getting attention, and they're getting the mentoring that they would like, but they may also feel like, “I'd like to have more time.” If they said that, I would probably say, “Yes, I know what you're saying. I would like to spend more time with you,” because in the long run, some time spent early on probably would pay bigger dividends later on. But we're in this rush mode. It's really not a negative. It's just the current reality. So, by saying that it doesn't fit easily into my daily routine, it doesn't mean that it's like I dread meeting with students, but I wish it could be a little bit different.

Professor Jack summarized his concerns regarding the number of students admitted to his department each year with: “Too much of a good thing isn't a good thing.”

Another contributing factor that can introduce negative elements into mentoring for Professor Jack has to do with his experience of being “overscheduled” with various
services to the institution, which therefore decreases the time he would like to devote to mentoring. He explained:

Literally, you could spend every hour of the day and still not really do what you need to do. So the student that I need to call in a bit, she's down three hours from here so we don't meet face-to-face, but we do a lot over the phone. And she's had some personal challenges, but she's at that point where she has to finish. So there are some deadlines. So just speaking to her over the phone and trying to get that all done and teaching classes and . . . you just feel like you're running from one thing to the next. And whereas there might have been a time where it would be nice to sit down in a more relaxed way and catch up with people. So it's like there's not enough time to do that. So that's a frustration.

Professor Jack continued:

I think I have grown in some ways [as a mentor], but am I handling the [mentoring] relationships the way I would like to? I would say: no. That is, I feel like ideally I know what I would like to do, and what I am doing is a lot less than what I ideally would like to do. . . . I don't have the time.

I asked Professor Jack about some of the things that he would like to do more of with his protégés, if he did have the time. He responded:

Well, really keeping track of them a little bit better. That is, I have a student right now, and I have . . . probably four I could dredge up, that I haven't heard from them in probably a month and a half. The last time I had a conversations with them we had said, and this is not only from me but the graduate school says, “You're going to have to meet these deadlines.” Well, we had talked about, “Well,
what are the things that are on this list? Let's put them in an order.” There are
things that are on that list that I know should have been done; so, they are not
done. I haven't heard from them, but what I would like to do is get on the phone
and say, “Hey, we got this list and we talked about it.” So we spend time making
up the list with the deadlines, but now I haven't had the opportunity to really call
them up and check with them. Now, I'm sure if I check with them, I'm sure it's not
good. But if I did have the time to call them up, then that might get them moving
and doing it. There are several students that fall into that camp. So the students
who are right here, they'll pop right in and it's not easy to avoid. The ones who are
off campus and are in the same boat, you might say, “Hey, I want to call this
person,” but time has just run out.

Professor Jack would like to have the time to “just get some feedback, getting feedback
on where are they at.”

Professor Jack has too many things to do, and not enough time to do them in the
fashion that he would like to, including mentoring. He related:

The challenge is really time. . . . Being accessible [to the protégés] I think is key,
but when you have the number of students that we have plus, there is a grant that
is due the 23rd. . . .Well, that's something new that's now going to be added in the
queue, and it's time sensitive. Then we have courses that we do face-to-face. Now
they want them online, so we have to do that. I'm on faculty council. I'm asked to
do the tenure and promotion now. I'm on the University IRB. So there are a lot of
things, and the numbers of students we have are probably too much for the
number of faculty that we have. Standards are important, but you find that you're
working all the time and still not meeting or doing it the way you really want to
do it.

Professor Jack illustrated some of the specific needs that the institution seems to rely
heavily on the professors in his department to fulfill:

Then knowing that we have a fairly large demand outside of our department.
When these grants need to be written almost every department will come to the . .
department or the research department here. There's a section that has to be done
on the methodology and the IES grants are very competitive and they have to
have the cutting edge methodology, so they're going to come here. Knowing that's
a fairly common thing, we have to build that in. We can't say: “Surprise: we need
a couple weeks of your time to help write that section and think through it.”

Professor Jack further described the inundation he has been experiencing between
mentoring, teaching and service to the institution:

Like, I look at my schedule today; I have 11 o'clock to 1 to follow up on a
qualifying exam that was done this summer. That's been a little delayed, but
finally we're getting to that. Then at one o'clock, we're doing interviews on trying
to develop an online course evaluation that I have to run over to the 21st Century
Teaching, and then come back by four to talk with a student who was J.'s student
who now we're going to transition. Then I have to fit in a conversation with a guy.
So it's just too much—overscheduled. It's like when you over schedule your kids.
The enjoyment is - you start wondering. That's just the way it is. Everything on
that list that I gave you are things that have to be done, and they're critical. It's just
there aren't enough hours in the day. Whereas sometimes you might want to have
a conversation with a student for a longer period of time to really sort some things out, you're putting it on the clock, because you know you've got to move to another meeting.

The recent conversion of Transition University to a top-tier research institution has also been a contributing factor to the time pressures. Professor Jack offered an insider’s perspective on some of the transition issues:

Well, the trajectory is that when I got here 19 years ago, it was a very different type of institution. As it's moved up, and it's searching or trying to gain AAU status, there are certain indicators. You can see from the president, to the provost, to the graduate school, to our deans, there's a press now for: OK, if we want to reach this level, we have to do all of these things. But we don't have the resources like some of the AAU institutions, so we're trying to do a lot of things. Somewhat like when you train for a marathon, you push yourself, and you end up doing it. Sometimes you feel pain at the end, but you still do it. I could look back at when things started changing, but the last two or three years, it's really ratcheted up. Whereas I feel like I have more of the skills, I probably have less of the time. If you go back in time to those earlier periods where you had less demands on your time. That's probably the biggest theme for today. Less control over my time, more demands. When the Dean says, “OK we need a governance document,” it's got to be written—for your department to talk about what you're doing and how you do it and all your policies. We sort of know what we do and we do it anyway, but now we have got to formalize it into a document, which takes time. It's got to be done, but it's not something I would choose to do if I had a choice, so that type
of thing. That interferes. If I have to do that then I don't have the time to maybe check on, well, where's this student I haven't seen . . . in three weeks. I have not heard from her and I haven't even emailed her. I've been thinking I need to send her an email to see what ended up happening because we had planned to have a conversation.

Professor Jack reflected on how the university’s transition has affected him, and the students:

Even the frustrations that I have, I'm wondering if it would be much diminished if other things could be cleared out. It's probably not a realistic thing. Transition University is where it is now and it's not going back, so it's going to be this way. Right now, you may be aware, there are some new policies about time-to-degree and it's an important indicator. A lot of our older students or the students who were admitted to the programs many years ago, they were never pushed to be on this pace but now they are, so suddenly it's like the rules have changed. They've known about the rules, so it's not like it's changed overnight, but people have lives and suddenly they're being asked, “You have to finish this in nine months and if you don't, you're out.”

Having too many student or too many things to do and not enough time can also lead Professor Jack to alter his preferred teaching style, which he also experiences as negative:

And I guess there can be an intersection. When time is tight, and let's say a student has some gaps in writing. Because often times you will be given a document and you have to read it, edit it and try to provide feedback's so that it
makes sense. Whereas if you had more time, you could probably do a little bit more teaching. But sometimes it's just faster to do some quick editing on it and, you know, hope that next draft is better. Sometimes there are things that I will do for the student that I normally would have not done. It may take an hour for me to do it and it make take two hours if I do it in a combination of teaching. So it's the time. In our department, we probably average 50 dissertations a year.

Protégés’ who have “gaps in writing” abilities was the final area of mentoring frustration that Professor Jack discussed:

There are some [students] that have some major [writing] problems. I would say that there is a minority of students who can write well and who write and edit their own work. I think what I try to communicate to students is that, and, you know, I have an example in mind of someone who sent me something. I got it. And it's a Friday night and its one o'clock in the morning, and I am reading this first chapter. And it was terrible. There were sentences that you could see had been copied and pasted [repeated]. I calmed down. I made all the edits and then I emailed them, and I said, “These are your tasks. One, get an APA Manual, because you violated every APA rule in this ten pages. And two, read what you write, because if you had read it, it would be obvious,” and there were a couple of other things. And he was very apologetic. He said he was rushed, and he wanted to get me something. But it's not a good use of my time.

Professor Jack related other writing and proof-reading lapses he has encountered while reviewing student’s papers:
And so I think some of our students have gotten into the habit of sending us first drafts. . . . I don't have the time to be working with first drafts—and I don't think I should. Personally, I think people need to sit back after they've written something and review it . . . . I had one, and the guy had written a sentence. I think it had six words in the sentence, and four of them were the same word. I said, “Do you ever listen to what [you write]?” It's so funny, because they'll come back and they'll go, “Yeah, I don't know how I wrote that.” Or there will be a sentence that will be almost an entire page long. . . . In some ways there is a positive part of that is that you can see the growth, but the challenge or maybe the frustration is sometimes when you've given feedback three times on the same issue, you would like to not see it on the fourth one. But some of our students do take four times.

Professor Jack concluded his observations on protégé writing deficits with:

Sometimes [students will] say, “Well, I knew somebody would figure it out.”

Some of them need to take a little more responsibility. That message is said many times, and so it can be frustrating when it's not always, it's not addressed.

Professor Jack reported a greater number and variety of negative mentoring experiences, and yet he maintained that he “enjoyed” mentoring, and would not want it excluded from his job.

Professor Jack – His Teleology of Mentoring

Mentoring, for Professor Jack, is also teleological, or purposeful. Professor Jack recognizes that the goal of the protégé is the initial influence that shapes his approach to the purpose of his mentoring, as he related:

Part of it is a student that wants an academic job, there are certain things that I
probably put more emphasis on versus someone who is, say, working for the school system and they are going to continue on with that job.

Once congruence on the ultimate purpose of the mentorship is established between the protégé and Professor Jack, he then begins to craft appropriate activities and experiences for the protégé to garner the requisite skills to be a successful professor or school district leader:

So, from there I think there are a variety of purposes. I've been trying to include more of the students on projects even when they can't be paid just so they can get a better sense of how they handle collaborative activities because that's a big thing in our department. I guess there are a lot of purposes. The classic mentoring, I would say, would fit in there with, what I would say, the ‘instrumental’. So, there are some specific things. Understanding policies and procedure, how to get through this, technical skills, what do [they] need to know.

The purpose to the mentorship continues to adjust to the particular career stage and needs the protégé progresses into, as Professor Jack elaborated:

I think that there are a lot of purposes and it varies depending on the stage and the student. So, sticking with the concrete details of the guy from North Carolina, his purpose now as a new Assistant Professor is to establish his career. He's at an institution that probably doesn't have the technical support. So, he's relying on the people that he knows from his home institution. So, I see the purpose as to help build his career to the point where he'll be able to do more of this on his own.

Even if he was here at Transition University, he would be working with methodologists because these grants tend to be on the technical side and not many
people outside of our area have those skills. So, it's a logical thing to do. So, the purpose is just continuing to work with him and see how he grows. I'll probably do some articles with him and he's contacted me about just other things related to being an Assistant Professor, the tenure process.

Professor Jack sees the purpose to his mentoring as assisting the protégé’s growth to attainment of his or her goal of becoming a professor, a tenured professor, or a school district professional.

*Professor Jack – His Motivations to Mentor*

When I asked Professor Jack what motivated him to mentor students, he replied, “I very much buy into the way you learn . . . is through this close relationship . . . . That is what I believe. . . especially at the doctoral level, the courses are only a part of the whole process.” Professor Jack believes that mentoring is an effective and primary teaching and learning strategy that is especially integral to the doctoral education process.

Another motivation to participate in mentoring Professor Jack reported was his enjoyment of working with protégés, even though he recognizes his mentoring style is different from his colleagues’ style:

I enjoy working with students. I would say I have seen, maybe in our department, some of the relationships that the faculty had with the students are, I probably set a few more boundaries than some, although I do talk to students from home . . . . But I wouldn't call up a student and I wouldn't expect a student to call me up to say, Hey, do you want to go to a movie,” or, “What do you think about this baseball game,” or anything like that.
Despite the frustrations students can sometimes engender, Professor Jack basically enjoys working with them. Furthermore, when I inquired if he loved his job, he responded, “I would say for the most part, yes.” Professor Jack basically likes his job, but as he previously described, “Too much of a good thing is not a good thing.”

The desire to help people learn and grow is another motivating factor that Professor Jack summarized with: “Yeah, I would say that is primary.” When I inquired if he viewed his mentoring as a service to the institution, or to his profession, or to his discipline, he responded:

Definitely. I think it only helps us if we have a reputation as being good mentors and good developers of the talent that we have. So I think it is good for our department, which makes it good for our college. It makes it good for the university and ultimately good for the profession. That is probably the best way that we can support the profession, by training our students and educating them and making sure that they are prepared. It is a nice feeling when the students do feel that they can step into a job and feel confident.

Professor Jack sees how his mentoring contributes to his department, the college of education, the institution, and ultimately, his discipline and profession. Additionally, Professor Jack receives gratification (“a nice feeling”) when his mentoring efforts have been successful in facilitating a new professor or school district professional who is competent and confident.

Professor Jack – His Values as a Mentor

Professor Jack sees mentoring as a contribution to his discipline, but not a duty, as he described in his narrative:
I think working with students and helping them develop so that they can contribute and do well in their profession, I think that is rewarding, and a benefit to the discipline. So that's what we do try to do. We want the students to be prepared such that they can do the things that they, they have lots of options. So I think that is a contribution. Duty sounds more like it's an obligation, and less of a choice. So I would see it as something that I value and voluntarily do.

Professor Jack declared that he “values” mentoring and does it “voluntarily”, despite all the negative aspects he reported as related to his mentoring endeavors. Professor Jack also values relationship as a medium teaching and learning in general, and the mentoring relationship in specific, as he stated:

And I think mentoring is a form of education, teaching. It is the full package. It builds on relationships. I have always been interested in relationships. I have studied parent, mom-infant relationships and couple relationships. Mentoring is just another one of those relationships. To me they have always been key in learning. I very much buy into the way you learn—especially research—is through this close relationship, that the subtleties of research are best learned working closely with someone.

Professor Jack also values research. He described how some students are in a Ph.D. program, and yet don’t really have a desire or an “orientation” for conducting research, and how that was problematic from his perspective. He further explicated how he valued research:

I like students who will be engaged in research, value it, and try to publish. It will always serve them well, especially if they're going for an academic job. But, even
non-academic jobs, there's an emphasis on trying to get publications, applying for grants, having a record of scholarship is key. To me, that's a real positive thing of having students who are committed to writing, researching.

He concluded with, “That's something that I value. We need, as faculty, to publish [research] and we are committed to our students. It's a good marriage I think.” Professor Jack values research and values mentoring as a “commitment to [his] students.”

Another value that Professor Jack espouses is that of quality, as he related how problematic it was when students did not care if their dissertation was a quality product, because “nobody” was going to read it:

That orientation usually leads into trouble with the quality of the document. And because I am associated with it, it is not something that I feel comfortable with. . . That's just not a value that I think we want from any of our students, and I certainly don't want from any of my students.

Additionally, I previously shared several examples of about his concern that being “overscheduled” had a deleterious effect on the quality of his mentoring. Professor Jack’s commitment to quality is something that he tries to share and model for his students, as he related:

Yes, I try to share what I know and my experiences. I am hoping that I'm sharing. It's funny, because we had this discussion with the faculty, we tend to really get into things, and we love it [smile]. We're looking at journal articles and we're searching things out, and sometimes we have this assumption that the students are like that, I guess it goes back to an earlier point. Some of the students are not exactly like that, and some of them maybe fake it a little, others don't even fake it.
That's just their mindset. But being in an academic job, you have to really be always at that cutting edge and wanting to, even if you're not reading all of the articles, looking at the table of contents, what are other people doing. And we're all like that in this department, as faculty members, we go well beyond. If we know we need to know x, we go x plus some, whereas some of our students are like x minus. And so we've tried to share that, and maybe we've moved some students, but I think we can sometimes be frustrated that we're not getting them exactly at that same enthusiasm that we seek. And we share it as faculty members, so it's not like “Oh, this is just unique to me or unique to J. F.” I don't know if it was just the way we were all trained, or the fact that we are all here and got hired under the same set of rules, but it's something that we can relate to, and I think sometimes we have problems when we don't see that in our students.

Part of quality, for Professor Jack, means exceeding expectations, and Professor Jack makes an effort to model this for his students. Modeling, “seeing [the student] through the entire process until they finish”, and providing “personal support” all contribute to a value of helping for Professor Jack.

Another concept that Professor Jack values is growth, as when he described what a positive experience it was for him to mentor a doctoral student who was not majoring in measurement, because he “could see [the student] developing and just being so open to learning.” Likewise, with his protégé who is now a new professor at a different university: “Yeah, and certainly this one up in North Carolina, he's not part of the University anymore and I would love for him to get the grant. So, anything I can do to help his development.” Professor Jack also values his own growth as an individual and a
learner:

I just enjoy the whole aspect of learning and developing, and continuing to grow. I mean, I think it's probably a lifelong developmental process of continuing to grow. . . . Then really sharing out with students and working with students that I've learned from them, and really even the students that have been challenging, it's sort of another opportunity to grow.

Professor Jack’s ability to find something positive in a negative situation is an interesting variation on the value of growth, as he stated:

In some ways there is a positive part of that is that you can see the growth, but the challenge or maybe the frustration is sometimes when you've given feedback three times on the same issue, you would like to not see it on the fourth one.

He shared another example of his propensity to find a silver lining in an apparent rain cloud:

Well, we do have, have had and will probably always have students who are characters in some way. Being a character can manifest itself in ways that some might say, “some opportunities to see some things that you normally wouldn't see.”

Professor Jack sees that even when a student can seem to be challenging, it can be another opportunity to learn about people and to grow.

Professor Jack also values helping, as he described

Professor Jack – Summary

To summarize: Professor Jack sees mentoring as a relationship in general and a learning relationship in particular, with some familial aspects that extend to doctoral
students; this relationship includes reciprocal sharing or collaborations that produce mutual benefits for himself and his protégés. He sees career help and psycho-social support as a basic part of his mentoring gestalt. When he mentors, it is intentional. He sees his mentoring as idiographic (particular to a protégé’s context and needs), and dynamic (changing with the protégé’s growth and needs). His mentoring is an essential part of his professional gestalt—that is, a fundamental element that he “wouldn’t want to do without”. Additionally, mentoring for him is teleological (has a purpose): to help people, and to support protégé’s growth into school district professionals or professors.

Professor Jack sees himself as a teacher and a guide who helps the student “all the way through”. He is motivated to mentor by his feeling that is it contribution to his department, the College of Education, the institution, and his discipline to produce new professors and school district professionals. Part of his motivation to mentor is the fact that he believes profoundly in mentoring and its effectiveness for helping and supporting the learning and development of students. He also mentors because he enjoys mentoring and finds it gratifying, and it is an integral part of what makes his job enjoyable. As a mentor, he values: relationship, helping, mentoring, growth, research, quality and giving back to his profession.

Professor Jack has identified some factors that contribute to negative experiences in relation to his mentoring. One factor that can create negativity in his mentorships is a disconnect between his values (such as quality) and those of his protégés,’ or when students have weak writing and proofreading skills. Other factors that contribute to negativity or frustration in his mentorships are having too many job duties to perform, and not enough time to do them or to do them well. He considers mentoring to be time
intensive. Despite these challenges, he still describes mentoring as a pleasant, enjoyable and rewarding experience. He feels that he receives several benefits from mentoring, such as: learning, reciprocal learning and sharing, a sense of efficacy, enjoyment and an overall positive affect (good feeling). Professor Jack recognizes that mentoring is an essential part of his overall job satisfaction. Figure 7 summarizes Professor Jack’s mentor-self.
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**Figure 7.** Professor Jack: His Mentor-Self

*Epilogue to Professor Jack — From My Reflective Journal, January 14, 2010.*

Last November, when Dr. Janesick read my first draft for the first mentor’s case, she suggested that I use a different pseudonym for Professor Enjoyable, rather than the generic name I had been using. My initial reaction to that was, “Hmm, I don’t think that
By the time I finished writing up the case of the second mentor, I was completely convinced of the value of her idea—I could clearly see the emergence of major themes from the mentors’ data. From that point onward, as I listened to the interviews and analyzed the transcripts, I was vigilant for the mentors’ new names as they emerged from their data. Most of their new names emerged rather evidently, such as when Professor Jack said, “That's probably the biggest theme for today. Less control over my time, more demands.”

Considering all the negatives associated with mentoring that Professor Jack reported, and the fact that his doctoral students are “assigned” and yet he sees his mentoring as “voluntary,” clarifies a crucial role that values—a “core belief” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 378) that guides your daily actions—may play for a mentor. The fact that Professor Jack values mentoring, conducting quality research, and lifelong learning and growth may be primary impetuses that keep him moving forward through negative experiences. Professor Jack’s ability to find and focus on things he values amidst frustrations that emanate from the very things he values may help to explain how he manages to maintain a positive affect regarding his current situation of being overscheduled. I find it remarkable that in spite of numerous irritations and pressures, he still enjoys mentoring, doctoral students, and his job. It would be very interesting to investigate further the details regarding what makes him resilient in this manner.

The Sixth Case: Professor Donna Structural

Prologue to Professor Donna Structural — From My Reflective Journal, June 8, 2009.

I arrived early this morning at the office suite for my first interview with Professor Donna; I and the departmental receptionist at the desk in the hallway seemed to
be the only ‘early birds’ present. I parked my bag of interview supplies (which always includes a bottle of water for the interviewee) in the chair across from the door to Dr. Donna’s office and paced back and forth from her door to the receptionist’s desk, reading the posters on the walls.

Professor Donna arrived promptly and I began to set up my recording equipment for our interview. Her office had a similar configuration to the other mentors’ offices—desk, filing cabinet, shelves loaded with books, and morning sunlight streaming in through the outside window. I noticed pictures of three young boys—her sons, I learned, all between the ages of three and 10 years old. She gratefully accepted the bottle of water and relaxed into the chair behind her desk for our discussion. She seemed to devote her full attention to my questions, and often paused pensively for a moment to gather her thoughts before responding. I became aware of her conversational rhythm and settled comfortably into her moments of reflection, not wanting to disturb her thought process.


I have just listened to, while verifying, both transcripts for Professor Donna. I think that Professor Donna is a dedicated and engaged mentor. I feel grateful that she took time out of her busy schedule to spend over two hours talking with me about her mentoring experiences—my second interview with her almost never transpired due to her busy schedule.

I realize that I have stated similar sentiments regarding the other mentors in this study; I feel that it is appropriate that I address this condition. But first, before I address my specific approach to bracketing, I feel that it would be illuminating for the reader to
discuss one fundamental issue surrounding the process of bracketing. Specifically, phenomenological researchers state that bracketing is one step in the data analysis process, and yet their descriptions or instructions on *exactly how to execute* bracketing are sparse and general. In November, 2009 I attended a defense of a phenomenological dissertation at the university at which I am enrolled; I was quite relieved to hear the defendant, Michael D. Smith, report the same absence in the literature regarding specific description of the bracketing process (Smith, 2009).

In his book *Phenomenological Research Methods*, Moustakas (1994) devotes half of a chapter to the process of bracketing, providing a little more detail that describes the bracketing process. He writes:

> I see [bracketing] as a preparation for deriving new knowledge, but also as an experience in itself, a process of setting aside predilections, prejudices, predispositions, and allowing things, events, and people to enter anew into consciousness, and to look and see them again, as if for the first time. (p. 85)

The most descriptive passage Moustakas offers for bracketing is as follows:

> I must practice the Epoche [bracketing] alone, its nature and its intensity require my absolute presence in absolute aloneness. I concentrate fully, and in an enduring way, on what is appearing there before me and in my consciousness. I return to the original nature of my conscious experience. I return to whatever is there in memory, perception, judgment, feeling, whatever is actually there (p. 87).

. . . The challenge is to silent the directing voices and sounds, internally and externally, to remove from myself manipulating or predisposing influences and to
become completely and solely attuned to just what appears, to encounter the phenomenon, as such, with a pure state of mind. (p. 88)

Moustakas refers to this as “reflective-meditation” (p. 89) and describes it as:

Letting the preconceptions and prejudgments enter consciousness and leave freely, being just as receptive to them as I am to the unbiased looking and seeing, This meditative procedure is repeated until I experience an internal sense of closure . . . until I feel an internal readiness to enter freshly, encounter the situation, issue, or person directly, and receive whatever is offered and come to know it as such. (p.89)

Moustakas candidly discusses that bracketing is difficult to perfectly achieve in every instance, however, he affirms its value with: “The energy, attention, and work involved in reflection and self-dialogue, the intention that underlies the process, and the attitude and frame of reference, significantly reduce the influence of preconceived thoughts, judgments, and biases. (p. 90)

It has been through my reflective journaling that I have wrestled with gaining an understanding of bracketing; I have also come to understand some observations regarding my particular application of bracketing that merit explication for the reader. Specifically, I feel that my execution of bracketing is mediated by four factors, which are: first, the fact that I do not just read the transcripts before bracketing but also listen to the interviews at the same time; second, how I experience listening to the interviews; third, how I engage in bracketing; and fourth, the amount of time that has elapsed between the mentor’s second interview and my final review of the tapes/transcripts for bracketing and analysis.
As I have previously mentioned, scholars indicate that the first step in phenomenological analysis is to read through the entire interview transcript to get a “sense of the whole” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 205). The total length of the combined interviews for each of the mentors in this study ranges from two hours to almost three hours, due to the fact that most mentors spent more than one hour talking with me for most of the interviews. When I read the transcripts, I also listen to both interviews. I listen to both interviews for one mentor consecutively, without interruption. How I listen to these interviews is very reminiscent to me of my former career as a professional classical organist, particularly, how I would practice. It was not uncommon for me to sit at the organ console learning or practicing a fugue by J.S. Bach for four hours at a time, without pausing for a break. In fact, I used to have to set my watch alarm so that I would not practice through classes or meetings. So, sitting at an organ keyboard or computer keyboard for three or four hours at a stretch and listening intensely and absorbedly is a common practice for me.

Additionally, four rigorous years of aural skills training at music school has provided me with the ability to discern intricate musical textures (such as Bach’s multi-voiced contrapuntal masterpieces) and nuances (such as identifying who sang what wrong note in a choir.) Currently, I am not able to practice the organ for four hours every day, however, typically I do meditate for one hour every day—longer, if my schedule allows. (More about meditation, momentarily.)

All this is to explain the “artistic sort of centered attention” (Burg, 2004, p. 16; Sullivan, 2000) I am immersed in as I listen to the interviews. I experience more than just the mentor’s words; I hear the *timbre* (musical qualities) and melody of their voice, I hear.
their breath, I feel their tempo and timing of fluid speech and pauses. For me, this is the most enjoyable part of the analysis process and before I know it, the mentor has finished their story.

Because I take the extra time to not only read the transcript but to also listen to the transcript, and because that allows me to engage more deeply not only with the mentor’s story but also with the mentor’s voice, and because that engagement entails more sensory activation, it seems to result in a more vivid recall of the interview, the mentor, and how I felt at the time, as opposed to just reading the transcript.

So, at this point in the phenomenological analysis process, I am remembering, even re-experiencing, how impressed I was with the mentor, because there were aspects about each of them that I did find impressive. But I am also recalling elements of their mentoring that I disagreed with, or found slightly disappointing or even startling. At this point in the process, I reread the journal entries I wrote after each interview; this also enhances my recall of the experience.

Now begins the bracketing process, and I ask myself: what do I think and how do I feel about this mentor? I close my eyes for several moments and view these memories with my mind’s eye and feel again how I felt before, during, and after the interview. I remain in this meditative state until these recalled memories and feelings dissipate like white clouds evaporating out of the blue sky. What remains is: what do I think and how do I feel about this mentor now—somewhere between two to four months after I have interviewed them?

I had been worried about the amount of time that has elapsed between conducting the mentor’s last interview and commencing the analysis process, but after reflecting and
journaling, I feel that this passage of time has had no deleterious effects on my research process. Rather, I feel that is has been a beneficial part of my analysis procedure. If I had engaged in the phenomenological analysis shortly after the interviews with the mentor, I believe that my perspectives on the mentors would have been unduly slanted toward the positive. My initial reflexive reaction to the negative elements of the mentors’ stories was to *not* include them in my report. I believe that the passage of time has allowed me to reflect / journal on these negative elements and ultimately find the courage to integrate them into the story of my research. This passage of time has also allowed me to progress through more stages of the research, which for me has been a developmental process.

So, to return to my bracketing statement: “I think that Professor _____ (fill in the blank) is a dedicated and engaged mentor. I feel grateful that s/he took time out of her/his busy schedule to talk with me.” I realized, through the course of this research, that I cannot draw any conclusion about these mentors regarding whether or not they were “good” or “bad” mentors, because mentoring is an *idiographic* endeavor—someone who may be a good mentor for me might be a *horrible* mentor for someone else. Furthermore, I could not make a good/bad judgment about a mentor without experiencing a good deal more of their mentoring beyond two to three hours of conversation. So it would be meaningless, if not imprudent, for me to offer any such comment about a mentor in this study.

The bracketing process that I have here described does allow me, however, to distill my thoughts and feelings into rational comments that I can share with the reader, based on my 12 years of experience as a protégé. What do I think about these mentors? What I can say is that the mentors in this study all happen to be dedicated: they think that
mentoring is important and make it a priority in their job routines. The mentors in this study all happen to be engaged: they make an effort to interact with their protégés and to engage in the mentoring endeavor. Those may be good qualities for a mentor to have, but that does not guarantee that they would be a “good” mentor for every student, and in fact it would be foolish to assume so, because “good” mentoring is idiographic—according to the individuals involved. And how do I feel about the mentors? After the passage of a few months and after engaging in the bracketing process, I am poised to begin analyzing the mentors’ data. As my feelings about the mentors dissipate and distill into the present moment, my feeling now is gratitude for their time and their help. I feel that the elapsed time and my bracketing process has facilitated my emotional disengagement from the mentors. Because bracketing is difficult to perfectly achieve (Moustakas, 1994), I reveal my current thoughts and feelings to the reader, and attempt to set them aside (to the extent that is humanly possible) and focus on the experience of the mentors. Let the analysis begin!

**Professor Donna Structural – Introduction**

Professor Donna is a Caucasian woman, approximately 45ish years old, slightly taller than average for a woman, with brown hair that brushes the tops of her shoulders. Professor Donna’s career as an educator spans 18 years, with 14 of those years as a professor; prior to that she worked as a school psychologist and a research scientist studying children with ADHD. Our first interview took place in her office at Transition University. She was nearly unable to meet with me for a second interview due to her schedule at the university, and a health issue that had arisen with one of her sons which further complicated her daily schedule. For the second interview I offered to meet her at
her home near the university, for her convenience; she graciously agreed. We sat at a
table nestled in front of large bay windows in her dining room; morning sunlight
streamed through the windows, accenting the ambient warmth of the pleasant décor of
her house. (From my Reflective Journal, September 24, 2009.)

*Professor Donna – Her Self as Mentor*

When I asked Professor Donna how she viewed her role as a mentor to her
doctoral protégés, she responded:

> I think the first thing is that I try to help people get organized in terms of what
they want to accomplish in their major of their program. . . . What I try to do as a
thesis chair and a doctoral chair is try to help people get structured up and see that
everything we're doing now is leading towards the goal of graduation and
whatever they want to do beyond that.

Professor Donna offered a few examples of how she tries to provide organization and
structure for her students:

> I think that sometimes people feel overwhelmed as they contemplate finishing a
degree. So I try to help them create a roadmap, so that they can have all the steps
laid out, including when they're going to defend the thesis, finish their course
work, take their qualifying exams. There's probably like 15 different steps, so I
have them actually write out what the steps are that they need to complete, come
up with a date by which they want to complete it, and talk about any roadblocks
they are going to encounter and how they are going to overcome those
roadblocks. So that's an exercise I do with them pretty early on.

Professor Donna sees her role as a mentor as helping students to create a framework for
completing all the steps to finish their degree, in general. She also seeks to help the students develop a framework for completing the stages of the dissertation, in particular:

Also, creating a timeline for them, what I find is that . . . there's a lot of course work in this program and a lot of times people's own research, their . . . dissertation research, gets put on the back burner. So, I feel like another role as a mentor that I play is to help them keep that in the forefront of their minds. I create an Excel spreadsheet with them sort of breaking down all of the steps of the . . . dissertation, then we come up with a timeline. I'm usually on top of people in terms of calling them regularly and asking them how it is going, are they meeting their goals, those kinds of things. So I guess in one sense I try to help them with organization, from the point they're at to graduation and beyond graduation.

She concluded her description of how she sees her role as a mentor as facilitating students’ development of a structure for completing the degree and the dissertation with:

I feel like structuring people up and getting them organized and helping them to see that if you just do x, y, z you are going to get your goal . . . instead of [students] feeling like it’s just an amorphous thing that is so far away, like: “There's no way I could ever write a dissertation.”

Another aspect that Professor Donna sees in her mentoring role is that of providing career information and guidance, as she explained:

When people come into the program, I think there is a big teaching component to mentoring because they don't even realize what options would be available to them. . . . I have a lot of people coming straight out of college, and . . . they know they're interested in school psychology, but they don't even have any idea of all
the different options that are available to them. So, I think there's a process that you go through with the student of first teaching them what options are available, and then helping them understand. So, I don't get a lot of people coming in who are like already seasoned professionals. They're pretty much right out of college, and pretty unaware of the different options that are out there for them.

Professor Donna recognizes that because her protégés have less professional experience than other doctoral students who are already “seasoned professionals”, part of her mentoring role typically includes helping the student become aware of and understand career options that are available after their doctoral degree.

When I asked Professor Donna what the term ‘mentor’ meant to her, she paused for a moment and then stated, “The first thing that came to my mind is someone who guides you. . . . I really like the idea of being able to help a younger person see the broader picture of their lives and what they want for themselves.” She explained:

Another important thing that I think I see myself doing as a mentor is talking to people about the broader context of their lives. . . . So, I think I've tried to help my students not only focus on becoming a [school] psychologist and finding their niche in terms of what they really love to study but also helping them look at the broader context of their lives and say OK, what do I want for myself and what do I want professionally, and what do I want personally and how am I going to merge the two.

Another facet Professor Donna see in role as a mentor is that of a guide. She concluded her reflection with, “I try to emphasize to them that you really can have a balanced life in academia. But somehow people don't really believe that.”
Professor Donna also sees her role as a mentor as teaching students about the dissertation and helping students through the steps of conceptualizing and executing the dissertation, as she described:

I feel like a lot of the dissertation mentoring is first off helping people to choose an idea, to choose to pursue a topic that's going to be doable. Is it going to be doable? Is it going to give you something that you want to work on after you leave here, like set up the foundation for a program of research? And have you arrived at this topic based on enough review of the literature that you really understand what other people are doing . . . . Getting them to take a big first step, in terms of reading what's out there.

Professor Donna continued to describe how she helps her protégés through the dissertation process:

So, structuring them up enough to know OK here's what you need to do first. And then once you read the literature, you're going to see this idea of the funnel. That research proceeds in a way where we're not just all coming up with our own ideas, but rather we're building on other people's research. Then teaching them about the funnel, you know, you start broad then get narrower. I also teach them when they write a literature review to think about it as like an attorney making an argument in court. Like, the argument is going to end up with: OK, so all these things have been done, and now the next logical step in this research is your question. Trying to give them that broader understanding of how research proceeds, what are the steps you should take. Also, I think a lot of times people come in and have no idea where to start in the process or how to proceed once they have the lit review done.
I think sometimes people think, “OK, you should write chapter one first, then chapter 2, then chapter 3.” It doesn't necessarily make any sense to write chapter one first because that's really a summary of two and 3. I encourage them to write 2 then 3, and then 1. I think also then when people get to the stage of analyzing their data that's a stopping point for some people. They feel like, “Oh my gosh, how can I do all these statistics?” Most of my students get past that OK and I usually try to send them to their stats person to help them with that. But then once you have all of the information, all of your data and the analysis completed, how do you sit down and write chapter 5? I think you first have to sit down and think about what all this stuff means and then create an outline for yourself.

She concluded her description of how she, teaches, helps and guides her students through the dissertation process with, “I think what I'm trying to do is get them to see the bigger picture and then show them the smaller steps.”

Professor Donna – Her Experience of Mentoring

Professor Donna describes her experience of mentoring as “very positive.” She continued with, “I don't feel like this has been a real publish or perish institution, as a result I feel like I've been able to spend more time mentoring students, and I really enjoy mentoring.” I asked Professor Donna what it is about mentoring that she finds enjoyable. She replied:

I think I really enjoy having people become passionate about things that I'm passionate about. For example, I really love to work with families who have kids with special needs, that's my area. I think when I'm mentoring someone and see [protégés] start to get emerged in that literature and really see what's exciting
about it, and then go out and talk to parents and you know say, “Wow, that was really fascinating!” I think to see what I love, someone else really finding the excitement in that, is exciting for me.

For Professor Donna, the experience of mentoring is also gratifying, as she proceeded to elaborate:

I also feel like at the age that I'm at now . . . I know so much more now than I knew when I was their age, it's . . . gratifying, to know that I'm helping them to see some of things that I learned along the way.

Professor Donna finds mentoring to be pleasant, as well as rewarding and satisfying (gratifying). She also does not find mentoring to be a difficult endeavor, as she concluded, “For the most part, I think mentoring is easy and enjoyable.”

Professor Donna - Benefits from Mentoring

One benefit that Professor Donna feels that she gets from mentoring is learning from her protégés, as she stated, “When I read lit reviews I'll see, ‘Oh my gosh I never read this article before,’ and I'll ask people if I can have a copy of it. Everybody has everything electronically now so it's so much easier.” She described another example of learning from her protégés:

My best student ever, she's up in Ohio now . . . I'd give her an assignment, she could do a way better job than I could have ever have done on it. There's a PowerPoint that she put together for one of my classes and I still use it today. It's such a great PowerPoint even though she did it ten years ago. I updated a couple of things. She just has an unbelievable way of putting information together, synthesizing information. . . . So, every once in a while I run into somebody like
that, I think, “Wow” when I read their work, I actually learn new things myself about how to approach a topic or how to put things together. Professor Donna added, “I've learned factual knowledge as well as ways to enhance my own research because a lot of people that I'm working with now actually are doing research in the same area that I'm doing research in.”

Professor Donna also learns from her protégés about how to improve her mentoring, as she related:

I guess I've also learned from some of my mentees what not to do in situations. I've had mentees freak out at practicum sites and over-respond emotionally to those situations, and I've been able to look at those situations and go, “I probably should have coached her not to respond this way and I didn't beforehand.” So now, I know for the future that this is something I really need to impart to students: “If this kind of thing happens you don't freak. Call me, we'll discuss it.”

Another benefit Professor Donna sees as a result of her mentoring is a synergistic reciprocal learning and sharing, as she related:

And then also, in terms of moving ahead with my own research, now, I think the last time I spoke about how I have this research group going, and there's no way I could do all the things that I'm doing now without all of the students that are working with me. We have four different major projects going on, all research based. I feel like as much as I give, I get back, in terms of having students who really understand the research process, are able to be active contributors to the group.
Professor Donna scaffolds her students’ research competencies by involving them in a research team and then assigns each a small part of the project. The students develop various skills while contributing back valuable components of the project.

When the students in the research group hold Professor Donna accountable, she also considers that to be a benefit from mentoring, as she explicated:

I think what that has done for me is when you work on research in isolation and you have your own schedule, so if it gets put on the back burner, it could sit there for several months and nobody's going to put it on the front burner unless you get up yourself and do it. But, when you're working with a group of people, you have deadlines you have to meet. You have accountability. So, working with my research group has given me much greater accountability for completing my own research. So, that's definitely been a benefit because the more people that I have work with me, the more people I'm accountable to.

Professor Donna finds it beneficial that this accountability from her students helps her to stay on track with her own research.

Another benefit that Professor Donna receives from mentoring is recognition from colleagues for being a good mentor, as she described:

I've also had people come to me, one of my colleagues. We have a new colleague and one of my other colleagues came to me. That new colleague wanted some advice about mentoring and the other professor said, “Well, why don't you go to Professor Donna, because she does that really well.”
She concluded with, “So, I guess that kind of recognition is a nice thing to have.” Obviously, recognition from peers also contributes a feeling of efficacy as a mentor for Professor Donna, as well.

Professor Donna also views mentoring to be rewarding and satisfying, as she related, “Definitely the personal satisfaction of knowing that I've helped someone. I think it's very rewarding to be involved, especially with people who are just beginning their professional lives and not really sure what to do.” Beside the positive affect from gratification, another benefit Professor Donna gets form mentoring is enjoyment, as she explained:

It's really enjoyable to be a . . . mentor. It brings you a lot of personal satisfaction. It takes time to become a good mentor. You shouldn't expect yourself to be a really great mentor right away. You have to learn. You have to make some mistakes.

She added, “I feel like there's so many decisions you have to make at that time in your life and being able to guide someone I’ve really found enjoyable.” Part of what Professor Donna finds enjoyable are the doctoral students, as she described:

I'm part of the selection team of choosing people who are going to come into our program. So, I feel like that's a great honor to have. We have such a selective program. We have about 100 people that apply every year and we only choose about eight people. So, it's highly selective. We get people that come all over the country. We get wonderful, wonderful students. It's really exciting to get to work with these people. I really feel honored.
Professor Donna enjoys working with her protégés, and finds that to be part of what is beneficial about mentoring.

Professor Donna - What Mentoring Means for Her

For Professor Donna, part of mentoring means providing career support to her protégés. I previously described how Professor Donna recognizes that her doctoral students have a nascent professional identity, and therefore she makes certain to provide career information and guidance. As she described, “I try to help people think about early on in their programs, you know, what they want to do when they finish.” Career support for Professor Donna also means working with students throughout their program and providing them with developmental opportunities to gain the skills needed to be a school psychologist, professor and/or researcher, as she described:

And I feel like what the students have learned working with me is, first off, how to build a study from the bottom up, conceptualize the study. They have engaged in the data collection with me, so they go with me to the families' homes and interview the families. They've transcribed the data . . . And then, now, one student and I are working - the project manager for that study - he and I are learning Atlas.ti together. We're coding and he also is going to be coding for his thesis, because he's doing a . . . qualitative thesis, so I feel he's learning from that. We're all going to sit down together and try to make sense of it. We've already presented at a conference. We're all working together on a publication.

Providing opportunities and scaffolding for doing research, publishing and presenting are all part of the career support that Professor Donna provides in her mentoring.
Professor Donna described other career support that she provides to her doctoral students:

I actually probably do a lot of mentoring in one of my classes . . . there's some things that I feel like students are left to do on their own that they may not do a very good job of. For example, keeping their vita up to date as they're going through their program. We all make our own vita and then we know what it looks like. But, do we ever really look at other people's? Or, do we have people review our vitas? So, that's one of the things I do in that class. I also do things like manuscript reviews in that class. So, they would actually review real manuscripts. Then, they see the real reviews from the people who actually reviewed them and the editor's decision.

Professor Donna added, “I really like to tell students about the things that, perhaps, you didn't read about in your typical journal article about pursuing a career in academia. For example, how do you negotiate for a position?”

For Professor Donna, mentoring also includes providing psychosocial support to protégés. Here is one example she related:

I had one student, J., who is absolutely stellar. She could probably write an article better than I could. She came in stellar; she is just really just a bright person. In some classes that I had her in I would have students return in assignments anonymously, so that I wouldn't have a ‘halo-effect’ kind of thing as I was reading their work, and I could always immediately tell which one was hers. Just head-and-shoulders above the rest, just really fabulous. She would come in and tell me things like, “I don't think I did this well,” and there were many occasions
where I would tell her, “You know, J., your own level of expertise and your ideas of how well you are doing are just so out of sync with each other; you're so good. You have to start believing that you're better because you are stellar.” I don't know if she was just modest, or if she really didn't believe what she did was that great, so I had many conversations with her to try to improve her own sense of confidence and self-esteem.

I have already indicated that Professor Donna creates research groups with her students in order to facilitate the students learning the convolutions of the research process; here is one example where she provided psycho-social support to a group of her students:

If we go to conferences and maybe there's five of us presenting, and we're waiting in the room for people to come in. And I've had students go, “Oh my God, please don't let anybody else come in the room.” I'll say to them, “Wow, we've done all this work and these people really want to know about it, I mean they're not here to critique us. They're here because they're interested in what we've done and we know a lot more than they do about our topic.” Not that it always makes people feel like, “OK, great, more people come in the room.” I think I try to explain to them what I went through because I understand that for a lot of people that can be very nerve-wracking, thinking that people are going to be questioning your results or whatever. It never is that way; people just want to learn from you.

Professor Donna recognizes that it is not only crisis situations that indicate the application of psycho-social support; occasionally the circumstances are a little more sanguine, or at least calm. She proceeded to describe her approach to more typical situations that indicated psycho-social support:
All of the people that you mentioned who [nominated] me as a mentor, obviously all women, and as a woman, myself, I feel like I know some of the struggles that I've encountered having a family and balancing this type of career. . . . I have tons of Subway napkins in case people come in here and cry. That is when I usually have to give them a Subway napkin.

Professor Donna continued by explaining formative events that shaped the development of her own psycho-social sensitivities:

An interesting thing happened to me. When I was first here, I had a graduate assistant that I've mentored throughout her time here. But this was in her first year of the program, and she had a young child who had asthma. She was really, really on top of things. She was always prompt. She always did her work. But there was one day she called me, and we were in the middle of a big project, and she said, “My son - They're calling me from his school. I think I need to go pick him up.” Other faculty members had been telling me, “You really need to make sure your assistants are doing what they need to be doing.” I obviously told her, “OK, do what you need to do,” but I don't think I was that kind about it. I think since I've had my own children, and I realize how hard it is to balance, I think I've probably had more empathy for students who have children while they're here. I feel like I've really wanted to support them because it is difficult to balance. And I've had a lot of conversations with people . . . about: “OK, so, let's problem solve how you're going to be able to write your chapter four on the weekends while you're child is there. Are there other people who can come and help you? How much time can you block off? What's the most productive way to finish this?” So, I've
really tried. I think I have a good understanding of what it means to balance, and I think that I wouldn't be... I can see other faculty members saying, “Well, you have kids? Deal with it! So what? You're still a doctoral student. You've still got to do what you've got to do.” I think I have had more compassion for the students because I realize how hard it can be.

Professor Donna understands that balancing your home life with your doctoral education can be a difficult balancing act, and tries to provide psycho-social support for her protégés in that regard.

Another facet to Professor Donna’s mentoring gestalt is the recognition that mentoring is partly about relationship, as she explicated:

I think you have to have a good relationship with that person. You have to have trust. You have to be expert enough that you really know what you're doing to be able to really provide good guidance to a person. . . . I think also there has to be a caring aspect of the [mentoring] relationship: ‘I actually care what happens to you, that I'm not just in it for myself, like I'm going to exploit whatever I can get out of you.’

Professor Donna sees that caring is an ingredient of the mentoring relationship. She discussed another characteristic of her mentoring relationships:

We're reading an article about Bruno Bettelheim. He's a very controversial figure in Psychology . . . . he was doing his work back in the 60's. But, we were reading an article where he talked about the word ‘discipline’ comes from the word ‘disciple’. When you are disciplining your children, discipline is meant to teach. It's not meant to punish and people often confuse the two. And I kind of feel with
a mentoring relationship, the person is kind of like your disciple. They're looking up to you, they're looking to you for guidance and you want to have a relationship that allows you to teach. I think that's really facilitated by the person feeling comfortable talking to you, feeling like you have knowledge to impart to them, feeling like you're making the time for them.

Professor Donna sees that mentoring is a relationship that includes teaching and caring; here she described another facet she feels can be involved in the mentoring relationship:

I think to some degree I feel sort of like a parent with some of my students. Like I said I have students who are pretty far away from home, they're in their 20's. I'm in my 40's so I could be their mom. There are times when people have come to talk with me about difficult things in a way that perhaps you would talk to a parent about, or someone that you felt you trusted and were close to. So, yeah, to some degree I guess it’s sort of like a parenting role because I want to guide them in a direction that is going to lead them to self-fulfillment.

For Professor Donna, the mentoring relationship is also reciprocal in nature, as she described earlier learning about current articles from her students’ literature reviews: “So things like that happen all the time.” Professor Donna described other reciprocal exchanges in her mentorships:

Just having the opportunity to help people and have people help you with your research . . . . I feel like as much as I give, I get back, in terms of having students who really understand the research process, are able to be active contributors to the group.
Professor Donna experiences a reciprocal exchange of help and learning in her mentorships.

Mentoring, for Professor Donna also means collaboration, as she explained:

I like to involve students in publications. I don't really have a lot of single author publications. That's a difficult skill to learn. There's a science and an art to a publication. How do you go about choosing the right journal for your research? I think that's part of the mentoring process as well.

As I reviewed her curriculum vita, I noted numerous co-authored publications and presentations Professor Donna has done with her students. She continued with another example of her collaboration with students:

We're starting a new project. I really like to do research that's community engaged. We're starting a new project where we're going to be interviewing parents whose kids went through a developmental screening in the community. We're going to be asking them about their satisfaction with the screening. The reason I undertook that project was, because I wanted my students to learn more about the community and the services that are available to kids and to have those connections in the community because I feel that's been very important for me in my research.

Professor Donna concluded with:

I love to collaborate. I like collaborating with students, and I like collaborating with people in the community and with other faculty. I just think you learn so much more that way. It's not like I couldn't do something on my own. I could easily do things on my own. But, I just think it's more fun to do things with other
people.

Professor Donna enjoys collaborating with doctoral students, and considers it integral to learning and mentoring.

Mentoring, for Professor Donna, is also holistically integrated into her work. Holistic, as she described:

It's something I do on a regular basis. But, it's so enjoyable that you don’t really think about the fact that it is mentoring. There's lots of things that we talked about throughout these interviews that I wouldn't have necessarily said, “Oh, well, that's mentoring?” I think I recognize it more now.

Professor Donna expanded upon the integrated nature of her mentoring:

I regularly have people come by my office and I always have an open door policy. I regularly talk to people about what's going on, how things are going, etc. Also, I have regular meetings with my graduate assistants or my graduate assistant . . . . We often talk about how things are going, where does she want to go with her thesis, the ideas that she has so far. So, I feel like it's something I do on a pretty regular basis. It's not like I set aside this hour each week for mentoring. I think it's just part of the regular flow of everyday activities.

Professor Donna described, as other mentors in this study have, how some aspects of mentoring are so integrated into their daily job activities that they transpire without much conscious effort.

For Professor Donna and the other mentors in this study, the mentoring that transpires without much conscious effort stands in contrast to the intentional mentoring activities they deliberately engage in. Previously, I have discussed the activities that
Professor Donna deliberately creates for her protégés, such providing them with support that she did not receive in graduate school and engaging them in information and deliberation regarding what particular career paths they might choose. Professor Donna further described her intentional mentoring with, “I think about it. I think about where a student is in their development and what kind of things they need at that particular time.”

She offered another example of her intentional mentoring:

I have student who is in his fourth year now. So, he's considerably more advanced and I asked him to actually serve as a project manager for me on one of the projects we're working on as a research group. And I did that because I wanted him to have more of a leadership role. . . . I know that he wants to pursue a career in academia But, I kind of set that up intentionally. And then also, there's been some opportunities that have come up recently for student leadership positions like in The National Association of School Psychologists. So, I've nominated him for those, for The State Association of School Psychologists. So, I try to give him opportunities to get involved in more leadership kinds of roles knowing that he wants to go into a career in academia.

Part of what makes mentoring intentional for Professor Donna is that she sees that her mentoring is also idiographic—specific to the needs of the protégé. When I asked her to describe her most effective mentoring activities, she replied, “It might be different between people. . . . when a person is in their first year, what they need in terms of mentoring I think is very different than when person is later on in their graduate career.” Professor Donna also adapts her mentoring according to the specific career goal of the student, as she described:
I try to help people think about early on in their programs, you know, what they want to do when they finish. And I say that in particular, because if you want to go into academia you have to do certain things while you are here. And if you don't do those things, it's going to make it much more difficult for you. Even if you do get a position in academia, it will make it more difficult for you to get tenure because you won't have publications under your belt. . .you won't know the art and the science of publishing. So I try to ask students when they choose me to mentor them, you know, “What do you want to do when you graduate,” so that if you do want to go into academia, I want to make sure you are having the experiences you need right now to be successful in getting a academic job.

She concluded with, “I try to go by what the student says they want . . . . I'm not trying to force people in a particular direction. I try to ask them where they want to go and help them get there.”

Professor Donna sees that mentoring is also idiographic as a result of changes that impinge upon the protégé’s progress, as she related, “Sometimes there's things that the student can't even control. For example, they're using an archival database and they're having a difficult time actually accessing the database or the IRB process is taking longer than anticipated or something like that.” She continued to discuss the unexpected changes that can be common for students:

There's certainly times that things come up with students, or they really needed more time. So, there comes a point when I'll say, “You've been having a hard time reaching these goals, let's rethink this. What's going on with you right now? How
much time do you really have to devote to thesis each week? What do you think is holding you back?” . . . So, there's definitely renegotiation. . . . I feel like graduate students have lives too. And I see other people sending the message to students that you better put graduate school first. And I'm not saying you shouldn't put your education first. But really, honestly, there's time when other things do have to come first. Your health or your family. . . . I've seen people come to class horribly sick, so the reality is when you set a schedule, sometimes it doesn't work out and you do have to renegotiate it.

Professor Donna sees that her intentional mentoring design to meet the idiographic needs of her students is often dynamic and subject to change; she concluded with, “There are definitely times when the plan does not work out as planned.”

Additionally, Professor Donna thinks that mentoring is not difficult to accomplish, as she stated, “For the most part, I think mentoring is easy and enjoyable. . . I don’t think I would enjoy my job as much if mentoring were not part of it. I would not be doing my job well if I did not mentor students.” Professor Donna also sees mentoring as an essential component of her job, which would not be as enjoyable without it.

Professor Donna – Her Negatives in Mentoring

I asked Professor Donna what her perception of her time investment into mentoring was: did she find it onerous? She responded, “No, not at all. . . I wish I had more time to devote to mentoring.” Then she added, “I think it's important not to take on too many students.” She then proceeded to recall a situation where time was a negative factor in her mentoring:
There was a year when almost everybody in a particular cohort, there were like
eight or ten students in the cohort, almost all of them chose me as their thesis
chair. At the time I was like, “Oh, wow. This is so cool. Everybody likes me so
much and it's so great.” Then I realized I can't really effectively mentor all these
people. . . . I found that when I had that many students, like six students at a time,
it was difficult to balance everything. . . . There was a reason why you shouldn't
take on too many students. . . . That was probably. . . about ten years ago. . . . But
actually, mentors need to be able to say, “No. I can't take on any more than I'm
doing right now”. I'm not good at saying, “No.” I'm getting better at it, though,
because you really can't do everything.

Currently, Professor Donna does not perceive that she has too many students or not
enough time for mentoring, but previously, there was a time when she did have a
negative experience such as that.

Another negative mentoring experience for Professor Donna occurs when
students are lacking an aspect of the professional clinical disposition, as she explicated:

One thing that's been hard for me is that I always expect that when we bring
students into this program that they have particular, let say, a personality
characteristic already that they are going to exhibit in their professional dealings
with other people. So for example, showing empathy or, you know, not flying off
the handle. [smiles] . . . And there have been some times when I have seen people
that I have mentored not be as mature working out in the field and doing some
things that I thought “Wow! That's just... somebody really needs to talk to you
about that.” But personally, I feel like I have a hard time doing that sometimes. I
feel like I have a hard time correcting things that I think a person should have
known already, especially when it comes to interpersonal kinds of situations . . . .

That, I think, is even harder to give people feedback on.

Professor Donna finds it unpleasant to have to provide corrective feedback to students,
especially when she feels that it should be a common practice. She continued:

There was one situation where one of my students was in the field and they had
like a suicide case. And, I felt like the way she responded to it in terms of working
with the administrators at the school wasn't entirely professional. So I felt like she
needed feedback about that, and I was glad that her onsite supervisor in the school
district was able to do that. Because I felt like she was quite defensive about it. So
that was hard.

The student responding to the corrective feedback with an inappropriate attitude can
exacerbate the negativity of the situation for Professor Donna.

Another negative mentoring experience that Professor Donna encounters is when
students have weak writing skills, as she described:

Another, I guess, negative would be when I get someone who doesn't know how
to write very well. . . . I can help them learn how to do APA style and how to use
the funnel technique in terms of writing a literary review. But when I have
somebody who doesn't write well, it's just a frustrating experience because I have
to spend so much more time editing their work, and it's just a lot more work for
me.
She concluded with, “Probably the most frustrating thing I do as a mentor is read papers where people - it's just so poorly written that you want to say, ‘Just start all over, please’.”

Professor Donna – Her Teoleology of Mentoring

When I asked Professor Donna if she thought her mentoring was purposeful, and what that purpose is, she responded with:

Certainly I think that I have definitely grown myself through mentoring my students, because I've had to seek out new information myself so I could share it with them. I really tried to stay on top of what's going on in our field so that I can make sure that they know what is new and out there for them.

For Professor Donna, part of her purpose to her mentoring is to cultivate her own growth as a professional. She continued to explain:

I think also, for me, I guess I can see several things. Mentoring brings me a lot of personal satisfaction. Teaching brings me satisfaction, and publishing brings me satisfaction but, I think I really like the interaction with people and feeling like I really helped someone, made a difference in their lives.

Helping the protégé is another purpose to Professor Donna’s mentoring, and she finds that gratifying. Again, she continued: “Also preparing people to be solid researchers, to be solid clinicians, to be well adjusted, to like what they do, hopefully.” Another purpose to Professor Donna’s mentoring is to help the protégé to reach their career goal of being a researcher or clinician. I asked her if ‘career goals’ also included being a professor or a school psychologist; she replied, “Definitely”.
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Professor Donna – Her Motivations to Mentor

I asked Professor Structural what motivated her to mentor. She paused for a moment to reflect, and responded:

I think the primary thing is just the enjoyment of having a positive influence on a young person's life. I don't feel like I'm selfishly motivated in terms of it's good that students help me with my research and it's going to help me be more productive, but that's not really the reason I mentor people.

Professor Donna finds mentoring to be enjoyable, and she finds it gratifying when she is able to positively influence students. She continued with:

I certainly needed more mentoring when I was in graduate school and I want to make sure people have a better experience than what I had . . . . For example, I have seen some people who have come here subsequent to me . . . who really knew how to negotiate for what they wanted and needed when they came here in order to be successful. Research labs, additional money, additional startup funds, graduate assistance. I had no idea how to negotiate my position when I came in. I thought it was just like taking any other position. They tell you the salary and you say, "OK I'll take it," which is not what you should do. I feel like the other faculty members here really had someone they could go to, who once they got the call saying they got the position they could call their mentor and say, "Here's what they offered me, what should I do next?" I didn't have someone like that. I always teach all of my students how to negotiate for a position. What kinds of things you should ask for, how to do it, how do you word it to somebody so you do not seem like you're just money hungry. You can word it in such a way to say, “OK I really
am interested in this position but here is what I think I need in order to be successful at your institution.” Then email them the things you need to be successful . . . . I didn't have the familiar relationships where I could call and say, "Oh my gosh, what do I do?" So I want to make sure that while my students are here that we have enough conversations that are personal enough that they know, “I'm going to call Professor Donna when this happens. She's going to be able to give me advice.”

Another motivation for Professor Donna to mentor doctoral students is to try to help them have a better graduate education experience than she did. She continued:

I also felt like I didn't have someone to tell me, “OK here's the benefits of academia or here's some of the downsides of it, here's the pitfalls to watch out for.” I want to provide that for other people so they have a better experience than I did.

Part of Professor Donna’s motivation to mentor is to provide help and guidance for her students, especially help and guidance that she would have liked to have received as a student. She concluded with, “So . . . there were things I didn't get that I know now are important that I try to get to my students.” Additionally, Professor Donna is happy with her job, as she stated, “I absolutely love my job. . . . I really, really like being a professor” and recognizes a need for school psychologists to help families with issues, as she stated, “I'm helping to prepare people who are going to do a great job when they go out and work with children and families.”

Professor Donna – Her Values as a Mentor

One concept that Professor Donna values as a mentor is that of research and the
importance of providing meticulous scaffolding to assist her students in learning the research process, as she stated:

I definitely see that as part of my job. Not just to serve as someone's thesis chair. But also to teach them about the whole process of doing research. And also for them to see the joy in doing research because when you find something you love to study, then it makes it so much fun. I'm sure you know as a dissertation student. She added, “I think to see what I love, someone else really finding the excitement in that, is exciting for me.”

Professor Donna also values relationship, and sees it as an integral method for teaching and learning, as she described:

If I don't keep in touch with a [student] on a regular basis, what can happen? They just fade away and reappear two years later saying I want to finish my dissertation. I feel like my opportunity to really work with them is when they are here. I really try to get as much out of the time when they're here. Obviously, after they leave, I want to have established a relationship with them where it continues. She also stated. “I think you have to have a good relationship with that person. You have to have trust.”

Professor Donna also values helping protégés, as she described the efforts she makes to provide students with career information and guidance and then support the student through the entire degree process in a conscientious fashion: “I certainly needed more mentoring when I was in graduate school and I want to make sure people have a better experience than what I had.”
Additionally, Professor Donna is passionate about teaching her protégés to help families and children with issues, and she feels like her mentoring of doctoral students is a contribution to her profession, as she stated:

I'm helping to prepare people who are going to do a great job when they go out and work with children and families. So, I mean I try to educate my students about the fact that there is a shortage of faculty in our area so that they're aware that there's lots of opportunities for academic positions out there if you're willing to move to another part of the country. . . . So I feel like I'm contributing to the discipline that way.

Professor Donna – Summary

To summarize: Professor Donna sees mentoring as a relationship that includes teaching as well as some familial and caring aspects that extend to doctoral students; this relationship includes reciprocal learning and helping, as well as collaborations that produce mutual benefits for herself and her protégés. She sees career help and psychosocial support as a basic building block of her mentoring gestalt. When she mentors, it is intentional. She sees her mentoring as idiographic (particular to a protégé’s developmental context and needs), and dynamic (changing with the protégé’s growth and needs). Her mentoring is an essential part of her professional job—that is, a fundamental element to “doing her job well”. She sees mentors as holistically integrated into her professional routine, and easy to accomplish. Additionally, mentoring for her is teleological (has a purpose): to help people; to support protégés’ growth into school psychologists, researcher/clinicians, or professors; and to continue her own growth. Professor Donna sees herself as a teacher, helper and a guide to her protégés; she
also sees herself as providing structural organization and career guidance. She is motivated to mentor because she enjoys mentoring, and wants to help students, and she wants to help students have a better graduate school experience than she did. Professor Donna also mentors because wants to contribute to her profession of school psychology by developing professionals who are needed to help families and children with issues. She also mentors because she finds mentoring gratifying, and it is an integral part of what makes her job enjoyable. As a mentor, she values research, relationship, and helping; she also believes that it is a contribution to her discipline to produce new professors, researcher/clinicians and school psychologists. Figure 8 summarizes these aspects of Professor Donna’s mentoring-self.

Figure 8. Professor Donna: Her Mentor-Self
Professor Donna has identified some factors that contribute to negative experiences in her mentoring. One factor that can create negativity in her mentorships is when students have weak writing skills. Other factors that contribute to negativity or frustration in her mentorships are students who have a professional disposition deficit, and the student becoming defensive upon correction. Overall, however, she does not find mentoring to be time-intensive; she believes mentoring to be a largely easy endeavor, and describes mentoring as a pleasant, enjoyable, gratifying, and rewarding experience. She feels that she receives several benefits from mentoring, such as: learning, enjoyment, accountability, gratification, recognition, efficacy, and sharing / getting things back. Professor Donna recognizes that mentoring is an essential part of her overall job satisfaction.

*Epilogue to Professor Donna—From My Reflective Journal, January 24, 2010.*

And now the stories of the mentors’ odysseys have been told. Each of the mentors has some experiences that are unique unto themselves. Other experiences are common among them, although, to varying degrees. I feel like I have been weaving a picture of their individual odysseys, sorting through the strands of data, gathering the various colors of their themes, and then weaving their various adventures into a representative scene. My next task is to assemble each of their scenarios into a cogent tapestry. I think I need to meditate, before embarking on that journey.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have described the setting of the six mentors, the College of Education at Transition University, a large top-tier research university located in the southern region of the United States, including relevant demographic statistics. I then
presented detailed accounts of the data I collected from interviewing each of the six mentors twice. I arranged the emergent themes from the data into coherent themes, supported by ample evidence. I then summarized the evidence into a phenomenological description of the experience of each mentor, and the meanings each mentor appears to drive from their mentoring activities. Along the course of the analysis, I disclosed my thoughts and feelings as the researcher and co-creator (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009) of the interview conversations. I also offered a transparent account of my experience of the mentors and of my application of the phenomenological analysis, including my own application of the bracketing process.

In the next chapter, I will present a cross-case analysis of the six mentors’ data, including common themes, themes that were prevalent but not entirely common, and notable exceptions and details. I will also respond to criticisms of the mentoring research (which I have discussed in previous chapters), and discuss implications for mentoring research, as well as implications for higher education institutions, mentors, faculty who are not mentors, and protégés.

*From My Reflective Journal, January 24, 2010:*

For the last two and a half months, every day I have come home from the office and become a hermit, cloistered in my house working through the phenomenological analysis of nearly 16 hours of interview data. I have declined all invitations to dinner and movies (except Thanksgiving and Christmas with mom) — I even skipped my birthday. I haven’t gone to the gym to work out. I’ve watched very little TV. I have eaten prepackaged or frozen foods for every meal, not wanting to take the time to cook (I am so over frozen dinners and cans of soup!) I have not walked my dog (good thing I have a big
back yard for her.) These aspects of the dissertation process have not been very much
fun; I liken it to the hard labor pains of pregnancy. Completing the analysis of such a vast
amount of data has been a milestone along my developmental odyssey. To have this
chapter competed is a gigantic step closer to the end of my journey; it’s one step closer,
but a few steps still remain….

I'm around the corner from anything that's real
I'm across the road from hope
I'm under a bridge in a rip tide
That's taken everything I call my own

One step closer to knowing
One step closer to knowing

I'm on an island at a busy intersection
I can't go forward, I can't turn back
Can't see the future
It's getting away from me
I just watch the tail lights glowing

One step closer to knowing
One step closer to knowing
One step closer to knowing
Knowing, knowing

I'm hanging out to dry
With my old clothes
Finger still red with the prick of an old rose
Well the heart that hurts
Is a heart that beats
Can you hear the drummer slowing

One step closer to knowing
One step closer to knowing
One step closer to knowing
To knowing, to knowing, to knowing

“One Step Closer” – by U2
CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study described and explained the perspectives on mentoring by selected doctoral faculty who recent doctoral graduates identified as mentors. The exploratory questions that guided the study were:

1. What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?
2. What variables influence those perspectives?

For approximately the past 30 years, mentoring has been an expanding domain for research (Crosby, 1999), piquing the interest of scholars primarily in the business and organization settings (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007). Of the mentoring research that does address the educational setting, most of the extant studies have concentrated on the K-12 educational setting (Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004). Research that has investigated mentoring in the higher education setting is sparse, and has mainly examined the experience of the graduate student (not the mentor) and employed a quantitative research method such as self-report, retrospective surveys (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983; Noe, Greenberger, & Wang, 2002; Rose, 2003). This study addressed a gap in the mentoring research literature by investigating the perspectives of faculty-mentors in the doctoral (higher) education setting and by employing a qualitative research methodology known as phenomenology to describe and understand the
experiences and meanings that mentors derive from their mentoring activities. Since the mentoring of doctoral students is not a contractual requirement for faculty, it was my hope that describing the mentoring experiences and the meanings derived from the experience from the mentor’s perspective would increase our understanding of what mentoring is like, how it may be meaningful, which, logically, might increase our understanding of why some faculty volunteer to go above and beyond the call of duty to mentor doctoral students.

Another gap in the mentoring literature that this study addressed pertains to the operational definition of mentoring: this is often not well addressed or is missing completely in previous research studies (Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983). From my review of the mentoring literature, I described in Chapter Two my inductive process for arriving at an operational definition for ‘mentor’ and ‘mentoring.’ For this study, I operationally defined ‘mentor’ as: ‘any faculty member in the Transition University College of Education who has been identified by a College of Education doctoral graduate as participating in a relationship that provides support that goes beyond the basic duties of student advising, with the intention of enhancing/promoting/supporting both the career and personal development of the student.’ Additionally, I informed the graduates that they could nominate any College of Education faculty member whom they felt fit this description—the faculty member did not have to be their dissertation committee chair or a member of their dissertation committee.

Next, I contacted 262 doctoral graduates from the College of Education at a large research university in the United States (Transition University), asking them to nominate any mentor they may have had during their doctoral program of study. Of the 262
graduates contacted, 86 returned the mentor nomination form, yielding a nomination response rate of 32.82%. I then proceeded to contact six of the most frequently nominated faculty-mentors and request two one-hour interviews with them to discuss their experiences of mentoring; they graciously agreed to talk with me. To support the validity of the inquiry, I followed a semi-structured (Berg, 2004) interview protocol (Rubin & Rubin, 2005), which I emailed to the professors prior to our interviews.

In an effort to respond to one suggestion made in the mentoring literature by three expert mentoring researchers, I asked the graduates who returned the nominations if they would allow me to inform the mentor(s) of their names. Johnson, Rose & Schlosser (2007) suggest this methodological approach as an improvement over previous methods employed in mentoring studies as a means to concretize the interview questions for the faculty-mentors by informing them of the protégés who have identified them as mentors, thus providing more focused and specific reflections on the interview questions. The fact that when I informed the interviewees at the beginning of the interviews of the names of the students who nominated them and that all the mentors concurred that they had indeed engaged in mentoring activities with these students adds further validity and triangulation to my operational definition of mentoring for this study.

After conducting all the interviews, I then proceeded with a phenomenological analysis of the interview data which included identification of the meaning units present in the data as related to the specific topic of inquiry for this study, identification of the emergent themes, and reduction of the themes into a phenomenological description of the mentoring experience. In Chapter Four, I presented this data that described how each faculty-mentor viewed his or her mentor-self and how they experienced the mentoring
endeavor, including benefits they reportedly gained from mentoring as well as negative aspects to their mentoring experiences. I also presented data that described the meanings the faculty-mentors derived from mentoring, including their perceived teleology (purpose) for mentoring, their values as mentors, and their motivations to mentor. I concluded the data presentation with phenomenological descriptions of the lived experience of mentoring for each interviewee, drawing on various data sources (interviews, curriculum vitae, personal communications, researcher field notes and reflective journal).

This chapter proceeds with a discussion of verification and transferability as related to this study, and definitions of key concepts that will facilitate the reader’s engagement with and understanding of my synthesis of the emergent themes from the data as I address the exploratory questions. I will then present my responses to the exploratory questions, including a model of the study. Finally, I will discuss the implications of the study, including the impact of the study on my self-as-researcher, and draw the study to a close with a concluding section.

Verification and Transferability

In Chapter Three, I explained in detail several techniques of verification used within this study. At this time I would like to offer the reader some insights I have gleaned regarding the verification techniques of reflective journaling, bracketing, member checks and peer review, as a result of reflecting on the concluding of these processes. Throughout this study I have transparently shared with the reader my reflective journaling, as well as my process and deliberations of bracketing as one step in phenomenological data analysis. I can honestly say that these two procedures were
helpful to my research process and transformative for me as a researcher. Both of these processes allowed me to clarify for myself and increase my understanding of my role as the researcher. These processes also provided a forum for deliberation as I grappled with the bracketing process until I felt truly comfortable with my understanding of it.

I have also completed member checks with all six mentors in this study. I emailed each mentor my phenomenological analysis of their interviews along with my textual description and summary of the mentoring experiences they shared with me. All of the six mentors in this study participated in the member check, and emailed me feedback indicating consensus with my analyses and descriptions. The following are some of the comments the mentors included in their feedback: “It rings true as far as what I’ve felt and thought. This is a good example of the power of research – your write-up provided me some time to pause and reflect on what I’m doing and what I might do differently.” (Professor Jack, personal communication, February 6, 2010); “I think you have done a great job of rendering me.” (Professor Jacob, personal communication, January 26, 2010); “I agree with all of your assumptions about my discourse.” (Professor Jade, personal communication, January 26, 2010); and “[I] consider your interpretations to be an accurate representation.” (Professor Hanna, personal communication, February 4, 2010.) Their consensus with my analysis and interpretations adds further validation to the verisimilitude of my findings, and has proven to be a valuable component of the checks and balances in my research method.

The mentors’ confirmation of the emergent Perspectives found in this study also supports the validity of the conceptual transferability (as opposed to empirical generalizability) for the readers of this study, as they “make links between [the analysis
in this study], their own personal and professional experiences, and the claims in extant literature. . . to evaluate its transferability to persons and contexts which are more, or less, similar” (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009, p. 51). I will discuss possible areas of transferability presently, in the Implications sections.

Definition of Terms

In order to facilitate a conversation between myself and the reader regarding the findings of this study, I would first like to parse the exploratory questions that guided this study, specifically regarding the terms perspective, elements, and variables. To reiterate, the exploratory questions that guided this inquiry were:

1. What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?
2. What variables influence those perspectives?

The American Heritage Dictionary (2000) defines perspective as “a mental view or outlook,” or “a subjective evaluation of relative significance; a point of view.” The term perspective is commonly used in certain research methods, such as “the sociological perspective”, defined as, “the particular way that sociologists, as opposed to non-sociologists, try to understand human social behaviour and the relationships this presupposes” (Sociology Central, n.d.). In the qualitative research paradigm in general, and in phenomenology in particular, the term perspective describes “a reflective, socially derived outlook based on beliefs and behaviors” (V.J. Janesick, personal communication, February 3, 2010.) Therefore, in this study, a perspective is an outlook or approach that a mentor uses in mentoring: for example, mentors take a teleological approach to mentoring—they ask the protégé what the purpose or goal of their doctoral education is,
and then mentor accordingly. In this study, a *perspective* can also be how the mentor experiences mentoring (e.g., gratifying), especially if the experience of gratification is common to most or all of the mentors.

In this study, *elements* are aspects to the perspective that are common to all the mentors. For example, in the gratifying perspective, all the mentors reported that they found mentoring to be pleasant, enjoyable, rewarding and beneficial. I will also discuss aspects to the perspectives that are not unanimous among the mentors in this study, but are notable and worthy of discussion. *Variables* are aspects to the mentoring situation that can influence the mentor’s experience of the perspective and/or mentoring. For example, having *too many students* or being *overscheduled* can decrease the gratifying perspective for the mentor, and therefore would be *variables*.

At this time I would also like to reiterate the definitions for two other terms I have previously described in Chapter Four, as they figure prominently in Chapter Five. Specifically, *idiographic*, in general means, “concerned with the particular”, and describes a research approach that is “committed to understanding how particular experiential phenomena have been understood from the perspective of particular people, in a particular context. . . . [and that] experience is uniquely embodied, situated and perspectival” (Smith, Flowers, and Larkin, 2009, p. 29). Additionally, Merriam-Webster defines *teleological* as “exhibiting or related to design or purpose, especially in nature” (Teleological, 2009).

**Responses to the Exploratory Questions**

In response to the exploratory questions: ‘What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?’ and ‘What variables influence
those perspectives? the data from the interviews reveal five perspectives that are common to all six mentors in this study: a Gratifying Perspective, a Teleological Perspective, an Idiographic Perspective, a Dynamic Perspective, and an Intentional Perspective. In the following section, I will discuss each perspective with their respective elements and variables.

A Gratifying Perspective

Gratification may be thought of as “a reward” or “a source of satisfaction or pleasure” (Gratification, 2009). The elements that were found to comprise the gratifying perspective in this study were the aspects reported by the faculty-mentors that mentoring is: pleasant, enjoyable, rewarding and beneficial. All six mentors in this study reported that they found mentoring to be pleasant, enjoyable, and rewarding; additionally they all reported receiving benefits as a result of engaging in mentoring. Most of the rewards reported by the mentors were personal, such as pride in the protégé’s accomplishments, satisfaction, or gratification. Four of the six mentors also reported recognition by peers as an “external” reward for their mentoring.

In terms of the benefits, all of the mentors in this study shared the following benefits as a result of mentoring: learning (professional and/or personal); sharing (reciprocal support); a feeling of efficacy as a mentor and/or a professor; and enjoyment, happiness, a “good feeling” or a general positive affect. Two phrases that may generally sum up the gratifying perspective and that were frequently spoken by the mentors were: “Mentoring gives me a good feeling,” and “I get so many things back from mentoring.”

Variables that may influence the gratifying perspective would be the mentors’ perception of the time required for mentoring, and the negative mentoring experiences
they reported. Both of these variables have the potential to decrease the experience of gratification for the mentors; however, there was little commonality reported by the mentors on both of these variables. In terms of their perception as to whether mentoring was time intensive or not, three mentors reported that mentoring was *not* time intensive, while the other three responses were: “sometimes,” “rarely,” and “yes – mentoring is time intensive.” All of the mentors reported some type of negative experiences related to their mentoring, and their negatives were varied. The only negative variable that had any correspondence between mentors was that of “doctoral students having poor writing skills”; two mentors reported this as negative experience that reduced their enjoyment of mentoring. Other negative experiences reported by the mentors were: when the student’s values are not in agreement with the mentor’s values (e.g., quality), plagiarism by the student, unreasonable expectations by the student for the mentor to extricate him/her out of a problem, over-reliance on the mentor by the student for APA editing, when students fail out of the program, and students who exhibit a disposition deficit and then react defensively upon correction. Other negative experiences mentioned by mentors that are not a direct result of the protégé were: having too many students to mentor, being overscheduled with university duties and not having adequate time for mentoring, and other faculty who are deleterious mentors for students. The lack of correspondence between the mentors on these variables truly speaks to the idiographic nature of mentoring: the mentoring experience is specific to the needs of the individuals involved and impinged upon by intervening environmental variables present in their particular contexts. Table 10 summarizes this data.
Table 10

The Gratifying Perspective: Elements and Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Gratifying Perspective:</th>
<th>Jade</th>
<th>Jacob</th>
<th>Hanna</th>
<th>Reeba</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Donna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mentors’ Benefits from Mentoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring:</th>
<th>Enjoyment / Good Feeling</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Sharing / Get Things Back</th>
<th>Recognition by Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables of the Gratifying Perspective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the Mentor Find Mentoring to be Time Intensive?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mentor’s Various Negative Mentoring Experiences

| Mentoring Experiences | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
A Teleological Perspective

All of the mentors in this study took a teleological (purposeful) approach to their mentoring relationships: they ascertained the protégé’s purpose for doctoral study, and then intentionally planned mentoring activities that would meet the idiographic (specific) needs of the protégé in order to facilitate accomplishing that purpose. The mentors also had their own purposes for the mentoring relationship. The elements of the teleological mentoring perspective are the protégé’s purposes and the mentor’s purposes for the mentoring relationship.

First, every mentor discussed ascertaining the student’s purpose for embarking on doctoral study and every mentor recognized that a student’s purpose for attaining a doctoral degree is idiographic (specific to the individual) and dynamic (changeable, either by the student’s growth or by environmental/life interventions). The protégé’s purposes, as reported by the mentors, were: to become a professor, to become a school district professional, to become a school psychologist – clinician, or to attain job advancement. Besides the protégé’s purpose, all the mentors reported their own purposes for the mentoring relationship. The two purposes unanimously reported by the mentors were: to help the student, and to create a good professor. Two purposes that were reported by four of the six mentors were: to facilitate the best achievement of the protégé, and to develop local school district professionals. Two mentors saw their purpose for mentoring as helping the student to get a good job after graduation. Other purposes reported were: to create a school psychologist/clinician, and to foster the mentor’s own personal growth. Once these purposes were established for the mentor, each mentor engaged in mentoring in a teleological fashion—intentionally working toward facilitating the student’s purpose.
One reason why this is an important finding in the mentoring literature is because it describes an important area for possible conflict or negativity between the mentor and the protégé. To illustrate, here is a hypothetical example: it is entirely possible that within certain fields, e.g., Educational Leadership or Higher Education Administration, that a professor might be supervising doctoral students who only want to be a school or college administrator—not a professor or a researcher. However, the mentor may prefer or wish to have students who want to become professors. This potentially may lead mentors to unduly influence protégés to change career paths—a course of action fraught with peril for the student, as well as professional frustration and/or ethical peril for the mentor.

Variables that may influence the teleological course of a mentorship are dynamics (changes) to the mentors and protégé’s purposes or needs, the mentor’s values and the mentor’s motivations. All of the mentors in this study recognized an awareness that dynamics (changes) can and do occur and may subsequently alter the student’s goal or the student’s needs. If the student’s goal for doctoral degree pursuit changed, the mentors adapted their teleological approach to the mentorship vis-à-vis the student’s new purpose.

All of the mentors in this study also described values—a “core belief” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 378)—that guide daily actions. The values that were common to all six mentors were: helping, relationship, and giving back to the profession. Four of the six mentors also valued collegiality and sharing. Three mentors valued growth—the student’s and their own. Two mentors valued mentoring and research; one valued quality. Although the values of growth, research and quality were not unanimously reported by the mentors, the mentors provided clear evidence (in Chapter Four) of their values interacting with the student’s purpose for their doctoral degree: Professor Hanna valued
growth and described how in three mentorships the student would have to choose a dissertation topic that provided growth for the student or she would not be their mentor; Professor Overscheduled described the difficulty he encountered in the mentorship when a student does not value research or quality as he did.

Likewise, a mentor’s motivations are another variable that may influence the teleological course of a mentorship. All of the mentors in this study reported the following motivations to mentor: helping, enjoyment, and giving back to the profession. Four of the mentors were motivated by gratification; three of the mentors found the sharing that transpires in mentoring to be a motivation to mentor. Two mentors reported that their belief that mentoring was important was a motivating factor for them to mentor. As you can see, if a mentor values giving back to the profession and his/her motivation for mentoring is to give back to the profession, and the mentor’s preferred teleology (purpose) to his or her mentoring is to create a good professor, this might unwittingly foster an inclination for the mentor to unduly influence a mentorship to fulfill the mentor’s purpose and goal, rather than the student’s. So clearly, values and motivations can interact with the teleological course of a mentorship, sometimes in a positive way (Professor Hanna valuing growth and insisting upon it), sometimes creating difficulty for the mentor to execute his perceived purpose for mentoring (Professor Overscheduled valuing quality and research when the student did not), or sometimes in a deleterious way for the protégé (as in the hypothetical situation where the mentor’s purposes override the student’s purposes.) This data is summarized in Table 11.
Table 11

The Teleological Perspective: Elements and Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Teleological Perspective:</th>
<th>Jade</th>
<th>Jacob</th>
<th>Hanna</th>
<th>Reeba</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Donna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Protégé’s Purpose</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mentor’s Purpose</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the Student</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Good Professor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Local School Talent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Achievement of the Protégé</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables of the Teleological Perspective:

| Dynamics in the Protégé’s Purpose      | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |
| Dynamics in the Mentor’s Purpose       | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |
| The Mentor’s Motivations:              | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |
| Helping                                | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |
| Enjoyment                              | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |
| Giving Back to the Profession          | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |
| Gratification                          | x    | x     | x     | x     |      |       |
| Believes Mentoring is Important        | x    | x     |       |       |      |       |
An Idiographic Perspective

All of the mentors in this study took an idiographic approach to their mentoring relationships: they all sought to address the specific needs of the individual protégé. The idiographic elements that were common to all six mentors were career support, psychosocial support, relationship and collaboration. In order to provide appropriate career support, each mentor appraised the particular strengths and needs of a protégé and then sought to meet those developmental needs, especially vis-à-vis the student’s specific teleology or purpose, such as to become a professor, a school psychologist or a school district professional. All of the mentors viewed the one-on-one mentoring relationship as a primary strategy to scaffold the protégé’s acquisition of skills to become a professor or researcher. Furthermore, all of the mentors also viewed one-on-one collaboration with protégés (co-writing, co-presenting, co-publishing) as an key method for facilitating the acquisition of research and scholarship skills. Thus, all of the mentors employed individual relationship and collaboration to address the idiographic needs of protégés.
The six mentors also expressed an awareness of the specific psychosocial needs of the individual student, which might include emotional support and encouragement or professional socialization into the discipline, university or department. Additionally, one mentor provided emergency financial support such as “lots of leftovers” from a dinner or a short-term loan. One notable concept that emerged from the data was that of “contextual negotiation.” Four mentors found it common to negotiate a developmental plan with the protégé, and then renegotiate the plan when either their career goal changed, or life unexpectedly intervened with emergencies and other set-backs for the protégé. The mentors provided contextualized career or psychosocial renegotiation that addressed the specific personal needs of the student, in an effort to keep moving the student forward toward their goal.

All the mentors took an idiographic approach to their mentorships, but this does not preclude mentoring transpiring as a group activity with several protégés at once, such as Professor Jade’s advanced graduate student writing group, or Professor Reeba’s brunches for the female doctoral students in her department, as well as her departmental session that provided “secret insider knowledge” for beginning teaching assistants. But by and large, the preponderance of mentoring reported by these six mentors transpired on an idiographic basis, with the mentor meeting an individual’s specific (idiographic) developmental needs.

Variables that can influence the mentor’s idiographic perspective were the teleology (career goal) of the student that would initially set the idiographic course for mentoring, and the introduction of a dynamic (student growth or life-intervention) altering the career goal, thereby spurring the mentors to make adjustments to their
mentoring in order to support the student or meet their new needs. This data is summarized in Table 12.

Table 12
The Idiographic Perspective: Elements and Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Idiographic Perspective:</th>
<th>Jade</th>
<th>Jacob</th>
<th>Hanna</th>
<th>Reeba</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Donna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Negotiation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables of the Idiographic Perspective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Protégé’s Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics in the Protégé’s Purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Intentional Perspective

All six of the mentors in this study experienced mentoring to be intentional. The elements of the intentional perspective are the protégé’s purpose, the protégé’s idiographic needs and career support. All of the mentors intentionally discerned the student’s purpose (career goal) and the student’s strengths and weaknesses (idiographic needs) and intentionally designed their mentoring to meet the student’s needs. They intentionally addressed the student’s idiographic needs in order to help the student meet their goal (teleology).
The variables that can influence the Intentional Perspective are dynamics in the protégé’s purpose and in the protégé’s needs, either due to growth of the protégé wherein the protégé’s purpose changed, or the protégé’s needs changed. A dynamic of change from the environment (life issues) can also impinge upon the goals and the needs of the student. All six mentors shared mentoring stories that acknowledged how these variables can alter their intentions in mentoring.

Although the mentors found their mentoring to be largely intentional, this is not to say that mentoring is not serendipitous at times; in fact most of the mentors in this study mentioned such occurrences, such as quick exchanges with students that happen while passing in the hallways. Professor Hanna described her mentoring as “50-50”, or 50% intentional and 50% serendipitous. Professor Jade and Professor Reeba both described looking for articles for their own work and serendipitously running across research articles that would also be helpful to their students. But then as they both related, that becomes an intentional act when they download the article and email it to a student. Furthermore, Professor Reeba described “acting as a conduit of opportunities” for her protégés; often these opportunities serendipitously arise, such as opportunities to guest edit journals. But then she intentionally funneled these opportunities to students, according to their individual needs and purpose. Table 13 summarizes the Intentional Perspective.

A Dynamic Perspective

And finally, all of the mentors who participated in this study were all aware of dynamics (changes) as part of their mentoring experiences. The element of the Dynamic
Table 13

The Intentional Perspective: Elements and Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Intentional Perspective:</th>
<th>Jade</th>
<th>Jacob</th>
<th>Hanna</th>
<th>Reeba</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Donna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Protégé’s Purpose</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Protégé’s Idiographic Needs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables of the Intentional Perspective:

| Dynamics in the Protégé’s Purpose      | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |
| Dynamics in the Protégé’s Needs        | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x     |

Perspective is protégé growth. All the mentors reported that they experienced mentoring as dynamic and changing throughout the course of the mentorship. All six mentors expected that the protégé would grow as a result of their learning experiences in their doctoral program, such as Professor Hanna advising brand new doctoral students not to be too decided upon their dissertation topic on their first day of their doctoral program. The mentors then expected to adapt their mentoring to the protégé’s emergent status.

Variables of the Dynamic Perspective are: intervening life-issues for the protégé, changes in the student’s idiographic needs either as a result of their growth or intervening life-issues, and changes in the student’s career goal (teleology). Each of the six mentors in this study discussed experiences they had with variables such as these, and the adaptations they would enact in their mentoring to make accommodations for the
student’s new situation, which some of the mentors referred to as re-negotiations. This data is summarized in Table 14.

Table 14

The Dynamic Perspective: Elements and Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the Dynamic Perspective:</th>
<th>Jade</th>
<th>Jacob</th>
<th>Hanna</th>
<th>Reeba</th>
<th>Jack</th>
<th>Donna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protégé Growth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables of the Intentional Perspective:

| Dynamics in the Protégé’s Purpose | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x |
| Dynamics in the Protégé’s Needs    | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x |
| Dynamics from Life-Interventions   | x    | x     | x     | x     | x    | x |

Model of the Study

This study investigated the perceptions and experiences of six faculty-mentors who were nominated by doctoral graduates from the Transition University College of Education as having provided them with support that went beyond the basic duties of student advising, with the intention of enhancing/promoting/supporting both the career and personal development of the student. The exploratory questions that guided this inquiry were:

1. What elements constitute selected doctoral faculty-mentors’ perspectives on mentoring?

2. What variables influence those perspectives?
The major findings of this study reveal that five perspectives were common to all the mentors in this study: a Gratifying Perspective, a Teleological Perspective, an Idiographic Perspective, a Dynamic Perspective, and an Intentional Perspective. Elements (aspects to the perspectives that were common to all six mentors) and variables (aspects to the mentoring situation that can influence the mentor’s experience of the perspective and/or mentoring) respective to each perspective were also found and presented.

From the above discussion of the five Perspectives found among the mentors in this study, we can see how the Intentional Perspective, the Idiographic Perspective and the Teleological Perspective can all interact at the initiation of a mentoring relationship: the mentors in this study discerned the protégé’s teleology (purpose) and idiographic needs and then intentionally endeavored to fulfill the purpose and meet the needs of the student. Four of the six mentors described contextually negotiating a developmental path with the student’s purpose as the ultimate goal. Then when a dynamic altered the student’s progress, needs or purpose (either through student growth or life-issues), all of the mentors reported routinely adapting their mentoring to the new change-dynamic in the student’s evolution, which may also include contextual re-negotiation.

As you may see, the mentor and the protégé are involved in an evolving relationship, each experiencing similar events (intentions, idiographic needs, purposes, dynamics, and negotiations), but from different viewpoints. Not only is there interaction between the various perspectives identified in this study (such as the Intentional, Teleological, and Idiographic Perspectives) for the mentor (and, logically, for the protégé, too), but the mentors in this study have illustrated how the Dynamic Perspective can introduce alterations to a protégé’s established goals and needs, and the mentor’s
intentional plan to meet said goals and needs: the mentors related an expectation of student growth and an awareness of life-issues, both of which can introduce a change-dynamic. All of the mentors discussed making mentoring adjustments vis-à-vis the change-dynamic, four of the mentors described these adjustments as a negotiation or re-negotiation.

For the mentors in this study, their Intentional, Teleological, and Idiographic Perspectives were largely focused on meeting the needs and goals of the protégé. However, all of the mentors reported “getting so much back” from their mentorships, as illustrated in the Gratifying Perspective (pleasure, enjoyment, rewards and benefits.) From the earliest research on mentoring through the present, scholars have described mentoring as a reciprocal relationship (Cohen, 1995; Johnson, Rose & Schlosser, 2007; Kram, 1985; Levinson et al, 1978) primarily in reference to a mutual exchange of benefits in the mentoring dyad (Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, 2007a). The pleasure, enjoyment, rewards (such as a feeling of efficacy) and benefits (such as a positive affect) described by the mentors in this study suggest a more nuanced relationship that goes beyond reciprocity, into more of a symbiotic relationship—one that is not only mutually beneficial but also interdependent (Symbiosis, 2010), in light of the fact that all six of the mentors viewed mentoring as an essential component of their professional routine, and could not imagine accomplishing their job role without it. Figure 9 shows a dynamic model summarizing the emergent concepts found in this study.

Impact of the Study on the Researcher
Before I discuss the implications of this study on the theory and practice of mentoring, I feel it beneficial to relate to the reader the impact the study has had on me as a student, a
protégé and as a soon-to-be junior faculty-member who aspires to learn how to be a mentor. It was easy and natural for me during the interviews I had with the mentors in this study to interact with the mentors as a doctoral student. As a student, I was impressed with their willingness to expend their time and effort to help a student they had never before met. I was also impressed with their descriptions of the initiative they took to engage with their protégés in a rich and meaningful developmental journey of doctoral degree pursuit, which included a proactive and responsive communication style on the part of the mentors. I have frequently described these mentors as engaged and dedicated. These seem to be very good qualities as part of the chemistry for a positive mentorship experience (at least for the student); but when it comes to a relationship (mentorship), there are many more qualities needed to promote a positive experience (for both parties).
As a student, I have learned from this study to be more deliberate regarding the ‘mating dance’ between potential-protégé and potential-mentor. I can see how it is very beneficial as a student to interact with a faculty-member over the course of a semester class, being much more cognizant of what my needs and values are, and what the subtext of the faculty-member’s communications are regarding their needs, values, and rewards. In the future I will pay much more attention to this process and attempt to discern as many matches or mismatches between our chemistries as I can, because there are many more idiographic characteristics beyond dedication and engagement that comprise an all-around positive mentoring experience.

As an experienced protégé, I did not find myself sitting in the interviews wishing that these mentors were my mentors; rather, I found myself reflecting on my experiences in my previous mentorships. I am dumbfounded by how clueless I was as a protégé about what my mentors were experiencing, and what their perspectives were. Over my 12 year protégé-history, I now realize that I experienced my mentor behaving intentionally to meet my idiographic needs, I experienced my mentor asking me what I wanted to do after graduation (what my purpose was for my doctoral study), I experienced my mentor negotiating a developmental path with me and then re-negotiating that path when a dynamic interceded, but at the time I was unaware that my mentor was intentionally engaging in these perspectives. (Perhaps that is one hallmark of a seasoned mentor: they make mentoring appear as an effortless effort.) And, if, on a rare occasion, I became vaguely aware of my mentors intentional actions, I certainly never considered their side of the perspective—from my viewpoint, it was all about me. I do not consider myself self-absorbed or without empathy for others; my only explanation for
my cluelessness regarding my mentors’ perspectives in our relationships is my habit of totally immersing myself in my studies in order to grow into my next professional role. After interviewing these mentors, I am now aware of how mindful my mentors were in deliberately engaging me in these perspectives, the times where I rose to the opportunities, the times that I declined the opportunities, and the times where I simply didn’t see the opportunities.

Now, (hypothetically) as a junior faculty-member, I am concerned about learning how to initially be at least a decent mentor, since I have never been a mentor. What personal experience might I draw upon in order to build my conscious-competence as a mentor? For three years during my doctoral studies, I was assistant editor of a journal that only published articles on mentoring. My duties as assistant editor included reviewing article submissions and providing feedback to the authors on how to improve their articles for publication in the journal. (I also review article submissions for another educational journal; in my five years of reviewing articles for publications, I have only received one article that was ready for publication “as is,” and that article was a re-submission to the journal.) As I sit here at my desk, reflecting and writing, I realize that in the three years of reviewing mentoring articles for publication, I did not review one article that explored the perceptions of a seasoned mentor in the higher education setting (and I was the reviewer who dealt with articles in the higher education setting.) In an effort to corroborate my memory, I turned around from my computer, pulled the three years of journals off the shelf behind my desk, and perused the table of contents of the issues from those three years; my memory was confirmed: there was no research article investigating the perceptions of a seasoned mentor in the higher education setting in any
of these journal issues. (I did find one article that was an autobiographical account of a novice faculty-member as a protégé—but it did not investigate the perceptions of the mentor.)

What other avenues might I pursue in order to learn how to be a mentor? Turning to the extant research literature on the mentor’s experience, I can read Rose’s (2003) Ideal Mentor Scale and learn about the qualities that doctoral students most prefer in their mentors; I consider that to be of some help in learning to be a mentor. I can also read Cohen’s (1993) Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale which describes six behavioral functions mentors see themselves engaging in while mentoring adult students: that is certainly helpful in learning to be a mentor. There are publications by mentors that offer personal opinions and accounts of their own experiences; these could be very helpful, providing there is transferability between their mentoring context and mine. (One of the most prolific mentor-writers is in the discipline of clinical psychology.) What would be even more helpful (to me) would be research that systematically investigates the perspectives of several mentors in a fashion that offers detailed and nuances descriptions of their experiences and understandings. As a ‘junior faculty-member’ in the discipline of education who wants to learn how to mentor, I feel like the experience of interviewing these mentors not only provided me with insight into what mentoring is like for them and what makes it meaningful, but also lessons on how to be a mentor. I am very appreciative that they took the time from their schedules in order to share this special knowledge with me. I am sure that as I employ their advice, I will remember them fondly, and with gratitude.
Moreover, learning about the various perspectives that these mentors routinely detailed in their experiences of mentoring has provided me with new perspectives by which I can reframe (Bolman & Deal, 1997) my experiences as a protégé and thereby use my protégé experiences to begin to learn and understand about how to be a mentor. Having personal experience that I can somehow apply to the new setting of being a mentor does offer me some feelings of reassurance that I may not be entirely clueless as a mentor, after all.

**Implications of the Study**

In the following section I will describe the implications this study has generated in regards to a response to criticisms in the mentoring literature (as previously described in Chapter Two), implications for research in mentoring, implications for future practice in mentoring, and implications for departments, Colleges of Education and/or institutions of higher education.

**Response to Criticisms of the Mentoring Research**

Scholars have criticized the largely positive findings in the mentoring literature (Allen & Eby, 2007; Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983; Mertz, 2004). In response to this criticism, first, it is important to remember that for all the mentors in this study, mentoring is voluntary—even Professor Overscheduled stated that he “sees [mentoring] as something that [he] values and voluntarily [does].” Second, five of the six mentors in this study reported that their mentorships were initiated by mutual consent (voluntary). Additionally, all the mentors in this study reported a gratifying perspective to their mentoring: mentoring is pleasant, enjoyable, rewarding and beneficial (“It feels good,” and, “I get so much back...”)
from mentoring.”) Precious few people volunteer for an activity that is not pleasant or enjoyable. Thus, it logically follows that if researchers investigate mentors and protégés who volunteer for an activity which is pleasant, enjoyable, rewarding and beneficial, that the research findings will be largely positive.

However, scholars and researchers are also concerned with problem contexts, the research questions that arise from those contexts, and the discovery of new information that may advance knowledge. As you may recall, even though Professor Overscheduled feels his mentoring is voluntary, he has very little choice or previous knowledge of the doctoral students who are “sorted” into his tutelage; he also reported the greatest number and variety of negative mentoring experiences. This study seems to indicate an area for investigation that may yield a more problematic outlook on mentoring, specifically, contexts where the mentor does not feel like his or her mentoring is voluntary (perhaps settings such as business or organizations, medical school or nursing school) and situations where perhaps both the mentor and the protégé have volunteered for a mentorship experience, however the mentoring dyads are assigned, and not determined by mutual consent (such as assigned senior-junior faculty mentoring dyads, and assigned compensatory mentorships for youth, etc.) Locating and obtaining participation of such a specific group of people may prove to be exceedingly challenging, given the general difficulty of locating and recruiting research participants who engage in mentoring (Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997).

Scholars have also criticized the absence of or even contradictory operational definitions of mentoring across disciplines in the literature (Allen & Eby, 2007; Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Merriam, 1983;
The perspectives of the mentors in this study seem to shed some light on this apparent problem in the extant mentoring research. First, mentoring is idiographic, meaning specific to the needs of the protégé (and/or mentor); and second, mentoring is teleological, or purpose driven according to the purpose of the protégé (and/or mentor). This alone would be enough to explain contradictory operational definitions of mentoring across disciplines, as the purposes for mentoring and the attendant skills needed to fulfill those purposes have variation across disciplines. Moreover, mentoring is dynamic, meaning the purposes and needs can change, either due to protégé growth or external environmental interventions. This would further complicate a uniform operational definition of mentoring across disciplines, because it indicates a possibility for constant change in the needs of the protégé and the purpose of the mentoring.

In light of the idiographically purpose-driven and dynamic nature of mentoring, perhaps the expectation for a uniform operational definition of mentoring across disciplines is unrealistic. Consider, again, Professor Overscheduled: one might argue that since his doctoral students were assigned, that he therefore was not participating in a mentoring relationship. This assertion would be erroneous, due to several facts: first, I operationally defined mentors, protégés and mentoring in this study; second, I gathered data from protégés and mentors who met those definitions; and third, the protégés and mentors corroborated each other’s data that they were indeed participating in mentoring, as operationally defined. This speaks to the importance of carefully and thoughtfully operationally defining the terms ‘mentor,’ ‘protégé’, and ‘mentoring’ in a study; the critics are precise in this regard, and perhaps the advancement of mentoring literature would better be served by emphasizing the importance of idiographically focused
operational definitions, rather than a uniformity of definition across disciplines. The following quote from Professor Hanna illustrates how the idiographic purposes and needs of a mentorship can serve to conceptualize mentoring within a specific context, such as higher education:

There is always a purpose to my mentoring even if it's just the very broad: “I'm experienced. This is a doctoral student who is inexperienced in a realm that I am aware of, and so I am going to offer assistance that will take the form of mentoring.” To me, if I tell you what to do, that is not necessarily mentoring. It is giving you direction. I guess some people might consider that mentoring. If I talk to you about what you're thinking about and what the possibilities are, to me that is mentoring.

Response to the Mentoring Literature

The present study also expanded on several previous research studies, as I will here describe. As I mentioned in the Review of the Literature (Chapter Two), Busch’s 1985 survey of faculty-mentors reported a few open-ended responses that indicated themes for further investigation, such as: the mentors felt they gained personal satisfaction from the protégé’s progress and the mentors found mentoring to be professionally stimulating; these sentiments were reported in detail by the mentors in this study in the Gratifying Perspective. The findings of this study expanded Cohen’s 1993 study by providing a more nuanced description of how faculty-mentors view their relationship with their protégés, the information and benefits exchanged in the mentorship, and how mentors model scholarly skills for protégés. This study also paralleled Allen, Poteet & Burroughs’ 1997 study of mentors in the business setting in
that benefits from the mentorship did fall into two categories (benefits for the protégé and benefits for the mentor), however this study indicated that the benefits were not solely focused on job-related issues, but rather included a more holistic developmental scope, such as enjoyment and efficacy. Eby & Lockwood (2005) and Angeliadias (2007) both found that mentors learned from mentoring; the present study related detailed descriptions of what exactly the faculty-mentors felt they learned from mentoring doctoral students. Allen’s (2003) survey of mentors in the business setting found two motivations by mentors: a self-enhancement motive and an intrinsic satisfaction motive. The motivation of enjoyment found in the mentors in this study seems to parallel the intrinsic satisfaction motive; However, the two other common motivations reported in this study of helping the student and giving back to the profession do not seem to parallel Allen’s self-enhancement motive.

Allen & Eby (2003) found that accounting and engineering mentors reported satisfaction with the quality of the mentorship when they perceived similarity between their interests, values and personality and that of their protégés. One mentor in this study described the negative issues that arose in his mentorships when he perceived a disconnect between his values (such as quality) and his protégé’s values. The concept of values of the mentor and the role values may play in any idiographic mentoring setting is one area of research that is indicated for future study. In contrast to Kram’s (1985) finding that mentors in the business setting have a propensity to clone themselves by selecting protégés that are similar to themselves in several regards, the mentors in this study did not convey any personal desire to turn their protégé into a “mini-me;” rather, the mentors in this study expressed some concern with influencing the next generation
of professors and teachers by promulgating their own educational ideas or approaches, but were more concerned with creating good professors, researchers and teachers.

**Implications For Research and Contexts Other Than Higher Education**

As I have just discussed in the previous section, there is a dearth of research that reports negative or unpleasant findings regarding mentoring. The findings of this study described several positive aspects of the Gratifying Perspective that the faculty-mentors in this study experienced when they volunteered to mentor doctoral students. One implication from this study for future mentoring research is that a possible area for investigating and possibly finding negative mentoring experiences would be in educational, business or medical settings where either the mentor does not feel that the mentorship is entirely voluntary, such as when the mentoring is mandated by the employer, or the mentoring dyad is assigned.

Possible venues for research in this area might include assigned mentoring dyads in the following contexts: assigned compensatory youth mentoring, mandatory mentoring of new teachers in the K-12 setting, mandatory mentoring of nursing or medical students in their clinical settings; as well as mandatory pairing of mentor and protégé in a business, organizational, or higher educational setting. The findings of this study pose possible exploratory questions such as: Is there a Gratifying Perspective for mentors in these assigned mentorships with assigned parings, and what are the elements and variables of these perspectives? Do they see the mentorship as negotiated, collaborative or reciprocal, especially in nursing and medical settings?

Another possible area for investigation might be mentors who volunteer to mentor and are assigned a protégé, but receive some sort of remuneration for mentoring. If
mentors are paid to mentor (either as an assigned job duty, or from extra remuneration from the school district), do they perceive a Gratifying Perspective at all in their mentorships, and if so what are the elements and variables of that perspective? Do mentors who are paid to mentor view mentoring as a relationship at all, or just a job duty? What are these mentors’ values and motivations for mentoring, especially if the mentors are getting paid to mentor?

Do mentors (and protégés) in other contexts clearly perceive a Teleological Perspective to their mentoring and if so, what are the elements and variables of that perspective? Are the purposes explicitly discussed and/or negotiated between the participants? In business and organization settings, is one purpose for mentoring to increase bottom line profits for the corporation, especially of the mentorship is assigned by the corporation? Do nursing and medical mentors see one of the purposes for their mentoring as service to society or humanity?

The findings of this study also suggest areas for investigation regarding sources of possibly conflict or negativity between the mentor and protégé, such issues surrounding change-dynamics, or conflict in the purpose (teleology) values, or motivations in the mentorship.

In mentoring contexts that involve specific clinical or vocational competencies (such as nursing, medicine, psychiatry, mechanics), are there fewer or less variety of idiographic needs of the protégés, and therefore less of an Idiographic Perspective in these mentorships?

There are several emergent concepts from this study that are the focus of little to no empirically grounded research in the mentoring literature. Investigation of these
concepts in any mentoring context (K-12 education, undergraduate education, adult education, vocational education, business, nursing, medicine, etc.) would expand the mentoring literature in general: 1) What are the perceived purposes (teleologies), motivations, and values of the mentoring participants, and how do these perceptions impact the mentorship? 2) What are the idiographic characteristics of mentoring in various contexts? 3) What is the role and extent of negotiation in various mentoring contexts? Is the negotiation unrecognized, meaning implicit or unspoken, or explicitly recognized, discussed and navigated? And if so, how?

**Implications for Future Practice for Faculty-Mentors of Doctoral Students**

Based on the findings of this study, there are several implications for mentors who are already involved in doctoral student mentoring. The following implications may also be especially helpful for people who are just learning or beginning to mentor. At the beginning of a mentorship, ascertain what your protégé’s purpose or goal is for their degree pursuit. If your protégé’s initial purpose or goal for his/her doctoral study is somewhat unfocused, as was mine, it would likely prove beneficial to engage the protégé in some periodic dialogue until the protégé seems comfortable with a clear goal for his/her doctoral study. Then, periodically check to see if your protégé’s purpose has changed. My initial goal evolved into a new goal by the time I reached the qualifying exams; and it has changed again slightly since then. It’s OK, and probably a good idea, to explicitly discuss goal setting and periodically revisit goals with the protégé. I think for me, the mental exercise of having to occasionally check in with my mentor and discuss long term goals would have expanded my myopia centered on just getting through the degree, and helped me develop a long-term vision. As a mentor, endeavor to discern
your protégé’s idiographic needs and then attempt to meet those needs as best you can. Try to maintain an awareness of your protégé’s needs, or, periodically check to see if his/her needs have changed, and if the protégé feels like his/her needs are being met.

If you feel like you could use some help at becoming a better mentor, consider learning about a counseling technique, such as Rogerian counseling, which includes concepts such as active and empathic listening, responding back to the protégé by paraphrasing the protégé’s content and affect, and demonstrating unconditional positive regard for the protégé. If you personally feel that relationships in general are challenging, and/or perceive that mentoring relationships in particular might be challenging, observe colleagues who seem to be more comfortable or successful at mentoring, and then ask for their advice; the present study suggests they will likely find it pleasant and gratifying that you asked them to share their mentoring wisdom.

If mentoring initially seems to be a monumental challenge, take heart: there is absolutely no need for you as the mentor to be the font of all mentoring knowledge. You need not have a predetermined master plan for the protégé. Asking the protégé what his or her purpose is takes the heat off of you as the mentor; then serve as a “conduit of opportunities” to guide and facilitate the protégé’s progress toward the goal. When a change-dynamic happens, negotiate a plan of action; re-negotiate as needed. Mentors do not have to have all the “answers”, just the ability to listen to the protégé’s needs and offer their best ideas, solutions, and help.

Implications for Future Practice For Doctoral Students

Based on the findings of this study, there are a few implications for doctoral students who may currently be protégés, or want to become protégés. The following are
suggestions offered directly to doctoral students, based in the research findings of this study. Specifically, mentoring is a symbiotic relationship. All relationships require some effort and nurturing; endeavor to periodically inventory your efforts to sustain and enhance your mentoring relationship with your mentor. Additionally, a symbiotic relationship indicates that your mentor derives life-enhancing gratification from the mentoring relationship, just as you do. Endeavor to ascertain your mentor’s idiographic needs, values, motivations, rewards, benefits and enjoyments of mentoring, and then get intentional about reciprocating some of those back to your mentor.

It can be appropriate to negotiate with your mentor; be forthcoming about your needs. Change happens; be proactive about re-negotiating with your mentor. Determine your purpose or goal for your doctoral studies and discuss it with your mentor. Candidly discuss any doubts or changes you have about your needs or purpose. Be positive, proactive, and responsive regarding your communications with your mentor, especially any formative feedback. Don’t give your mentor rough drafts to read. Learn APA style. Use your mentor’s time efficiently – they are really busy. Protégés who evince empathy and respect will enrich the mentoring relationship.

Implications for Future Practice for Institutions

Based on the findings of this study, there are a few implications for institutional practice that might be implemented at the College of Education or university level (or both) revolving around building and sustaining a culture of mentoring. In order to create a culture of mentoring, the institutional leadership could promulgate an institutional vision in which mentoring figured prominently.
For example, the Dean of the College of Education might address the faculty with a visionary goal, such as state or national recognition of their graduates as outstanding educators at all levels (undergraduate, master’s and doctoral), state or national recognition of their partnerships with local school districts, and state or national recognition as producers of transformational educational researchers (including doctoral students, junior faculty, and faculty), and explicate how mentoring at all levels can be a means to these ends. This leadership vision might begin with an appeal to what the mentors in this study reported as their purposes for mentoring: to facilitate the best achievement of the protégé, to develop local school district talent, and to create good professors.

Next, the Dean could illustrate how the values of this vision and of the College of Education are congruent with values expressed by mentors (e.g., the mentors in this study), such as: giving back to the profession, growth, quality, research, community (relationship), and collegiality. The Dean could also illustrate congruence in motivations between the institution and mentors (as also found in this study), such as the motivation to give back to the profession, and the motivation for personal and institutional benefits and recognition. The Dean might use research findings, as well as testimonials from mentors, to illustrate these values and motivations. (Testimonials should include extra details on the personal rewards, benefits and enjoyment for mentors.) Third, the Dean could implement programs and structures to support mentoring and to help faculty learn to mentor, such as creating an emotionally safe discussion forum or a mentor’s network where troubled mentors can process issues.
I have already discussed suggestions (previously) about how to learn to mentor. The mentors in this study had the following suggestions on how to ensure good mentoring in the future at Transition University. They suggested: informal mentoring discussions among faculty, formal mentoring programs that avoided forced / bad pairings in the mentoring dyads, and incorporating mentoring a part of faculty assignments but let the assignment to mentoring dyads be voluntarily selected by the faculty. Finally, the Dean could also include some sort of reward for mentoring. This could range from publicly recognizing good mentoring in the college, demonstrating that mentoring is valued by leaders of the professional learning community, to some sort of financial reward such as occasional load release time for mentors, or an annual mentoring award that included a financial gift along with recognition by peers.

Conclusion

In concluding this study, I have reached a milestone. Looking back I realize that I have completed a nine year odyssey consisting of four years of doctoral coursework and then five years of dissertation research and have come to realize the value of the impact of this journey on both my growth as a researcher and educator.

I have realized tremendous value in moving beyond my experiences as a protégé to study in-depth the qualities and the dynamics of effective mentors and mentoring relationships. I believe this study is a distinctive success both on the level of my personal growth and on the level of a contribution to the field of mentoring. I was gratified to receive positive feedback from the mentors in this study as well as the members of my dissertation committee as I processed the data through the rigors of phenomenology. I find that the modern mentor-protégé relationship in an academic setting still echoes the
qualities and the journey of Odysseus’ ten year journey to return to hearth and home and restore homeostasis to his life.

*Researcher Reflective Journal, February 7, 2010*

. . . . It's not a hill, it's a mountain

As you start out the climb

Do you believe me, or are you doubting

We're gonna make it all the way to the light . . .

(Excerpt from: I Know I'll Go Crazy if I Don't Go Crazy Tonight by U2)
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Appendix A

Interview Protocol 1

1. [Name of doctoral student] has nominated you as a mentor. Can you describe to me how you view your role as a mentor to [name of student]? Or, if permission was not given to use the student’s name: Can you describe to me how you view your role as a mentor to doctoral students?

2. When you were a mentor to [name of student], what was the mentoring experience like for you? Or, if permission was not given to use the student’s name: Typically, what is the mentoring experience like for you?
   a. Follow-up probing question: Were there any negative experiences for you as a mentor?

3. Keeping in mind your mentoring experiences with [name of student], what type of activities did you typically engage in with [name of student] and what do you consider to be your most effective or important mentoring activities?
   Or, if permission was not given to use the student’s name: Think of a specific mentoring relationship that you felt worked well; what type of activities did you typically engage in with doctoral students whom you mentored and what do you consider to be your most effective or important mentoring activities?

4. What motivated you to engage in these activities with the student [or name of student, if permission is given to use the name]?

5. How did you learn to mentor?
Appendix A (Continued)

6. Can you describe how you decided to be [name of student’s] mentor? Or, if permission was not given to use the student’s name: Can you describe how you decided to be someone’s mentor?
   a. Follow-up probing question: Are there some general qualities of a protégé that you look for?
   b. Do you have any documents or artifacts from your mentoring relationships that you can share with me?

7. Is there anything else you want to tell me at this time?
Appendix B

Interview Protocol 2

1. In revisiting our first interview is there anything you wish to add to your statements on mentoring?

2. How would you define the term "mentor"?

3. In the ideal, what would help insure excellent mentoring?

4. When you think about your life as a mentor, what can you tell future mentors?
Appendix C
Nomination Form Sent to Graduates

Dear “Transition University” College of Education Doctoral Degree Graduate:
I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida. I am pursuing my dissertation topic on the perspectives of faculty who mentor doctoral students who complete the doctoral degree. The purpose of the study is to describe and explain selected faculty-mentors’ perspectives on the mentoring of doctoral students.

In order to locate faculty in the College of Education, I am asking alumni who have graduated with their doctoral degree within the past seven years from the “Transition University” College of Education to nominate COE faculty-mentors for participation in two interviews for this study, by filling out the nomination form below. You may nominate ANY College of Education faculty member who you feel fits the definition of mentor (below); the faculty member does NOT have to have been your dissertation committee chair or a member of your dissertation committee.

If you could please take a minute to fill out the form below and return it to me, I would greatly appreciate it. Your nomination will remain anonymous, unless you indicate otherwise on the form.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Burg

Information About My Research Study – Informed Consent

1. This study involves interviewing faculty regarding their mentoring experiences, and is therefore research.
2. The purpose of the study is to describe and explain selected faculty-mentors’ perspectives on the mentoring of doctoral students.
3. I expect the study to last from March 2009 thru May 2010.
4. The approximate number of faculty-mentors to be interviewed ranges from five to 10 interviewees.
5. The procedure of the research involves asking doctoral graduates from the “Transition University” College of Education to nominate faculty-mentors. Faculty-mentors who consent to participate will then participate in two 1-hour interviews.
6. There are no foreseeable risks to either the students who nominate the mentors, or the faculty-mentors.
7. Possible benefits to the faculty mentors are: they will receive copies of the interview transcripts, tapes and the research study. Also, significant new findings which relate to the faculty-mentors’ willingness to participate will be provided.
8. Doctoral graduates may choose to remain completely anonymous. If they choose to disclose their identity to myself and the faculty-mentor, this information will only be known to me and the faculty-mentor.
9. The confidentiality of the faculty-mentors will be completely maintained throughout the study; only I will know their identities, which will remain anonymous in the study.
10. For questions about the research and the participants rights and any other issues arising from the research, please contact me, Carol A. Burg, at: cburg@mail.usf.edu.
11. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Refusal to participate will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits. Participants are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.
12. There is no cost to you for participation in this research study.

13. The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB) may be contacted at:
12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd, MDC035, Tampa, Florida, 33612; telephone: 813-974-5638. The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board / Department of Health & Human Service may request to see my research records of this study.

**Nomination Form for Faculty-Mentors in the “Transition U.” College of Education**

For the purpose of this study, a mentor is defined as: Any faculty member in the “Transition University” College of Education who has been identified by a COE doctoral graduate as participating in a relationship that provides support that goes beyond the basic duties of student advising, with the intention of enhancing/promoting/supporting both the career and personal development of the student.

Below, please PRINT the name of any “Transition University” College of Education faculty you have encountered that fills this description. You may nominate more than one faculty member, if you wish:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Your nomination will remain anonymous; however, it would enhance the focus of the interview responses if I may inform the faculty member of the name of the person who nominated him/her as a mentor. If you agree to let me inform the faculty-mentor of who nominated him/her as a mentor, please:

Print your name here: ___________________________________________________

I agree to participate in this study with Carol A. Burg. I realize that this information will be used for educational purposes. I understand I may withdraw from the study at any time. I understand the intent of the study.

And sign your name here: ___________________________________________________

Date: ____________________________

If there is NO faculty member whom you feel has acted as a mentor to you, please indicate so below with a check mark, and return this form in the envelope provided:

___No faculty member in the “Transition U.” College of Education has acted as a mentor for me.

Please return the nomination form by May 15, 2009 in the envelope provided.
Thank you very much for your participation!

Carol A. Burg  
626 7th Ave. N., St Petersburg, FL 33701  
cburg@mail.usf.edu  
USF IRB #107792  
Approved 4/7/09
Appendix D

Explanatory Letter to Interviewees

Dear “Transition University” College of Education Faculty Member,

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida. I am pursuing my dissertation topic on the perspectives of faculty who mentor doctoral students to degree completion. The purpose of the study is to describe and explain selected faculty-mentor’s perspectives on the mentoring of doctoral students. Your participation is requested because a doctoral degree graduate of the “Transition University” College of Education has nominated you as someone who provided mentoring to him/her during the course of his/her doctoral studies.

For the purpose of this study, a mentor is defined as:
Any faculty member in the “Transition University” College of Education who has been identified by a COE doctoral graduate as participating in a relationship that provides support that goes beyond the basic duties of student advising, with the intention of enhancing/promoting/supporting both the career and personal development of the student.

Participation in the study will require approximately two one-hour, in-depth interviews. The interviews will, with your permission, be taped and transcribed. To maintain confidentiality, you will not be identified by name on the tape. I and/or a professional typist will be transcribing the tapes. A peer-review reader will read the transcription of the tape; however, they will be able to identify faculty only as Faculty A, or Faculty B, etc. The audio files will be kept in a safe at my house. Each participant will be offered a copy of the audio files as well as a copy of the transcriptions. The interviewees and I will be the only ones with access to the audio files. Once the interviews are transcribed from a copy of the audio file, the audio file will be returned to me and erased. The master audio file will remain in my possession and will be destroyed five years after the publication of the dissertation.

Interviews will be arranged at the college at your convenience. The tentative schedule calls for one interview in May 2009 and another interview by September 2009.

In addition, you may be asked to share relevant artifacts and documents. Your name and the name of the college and any other information gathered in this study will remain confidential and will only be used for educational purposes.

I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of my request. I look forward to your participation in the study.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Burg
626 7th Ave. N, St. Petersburg, FL 33701 cburg@mail.usf.edu

USF IRB #107792 Approved 4/7/09
## Appendix E

### Estimated Dissertation Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digital Voice Recorder</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS.ti Software</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notebook / Journal</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper &amp; Postage Expenses</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses for Interviews</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription of 12 – 1 hour Interviews</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Processing Submission Fee</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilming Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Editing of Dissertation</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Dissertation Copies</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest UMI Fee</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 Starbucks Gift Certificates for Interviewees</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,410.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Consent Form for Interviewees

Information About My Research Study – Informed Consent

This study involves interviewing faculty regarding their mentoring experiences, and is therefore research.

1. This study involves interviewing faculty regarding their mentoring experiences, and is therefore research.

2. The purpose of the study is to describe and explain selected faculty-mentors’ perspectives on the mentoring of doctoral students.

3. I expect the study to last from March 2009 thru May 2010.

4. The approximate number of faculty-mentors to be interviewed ranges from five to 10 interviewees.

5. The procedure of the research involves asking doctoral graduates from the “Transition University” College of Education to nominate faculty-mentors. Faculty-mentors who consent to participate will then participate in two 1-hour interviews.

6. There are no foreseeable risks to either the students who nominate the mentors, or the faculty-mentors.

7. Possible benefits to the faculty mentors are: they will receive copies of the interview transcripts, tapes and the research study. Also, significant new findings which relate to the faculty-mentors’ willingness to participate will be provided.

8. Doctoral graduates may choose to remain completely anonymous. If they choose to disclose their identity to myself and the faculty-mentor, this information will only be known to me and the faculty-mentor.

9. The confidentiality of the faculty-mentors will be completely maintained throughout the study; only I will know their identities, which will remain anonymous in the study.

10. For questions about the research and the participants rights and any other issues arising from the research, please contact me, Carol A. Burg, at: cburg@mail.usf.edu.

11. Participation in this completely voluntary. Refusal to participate will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits. Participants are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

12. There is no cost to you for participation in this research study.

13. The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB) may be contacted at: 12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd, MDC035, Tampa, Florida, 33612; telephone: 813-974-5638. The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board / Department of Health & Human Service may request to see my research records of this study.

I, ____________________________________________________________________________,

(Please print your name above.)

Agree to participate in this study with Carol A. Burg. I realize that this information will be used for educational purposes. I understand I may withdraw from the study at any time. I understand the intent of the study.

Signed _____________________________ Date ___________________

Please return this consent form by May 30, 2009 in the envelope provided to: USF IRB #107792
Carol A Burg 626 7th Ave. N., St. Petersburg, FL 33701 cburg@mail.usf.edu  Approved 4/7/09
January 25, 2010

Dear _______________________________________________

Thank you for enjoyable and insightful interviews. Attached please find a draft copy of the verbatim transcripts of the interview and concomitant analysis. Please review the transcription / analysis for accuracy of responses and reporting of information. Please feel free to contact via email at cburg@mail.usf.edu should you have any questions.

Thank you again for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Burg

cburg@mail.usf.edu
Appendix H

Peer Reviewer Form

I, Ruth Slotnick, have served as a second reviewer for “Faculty Perspectives on Doctoral Student Mentoring: The Mentor’s Odyssey” by Carol A. Burg. In this role, I have worked with the researcher in capacities such as reviewing the analysis of transcripts and assisting in emerging issues.

Signed:  
(Signature on File)

Date:  
February 23, 2010
### Appendix I

#### Sample Interview Transcript and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Transcript Meaning Units Highlighted</th>
<th>Theme of Meaning Units</th>
<th>Emergent Central Theme</th>
<th>Emergent Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof Intentional 06.01.09</strong> (The interview begins with a brief discussion of an article Prof. Intentional wrote about mentoring.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carol:** [1:18] Thank you. First of all, can you describe to me how you view your role as a mentor to doctoral students?

**Professor Intentional:** [1:29]
Well, I shared with you that chapter that I wrote on mentoring. [1:36] That was published not too long ago. Actually, very recently. As I was doing the research for that chapter I came across the term intentional mentoring. That is a term, I think, really kind of embraces my philosophy on mentoring. [1:58] It is

- Prof. Intentional sees her mentoring role as an intentional one.
- Mentors see their mentoring role as an intentional one.

Mentoring: Intentional
## Sample Interview Transcript and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Transcript Meaning Units Highlighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intentional. It is conscious. Now, there are many, many things that happen in a mentoring relationship that you don't necessarily think about very consciously. . . . It is something that happens in passing conversation. [2:15] But, I would classify my particular view of it as intentional mentoring. I try to make very sure that when I see opportunities that come through, I think, &quot;Which of my doctoral students would benefit from this? Who could contribute to this? How can I position them for a job later on? What does this person need that this person may not need as much of?&quot; [2:41] . . . So it is intentional. . . . I try to fashion the opportunities that I make available and how I interact with them, a very conscious choice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme of Meaning Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Intentional sees her mentoring role as an intentional one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Central Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentors see their mentoring role as an intentional one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring: Intentional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mentors see part of their role as mentor as positioning protégés for jobs later on. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring: Protégé Job Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring: Intentional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 27, 2009 Prof. Jade:

I arrived at the faculty office suite at 8:50am for my 9:00am interview today. The secretary notified my interviewee, Prof. Jade, that I had arrived. As Prof. Jade was taking me back to her office, she mentioned that she had 30 minutes available for the interview.

My heart sunk into my stomach; I had clearly requested a 60 minute interview, which Prof. Jade agreed to provide. I started to panic: the purpose of the pilot interview was to ascertain that my interview questions were constructed adequately to garner the data I needed for my phenomenological study. The pilot interview was also to indicate any changes to the interview protocol, if needed, before I collected the bulk of the data. Should I reschedule the interview for another time when Prof. Jade had an hour available? By the time we reached her office, I had decided: No, I will go forward with the opportunity I have right now – don’t worry about only having 30 minutes – concentrate on doing the best interview that I can. I smiled, and replied to Prof. Jade, “Thank you!” I proceeded with the interview with intense focus, wanting to be sure I covered all the interview questions. Prof. Jade was enthusiastic, and equally focused – until the phone in her office rang. She asked me if she should get that. I responded with a sort of wilted expression on my face. She turned around anyway and answered the phone, but was extremely brief, and talked less than 1 minute. I smiled and we resumed the interview. Always keep smiling with your participants! Precisely at 9:30am Prof. Jade made it evident that she had to leave. I was happy to see that in 30 minutes I had indeed covered all my interview questions.
Appendix K

List of Documents and Artifacts

Professor Jade:
  Curriculum Vita: September 10, 2009
  Personal Communication: November 1, 2009; November 2, 1009
  Article she wrote on hermeneutical research: November 15, 2009; January 26, 2010
  Member Check: January 26, 2010

Professor Jacob:
  Curriculum Vita: June 19, 2009
  Personal Communication: November 27, 2009
  Member Check: January 26, 2010

Professor Hanna:
  Curriculum Vita: June 17, 2009
  Personal Communication: December 9, 2009
  Member Check: February 4, 2010

Professor Reeba:
  Curriculum Vita: May 14, 2009
  Personal Communication: December 31, 2009
  Article she wrote on mentoring: May 14, 2009
  Member Check: January 26, 2010

Professor Jack:
  Curriculum Vita: September 23, 2009
  Personal Communication: July 2, 2009; January 8, 2010
  Member Check: February 6, 2010

Professor Donna:
  Curriculum Vita: June 23, 2009
  Personal Communication: January 18, 2010
  Member Check: February 5, 2010
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