2009

Exploring Mentoring Experiences in College Student Affairs : A Q Methodology Study

Matthew Woodward Clifford
University of North Florida

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd

Part of the Education Commons

Exploring Mentoring Experiences in College Student Affairs:
A Q Methodology Study

by

Matthew Woodward Clifford

A dissertation submitted to the
Department of Leadership, Counseling, and Instructional Technology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

October 2009

The dissertation of Matthew W. Clifford is approved:

_____ Date _October 29, 2009_

Katherine Kasten, Ph.D., Chair

_____ Date _October 29, 2009_

Christopher Janson, Ph.D.

_____ Date _October 29, 2009_

H. Eugene Baker, III, Ph.D.

_____ Date _October 29, 2009_

Mauricio Gonzalez, Ph.D.

Accepting for the Department:

_____ _12-15-09_

E. Newton Jackson, Jr., Ph.D., Department Chair   Date

Accepting for the College:

_____ _12/15/2009_

Larry G. Daniel, Ph.D., Dean   Date
College of Education & Human Services

Accepting for the University:

_____ _12-16-09_

Dean, Graduate School   Date

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my wife, JoAnne, without whose support I would not have

been able to embark on this tremendously fulfilling journey.

Acknowledgements

For the past year, I exiled myself to this computer every other night. Some nights I would write volumes, while others I would just sit and stare at the monitor. Progress was, at times, quite hard to come by. For me, the ritualistic act of returning to this keyboard a few nights a week was progress enough. Working on this immense project has oftentimes felt extremely lonely. However, my friends, family, and colleagues have helped me immensely throughout this progress. Only by standing on their shoulders have I been able to reach this pinnacle.

My mother was my first teacher. An art educator in North and South Carolina for 30 years, she taught me how to create, a fundamental lesson in art. Her love of teaching inspired me to become an educator. I am so thankful for her presence in my life. Through her example, I found a meaningful career, and I can only hope to impact students in the ways that she did.

My dad never hesitates telling me how proud he is of me. In every card I have ever received from him – for birthdays, Christmas, and now Father"s Day – he enclosed a note telling me about his unending pride. I shrugged those notes off as something he felt he had to say. Now I know that those notes helped me realize the potential that I could fulfill for myself. I also realize how proud I am to be my father"s son. His support has been unwavering, and his belief in me to accomplish my goals has buoyed me during every difficult moment.

During my last semester in the doctoral program, my wife and I welcomed our beautiful triplets – Peyton, Sam, and Adah – into the world. As I prepared for my comprehensive exams, my wife and I were still in the throes of a seemingly endless

pattern – feed babies, change babies, put babies to sleep, repeat. A few months before my data collection, our second son, Luke, was born. I completed nearly all of this study as the father of four children under 2 years old. Some people have marveled at how I have overcome such an obstacle. Although there were times when the effects of fatherhood exacted their toll on my efforts, overwhelmingly my children have been a source of energy. Their laughs, smiles, hugs and kisses have kept me going until the early hours of the morning on many days. Thank you to Peyton, who loves to tell me about her day even though I can only understand every other word. To Sam, who cuddles with the best of them. To Adah, who gives the best hugs. And thank you to Luke, who has been the best baby when we really needed him to be.

This study is about mentoring relationships. I was drawn to this topic because of the care and guidance provided by my mentors. Four themes surface during the course of this study – the mentor as ideal, as cheerleader, as friend, and as teacher. I have been blessed to have all of these mentor types during my career. To my teacher, Dr. Suzanne Churchill, thank you for teaching me how to be a scholar. To my cheerleader – Katie O'Dair, thank you for encouraging me to enter the field of student affairs. To my friend, Kristie Gover, thank you for your friendship, support, care and concern. To my ideal, Bobby Vagt, thank you for showing me the kind of leader I want to be. I am indebted to these mentors, without whom I would not be Dr. Matthew Clifford.

I am also indebted to my committee members. Dr. Kasten, thank you for your encouragement, your exacting questions, and your firm belief in me as a scholar. You always asked the right questions and provided the perfect dose of challenge and support. I will never forget our conversation when you helped pull me from the edge of eternal

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of new professionals in college student affairs as protégés in mentoring relationships. This study was designed as an exploratory study into the types of mentoring relationships that exist among college student affairs professionals, using Q methodology. The profession of college student affairs can use mentoring relationships to help recruit, train, develop, and retain high-quality individuals. Although mentoring relationships are frequently used to develop college student affairs professionsl, little is known about these relationships.

Fifty-five new professionals in college student affairs from 29 different states sorted 39 statements describing mentoring relationships on a continuum from "least like my mentoring relationship" (-4) to "most like my mentoring relationship" (+4). These 55 sorts were factor analyzed and rotated. Following these procedures, four factors emerged that represented different perspectives on mentoring relationships in college student affairs. Interpretation of these factors yielded distinct themes within them. These factors were named: (a) Mentor as Ideal, (b) Mentor as Cheerleader, (c) Mentor as Friend, and (d) Mentor as Teacher.

The results of the study, which intended to elicit the subjectivity of new college student affairs professionals regarding their mentoring relationships, suggest that college student affairs professionals value, in different ways, the interaction with their mentor. The results from this study suggest the personal interaction between a protégé and a mentor is a valuable part of a protégé"s career. Additionally, the results from this study seem to indicate that mentoring relationships in college student affairs are, on balance, positive. The results also suggest that mentoring relationships in college student affairs

are highly developmental. The perspectives described and the interpretation provided in this study can greatly assist student affairs professionals in the development of new professionals.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Every April, in a ritual unlike any other, prospective graduates of preparatory programs in college student affairs gather in a large convention space and interview at small, cloth-lined tables for hundreds of jobs. These candidates blindly weave through the other candidates on their way to the next eager employer for a brief interview. They hope their efforts will be rewarded with a visit to campus and a more in-depth conversation about their qualifications and background. A large majority of these individuals translate their initial interview into their first full-time job in college student affairs. Despite their success in securing a job, these new professionals often wander into the first few years of employment in college student affairs with little or no direction or guidance. Unfortunately, many of them leave their masters degrees behind and pursue employment outside college student affairs. A few of them, however, successfully navigate the tumultuous first few years as a new professional and remain in the field, contributing to the development of the fledgling field of college student affairs. Some of those new professionals who make it past the first few years owe at least part of their success to their mentors, senior college student affairs professionals who helped them with their first steps into the profession and who will likely guide them throughout their journey. This study examined the experiences that protégés had with their mentors during this formative period in their career.

Mentoring has been difficult to define, partly because of its popularity in the literature. Actually, one of the first authors to consider the developmental nature of the mentoring relationships noted, "No word currently in use is adequate to convey the nature of the relationship we have in mind here" (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978, p. 97). In the seminal work on mentoring relationships, Kram (1985) seated her definition of mentoring in the developmental context. Kram noted that the word *mentor* had many different connotations, and she decided not to use the term in her research, concentrating instead on developmental relationships. Despite the lack of a concrete operational definition of mentoring, there is little doubt that the relationship between mentor and protégé is process-oriented and focused on the development of both mentor and protégé. Mentoring relationships can occur in a variety of contexts, but this study examined mentoring in the workplace, specifically educational environments.

Mentoring is a relationship between a senior, more experienced individual in an organization and a junior, less experienced colleague. Mentoring relationships take time to form, coalesce, and develop into a long-term relationship that benefits both parties. Mentoring relationships develop through several phases. Kram (1985) described these four phases as initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. The initiation phase typically last from 6 months to 1 year. During the initiation phase, the mentor and protégé set positive expectations for the relationship, and the pair must rely on these expectations to carry the relationship to the next phase. The next phase, the cultivation phase, is a period of 2 to 5 years when the maximum range of mentoring functions is provided (Dougherty, Turban, & Haggard, 2007). The relationship moves from the cultivation phase to the separation phase. Typically, a specific event, such as a promotion or the

protégé‟s departure from the organization, triggers the separation phase. The separation phase is also marked by the departure of the protégé from the protection of the relationship as he or she becomes more independent. With the protégé‟s new independence from the guidance of the mentor, the relationship changes and the mentor and protégé redefine how they relate to one another. The redefinition phase is an indefinite period after the separation phase when the relationship ends or takes on significantly different characteristics, sometimes making it a more peer-like friendship.

The cultivation phase of the relationship is often the most developmental because it contains the highest amount of mentoring functions. Mentoring functions are the specific behaviors and experiences that take place in a mentoring relationship that encourage development. Kram (1985) classified mentoring functions into one of two broad categories: career functions and psychosocial functions. Career functions, of course, are those aspects of a mentoring relationship that enhance career development. Psychosocial functions are the aspects of a relationship that heighten an individual‟s competence, identity, and professional effectiveness. Career-related functions include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments. Psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. The current study examined both career-related and psychosocial functions in mentoring relationships between college student affairs professionals.

Regardless of the mentoring functions provided during the relationship, mentors and protégés alike enter into the relationship expecting some positive benefits. Mentoring is widely considered a mutually beneficial developmental relationship (Dougherty et al.,

2007; Dymock, 1999; Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988) in which the mentor, protégé, and the

organization benefit considerably. Protégés can expect that the mentoring relationship

will help them to grow personally through an increased sense of self-worth, competence,

and self-efficacy (Kram; Waters, 2004). Additionally, the protégé will likely experience

career advancement and development from the mentoring relationship (Kram; Wanberg,

Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese 2006). On the other side of the relationship, mentors

can expect to gain personal satisfaction, increased job performance, respect of colleagues,

networking within the organization, and, of course, learning from the protégé (Allen,

Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997; Bozionelos, 2004). Organizations will benefit from an

increase in the talent and productivity of the workforce, as well as a reduction in turnover

costs (Ramaswami & Dreher, 2007).

Mentoring is very important to many organizations and occupations. The field of

college student affairs relies on mentoring relationships at least in part for the

recruitment, training, development, retention, and promotion of individuals within the

profession. Despite the value of mentoring to student affairs professionals, very little is

known about what new professionals experience during the course of a mentoring

relationship. Only a handful of studies have examined mentoring in college student

affairs. The current study extended the knowledge base on mentoring in student affairs by

exploring the experiences that new professionals have as protégés in mentoring

relationships.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of new professionals in

college student affairs as protégés in mentoring relationships. This study was designed as

4

an exploratory study into the types of mentoring relationships that exist among college student affairs professionals. Specifically, this study examined the experiences that take place in mentoring relationships and distilled any patterns that exist within the group studied. For the purposes of this study, mentoring is defined as a "relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes the task" (Kram, 1985, p. 2).

Research Question

The research question for the current study was derived from the previously stated purpose. The study addressed the following research question: What are the experiences of new college student affairs professionals as protégés in mentoring relationships? The research question is exploratory in nature, and therefore required a research methodology that was primarily exploratory. Additionally, the research question implies that protégés experience a finite range of experiences in mentoring relationships. Finally, the research question is an inquiry into subjectivity, specifically, the individual and subjective recollections and experiences of protégés in mentoring relationships. In summation, the research question required a methodology that explores the limited range of individual experiences in mentoring relationships by protégés. Q methodology is particularly well suited to these tasks, and this study utilized Q methodology to examine the research question outlined above.

Conceptual Framework

Mentoring relationships can play a large role in the recruitment of individuals into the field of college student affairs (Taub & McEwen, 2006). Additionally, mentoring

relationships can be very instrumental in the personal and career development of new college student affairs professionals. Mentoring relationships have many possible outcomes for the protégé, including greater job satisfaction, organizational commitment, satisfaction with promotion opportunities, career commitment, organization-based self-esteem, and lower intentions to quit (Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). For the mentor, outcomes include improved job performance, recognition, and personal satisfaction; the development of a loyal base of support; intention to mentor again; salary and job satisfaction; and organizational commitment (Eby, Durley, Evans, & Ragins, 2006). An additional outcome of mentoring relationships is organizational socialization.

Organizational socialization is the process through which an individual, especially a new professional, becomes acquainted with the values, norms, skills, attitudes, politics, and people needed for membership in an organization, occupation, profession, or group (Tierney, 1997; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Orienting new members into an organization or profession is an important stage in newcomers" development and can be vital to their success in the organization. Mentoring relationships can be a catalyst for the socialization process, helping the protégé acquire essential knowledge. Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) hypothesized that a "mentor may provide critical career-enhancing functions during very early stages of a newcomer"s experience in the organization" (p. 172). Individuals involved in mentoring relationships report higher levels of socialization than non-mentored individuals (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992). Socialization is a complex process, but mentoring relationships serve a small role in facilitating the socialization process.

Mentoring relationships have also been loosely tied to organizational socialization in student affairs. Tull (2006) examined the relationship between socialization and supervision. Specifically, Tull explored the use of synergistic supervision, a model developed by Winston and Creamer (1997) for use in college student affairs. Tull found that effective use of synergistic supervision resulted in increased job satisfaction and reduced role ambiguity. A strong orientation and socialization period for new professionals can help clarify their role within the organization and profession. Although the study explored the use of synergistic supervision, mentoring functions and synergistic supervision are strongly linked (Janosik et al., 2003; Winston & Creamer, 2001). Mentoring can be a catalyst for the field of college student affairs to orient and develop individuals into contributing members of the profession.

Organizational and occupational socialization is an important framework for the current study. The socialization process is the means through which organizations and professions communicate values, requisite skills and behaviors, and other important elements for the profession to newcomers. It is the process through which new professionals "learn the ropes." Mentoring relationships can complement organizational and occupational socialization by enhancing the information acquisition aspect of socialization. The current study examined mentoring not as a holistic solution to organizational socialization but as an aspect of socialization that deserves more exploration.

Methodology

The study used Q methodology to explore the research question. Q methodology is distinguished by a unique approach to problem analysis and a specialized set of

statistical procedures and techniques. Robbins and Krueger (2000) stated, "Q method"s approach renders empirical the question of who is similar, under what conditions difference is expressed, and why" (p. 644). This succinct definition of Q methodology captures its core feature: grouping individuals with similar viewpoints, perspectives, ideas, or beliefs. The study used Q methodology to group common experiences by protégés in mentoring relationships in college student affairs.

This study was conducted in two phases. The first phase was the generation of the research instrument. In Q methodology, the research instrument is known as the Q sample. The Q sample is a set of statements that individuals sort according to their own perspectives. The Q sample is drawn from the concourse, which is "the flow of communicability surrounding any topic" (S. Brown, 1993, p. 93). The concourse is the population of subjective statements contained within an opinion domain. The Q sample is a smaller sample of the concourse and should be broadly representative of the concourse (Watts & Stenner, 2005). The second phase of the research was the administration of the Q sample to the participants, or P set.

The development of the instrument, the Q sample, was conducted during the first phase of the current study. Several different types of Q samples are used in Q methodology. Naturalistic samples are created from interviews. Quasi-naturalistic samples use statements collected by researchers in previous studies. Q samples can also be developed from existing measures, standardized or other conventional scales (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The current study used a hybrid of naturalistic techniques and existing measures. Interviews were conducted during phase 1 of the study in order to collect statements from participants for the Q sample. Interviews were conducted with 10

8

student affairs professionals. I supplemented statements gathered from interviews with items from 3 existing measures. Ragins and McFarlin"s (1990) Mentor Role Instrument, a scale developed for graduate students by Tenenbaum, Crosby, and Gilner (2001), and an instrument developed by Noe (1998). I distilled the accumulated statements to 39 unique statements for the final Q sample.

The second phase of the study was the administration of the instrument to the participants. Q methodology operates from the participant"s perspective, rendering unnecessary large sample sizes to control for validity and reliability. It is not unusual to see Q methodology studies that use a single participant (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Although Q studies on a single participant are rare, studies that use more than 50 participants are considered "extensive" (McKeown & Thomas, p. 37). The current study included 55 participants from the membership of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the Southern Association for College Student Affairs (SACSA). I used an online Q sorting technique called FlashQ (Hackert & Braehler, 2007).

<div align="center">

Significance

</div>

The profession of college student affairs is still in its infancy. Several issues are vital to the success of the profession, one of which is the development and support of high-quality employees who can support and serve the profession. Certainly, the ability to recruit, hire, train, and retain individuals who uphold and advance the espoused values of a profession is important to the vitality of that profession. Difficulty recruiting and failure to retain student affairs professionals has recently plagued the profession. In 2004, the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) awarded a commissioned research grant for an examination of the recruitment and

retention of entry-level housing professionals. The researchers for this project reported

that the recruitment and retention of housing professionals was not much different than it

was during the initial days of the profession. In 1951, the president of ACUHO-I stated

that the recruitment and hiring of staff members was the biggest problem facing the

organization (Ellett, Guram, Robinette, & Shell, 2006). More than fifty years later, those

words remained true, with recruitment and retention consistently ranked among the

profession‟s biggest challenges (Jahr, 1990). Staffing challenges are not solely

characteristic of housing and residence life. Jones (2002) went so far as to say that

college student affairs was "handicapped" by failing to retain people in the profession.

Finding and keeping good employees in college student affairs does not seem to be a new

problem.

Mentoring relationships can be a catalyst for the recruitment, development, and

retention of high-quality professionals in the field of college student affairs. Mentoring

can help move college student affairs into prominence as an educational profession.

Mentoring relationships can be used as a tool to socialize and orient new professionals in

college student affairs, and, through that socialization, teach newcomers the values,

norms, and expectations of the student affairs profession. Additionally, mentors can serve

as exemplars to professionals who are new to the field. In a limited qualitative study of

mentoring in student affairs, one respondent stated, "I think it is important to mentor

young professionals in an attempt to improve our profession and the contribution they

make to the profession of student personnel work. Being a mentor involves being a

mentor through example as well as through the verbal advice that is given along the way"

(Bolton, 2005, p. 186). Mentoring a new professional is a way to move the profession forward through the development of contributing members of the field.

Despite the importance of mentoring to student affairs professionals, very little is known about what new professionals experience during the course of a mentoring relationship. Ellet et al. (2006) explored surface-level information about mentoring, including demographic information about mentors and a few details about the relationship dynamics. Ellet et al. stated that what constititutes mentoring in student affairs is confusing and recommended further clarity regarding the relationship. In a qualitative study, Cooper and Miller (1998) conducted the most in-depth study to date of mentoring relationships in student affairs. The authors did not specifically focus on mentors, choosing rather to examine the broader term "personal influencer." Respondents described qualities of guidance (psychosocial development), role modeling, and career support of their personal influencers. The Cooper and Miller study significantly advanced the understanding of mentoring relationships in student affairs, but it lacked the analysis necessary to explore the nuances of the mentoring relationship. The current study extended the research by exploring the experiences that new professionals have as protégés in mentoring relationships.

<p style="text-align:center">Summary</p>

This chapter began with an introduction of the powerful developmental nature of mentoring relationships. Additionally, this chapter outlined the specific research question that guided the current study. I also discussed the methodology that was used to address the research question. Specifically, I used Q methodology to explore the experiences protégés have with their mentors in college student affairs. Finally, I discussed the

significance that the research has to the field of college student affairs. I will review the

relevant literature in chapter 2. Chapter 3 will consist of an overview of the methodology

and the research design used for the current study. I will discuss the data and releant

findings from the study in Chapter 4. Finally, chapter 5 will consist of a summary of the

study, a discussion of the major implications of the study, and recommendations for

research and practice.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

The following review of the literature will cover four main areas related to mentoring relationships in college student affairs. The first section will provide the reader with an overview of mentoring relationships, including definitions of mentoring, the context of mentoring, and the importance of mentoring relationships. Having provided a background on the notion of what constitutes mentoring, this review of the literature will address the specific aspects of the mentoring relationship. Specifically, the second section will focus on the phases of a mentoring relationship, mentoring functions, and mentoring outcomes. The third section will cover the conceptual framework of the current study. Specifically, organizational and occupational socialization will be used to examine the role of the mentoring relationship as a socialization tactic. Finally, having described the operations and benefits of mentoring, this review will demonstrate the need for the current study and will address several questions pertaining to new professionals in college student affairs. Specifically, the final section will address the role of new professionals within the field of college student affairs, the recruitment, retention, socialization, training, supervision, and finally the mentoring relationships of new college student affairs professionals.

Mentoring Defined

Mentoring has received an increasing amount of attention over the past two decades. Since the seminal work on mentoring relationships by Kram in 1985, several

researchers have led the examination of mentoring relationships in the organizational setting. Before discussing the key findings of the mentoring literature, an overview of mentoring, its contexts and its importance, is appropriate. Much of the foundation on mentoring research can be traced beyond Kram‟s work to Levinson et al.‟s examination on the adult development of males (Levinson et al., 1978). Levinson et al. stated that

> The mentor relationship is one of the most complex, and developmentally important, a man can have in early adulthood. The mentor is ordinarily several years older, a person of great experiences and seniority in the world the young man is entering. *No word currently in use is adequate to convey the nature of the relationship we have in mind here.* (p. 97, emphasis added)

Levinson et al. used words such as *host, guide, teacher, sponsor, exemplar,* and *counselor* to describe the functions of the mentoring relationship. According to Levinson et al., mentoring has been the linchpin in the development of adult males. In this light, mentoring should be viewed as one of the most fundamentally important relationships that someone can enter into as an adult.

The role of the mentor, as Levinson et al. (1978) described it, is to serve as a transitional figure, assisting the protégé in the transition from child to adult. Levinson et al. claimed that a person must shift from a child who relies on parents for development to an adult who relies on other adults or peers to develop. The mentor, in Levinson et al.‟s depiction, helped protégés make this transition and realize their dream. Levinson et al.‟s mentor must be both parent and peer in an attempt to assist protégés in their development. Indeed, Levinson et al. claimed that the "true mentor…serves as an analogue in adulthood of the „good enough‟ parent for the child" (pp. 98-99). Levinson et al.‟s highly

stylized and parental mentoring relationship was the first formal description of mentoring. Although Levinson et al.'s concept of mentoring may seem outmoded, they highlighted some key aspects of the relationship, specifically, the developmental nature of the relationship and the depth that can be achieved through mentoring relationships.

Kram (1985), in a seminal in-depth qualitative study of 18 mentor-protégé pairs in a public utility organization, seated her definition of mentoring in the developmental context. Kram noted that word *mentor* had many different connotations, and she decided not to use the term during her interviews. Instead, she focused her inquiry more broadly on developmental relationships. Kram's discard of the term mentor from her study is a critically important notion for the concept of mentoring. At the time of Kram's research, the notion of mentoring was difficult to operationalize largely due to its different interpretations. In the nearly 25 years since Kram's research, interest in mentoring has grown, both in scholarly research and in popular media outlets. This popularity has made it difficult to settle on a understanding of the nature of mentoring. Eby, Rhoads, and Allen (2007) noted that "the application of mentoring to diverse settings and its broad scope of potential influence has created definitional and conceptual confusion about what is mentoring" (p. 7). In her study, Kram operationalized mentoring as

> A relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes the task. (p. 2)

Kram provided a relatively simple definition of mentoring compared to Levinson et al."s (1978) sweeping concept, but Kram"s ideas have been challenged by other researchers seeking to define mentoring.

Jacobi (1991) noted 15 conceptually different definitions of mentoring in the literature, echoing the findings of Merriam (1983):

> The phenomenon of mentoring is not clearly conceptualized, leading to confusion to just what is being measured or offered as an ingredient in success. Mentoring appears to mean one thing to developmental psychologists, another thing to business people, and a third thing to those in academic settings. (Merriam, 1983, p. 169)

Eby et al. (2007) noted that some of the definitional debate centers on the amount of emotional intimacy characteristic of the relationship, the age difference between the mentor and the protégé, and the specific mentoring functions provided by the mentor. Despite this diversity of concepts regarding mentoring, Eby et al. identified several attributes of mentoring that establish some commonalities among the many approaches to mentoring relationships. They noted that mentoring relationships reflect a unique relationship between individuals. Additionally, mentoring is a learning, developmental relationship. Specifically, Eby et al. noted that "although the goals of the mentoring relationship may differ across both settings and relationships, nearly all relationships involve the acquisition of knowledge" (p. 10). Also, mentoring is a process, defined by the mentoring functions given by the mentor to the protégé. Kram (1985) identified these functions broadly into two categories: psychosocial and career-related. Eby et al. also found that a mentoring relationship is "reciprocal, yet asymmetrical" (p. 10); protégé

development is the primary goal of the mentoring relationship, although mentors typically gain from the relationship as well. Finally, mentoring relationships are dynamic and change during the course of the relationship"s life cycle. Phases of the mentoring cycle have been established as an example of this notion (Chao, 1997; Kram).

The widespread use of the term mentoring without a solid conceptual understanding of its complexities has led to a dilution of its value. To a certain extent, mentoring has become a commonplace term in the worlds of business, medicine, and education. However, without an understanding of the foundational aspects of mentoring, the term has been misused and misapplied. Eby et al. (2007) advanced five foundations of mentoring that ground and guide the current study in a more common understanding of the phenomenon of mentoring. Again, mentoring is characterized by (a) a unique relationship between individuals, (b) a learning and developmental relationship, (c) a process-oriented relationship, (d) relationships that are unequally beneficial to both mentor and protégé, and (e) relationships that are dynamic and constantly changing (Eby et al., p. 10). With a better understanding of what constitutes mentoring, one must also gain an understanding of where mentoring takes place.

Mentoring Context

With respect to the five foundational areas of a mentoring relationship advanced in the previous section, mentoring can take place in virtually any environment. Levinson et al. (1978) described a mentoring relationship that likely did not take place in a formal organization, but rather was a deep friendship between two individuals. They made no mention of a supervisor, advisor, or teacher as a mentor and almost wholly described an informal mentoring relationship where both mentor and protégé sought each other out

17

intentionally. Mentoring, Levinson et al. suggested, is rare in an organization. The competitive, accountability-driven environment of organizations suppresses supportive and developmental relationships, according to Levinson et al.

The view supported by Levinson et al. (1978) is rare among researchers. Many early studies of mentoring relationships also focused on mentoring in an organizational setting (Dalton, Thompson & Price, 1977; Kanter, 1977). Kram (1985) firmly set her concept of mentoring within the workplace setting. Again, she asserted that the mentor helped the protégé "navigate…the world of work" (p. 2). Most current research has focused on mentoring in the context of an organizational setting (Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006; Scandura & Williams, 2004; Underhill, 2006), and the current study also focused on mentoring relationships within organizations.

Eby et al. (2007) identified three environments in which the mentoring relationship often occurs: academic, community, and workplace. These three areas are equally important, although the current study focused on the educational workplace context of mentoring, that is, the educational institution and its workplace environment. Eby et al. noted the contextual similarity between the mentoring relationship and role modeling. Although role modeling is a function typically seen in mentoring relationships (Johnson, 2007; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007), role modeling is distinctive and unique from mentoring on several levels (Gibson, 2004). Although a general understanding of the context in which mentoring occurs has been advanced, there remains one aspect of the mentoring context that should be explored: the formality of the relationship and the context in which the relationship is formed.

The phases of the mentoring relationship will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, although the initiation of the relationship deserves some discussion because mentoring relationships occur in two distinct contexts. Mentoring relationships that pair the mentor and protégé through another person, program, or department are typically defined as formal mentoring relationships. In formal mentoring relationships, the mentor and protégé are matched through a formal program such as a teacher induction program. Both the mentor and the protégé enter into the program with certain expectations about the outcomes, and a formal program monitors the relationships and the outcomes that are received by the parties involved. Informal relationships, however, are initiated naturally like any other relationship and do not rely on a third party to pair the mentor and protégé together. Informal relationships develop without the oversight of another entity as the mentor and the protégé manage the relationship dynamics. Formal and informal mentoring relationships are contextually different; that is, the nature of the mentoring relationship is entirely different if it is informal or formal.

Several major differences distinguish between formal and informal mentoring relationships as reflected in the literature (Bozionelos, 2004; Ragins et al., 2000). In a longitudinal study that examined the career development of college alumni, Chao et al. (1992) noted that informal mentoring relationships were marked by significantly greater career-related support than formal relationships, although the amount of psychosocial functions provided in formal and informal mentoring relationships was similar. In a comparison among non-mentored, formally mentored, and informally mentored individuals, Chao et al. found that informally mentored individuals reported the highest

job satisfaction and organizational socialization, followed by formally mentored and then non-mentored individuals.

Consistent with Chao et al."s (1992) findings, Fagenson-Eland, Marks, and Amendola (1997) found that formal mentoring relationships were not rated as highly as informal mentoring relationships in a survey of formal mentor-protégé pairs and informal protégés. However, their results were somewhat different than those noted in the Chao et al. study. Whereas Chao et al. found that informal relationships were characterized by markedly higher career-related support than formal mentoring relationships, Fagenson-Eland et al. did not report a difference in career mentoring based on relationship formality. Similarly, where Chao et al. found no difference between formal and informal mentoring on the amount of psychosocial support provided, Fagenson-Eland et al. found that psychosocial support was greater in informal mentoring relationships than formal mentoring relationships. Fagenson-Eland et al. explained that a possible reason for the difference in the two studies was the difference in the studies" samples, specifically in the number of years that the relationship had been active. They noted, "career-related benefits may take more time to achieve than psychosocial benefits and may not have revealed themselves yet for the current sample" (1997, p. 40). Mentoring functions are not evenly distributed over the life of mentoring relationships, but rather occur in graduated intervals. Psychosocial support and career-related support may not occur concurrently in a mentoring relationship. To capture the greatest range of experiences, the current study focused on mentoring relationships that had endured long enough so that the protégé had encountered both career-related and psychosocial support. Additionally, the current study focused on informal mentoring relationships in part because the greatest

amount of mentoring functions occur in informal relationships compared to formal mentoring relationships.

Value of Mentoring

Mentoring is widely considered a mutually beneficial developmental relationship (Dougherty et al., 2007; Dymock, 1999; Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988) in which the mentor, protégé, and the organization benefit considerably. Protégés can expect that the mentoring relationship will help them to grow personally through an increased sense of self-worth, competence, and self-efficacy (Kram; Waters, 2004). Additionally, the protégé will likely experience career advancement and development from the mentoring relationship (Kram; Wanberg et al., 2006). Many of these factors influence the protégé‟s desire to enter into a mentoring relationship. On the other side of the relationship, mentors can expect to gain personal satisfaction, increased job performance, respect of colleagues, networking within the organization, and, of course, learning from the protégé (Allen et al., 1997; Bozionelos, 2004). Organizations will benefit from an increase in the talent and productivity of the workforce, as well as a reduction in turnover costs (Ramaswami & Dreher, 2007). Despite these substantial benefits, the value of the relationship can only be determined by evaluating the costs and benefits of participating in the relationship.

Mentoring relationships are complex developmental relationships between two professionals in the workplace, and they often have a "dark side." Eby, McManus, Simon, and Russell (2000) noted, "the almost exclusive focus on the positive aspects of relationships paints a distorted and unrealistic picture of relational patterns and fosters the perception that any negative experience is pathological and aberrant rather than a normal

aspect of relationships" (p. 13). Mentoring relationships can vary widely in quality, the amount of mentoring functions provided, and the outcomes that are generated from a mentoring relationship. Eby and McManus (2004) conceptualized mentoring as "existing on a continuum where some relationships are marginally effective, some are ineffective, and others are truly dysfunctional" (p. 256). In a qualitative study of 90 protégés, the authors found that experiences associated with marginally effective relationships were reported the most often. The concept of marginal, negative, or dysfunctional mentoring has become so popular that Eby et al. (2004) developed a 42-item negative mentoring measure. The measure was based on a negative mentoring taxonomy developed by Eby et al. (2000) that categorized negative mentoring experiences into five categories: match within the dyad, distancing behavior, manipulative behavior, lack of mentor expertise, and general dysfunctionality.

Although negative mentoring has gained recent attention, several studies of note examined positive mentoring relationships. Ragins et al. (2000) conducted a robust quantitative study of 1,162 protégés and found that protégés who reported highly satisfying mentoring relationships reported greater job satisfaction, organizational commitment, satisfaction with promotion opportunities, career commitment, organization-based self-esteem, and lower intentions to quit than protégés who reported marginal or dissatisfying mentoring relationships. These findings underscore the importance of the mentor-protégé dyad and the initiation phase of the relationship (Long, 1997), although Eby et. al (2004) found evidence that mismatches within the dyad were not related to the initiation phase. Wholly negative mentoring relationships are rare, while negative aspects of positive mentoring relationships are related to diminished relational

quality (Eby et. al, 2004; Eby & McManus, 2004; Ragins et al., 2000). Strangely, Eby

and McManus (2004) found that relationship satisfaction was not significantly related to

the longevity of the relationship. The mentoring experience of a protégé may not be

entirely positive. Protégés may experience positive and negative effects with the same

mentor (Eby et. al, 2004). Mentoring must be conceptualized as existing on a continuum,

ranging from ineffective and dysfunctional to marginal to highly effective. The value of a

mentoring relationship must be determined by weighing where on this continuum the

relationship lies. The current study examined mentoring relationships that are perceived

to be on balance positive, that is, a relationship where the positive experiences associated

with the relationship exceed the negative aspects of the relationship.

Aspects of the Mentoring Relationship

To this point, this review has provided a general understanding of what mentoring

is, where and how it takes place, and the valuation of the mentoring relationship. The

following sections will discuss the structure of the mentoring relationship. Specifically,

the review will address the phases of the relationship, the functions provided during the

relationship, and the outcomes achieved by mentoring.

Phases of the Mentoring Relationship

Through her in-depth interviews and extensive study on the mentor-protégé dyad,

Kram (1985) described the typical phases for a mentoring relationship. Her research on

the phases of mentoring relationships has been widely referenced, but only sparsely

supported. Only one study of note (Chao, 1997) has been conducted to support Kram‟s

model of mentoring phases. Nonetheless, Kram presented the only viable model for the

phases of the mentoring relationship. Understanding the basic phases of the mentoring

relationship is important, as they are foundational to nearly all other aspects of mentoring.

Kram (1985) described four phases of the mentoring relationship: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. The initiation phase is typically a period of 6 months to 1 year when the relationship begins and becomes important to both parties. During the initiation phase, many of the fantasies surrounding mentoring become a reality for both parties, although the fantasies of the positive outcomes of mentoring carry more weight than concrete experiences (Kram). The mentor and protégé set positive expectations for the relationship during this phase, and the pair must rely on these expectations to carry the relationship to the next phase. The cultivation stage is a period of 2 to 5 years when the maximum range of mentoring functions is provided (Dougherty et al., 2007). In the initiation phase, the relationship is decidedly one-way, with the mentor engaging in a helping relationship with the protégé. The cultivation stage is marked by greater mutual benefit for both parties. Partly because of this, the cultivation stage is generally positive and defined by growth for both individuals in the relationship. The cultivation stage is also less likely to see conflict between the mentor and protégé, although the separation phase is typically fraught with conflict.

The separation phase is a period of 6 months to 2 years after a significant change in the structure or the emotional experience of the relationship. The separation phase is one of transition in the relationship, as the pair moves away from the expectations of the original relationship and toward a period of uncertainty regarding the future of the relationship (Dougherty et al., 2007). The separation phase is also marked by the departure of the protégé from the protection of the relationship as he or she becomes

more independent. With the protégé's new independence from the guidance of the mentor, the relationship changes and the mentor and protégé redefine how they relate to one another. The redefinition phase is an indefinite period after the separation phase when the relationship ends or takes on significantly different characteristics often making it a more peer-like friendship. Obviously, the transition to a collegial relationship is not always achievable, especially if the separation occurred due to a conflict in the relationship. The phases that Kram (1985) described in her research are valuable for understanding the life of the relationship.

Kram's work on mentoring phases is widely accepted, and the phases of a mentoring relationships have been supported by empirical studies. Chao (1997) conducted a longitudinal 5-year study of 178 protégés who were alumni of a large Midwestern university and a small private institution. Chao's findings supported Kram's conceptualization of the mentoring phases and the length for each phase. Chao also found that protégés in the initiation phase reported the lowest levels of psychosocial and career-related support, which supported Kram's description of the initiation phase. Chao's research did not support Kram's notion that mentoring functions would reach their peak during the cultivation stage, however, these findings could have been due to the wording on the instrument. However, in a study of mentoring behaviors exhibited by supervisors, Pollock (1995) found that all mentoring functions were present during the early stages of the relationship, although psychosocial functions dominated. During the middle of the relationship, mentoring functions occurred more frequently than in other stages. Additionally, mentoring functions were more balanced between career-related and psychosocial functions. Pollock's study did not utilize Kram's descriptions of mentoring

phases, using instead the relatively imprecise terms "early," "middle," and "end" to describe the relationship. These studies support Kram‟s model for mentoring phases and serve to reinforce the notion that the peak of all mentoring functions occurs during the cultivation stage.

Although Kram‟s (1985) work provided a solid theoretical description of the life cycle of a mentoring relationship, researchers have often struggled with *how* the mentor-protégé dyad begins. This literature review is limited for the most part to studies that examined informal mentoring relationships. Formal mentoring programs, where mentor and protégé are assigned to one another for a prescribed period of mentoring, are pervasive in the workplace. Organizations have increasingly turned to formal mentoring programs as another way to provide training for employees. Although formal mentoring programs have many positive benefits for the mentor, protégé, and organization, research has shown that formal mentoring relationships do not compare favorably with informal mentoring relationships on mentoring outcomes (Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Ragins et al., 2000; Underhill, 2006). Additionally, informal mentoring relationships are the most typical mentoring relationship in college student affairs (Ellett et al., 2007).

While formal mentoring programs can rely on the artificial creation of the mentor-protégé dyad, informal mentoring relationships are initiated in a much less exact manner. Allen (2004) conducted a two-part study on the selection of protégés by mentors. Her first study was an experimental within-subjects design where mentors rated and ranked fictional protégé profiles. Her second study surveyed 391 participants on protégé preferences. She found that ability and willingness to learn were the most important factors for mentors when selecting protégés. However, willingness to learn seemed to

compensate for protégé ability, suggesting that willingness to learn was the most important factor for mentors when selecting protégés. Similarly, Allen et al. (2000) found that a mentor was more likely to select a protégé with greater perceived ability or potential rather than selecting on the protégé"s need for guidance or help. The authors suggested that mentors would be in a position to gain more from higher ability protégés than those who are in need of a mentor but who may be low ability. Research also shows that protégés have higher need for achievement, self-esteem, and job-stress reduction techniques than non-mentored people. Protégés with lower levels of these characteristics reported fewer mentoring relationships than those who had higher levels (Fagenson-Eland & Baugh, 2001).

Tonidandel, Avery, and Phillips (2007), in a quantitative study of 74 women"s basketball coaches, found that *mentor* success was the greatest determinant for protégé performance. These three studies are predicated on the notion that the mentor initiates the relationship by selecting a protégé, and I would claim that both mentor and protégé ability have a bearing on the success of the mentoring relationship. Scandura and Williams (2001) conducted a quantitative study on mentoring relationship initiation and found that the mentor, the protégé, or both individuals can initiate a mentoring relationship in an informal setting. They also reported that gender moderated the relationship between relationship initiation and the amount of mentoring received. Male protégés benefited more from a protégé-initiated relationship, while female protégés benefited more from a mentor-initiated relationship. Specifically, protégé-initiated relationships gave males more vocational support, psychosocial support, and role modeling, while females reported higher levels of mentoring functions when the

relationship was mentor-initiated. From these studies alone, one can conclude that an informal mentoring relationship may be initiated in a variety of ways, although some important general characteristics define how the relationships are initiated. Specifically, a protégé‟s ability or potential to achieve is an important factor in the initiation of a mentoring relationship. Additionally, the protégé‟s willingness to learn and the mentor‟s willingness to provide guidance are important factors in the initiation of the mentoring relationship.

The second phase of the mentoring relationship is the cultivation stage (Kram, 1985). The cultivation stage is the time in the mentoring relationship where the greatest amount of development takes place (Kram; Pollock, 1995). During this cultivation phase the relationship begins to develop into a true mentoring relationship. Research on the separation and redefinition phases is limited, and the current study addressed relationships in the cultivation stage, because the cultivation phase contains the greatest amount of mentoring functions. Mentoring functions are the essential elements of a mentoring relationship; that is, they are the behaviors, actions, and aspects of the relationship that "enhance both individuals‟ growth and advancement" (Kram, 1985, p. 22).

Mentoring Functions

Through her qualitative research, Kram (1985) established a set of mentoring functions that are widely used in research today. All mentoring functions can be classified into one of two broad categories: career functions and psychosocial functions. Career functions, of course, are those aspects of a mentoring relationship that enhance

career development. Psychosocial functions are the aspects of a relationship that heighten an individual‟s competence, identity, and professional effectiveness.

In Kram‟s (1985) typology, career functions included sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments. Sponsorship entails the mentor supporting the protégé for promotions or other job opportunities. Sponsorship can give the protégé much-needed credibility within the organization or field. For the mentor, supporting a protégé who succeeds in an advocated-for position can benefit the view of the mentor‟s judgment within the organization. Exposure and visibility is a career function characterized by the mentor assigning tasks and responsibilities to a protégé that increase the protégé‟s professional network through the development of relationships with key constituents within the organization. The most often used mentoring function is coaching, which is any behavior that involves guiding the protégé through specific aspects of the organization. Protection, as its name implies, involves the mentor keeping the protégé from damaging relationships or situations. The mentor can usually only give challenging work assignments when he or she supervises the protégé.

Psychosocial mentoring functions are, again, aimed at enhancing the protégé‟s sense of self-worth. Psychosocial mentoring functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. Kram (1985) claimed that role modeling was the most frequently reported mentoring function. Role modeling involves the protégé identifying with the example, either professional or personal, of the mentor. Oftentimes in role modeling, an emotional attachment is formed between the mentor and protégé. Gibson (2004) claimed that role modeling and mentoring are often confused for one another, and that some relationships that are *merely* role modeling are mistaken for

mentoring relationships. Acceptance and confirmation involves the development of both the mentor‟s and the protégé‟s sense of self as the two enter into an exchange of support and encouragement. Intimacy in the mentoring relationship is heightened when counseling and friendship functions become a part of the relationship, signaling deep personal development for both parties.

A few researchers used Kram‟s (1985) model of mentoring functions and developed those functions into measurable areas. Noe (1988) developed a valuable mentoring functions measure that validated Kram‟s typology. In his study, Noe administered the mentoring functions instrument to protégés and mentors in a formal mentoring program in education. Numerous other studies (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000) have relied on the mentoring functions instrument developed by Noe. Noe developed a 32-item scale designed to assess the extent to which protégés believe that career and psychosocial mentoring functions were provided. Protégés reported the extent to which each mentoring function described their mentoring relationship. In an exploratory factor analysis of the results, 2 factors emerged represented by 21 items from the instrument. Noe described factor 1 as psychosocial mentoring functions. Many of the items in this factor addressed mentoring behaviors such as coaching, counseling, role modeling, and acceptance. Factor 2 represented career-related behaviors, namely challenging assignments, protection, and sponsorship. Interestingly, items related to friendship did not load onto either factor. The two-factor model explained 82% of the variance in the mentoring function items. Noe‟s instrument was revised by Ragins and McFarlin in their examination of mentor roles in cross-gender relationships. Ragins and McFarlin refined Noe‟s instrument into the 33-item Mentor

Role Instrument that measures11 mentor roles described by Kram (1985). These two instruments and their validation give valuable insight into the experiences of a mentoring relationship.

Several studies have examined the differences in mentoring functions for a variety of variables, including gender, relationship characteristics, and leadership styles. In a study that used some of the items developed by Noe (1988), Mullen (1998) examined mentors who served both career-related and psychosocial mentoring functions. Mullen surveyed 160 mentors and 140 protégés from several organizations ranging from health care to manufacturing firms. She found that, according to the mentors, the highest level of both career-related and psychosocial mentoring functions is characterized by mentor-initiated relationships, mentors who feel valued by the organization, mentors who allow their protégés to influence them, and mentors who spend more time with their protégés (p. 327). Additionally, more combined functions were reported in relationships with an older mentor than a younger mentor.

Chao et al. (1992) conducted one of the first empirical studies on mentoring functions in their examination of mentoring functions provided to individuals in formal mentoring relationships, informal mentoring relationships, and those who were non-mentored. Results from their study indicated that protégés in informal mentoring relationships reported higher levels of career-related support than protégés in formal mentoring relationships, but there was no statistically significant difference in the means for the two groups on psychosocial support provided. The authors suggested that one possible explanation of the non-significant difference on psychosocial support provided is that psychosocial functions are easier to provide than career-related functions. Contrary

to the findings by Chao et al., a study conducted by Fagenson-Eland et al. (1997) found that psychosocial mentoring functions were perceived by protégés to be greater in informal mentoring relationships compared to formal relationships. There was no statistically significant difference in career-related support based on relationship formality in the Fagenson-Eland et al. study. Overall, however, they found that psychosocial support was perceived to be enacted the least, which echoed Kram‟s (1985) findings.

Allen and Eby (2004) confirmed the findings by Fagenson-Eland et al. (1997) in a study on gender and relational characteristics‟ influence on mentoring functions. Allen and Eby found that there was no statistically significant difference in mentoring functions provided by mentors to protégés in formal or informal relationships. Allen and Eby found several important discrepancies in mentoring functions based on gender. Mentors reported providing more psychosocial support to female protégés, although there were no statistically significant differences in career-related support by gender. For the gender of mentors, Allen and Eby found that male mentors reported providing more career-related support, while female mentors reported providing more psychosocial support. Whereas the findings regarding gender differences are important, Allen and Eby found that the only variable that contributed uniquely to both psychosocial and career-related mentoring functions was mentor experience, with more experienced mentors providing more mentoring functions than less experienced mentors.

Scandura and Williams (2001) also conducted a study on the moderating effects of gender on mentoring functions. In a study of 297 individuals, Scandura and Williams found that gender moderated the relationship between relationship initiation and the

amount of mentoring received. Career-related support was higher when the mentor or both mentor and protégé initiated the relationship. Informal initiation resulted in higher levels of career-related support and role modeling reported. Contrary to the results found by Allen and Eby (2004), Scandura and Williams found the means on mentoring functions were not significantly different for male or female protégés. Males reported more role modeling when the mentor was male, and females reported more role modeling when the mentor was female, which echoes the findings by Allen and Eby that with respect to role modeling, cross-gender mentoring relationships might not be effective. Protégé-initiated relationships gave males more vocational support, psychosocial support, and role modeling, while females reported higher levels of mentoring functions when the relationship was mentor-initiated. This implies that for female protégés, mentor-initiated relationships provided the most mentoring functions, whereas for male protégés, protégé-initiated relationships provided the most mentoring functions.

Levesque, O‟Neill, Nelson, and Dumas (2005) conducted another study on gender differences for mentoring functions. In a study of 783 alumni of an MBA program in the northeastern United States, Levesque et al. found that the five most frequently listed mentoring functions in terms of importance were coaching, information support, exposure and visibility, political assistance, and championing (p. 435). The authors found that men and women are largely similar in regards to identifying the most important mentoring behaviors to them. Two mentoring behaviors, championing and acceptance and confirmation, were found to be significantly more important to female protégés than male protégés. The results on gender differences in mentoring functions are widely disparate and without a consistent conclusion.

Finally, all of the studies reviewed on mentoring functions use Kram‟s binary typology of career-related and psychosocial mentoring functions. Fowler and O‟Gorman (2005) conducted a two-part study in which they repeated the qualitative work of Kram (1985) in an effort to design an instrument for assessing individual mentoring functions rather than groups of mentoring functions. In part 1 of the study, the authors interviewed 24 mentor-protégé pairs in an effort to recreate Kram‟s original study. Fowler and O‟Gorman found through the interviews that mentoring functions could be grouped into the following categories: personal and emotional guidance, coaching, advocacy, career development, role modeling, learning facilitation, systems advice, and friendship (p. 53). This eight-component model and Kram‟s two-component model are both similar and different. Notably, learning facilitation is a new category and protection is left out from Kram‟s original model. All of the other functions are slightly revised versions of Kram‟s model. Fowler and O‟Gorman claimed that their eight-component model is a better fit than the two-component model, although they seemed to oversimplify Kram‟s model to the 2 major functions (career-related and psychosocial) whereas each of the two major functions are broken down into 9 subcategories.

It is important to remember that not all mentoring functions are positive. Through a literature review, Scandura (1998) established a typology of dysfunctional mentoring behaviors: negative relations (bullying), sabotage (silent treatment), difficulty (conflict), spoiling (betrayal), submissiveness (over-dependence), deception, and harassment. The negative mentoring typology is important in the development of mentoring functions. Following Scandura‟s research, Eby et al. (2000) conducted a survey of 156 participants and found 5 metathemes for negative mentoring: match within the dyad, distancing

behavior, manipulative behavior, lack of mentor expertise, and general dysfunctionality. These themes were later developed into a negative mentoring experiences instrument (Eby et al., 2004).

The literature reviewed on mentoring functions has stressed the prevalence of specific experiences that take place in the mentoring relationship. The typology of mentoring experiences originally set forth by Kram (1985) has been validated (Mullen, 1998) and used by many studies, several of which were reviewed here. Mentoring functions can be classified into two major groups: psychosocial and career-related. Career-related functions included sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments. Psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. The current study examined both career-related and psychosocial functions in mentoring relationships between college student affairs professionals. The mentoring relationships in college student affairs are largely informal and involve varying degrees of involvement from both men and women (Ellett et al., 2006). The studies reviewed on mentoring functions provide a base of knowledge on the range of mentoring relationships that likely exist in college student affairs.

Mentoring Outcomes

Having discussed the definition of mentoring, the phases of the mentoring relationship, and the experiences that are contained within the relationship, I must give some consideration to the outcomes of a mentoring relationship. The current study examined the positive aspect of mentoring relationships in college student affairs, and the following section will examine the benefits of a mentoring relationship.

The expected outcomes for a mentoring relationship can be traced back to the developmental definition proposed by Levinson et al. (1978). In a description of the mentor"s relationship to the protégé, Levinson et al. stated

> He [the mentor] may act as a teacher to enhance the young man"s skills and intellectual development. Serving as sponsor, he may use his influence to facilitate the young man"s entry and advancement. He may be a host and guide, welcoming the initiate into a new occupational and social world and acquainting him with its values, customs, resources, and cast of characters. Through his own virtues, achievements, and way of living, the mentor may be an exemplar that the protégé can admire and seek to emulate. (p. 98)

From this description, the protégé can expect intellectual, career, and personal developmental outcomes as a result of the mentoring relationship. Kram (1985) aligned the outcomes that the protégé should expect to receive with the mentoring functions that she described in mentoring relationships. She developed a typology of mentoring functions that branched into two streams, those that enhanced career development and those that enhanced personal or psychosocial development. The protégé, through the mentor, should expect to grow in those two areas according to Kram.

Ehrich, Hansford, and Tennent (2004) provided a strong foundation for outcomes in mentoring relationships through a structured analysis of literature from three professional disciplines: education, business, and medicine. Although the literature review was conducted on formal mentoring programs, the results are still applicable to the current study. In education, the authors found that 47.8% of the studies reviewed reported positive outcomes for the mentor and an overwhelming 82.4% reported positive

outcomes for protégé. Positive mentor outcomes included collegiality, reflection, professional development, and personal satisfaction. For the protégé, the authors found that positive outcomes were support, teaching help, idea sharing, and feedback. Many studies also noted problematic outcomes. For mentors, those included lack of time, personality mismatch, lack of training, and the extra burden of mentoring. Protégés had similar problematic outcomes: lack of time, personality mismatch, critical mentors, and difficulty meeting with their mentor.

Ramaswami and Dreher (2007) developed a model of the benefits of a mentoring relationship for both the protégé and the mentor. Their model is also predicated on the existence of mentoring functions, specifically those developed by Kram (1985), within the relationship. Ramaswami and Dreher did not simply connect mentoring functions to outcomes, but rather from each mentoring function they developed cognitive or behavioral responses that ultimately affected individual or organizational outcomes for that function. Ramaswami and Dreher combined Kram"s nine mentoring functions into five "process paths," specifically, human capital, movement capital, social/political capital, path-goal clarity, and values clarity (p. 215) that connected mentoring to career outcomes. Ramaswami and Dreher named career and salary attainment, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction as the outcomes associated with the protégé and mentor. They claimed that the organization would receive outcomes from the relationship as well. Specifically, the organization could expect to see benefits with talent pool development, staff productivity, and a reduction in turnover and retirement costs. The process model developed by Ramaswami and Dreher extended the scope of mentoring outcomes beyond

mentoring functions by including cognitive and behavioral responses by the mentor or protégé associated with mentoring functions.

Although the current study focused on outcomes for the protégé in mentoring relationships, recognizing outcomes for the mentor is also important. Considerably more studies addressed protégé outcomes than mentor outcomes, but a few studies on the mentor side of the dyad are worth noting. Allen et al. (1997) noticed that the research on mentors was limited, and they advanced a research agenda through a qualitative study. In 27 semi-structured interviews, Allen, et al. studied mentors" motivation to mentor others, the organizational factors that facilitated and inhibited mentoring, protégé attractiveness, and positive benefits of mentoring. They found that reasons to mentor others could be categorized into two factors: other-focused and self-focused. Organizational factors that facilitated mentoring were grouped into seven dimensions: training, organizational support for learning and development, manager support, team approach to work, mentor empowerment, comfortable work environment, and a structured environment. Organizational factors that inhibited mentoring were grouped into four factors: time demands, organizational structure, competitive political environment, and unclear expectations. Protégé attractiveness factors were grouped into six factors: similarity between the protégé and mentor, personality indicators, motivational factors, competency indicators, help arousal, and learning orientation. Finally, positive benefits of mentoring were grouped into four factors: support networks, self-satisfaction, self-focused, and other focused.

In a study that compared short-term mentor outcomes to long-term outcomes, Eby et al. (2006) found similar results to Allen et al. (1997). In a quantitative study of 218

participants, mentor short-term benefits were improved job performance, recognition, personal satisfaction, and the development of a loyal base of support. Long-term benefits included intention to mentor again, salary and job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The authors found that the strongest connection between short-term and long-term benefits was with intention to mentor others in the future. Interestingly, there was no relationship between mentoring benefits and salary or promotions, although this relationship exists for protégés (Dreher & Ash, 1990). Eby et al. noted that the lack of a relationship could be because mentors reported their most recent mentoring experience and the effect on salary and promotions likely develops over time and several mentoring experiences. Both psychosocial and career-related mentoring functions were predictors of long-term benefits, an indicator that good mentoring relationships must be well balanced. Short-term benefits are most closely linked to long-term outcomes related to mentoring, rather than the job or organization.

The studies on mentor outcomes conducted by Eby et al. (2006) and Allen et al. (1997) demonstrated that mentor benefits are most closely related to mentoring and personal development rather than career-related or organizational benefits. Personal satisfaction and the development of support networks were noted in both studies as outcomes for mentors. The outcomes for mentors provide a comparison to protégé outcomes, which will be reviewed next.

In a foundational study on the wide range of mentoring relationships, Ragins et al. (2000) found that the only mentoring that matters is good mentoring. In fact, bad mentoring may be more detrimental than no mentoring at all. The authors conducted a

national survey of 1,162 participants. Protégés reported a wide range of benefits from mentoring, touching on psychosocial and career-related areas of mentoring.

Conceptual Framework

An additional, although not extensively researched, outcome of mentoring relationships is the organizational and professional socialization that can take place in the relationship. Organizational socialization refers to the process through which an individual, especially a newcomer, becomes acquainted with the values, norms, skills, attitudes, politics, and people needed for membership in an organization, occupation, profession or group (Tierney, 1997; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Incorporating new members into the essential features of an organization or profession increases the fit between the person and the organization and can be an important stage in the new member‟s success in the group (Chatman, 1991; Wanous, 1980).

The current study used organizational socialization as a framework. The research question for the current study focuses on the *new* professional‟s experience in a mentoring relationship, and professional socialization literature is focused on the organizational newcomer and the way that the newcomer "learns the ropes" of the organization. Although organizational and professional socialization are similar, the two concepts differ. Professional socialization refers to the development of values and skills that are particular to an occupation but may be generalized across many different organizational settings. Organizational socialization refers to the skills and behaviors specific to a particular organization (Fisher, 1986). Learning is an integral aspect of the socialization process. Newcomers to an occupation or organization learn about the people, politics, roles, processes, and tasks of a given profession or organization, but

newcomers also experience a significant amount of self-directed learning, learning about themselves through socialization (Schein, 1978).

Although several models for organizational socialization have been developed, most researchers have settled on a phase model for socialization (Feldman, 1988; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Wanous, 1980). Despite the plurality of stage models developed for organizational socialization, many of the models converge on the same general format. Feldman's three-stage model will be described here.

The first stage of Feldman's (1988) model is referred to as anticipatory socialization, and this stage typically begins before the individual enters an organization. As individuals choose a career or occupation, they develop expectations regarding what that profession will be like. Many individuals will change their behaviors and values in anticipation of the new occupation. The second stage is called the encounter or accommodation stage. This stage is concerned with the individual's initial encounter with the organization and is considered the most crucial stage (Fisher, 1986). The encounter stage is marked by rapid growth and change on the part of the newcomer, as the individual begins to develop the skills and traits required by the occupation or organization. Newcomers begin to form important relationships with supervisors, co-workers, and mentors during this stage, important because these individuals often help the newcomer learn important information about the organization or occupation. The final stage is called the metamorphosis stage because of the substantive changes that take place in both the organization and the newcomer (Feldman, 1988). Newcomers have become much more comfortable in their organization or occupation by this point and have begun to master the skills necessary for the job.

Most researchers consider the socialization process to be complete when the newcomer has progressed through all three stages. The important outcomes for organizational and occupational socialization are quite similar to those for mentoring relationships. Feldman (1988) noted that successfully socialized employees show higher levels of job satisfaction, motivation, commitment, and organizational identification. In the case of occupational socialization, socialized newcomers will show a greater loyalty to the profession (Schein, 1978). Additionally, they are less likely to leave the organization or profession.

The role that mentoring relationships play in organizational socialization has not been widely researched. The most extensive study to date was conducted by Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) on effects of mentoring relationships on the learning processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. Ostroff and Kozlowski hypothesized that a "mentor may provide critical career-enhancing functions during very early stages of a newcomer's experience in the organization" (p. 172). As mentioned previously, newcomers may go through several iterations of the socialization process as they adjust to the organization or occupation (Feldman, 1988). Ostroff and Kozlowski suggested that mentoring is an important bridge in multiple socialization processes. They conducted their study with 343 participants who had recently begun career-related work. The authors found that mentors had a significant impact on providing information to newcomers about role and organizational features such as politics, procedures, and policies, as well as organizational issues. This indicated that mentored individuals were more quickly apprised of important topics such as organizational culture, politics, and history than non-mentored individuals. Individuals in the study who were engaged in a

mentoring relationship relied on their mentors for information acquisition, whereas their non-mentored counterparts relied on co-workers for the initial phase of the socialization process. Kram (1985) suggested that the career-development functions of mentoring occur only after the initial socialization phase. However, Ostroff and Kozlowski claimed that the effects of mentoring begin early in the socialization process, possibly enhancing the incorporation of newcomers into an organization. The study by Ostroff and Kozlowski provided significant groundwork for mentoring as a socialization tactic, which previously had only been mentioned (Feldman; Schein, 1978).

Engaging in mentoring relationships is considered a "proactive" behavior for protégés. Proactive behaviors enable the newcomer to hasten the socialization process (Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006). Specifically, newcomers who have a mentor operate on the feedback and information-seeking aspect of socialization. Generally, informal mentoring relationships produce greater feedback and information-seeking than formal relationships (Griffin, Collela, & Goparaju, 2000). In a study that compared mentored and non-mentored individuals, Chao et al. (1992) tested the hypothesis that mentoring can facilitate the socialization process of protégés. The authors found that individuals in informal mentoring relationships reported higher socialization than non-mentored individuals and individuals in formal mentoring relationships.

Two formative studies examined professional socialization in college student affairs. In a study conducted on graduate student involvement and professional socialization, Gardner and Barnes (2007) used organizational socialization as a theoretical framework in a qualitative study of 10 graduate students in college student affairs. During interviews with participants, Gardner and Barnes discovered that college

student affairs graduate students did not often use the phrase "professional socialization" but instead often substituted "professional development" for socialization. These graduate students saw their professional development as "direct preparation for their future careers, providing them with skills, connections, and better understandings of what is expected of them in these chosen careers" (p. 381). The most significant source of support for socialization through involvement for the participants was their faculty mentor. Tierney (1997) also found significant support of organizational and professional socialization from the faculty mentor. Most participants were involved in their own professional development because their mentor was involved in professional associations and other professional development activities.

Organizational and occupational socialization is an important framework for the current study. Through the socialization process, organizations and professions communicate values, requisite skills and behaviors, and other important elements for the profession to newcomers. New professionals "learn the ropes." These studies demonstrate the important role that mentoring can play in the socialization process. Mentoring relationships can complement organizational and occupational socialization by enhancing the information acquisition aspect of socialization. The current study examined mentoring not as a holistic solution to organizational socialization but as an aspect of socialization that deserves more exploration.

Mentoring and Socialization in College Student Affairs

The profession of college student affairs is still in its infancy. Several issues are vital to the success of the profession, one of which is the development and support of high-quality employees who can support and serve the profession. Certainly, the ability to

recruit, hire, train, and retain individuals who uphold and advance the espoused values of a profession is important to the vitality of that profession. The recruitment and retention of student affairs professionals has recently plagued the profession. Specifically, the field of college student affairs has struggled to recruit high-quality staff members. Additionally, turnover has been problematic for college student affairs as it has been difficult to keep staff members in the field. In 2004, the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) awarded a commissioned research grant for an examination of the recruitment and retention of entry-level housing professionals. The researchers for this project reported that the recruitment and retention of housing professionals was not much different than it was during the initial days of the profession. In 1951, the president of ACUHO-I stated that the recruitment and hiring of staff members was the biggest problem facing the organization (Ellett et al., 2006). More than 50 years later, those words remained true, with recruitment and retention consistently ranked among the profession‟s biggest challenges (Jahr, 1990). Staffing challenges are not solely characteristic of housing and residence life. Jones (2002) went so far as to say that college student affairs was "handicapped" by failing to retain people in the profession. Finding and keeping good employees in college student affairs does not seem to be a new problem.

Although the recruitment and retention of college student affairs employees is a problem, little definitive research has examined the cause of these issues. Belch and Mueller (2003) examined the perspectives of senior housing officers and graduate students regarding the declining number of candidates for entry-level housing positions. They found that the decline was related to three areas: quality of life, remuneration, and

lack of interest. Rosser and Javinar (2003) studied work life issues and the impact they can have on the intention to leave the profession of midlevel student affairs administrators. They found that midlevel student affairs administrators receive sufficient guidance, feedback, and mentoring to remain in the profession. The development and maintenance of relationships with colleagues, including mentoring relationships, was seen as a hallmark of the student affairs profession. Given these studies, mentoring does not seem related to the attrition of student affairs administrators.

Mentoring relationships have also been loosely tied to organizational socialization in student affairs. Tull (2006) examined the relationship between socialization and supervision. Specifically, Tull explored the use of synergistic supervision, a model developed by Winston and Creamer (1997) for use in college student affairs. Tull found that effective use of synergistic supervision resulted in increased job satisfaction and reduced role ambiguity. A strong orientation and socialization period for new professionals can help clarify their role within the organization and profession. Although the study explored the use of synergistic supervision, strong links have been found between mentoring functions and synergistic supervision (Janosik et al., 2003; Winston, Torres, Carpenter, McIntire, & Petersen, 2001).

Mentoring can be a catalyst for the field of college student affairs to develop individuals into contributing members of the profession. Susan Komives (1992) explored the nature of professionalism in a qualitative study that examined typical student affairs professional behaviors through focus groups. Komives found that behaviors such as mentorship of and a genuine concern for staff were noted as typical of true professionals. Komives also claimed that more meaningful supervision and mentoring would help

propel student affairs into the status of a profession rather than just a specialty or field. Mentoring relationships can help solidify college student affairs as a profession by attracting entrants into the field. Taub and McEwen (2006) studied 300 graduate students" decision to enter the field of student affairs and found that more than 80% of respondents were influenced by a mentor.

Mentoring relationships are also important to the professional development of student affairs administrators. Fey and Carpenter (1996) studied the importance of specific management skills for midlevel student affairs administrators and those administrators" perceived need for further development of those skills. The authors found that mentoring was the preferred method of development by nearly 24% of respondents. In a limited qualitative study of mentoring in student affairs, one respondent stated, "I think it is important to mentor young professionals in an attempt to improve our profession and the contribution they make to the profession of student personnel work. Being a mentor involves being a mentor through example as well as through the verbal advice that is given along the way" (Bolton, 2005, p. 186). In the most in-depth study to date on mentoring in student affairs, Cooper and Miller (1998) found that 25% of participants used the term "mentor" to describe their "personal influencer." These studies demonstrate the importance of mentoring relationships to the profession of college student affairs.

Despite the relative importance of mentoring to student affairs professionals, very little is known about what new professionals experience during the course of a mentoring relationship. Ellet et al. (2006) explored surface-level information about mentoring, including demographic information about mentors and a few details about the

relationship dynamics. Ellet et al. stated that what constitutes mentoring in student affairs is confusing and recommended further clarity regarding the relationship. In a qualitative study, Cooper and Miller (1998) conducted the most in-depth study of mentoring relationships in student affairs. The authors did not specifically focus on mentors, choosing rather to examine the broader term "personal influencer." Respondents described qualities of guidance (psychosocial development), role modeling, and career support of their personal influencers. The Cooper and Miller study effectively described mentoring relationships in student affairs, but it lacked the analysis necessary to explore the nuances of the mentoring relationship. The current study extended their research by exploring the experiences that new professionals have as protégés in mentoring relationships.

Summary

This literature review has addressed mentoring relationships and their role in the workplace. At their best, mentoring relationships can be powerful, in-depth, and enduring tools for the professional and personal development of both mentors and protégés. Researchers have found it difficult to define mentoring, because the goals of the relationship can be somewhat diverse. The foundation of all mentoring relationships is the sharing of information within the dyad. In the relationship, the mentor and the protégé share information and knowledge. In addition to the sharing of knowledge, mentoring relationships are also geared toward the development of the protégé. Mentoring functions can be classified into two categories: career-related and psychosocial. The current study explored both aspects of the mentoring relationship.

While the focus of the current study was an exploration of the experiences of protégés in mentoring relationships, understanding the expected outcomes of mentoring is also important. Mentoring can provide the protégé, mentor, and the organization with many benefits. Protégés can expect that the mentoring relationship will help them to grow personally through an increased sense of self-worth, competence, and self-efficacy (Kram, 1985; Waters, 2004). Mentors can expect to gain personal satisfaction, increased job performance, respect of colleagues, networking within the organization, and, of course, learning from the protégé (Allen et al., 1997; Bozionelos, 2004). The organization typically experiences increased performance and loyalty from both the mentor and the protégé. Finally, mentoring can be an important aspect of the organizational and occupational socialization process.

Mentoring relationships are an important feature of college student affairs. Mentors serve a vital role in the recruitment and retention of high-quality professionals to the field of student affairs. More than 80% of students in student affairs graduate programs were influenced to enter the profession of college student affairs by a mentor (Taub & McEwen, 2006). Mentoring can play an important role in the orientation and socialization of new professionals. Additionally, work by Cooper and Miller (1998) evidenced that mentoring relationships are important to student affairs professionals after they enter the field as well. Despite the apparent importance of mentoring to the profession of student affairs, misunderstandings persist about what constitutes mentoring and what happens in a mentoring relationship (Ellett et al., 2006). The current study explored the experiences for protégés who are new professionals in college student affairs. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology that was used to explore their experiences.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This chapter presents and discusses the research questions, research design, and research methodology for the study. The chapter begins with a review of the research questions and a brief discussion of the research methodology for this study. The chapter continues with a description of the research design, including a discussion of participants, procedures, and data analysis.

Howe and Eisenhart (1990) developed several standards for quantitative and qualitative research, perhaps the foremost of which was that the research questions should drive the research methodology, rather than the researcher honing in on a preferred data collection technique and deriving research questions around an analytical tool. This standard holds for the current study, and so this chapter will revisit the research question discussed in chapter 1. The examination of mentoring experiences in college student affairs addressed the following research question: What are the experiences of new college student affairs professionals as protégés engaged in mentoring relationships? The research question is exploratory in nature and, therefore required a research methodology that is primarily exploratory. Additionally, the research question implies that a finite range of experiences for protégés in mentoring relationships exists. Finally, the research question is an inquiry into subjectivity, specifically, the individual and subjective recollections and experiences of protégés in mentoring relationships. In summation, the research question required a methodology that explores the limited range

of individual protégés‟ experiences in mentoring relationships. Q methodology is particularly well suited to these tasks, and the study utilized Q methodology to examine the research question described above.

Q Methodology

Although first introduced by William Stephenson in 1935, Q methodology has gained recent attention in educational research because of its ability to combine qualities of quantitative and qualitative research traditions into one methodology. Indeed, Watts and Stenner have labeled Q methodology a "qualiquantological" method (2005, p. 69). As such, Q methodology offers researchers a valuable tool for studying qualitative data through conventional quantitative means. As Robbins and Krueger (2000) stated, "Q method‟s approach renders empirical the question of who is similar, under what conditions difference is expressed, and why" (p. 644). This succinct definition of Q methodology captures its core feature: grouping individuals with similar viewpoints, perspectives, ideas, or beliefs. The current study used Q methodology to group common experiences by protégés in mentoring relationships in college student affairs.

Q methodology is distinguished by a unique exploratory approach and a set of statistical procedures and techniques. Q methodology is used to study the subjectivity of individuals (S. Brown, 1980). Subjectivity, for the purposes of Q methodology, is merely the communication of an individual‟s point of view (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The underlying principle for all applications of Q methodology is that an individual‟s subjectivity on any given concept can be grouped together with other perspectives that are highly similar. In this sense, an individual‟s subjectivity is self-referent; the concept being studied only has meaning in relation to that individual. Another important principle

for Q methodology and for this study is that a limited range of viewpoints exists on any given topic or concept. Q methodology provides the researcher with the opportunity to gather and examine the range of possible perspectives, and the individuals who represent them, on a given topic.

Q methodology is pointedly at odds with R methodology in how attitudes, beliefs, and values are measured. For the purposes of this study, R methodology will be used to describe studies where factor analysis produces a matrix with people in columns and items in rows. Q methodology has been labeled a statistical "inversion" of conventional factor analysis, although that label is somewhat of a misnomer. The inversion of R methodological processes allows the researcher to group individuals who have similar perspectives on a concept. However, Q methodology is distinct in its method and approach to research questions, rather than being a simple adaptation of other methods (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

Q methodology is a way to see the various perspectives and perceptions within a singular individual and among groups of individuals (M. Brown, 2004). One must acknowledge the strengths and limitations embedded within this approach. Q methodology and the Q sort process can be a way to sort out how individuals and groups of individuals cluster around different perspectives. Its founders rejected the restrictions of hypothetical-deductive reasoning, and, as such, Q methodology does not employ specific hypotheses. In keeping with its rejection of deductive logic, Q methodology should be used as a way to explore rather than to prove (Watts & Stenner, 2005). This is not to say that research questions are avoided entirely, but they should be phrased so as to explore, as is the research question for the current study. Q methodology is a very

powerful research tool perhaps because it is not bound by hypothetical-deductive restraints and can explore the nuances of individual subjectivity. Q methodology is best suited for exploring the various tastes, perceptions, sentiments, motives and perspectives of individuals (van Exel & de Graaf, 2005). The method is ideally suited for uncovering perceptions in any given context (M. Brown, 2004). However, Q methodology should not be limited to uncovering these areas, but rather Q methodology can be used to explore the impact these perspectives have on the problem.

Several distinct features of a Q methodological study deserve further explanation. These features are typical of a study using Q methodology and should provide characteristics that may be used to recognize Q methodology. First, studies that use Q methodology typically employ a much smaller sample size than R methodology studies. Large sample sizes are necessary in R methodology studies to control for measurement error because R methodology operates from the researcher's perspective. In contrast, Q methodology operates from the participant's perspective, rendering large sample sizes unnecessary. It is not unusual to see Q methodology studies that use a single participant (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The distinction between Q and R methodologies regarding the formation of the research question is important and unique to Q methodology. In a remarkable example of the way that the Q methodology processes align with its principles, a concept is not assumed to have an *a priori* meaning, but rather individuals define the concept in relation to their own perspective. R methodology studies individuals from an external (the researcher) perspective, whereas Q methodology studies individuals from an internal (the individual) perspective.

The internal orientation of Q methodology is important when developing the Q

sample. The Q sample is a set of statements that individuals sort according to their own

perspectives. The Q sample is drawn from the concourse. Stephen Brown stated,

> The concourse is the flow of communicability surrounding any topic. Concourse
>
> is the very stuff of life, from the playful banter of lovers or chums to the heady
>
> discussions of philosophers and scientists to the private thoughts found in dreams
>
> and diaries. From concourse, new meanings arise, bright ideas are hatched, and
>
> discoveries are made: it is the wellspring of creativity and identity formation in
>
> individuals…and it is Q methodology"s task to reveal the inherent structure of a
>
> concourse. (1993, pp. 94-95)

The concourse is the population, if you will, of subjective statements contained within an

opinion domain. The Q sample is a smaller sample of the concourse and should be

broadly representative of the concourse (Watts & Stenner, 2005).

Each statement in the Q sample can be printed on a card, and the entire set of

cards is given to an individual within the P set (the group of individuals being studied)

with a condition of instruction. The condition of instruction is simply the directions for

the individual as they complete the sorting process, but the research question is often

embedded within the condition of instruction (Watts & Stenner, 2005). The unique

process of Q methodology is Q sorting, which entails individuals sorting the Q sample

cards into a quasi-normal distribution according to the condition of instruction.

The final major distinction of Q methodology is its use of factor analysis. The use

of factor analysis itself is not unique, as certainly many studies use factor analysis. Q

methodology inverts the traditional approach to factor analysis and conducts a by-person

rather than a by-variable analysis. In Q methodology, the variables are the individuals performing the Q sort, not the Q sample statements themselves. This distinction allows the researcher to discover clusters of individuals who represent a certain perspective and marks a major theoretical departure from R methodology. The inversion of R factor analysis underscores Q methodology''s reliance on each individual''s rather than the researcher''s frame of reference. Beyond the inversion, the analytical procedures employed are not dissimilar from traditional methods.

Research Design

The research design for this study naturally fell into two phases, as dictated by the procedures in a Q study detailed above. The first phase was the generation of a representative Q sample from the concourse, which is of utmost importance. A shallow, skewed, or otherwise incomplete Q sample may lead the researcher to capture shallow, skewed, or incomplete patterns within the participants. The goal of phase 1 of this study was to gather the experiences of college student affairs administrators who have been protégés in a positive mentoring relationship. The collection of those experiences ultimately resulted in the development of the instrument, or Q sample. The second phase of the research was the administration of the Q sample to the participants, or P set. The goal of the second phase of the study was to administer the instrument, or Q sample, to college student affairs professionals who were actively engaged in a positive mentoring relationship. Analysis of the data exposed patterns in the types of mentoring relationships in which college student affairs administrators are engaged. Following the phased research design, the University of North Florida Institutional Review Board reviewed this study in two stages. For the first stage, a protocol was submitted to the IRB for approval

of the concourse development. This protocol included sample items for the concourse.

Additionally, the first stage of the IRB proposal was reviewed on the condition that the

research instrument would be submitted for review in the second stage. The second stage

of the IRB protocol detailed the development of the research instrument, the Q sample,

and the administration of the Q sample to the participants. The development of the

research protocol and the sorting process was influenced by the work of Janson (2007).

Concourse

As stated earlier, the concourse is "the flow of communicability surrounding any

topic…and it is Q methodology‟s task to reveal the inherent structure of a concourse" (S.

Brown, 1993, p. 94-95). The concourse is the population of subjective statements

contained within an opinion domain. The Q sample is a smaller sample of the concourse

and should be broadly representative of the concourse (Watts & Stenner, 2005). The

following section will describe the development of the concourse for the current study

I conducted a pilot study on mentoring experiences by protégés in college student

affairs in a class exercise. The pilot study used Q methodology and the Q sample was

constructed so that roughly half of the statements described a positive mentoring

relationship and the other half of the statements described a negative mentoring

relationship. The results were bifurcated, in that the statements that described a negative

mentoring relationship were placed at the negative end of the sorting grid, while the

statements that described a positive mentoring relationship were placed at the positive

end of the sorting grid. It seemed that the negative mentoring statements did not

substantially contribute to the data analysis. Additionally, the use of instruments from the

literature did not allow me to use language more germane to college student affairs

professionals in the Q sample. In an attempt to generate a Q sample that was relevant to mentoring relationships in college student affairs, I developed the Q sample using both naturalistic methods and existing measures. For this study, the Q sample was developed from two different types of sources, (a) naturalistic, in the form of interviews, and (b) ready-made, in the form of existing measures identified in the professional literature.

Concourse Interviews

Regarding the naturalistic methods, I conducted interviews with college student affairs professionals to collect information for the communication concourse. For the purposes of this study, experienced college student affairs professionals were defined as individuals with at least 3 years but not more than 10 years of experience in college student affairs. I interviewed experienced professionals who had previous experience as a protégé while a new professional because they were better equipped to reflect on their experience in the mentoring relationship. Concourse interviews were conducted with 10 college student affairs professionals. Ideally, these interviews were conducted in person, although when participants were not available for an in-person interview, I conducted the interview over the phone. Every reasonable effort was made to gather participants who differed on the following variables: gender, ethnicity, institutional size, student affairs functional area, state in which they worked, years in the profession of college student affairs, and the length of their current mentoring relationship. Of these variables, only gender has been researched in regards to its bearing on mentoring relationships. The research, however, is mixed as to the nature of the effect of gender on mentoring (Eby et al., 2004; Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Levesque et al., 2005; Scandura & Williams, 2001).

Participants in the concourse interviews were assigned a number so that the opinion statements could be traced back to individuals. The concourse interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes. I contacted the participants by phone or email in order to schedule the interviews. Participants who were interviewed in person signed a consent form (Appendix A) informing him or her that the study was part of a doctoral dissertation that was approved by the University of North Florida Institutional Review Board (Appendix B). I provided participants interviewed on the phone with a copy of the consent form and then obtained verbal consent.

During the concourse interviews, participants were asked to provide basic demographic information (Appendix C). The demographic information from the 10 individuals who participated in phase 1 is provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics for Concourse Interview Participants

ID	Gender	Ethnicity	Institution Size	Institution Location	Functional Area	Years of Experience	Years as a Protégé
1	Female	White	3000 - 9999	FL	Conduct	7 - 10	5+
2	Female	White	1000 - 2999	VA	Housing	3 - 6	5+
3	Male	White	10000+	SC	Housing	3 - 6	2 - 5
4	Female	White	1000 - 2999	MO	Activities	3 - 6	2 - 5
5	Male	White	10000+	FL	Activities	7 - 10	5+
6	Male	White	<1000	GA	Housing	7 - 10	5+
7	Male	Black	1000 - 2999	SC	Housing	3 - 6	2 - 5
8	Male	White	1000 - 2999	FL	Conduct	7 - 10	5+
9	Male	White	10000+	AL	Greek	3 - 6	5+
10	Female	White	1000 - 2999	MA	Housing	3 - 6	<2

Six participants from the concourse interviews were male, and 4 were female. There was 1 African-American participant and 9 Caucasian participants. The participants from the concourse interviews worked at a diverse group of institutions, according to the number

of students enrolled. Also, the participants worked in various locations, representing 7 different states. There were 5 participants who worked in housing and residential life, 2 who worked in campus activities/student union, 2 who worked in student conduct programs, and 1 who worked in greek affairs. Six participants from the concourse interviews had between 3 and 6 years of experiences in college student affairs, while 4 had between 7 and 10 years of experience. Six participants had been a protégé in their mentoring relationship for more than 5 years, while 3 had been a protégé for between 2 and 5 years, and 1 had been a protégé for less than 2 years. The 10 individuals who participated in the concourse interviews represented a diverse group of college student affairs professionals, which added to the breadth of the concourse statements gathered from the interviews.

Additionally, participants were asked to think about their mentoring experience as a new professional in student affairs and to respond to the following prompts and questions: "Describe your mentoring relationship." "If I were to observe that mentoring relationship, what would I see during the course of the relationship?" "What experiences with your mentor did you have that developed your career skills?" "What experiences with your mentor did you have that developed your psychosocial skills?" "How would your mentor describe your experiences in the relationship?" I asked follow-up questions based on participants" responses to the questions and prompts (see Appendix D). Each of the interviews with participants was audio recorded. The concourse interviews with the participants at this stage of the study generated 263 statements that contributed to the communication concourse.

Existing Instruments

In addition to the concourse interviews, I used three existing instruments on mentoring functions to support the development of a concourse that fully represents the topic of mentoring experiences by protégés. Specifically, I used the Mentor Role Instrument developed by Ragins and McFarlin (1990), the Mentoring Functions Scale (Noe, 1988), and a measure developed by Tenebaum et al. (2001). These instruments were developed to measure mentoring relationship experiences and have been used to obtain reliable and valid data. The following instruments were particularly useful in the development of the concourse because of their theoretical foundations. Noe (1988) was the first to develop a substantial mentoring functions instrument in a study conducted that examined successful mentoring relationships. Noe''s 29-item instrument (Appendix E) was developed "to assess the extent to which the protégés believed the mentors provided career and psychosocial functions" (p. 466). The specific items in Noe''s instrument represented the nine mentor roles that Kram (1985) posited in her work. Noe conducted an exploratory factor analysis on his instrument and noted that two factors emerged which represented career development and psychosocial development functions. The 29 items from Noe''s Mentoring Functions Scale were used in the communication concourse.

Ragins and McFarlin (1990) sought to clarify some "conceptual ambiguity" (p. 323) in Noe''s (1988) instrument in the development of their instrument for use in the examination of protégé''s perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. Ragins and McFarlin noted that some of the career development items in Noe''s instrument loaded onto the psychosocial development factor, and "over a third of the items failed to significantly load on either the career development or psychosocial

60

factor" (p. 323). Ragins and McFarlin‟s 32-item Mentor Role Instrument (Appendix F) also used the nine mentor roles defined by Kram (1985) in her qualitative study. The Mentor Role Instrument addressed two additional roles, parent and social, which Kram claimed may emerge in cross-gender mentoring relationships. The 32 items in the Mentor Role Instrument were used in the development of the communication concourse.

Finally, Tenenbaum et al. (2001) developed a 19-item instrument (Appendix G) also designed to measure psychosocial and career development functions of the primary advisor of graduate students. Tenenbaum et al. adapted items from a previous survey developed for business professionals (Dreher & Ash, 1990) for use in the academic arena. This particular instrument was especially helpful because it was developed for higher education, and its 19 items were included in the communication concourse.

Concourse Refinement

A total of 343 concourse items were generated during phase 1 of this study: 263 from individual interviews with the 10 student affairs professionals and 80 from the three instruments described above. The communication concourse can be found in Appendix H. The items that were collected for the concourse constituted a comprehensive representation of viewpoints on mentoring experiences in college student affairs. However, there was considerable repetition and redundancy among the statements in the communication concourse. The research instrument, or the Q sample, was derived from the concourse statements. The strategies that were used to reduce the communication concourse to obtain the Q sample are described in the following section.

I reviewed the taped interviews in an attempt to glean unique and singular statements about mentoring relationships. The result of this content analysis and the

inclusion of any statements from other instruments was the generation of a pool of concourse items that represented the depth and breadth of mentoring experiences by protégés in the field of college student affairs. With the assistance of the dissertation co-chairs, I reviewed and refined the concourse items so that they were understandable to the participants. In the refinement stage of the Q sample development, I rephrased some concourse items to the protégé‟s perspective to reflect a specific experience in the mentoring relationship rather than an opinion about the mentor. An example of this is the modification made to the statement "Served as a role model?" (Tenenbaum et al., 2001). This item was revised to read in the first person singular, "My mentor has served as a role model." During this phase, the number of items in the concourse was not reduced.

After I reviewed and refined the concourse items so that they were consistent in language and format and reflected specific experiences in mentoring relationship, I entered into the process of condensing several concourse statements of a similar domain into a singular statement that represented the content expressed by those items. The reduction of the concourse into the smaller Q sample will be discussed in the following section.

Q Sample

The Q sample is a representative set of statements drawn from the communication concourse. Ultimately, participants sorted the statements in the Q sample as a representation of their viewpoint on a particular topic or area of interest. McKeown and Thomas (1988) suggested that the statements selected for the Q sample may be unstructured or structured. Unstructured samples are constructed "without undue effort made to ensure coverage of all possible sub-issues" (McKeown & Thomas, p. 28).

Structured Q samples are more systematic and may follow a deductive research design that follows a theory, or inductive, where the researcher gleans patterns from the statements as they are collected. Because of the theoretical nature of mentoring functions, the current study used a structured Q sample.

The use of deductive Q sampling maximizes the closeness of Q methodology to theory (Kerlinger, 1973). Q samples differ in the source from which they were derived. Naturalistic Q samples use statements that are drawn from the respondents. Naturalistic Q samples are often created from interviews. Quasi-naturalistic Q samples use statements from individuals often collected by researchers in previous studies. Typically, other interview studies are used to derive the statements for a quasi-naturalistic Q sample. Q samples can also be developed from existing measures, standardized or other conventional scales (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The current study used a hybrid of naturalistic techniques and existing measures, as previously described.

After the concourse items were reviewed and clarified, I reduced the statements from the 343 items in the concourse to a more manageable set of items for the Q sample. Several factors controlled the reduction of the concourse items to the Q sample. First, I wanted to capture all the distinct and unique viewpoints on mentoring relationships in the composition of the Q sample. I wanted the Q sample to be manageable by the participants. Based largely on the collection method described later in this chapter, I wanted the participants to be able to sort the statements in a reasonable time frame (approximately 45 minutes). Finally, the Q sample should represent the theoretical design of mentoring functions. As discussed in Chapter 2, mentoring functions have been classified into two broad categories: psychosocial and career-related (Kram, 1985). In

Kram˝s typology, career functions included sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments. Psychosocial mentoring functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. I evaluated the statements from the concourse interviews and determined if there was sufficient coverage across the 9 mentoring functions described by Kram.

Initially, I reviewed the 343 concourse items in order to help ensure that each statement was understandable by participants. Next, I condensed concourse items into single statements that expressed similar content. For example, I determined that the following statements were similar and could be combined: "My mentors have offered constructive criticism" (Item #337), "My mentors have identified areas of development for me in my career" (Item #333), and "My mentor challenged and criticized areas for improvement" (Item #247). These statements were combined as follows: "My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve" (Q sample statement #37). The process of condensing items that shared similar content led to the reduction of the concourse items to the 39-item Q sample (Appendix I). The approved research protocol by the University of North Florida Institutional Review Board for phase 2 of the study can be found in Appendix L.

Participants

Q methodology has several features that distinguish it from other methods, not the least of which is the role of participants, denoted as the P set. Studies that use more than 50 participants are considered "extensive" (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 37). The study included 55 participants. I attempted to gather a P set that contained the widest possible representation of protégés based on their gender, ethnicity, education level, the region in

which they worked, the student affairs functional area in which they worked, years in the profession, and years in their mentoring relationship. Additionally, I attempted to gain a wide representation on those same areas for the protégé"s mentor. Participants were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire (Appendix J). The collection of this demographic information added another layer to the analysis of the Q sort data. The demographic data allowed me to better understand individual Q sorts based on the background of each individual and possibly any factor of which they were a part.

Participants for the current study were recruited from the membership of the Association of College Personnel Administrators (ACPA) and the Southern Association for College Student Affairs (SACSA), both of which are professional associations for student affairs. ACPA is one of two international professional associations for college student affairs personnel. ACPA was founded in 1924 and has nearly 9,000 members representing 1,500 higher education organizations. SACSA is the largest regional student affairs professional association for student affairs generalists. The organization was founded in 1949. The Office of Research for each organization provided membership lists with email addresses. Electronic mails (Appendix K) were sent to the members of these respective organizations asking them to participate in the study. Members who qualified and who were willing to participate were directed to a website where they could complete the Q sort.

Participation in phase 2 of the study was voluntary, and participants were self-selected regarding their qualifications to participate. The initial electronic mail message described the qualifications for the study. Additionally, the qualifications of the study were listed at the website where participants completed the Q sort. Once again, the

research question concerned the experiences of *new professionals* in college student affairs as *protégés* in mentoring relationships. Participants in the current study were required to have had an experience as a protégé in a mentoring relationship while working as a new professional in college student affairs. New professionals were defined as having less than 5 years of experience in the field of college student affairs. To this end, I solicited participants who were engaged as a protégé in a mentoring relationship while working as a new professional.

Q Sort Procedures

The sorting technique of Q methodology is "a modified rank-ordering procedure in which stimuli are placed in an order that is significant from the standpoint of a person operating under specified conditions" (S. Brown, 1980, p. 195). I collected data electronically. FlashQ is an online tool that allows participants to conduct a Q sort on a computer connected to the Internet (Hackert & Braehler, 2007). FlashQ uses Adobe Flash Player to simulate the activity of sorting physical cards during a Q sort. Participants were directed to a website, through the University of North Florida domain, for the Q sort. An introductory page described the study, any risks and benefits of the study, and that continuance in the Q sort represented a participant"s consent. Participants could not access the electronic Q sort without viewing the consent agreement (Appendix M). Continuing with the Q sort represented consent on behalf of the participant.

During the first step in the process, participants were given the 39 statements composing the Q sample and invited first to read through the statements in order to obtain an overall impression of the contents of the entire Q sample. The initial overview of the statements in the Q sample is helpful because participants may need time to adjust to the

task of categorizing the items (S. Brown, 1993). To ease the initial categorization of the items, participants were next directed to organize the statements, one at a time, into three preliminary categories. The preliminary categories were "least like my mentoring relationship," "most like my mentoring relationship," and unsure.

After the initial categorizing, participants were directed to another web page with the Q sorting grid viewable on the screen. Participants were provided with their initial categorization of the 39 statements and were instructed to place items "least like my mentoring relationship" near the left of the continuum, the neutral items in the middle, and the "most like my mentoring relationship" items to the right. A scale ranging from -4 to +4 was provided to aid participants in their sorting process as they began to make more specific decisions about how to categorize the statements within the forced quasi-normal distribution. McKeown and Thomas (1988) stated, "the recommended quasi-normal distribution is merely a device for encouraging subjects to consider the items more systematically than they might otherwise." From a statistical standpoint, the difference between the forced quasi-normal distribution and a "forced-free" distribution is minute (S. Brown, 1980). The quasi-normal sorting grid is, again, merely a convenience for the participant. The grid had two spaces under the end points, 7 spaces under the neutral column, and the rest scattered proportionally to resemble a normal curve (Appendix N). After all 39 statements had been placed into the grid, participants were asked to review their sort and make any necessary changes.

After the Q sort was completed, participants were directed to the post-Q sort questions (Appendix J). Post-sort interviews and similar post hoc analyses can help the researcher with the interpretation of the factors that result from the data analysis. The

post-sort interviews typically examine "(a) how the participant has interpreted the items given especially high or low rankings in their Q sort, and what implications those items have in the context of their overall viewpoint; (b) if there are any additional items they might have included in their own Q set (what they are, why they are important, and so on); and (c) if there are any further items about which the participant would like to pass comment, which they have not understood, or which they simply found confusing" (Watts & Stenner, 2005, p. 78). Participants were invited to write comments that explained their rationale for the placement of the two statements at both end points. After the post-Q sort questions, participants answered some brief demographic questions. The responses from the post-sort interview were used to aid in the interpretation of factors that emerged during the data analysis. Finally, the participants submitted their data securely. Data were submitted directly onto a database on a secure server located at the University of North Florida. The data were stored with the unique date and time at which the sorts were completed. I was the only person with access to the database.

Data Analysis

Q methodology distinguishes itself from other methodologies in how it employs factor analysis. Q methodology inverts the traditional approach to factor analysis and conducts a by-person rather than a by-variable analysis. In Q methodology, the variables are the individuals performing the Q sort, not the Q sample statements themselves. This distinction allows the researcher to discover clusters of individuals who represent a certain perspective and marks a major theoretical departure from R methodology. The individuals in each cluster created very similar configurations during the sorting process. As such, those individuals can be grouped together as representative of a unique

perspective or viewpoint. Additionally, the sorts associated with a particular factor are not highly correlated with other factors, allowing the sorts of those individuals to be distinguished from others. The inversion of factor analysis underscores Q methodology"s reliance on each individual"s rather than the researcher"s frame of reference.

Factor analysis of Q sort data is distinctive in its application of statistical procedures. Data analysis centers on three procedures: correlations, factor analysis, and the computation of factor scores (M. Brown, 2004). The analysis of a correlation matrix is a necessary step towards the generation of a factor matrix. Principal components analysis and the centroid method are acceptable tools for factor analysis. It matters little what measure is used for the correlation matrix or what factoring routine is used (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The selection of factors for rotation is typically reserved to those with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, although preserving more factors than anticipated is recommended to preserve as much variance as possible (Van Exel & de Graaf, 2005). Another standard for factor preservation is to keep factors that have at least two Q sorts that correlate with it alone (Watts & Stenner, 2005). McKeown and Thomas reiterated that selecting factors solely on the basis of statistical procedures limits Q methodology. Q methodology has both theoretical and statistical concerns. The researcher may choose to keep a factor that should not be retained statistically because the researcher feels that the factor could contribute to the overall understanding of an issue. In the current study, I used principal components analysis for the factor extraction method and used both statistical and theoretical considerations when selecting factors for rotation.

Once factors are selected, the factors are rotated. Rotation is usually conducted using the varimax method, although other methods are also acceptable. As with factor

selection, Q methodology balances theoretical and statistical considerations during the factor rotation. The varimax method was used in the current study.

The generation of factor structure coefficients through rotation is typically the endpoint for most analyses, although Q methodology relies on factor scores and factor arrays for interpretation. In Q methodology, factor scores are standardized measures that reflect the extent to which participants for a particular factor agree with specific statements within the Q sample. The use of a quasi-normal distribution allows the researcher to translate the factor scores to the Q sort itself. Factor scores are converted to match the format of the Q sorts. This process creates a factor array, a synthetic Q sort that represents the factor and which can be directly interpreted (Kerlinger, 1973; Watts & Stenner, 2005). If more than one sort correlates appreciably with a factor, the factor scores are merged together through a weighted averaging process to "yield a single (factor exemplifying) Q sort which serves as an interpretable ‚best-estimate" of the pattern or item configuration which characterizes that factor" (Watts & Stenner, p. 82). The individual statements for the factor array are interpreted. Distinguishing statements are distinctive for each factor. Consensus statements are those that are not distinguished between any pair of factors. The analysis of the factor arrays centers on these statements to describe the factors, or clusters of people whose perceptions are similar.

The current study used PQMethod 2.11 for data analysis (Schmolck, 2002). PQMethod 2.11 is a freeware statistical program designed specifically for use in Q methodology studies. I entered Q sort data for each participant into PQMethod 2.11 and conducted factor analysis using the statistical packages available in the software. PQMethod 2.11 produced factor loadings, factor scores, factor arrays, and distinguishing

and consensus statements useful in the interpretation of factors. The data analysis processes and the results of those analyses are presented in chapter 4.

Summary

As discussed in chapter 2, research on mentoring relationships in college student affairs is lacking. Mentoring relationships are an important part of the professional development process and professional socialization of college student affairs personnel. Substantial research on supervision and professional development in college student affairs has supported a more thorough understanding of mentoring relationships. The current research was tailored to explore mentoring relationships in college student affairs from the protégé"s perspective.

This chapter has described the merits and limitations of Q methodology. Q methodology is an exploratory method that examines human subjectivity. Q methodology offers researchers a valuable tool for studying qualitative data through conventional quantitative means. Robbins and Krueger (2000) stated, "Q method"s approach renders empirical the question of who is similar, under what conditions difference is expressed, and why" (p. 644). This succinct definition of Q methodology captures its core feature: grouping individuals with similar viewpoints, perspectives, ideas or beliefs.

The research instrument, or Q sample, was created from both interviews with 10 college student affairs professionals and existing instruments on mentoring experiences in the workplace. The final Q sample contained 39 items. Fifty-five participants completed Q sorts based on their experiences as a protégé in a mentoring relationship in college student affairs. The resulting data were analyzed through factor analysis and post-sort interviews. The results of the study are discussed in chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

Results

This chapter presents the results from the analysis of the Q sorts, completed by 55 participants, addressing the question of how new professionals in college student affairs perceived their mentoring relationships. In Chapter 3, Q methodology, including the specific application for this study, was discussed in detail. This chapter will describe the statistical analyses employed in Q methodology and the specific results from this study.

Q methodology provides the researcher with a powerful set of tools to examine qualitative data using some methods typically reserved for quantitative data. In Q methodology, data analysis allows researchers to determine how the qualitative data, the Q sorts, relate to one another. Q methodology relies on three statistical procedures: individual Q sort correlation, factor analysis, and the computation of factor scores (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The first step, correlation, determines the degree of similarity among the individual participants‟ Q sorts. After correlations are calculated, factor analysis is the procedure that allows researchers to mathematically cluster groups of similar Q sorts. Finally, factor scores and factor arrays are generated for all statements for each factor. Factor arrays represent an aggregate Q sort, or "an interpretable „best-estimate‟ of the pattern or item configuration which characterizes that factor" (Watts & Stenner, 2005, p. 82). The similarity and dissimilarity of each factor to the other factors is also subject to analysis. For this study, data analysis procedures were performed using the computer program PQ Method 2.11 (Schmolck, 2002).

P Set Demographics

Fifty-five participants completed the Q sort on their experience as a protégé in a college student affairs mentoring relationship. Of the 55 participants, 16 were male and 39 were female. A majority (40) of participants were Caucasian. Also, most participants had earned a Masters degree (43). The gender, ethnic, and educational representation is fairly consistent with that of the college student affairs profession. A large number of participants (37) were employed at institutions with more than 10,000 students, although 13 participants worked at smaller (less than 3,000 students) institutions. Three student affairs functional areas were the best represented, with 8 participants employed in student leadership programs, 8 in campus activities/student union, and 20 in housing and residence life. These distributions are also consistent with the profession. The professional work experience of participants was reported with 18 participants having worked less than 2 years, and 37 participants having worked for more than 2 years but less than 5 years. The duration of the mentoring relationship mirrored the experience level of participants, with 22 participants reporting a relationship that was less than 2 years old, and 33 participants reporting a relationship that had been in existence for more than 2 years but less than 5 years.

Participants in this study also reported information about their mentor. The gender of mentors was very similar to the gender distribution of protégés, with 15 male mentors and 40 female mentors. Mentor ethnicity was also similar to the distribution reported by the participants, as a large majority of mentors were Caucasian (41). Regarding the match between the mentor and protégé‟s gender, there were 5 male mentor-protégé pairs, 29 female mentor-protégé pairs, and 21 pairs of mentors and protégés who did not have the

same gender. On the match between the mentor and protégé‟s ethnicity, there were 40

pairs of mentors and protégés who had the same ethnicity, and 15 who did not have the

same ethnicity. Mentor work experience was reported with 13 mentors who had less than

6 years of experience, 17 mentors with 7 to 10 years of experience, and 25 mentors with

more than 10 years of experience. Finally, most mentors were current (18 mentors) or

former (22 mentors) supervisors to their protégés. Complete demographic information for

the person set can be found in Appendix O.

Correlation Between Sorts

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the computation of a correlation matrix is a necessary

step in Q methodology for the generation of a factor solution. One of the salient features

of Q methodology is its ability to assess how and to what degree Q sorts, each

representing an individual‟s perspective, relate to one another. Again, this study

examined to what degree individual perceptions of mentoring relationships among new

professionals in college student affairs clustered together around resultant factors. These

clusters of statements represent the different perspectives on mentoring relationships in

college student affairs among new professionals and the ways in which they were similar

and dissimilar to other perspectives. PQ Method 2.11 generated the correlation matrix of

individual Q sorts. This correlation matrix showed how each participant‟s Q sort

correlated with each of the sorts from other participants. A correlation of 1.0 between any

two sorts would represent absolute agreement between the participants, while a

correlation of -1.0 would represent absolute disagreement. A correlation of 0.0 would

indicate an absence of agreement or disagreement.

Q sorts that are highly correlated (closer to ±1.0) indicate a strong relationship exists between the two participants" perspectives, as expressed in their respective Q sorts. S. Brown (1993) likened these strong correlations to a "family resemblance," indicating that the sorts in one family are related to one another but unrelated to those of other families (p. 111). The sorts of participants who have had similar mentoring relationships were highly correlated and therefore could be thought to hold a particular "family resemblance." The analysis of the specific correlation between individual sorts yields no merit in a study using Q methodology, because the correlation matrix is simply a step towards a factor solution. The crux of analysis and interpretation in Q methodology is the factor analysis and factor arrays that are derived from the correlation matrix. In this sense, correlating individual sorts with each other is an important, yet intermediate, step in Q methodological data analysis. The correlation matrix is provided in Appendix P.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is fundamental to Q methodology because it provides the means through which Q sorts can be mathematically grouped together (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). To recall S. Brown"s (1993) use of "family resemblance," the researcher uses factor analysis to determine the number of families represented in the particular study. PQ Method 2.11 provides 2 methods of factor extraction, centroid analysis and principal components analysis (PCA). Regarding the use of the factoring method, McKeown and Thomas noted that the choice of the factoring method "makes virtually no difference," because the "resultant factor structures differ little from one another in any appreciable respects" (p. 49). In this study, PCA was selected for factor extraction because it has been described as being the "more elegant and mathematically precise" of the two factor

extraction methods (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 49). PCA accounts for the greatest

amount of variance by extracting factors in a way that places as much variance as

possible on the first factor, the next largest amount on the second factor, and so on, in a

way that explains the most variance in the fewest possible factors.

Factor loadings are, in essence, correlation coefficients. Factor loadings indicate

the extent to which each Q sort is similar or dissimilar to the composite factor array

(McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Factor loadings are statistically significant ($p < .01$) if they

are in excess of $\pm$ 2.58 times the standard error (SE). Standard error is calculated utilizing

the following equation: $SE = 1/\sqrt{N}$ where N is the number of statements in the Q sample

(McKeown & Thomas, 1988). For this study $SE = 1/\sqrt{39} = .160$, so factor loadings in

excess of $\pm$ 2.58 (.160), or $\pm$ .413 were considered statistically significant.

Factor Rotation

PQ Method 2.11 (Schmolck, 2002) extracts up to eight factors from a correlation

matrix. The initial, unrotated factor matrix does not usually lead to a view of the data that

is helpful to the researcher (S. Brown, 1999). Factor selection and factor rotation does not

follow conventional patterns in Q methodology. Whereas the use of eigenvalues and

scree plots are a mainstay in R methodological studies, those tools lose some of their

utility in Q methodology. As discussed in Chapter 3, Q methodology relies just as much

on theoretical considerations as it does on statistical procedures in data analysis. Whereas

an R methodological study would extract all factors whose eigenvalue is greater than

1.00, McKeown and Thomas (1988) warned that "caution should be exercised when such

purely statistical criteria are used" (p. 51). This is not to say that statistical measures

should be dismissed entirely, but they should not be solely relied upon. Nonetheless,

factors whose eigenvalue is greater than 1.00 are significant, and should be considered for extraction and rotation. The unrotated factor matrix for this study is provided in Appendix Q.

Varimax factor rotation is commonly used in Q methodology to "maximize the purity of saturation of as many variates (Q-sorts) as possible on one or the other" factors (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 52). Factor rotation effects "a change in the vantage point from which data are viewed" and reduces the amount of "muddling" in the data (p. 52). The varimax method of factor rotation seeks the mathematically superior solution that maximizes the amount of variance explained by the extracted factors (Watts & Stenner, 2005). Because resulting factor axes remain orthogonal, the varimax procedure is also well suited to optimize the distinctiveness of each factor while retaining the structure of participant input, as represented by the correlation matrix (Watts & Stenner). For these reasons, varimax rotation was adopted for this study.

Initially, 3-, 4-, and 5-factor rotations were selected in an attempt to discern which factor rotation would be the most helpful in viewing and interpreting the data. The 5-factor rotation explained the most variance (51%), however, just 4 people loaded on factor 2 and 39 people loaded onto at least one of the 5 factors. Additionally, the 5-factor solution produced a significant correlation (.45) between factors 1 and 5. The 3-factor rotation explained the least amount of variance (40%), although all but 3 of the 55 participants loaded onto one of the factors. The 4-factor solution explained 46% of the variance and 50 participants loaded significantly onto at least one factor. Given these considerations, the 4-factor solution was ultimately used in this study because it resulted

in perspectives that were most lucid and distinct relative to the other possible factor solutions.

The 4-factor rotation resulted in 50 total participants who loaded at the statistically significantly level ($\pm$ .413) onto at least one factor. Five participants (sorts 1, 5, 18, 52, and 54) did not load significantly onto any factor, and 10 participants (sorts 2, 8, 11, 12, 14, 22, 29, 44, 47, and 53) loaded significantly on two factors. These individuals indicated fairly equal agreement with two or more views concerning their experiences in a mentoring relationship in college student affairs. With 10 participants loading significantly on more than one factor, the correlations between factors are likely to be high. In this case, the correlation between factors 1 and 4 (.41) and factors 3 and 4 (.41) were both above the level of statistical significance. The high factor correlations indicated that some perspectives shared attributes and perceptions of mentoring relationships in college student affairs. While some sharing of attributes is to be expected, the high correlations between factors 1 and 4 and factors 3 and 4 would produce factors that are not sufficiently distinct from each other. In an effort to reduce this correlation and produce a more distilled view of the data, those 10 sorts were not included in the analysis. This resulted in 40 total participants and all factor correlations were reduced below the level of statistical significance. The factor loadings for the distilled 4-factor rotation are included in Table 2.

Table 2

Factor Loadings

Q Sort ID	Factor A	Factor B	Factor C	Factor D
6	**0.7729**	0.1935	0.0901	0.0231
10	**0.7599**	0.2571	0.0480	-0.0438

Q Sort ID	Factor A	Factor B	Factor C	Factor D
38	**0.6933**	0.0196	0.0925	0.0287
39	**0.6640**	-0.2641	0.1690	0.3486
31	**0.6313**	-0.0244	-0.2151	0.0789
46	**0.6142**	0.1353	-0.0069	0.0651
33	**0.5786**	0.3735	-0.1231	-0.1011
27	**0.5741**	-0.1384	0.0222	0.2564
48	**0.5648**	-0.1461	-0.0043	0.1820
26	**0.5226**	0.1112	0.1318	0.1489
19	**0.5022**	-0.0139	0.1287	0.2357
55	**0.4682**	0.1919	0.0025	0.3055
7	**0.4285**	-0.3203	-0.3384	0.3933
34	0.3435	**-0.6787**	-0.0068	-0.0186
20	0.1816	**0.6690**	0.1002	0.0966
30	0.3509	**-0.6482**	0.2832	0.0473
4	0.3368	**0.5946**	0.0136	0.2613
45	0.2406	**0.5289**	0.1848	0.2905
24	0.3512	**0.4798**	0.0316	0.0059
16	-0.1332	**0.4672**	0.2078	0.1731
23	0.0284	**0.4321**	0.0409	0.0430
25	-0.0060	-0.3264	**0.6507**	0.3559
9	0.2899	0.0243	**0.6275**	0.2195
13	0.0641	0.3437	**0.6078**	-0.0149
32	0.1855	0.0167	**-0.5474**	0.2948
42	-0.1712	0.0153	**0.5329**	0.0597
51	0.1517	0.1553	-0.0266	**0.7286**
50	0.0611	0.1995	0.0674	**0.7097**
3	0.3499	0.2329	-0.0285	**0.6858**
37	0.1245	0.0616	-0.0080	**0.6850**
49	0.2259	-0.0809	0.3632	**0.6332**
43	-0.0337	0.1834	-0.1128	**0.6265**
40	0.1067	0.0424	0.0993	**0.6020**
35	-0.0806	0.2837	0.3060	**0.5762**
41	0.0945	-0.0230	0.0027	**0.5102**
17	0.0258	0.3056	0.3113	**0.4775**
28	0.1457	0.0783	0.0571	**0.4714**
15	0.4042	0.2338	-0.3219	**0.4475**
21	-0.1088	-0.1440	0.2286	**0.4060**
1	0.2929	0.3104	0.3783	-0.0288
2	0.5481	0.3327	0.4195	0.1876

Q Sort ID	Factor A	Factor B	Factor C	Factor D
5	0.0841	-0.1662	0.2306	0.3514
8	0.1517	0.4679	0.6149	0.1358
11	0.4324	-0.0756	0.1860	0.5094
12	0.6103	0.2060	0.4585	-0.0406
18	0.1958	0.3916	0.0347	0.3147
22	0.2077	0.4099	0.4348	0.2614
29	-0.0165	0.1368	0.5588	0.4513
44	0.2527	0.1815	0.4363	0.4923
47	0.6858	0.0812	-0.4344	0.1565
52	0.3737	0.0987	0.2959	0.1761
53	0.4519	-0.0869	0.4689	0.2036
54	0.1016	-0.3364	0.3605	0.3893
Explained Variance	15%	9%	9%	13%

Note. Factor loadings > |0.413| (p<.01) are in boldface.

Correlation Between Factor Scores

A correlation matrix of the factor scores shows to what extent the factors scores are related to one another. Factor score correlations are statistically significant ($p < .01$) if they are in excess of $\pm$ 2.58 times the standard error (SE). Standard error is calculated utilizing the following equation: $SE = 1/\sqrt{N}$ where N is the number of statements in the Q sample (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). For this study $SE = 1/\sqrt{39} = .160$, so factor score correlations in excess of $\pm$ 2.58 (.160), or $\pm$ .413 were considered statistically significant. Therefore, correlations of less than .41 indicate lower levels of agreement, and correlations of .41 and above suggest higher levels of agreement.

As stated earlier, in the initial 4-factor solution, 10 individuals sorted significantly on more than one factor. This resulted in statistically significant levels of correlation between the factor scores of factors 1 and 4 (.41) and factors 3 and 4 (.41). This indicated that, as the value of one increases or decreases, the value of the other variable also

increases or decreases. The distilled data, with those 10 individuals omitted, resulted in lower correlations between all factors. Table 3 shows the factor score correlations for the distilled data. All of these correlations are below the level of statistical significance ($\pm$ .41), which indicates that the 4 factors represent perceptions of mentoring relationships in college student affairs by new professionals that are fairly distinct from one another.

Table 3

Correlations Between Factor Scores

Factors	A	B	C	D
A	1.0000			
B	0.1011	1.0000		
C	0.0917	0.0473	1.0000	
D	0.3414	0.3015	0.2309	1.0000

Factor Arrays

Many research approaches proceed with interpretation based on the factor loadings, however interpretation in Q methodology relies entirely on factor scores (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). A factor score is a z-score for a Q statement and is comprised of all the scores given to that statement by each individual who loaded onto that factor. Factor scores are computed using only those individual sorts that significantly and purely load onto a particular factor. Because some individual sorts load more significantly onto a particular factor than others, the factor scores are weighted based on how strongly or to what degree they relate to that factor. The weight of Q sorts is determined by using the formula $w = f/(1-f^2)$ where w is the weight and f is the factor loading for that particular individual. Factor scores are computed as z scores, and then converted into whole numbers using the range of numbers from the Q sorting process to

facilitate interpretation (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The range of whole numbers was the same that participants used for the completion of their Q sorts (-4 to +4). The conversion to whole numbers allows for ready comparison between factor arrays. Factor arrays allow the researcher to see how the relative placements of the 39 statements distinguish one factor from the other three. Each factor array represents a unique configuration of the 39 statements on the same sorting grid that each individual participant originally used (-4 to +4). Additionally, the statements in each factor array that occupy the anchor points in the composite continuum (-4 and +4) help to contextually interpret the meaning of the factors. The statements that occupy the anchor points of the continuum for each factor can be found within the respective factor arrays. The themes represented by each factor based on the factor arrays are discussed later in this chapter. Table 4 presents the factor arrays for the distilled factors. Table 4 describes how each statement was ranked for the four factors within the sorting grid. For example, statement #1, "My mentor has made efforts to relate to me," was ranked in the neutral, or *0* position, for Factor A, Factor B, and Factor C, while statement #1 was ranked in the *+1* position for Factor D. This table is useful to examine how the statements were ranked for each factor.

Table 4

Factor Arrays

		Factor Arrays			
Statement		Factor A	Factor B	Factor C	Factor D
1.	My mentor has made efforts to relate to me.	0	0	0	1
2.	My mentor has encouraged me to further my education or professional development.	3	4	-2	3
3.	My mentor has praised my work and me.	1	4	0	2
4.	My mentor has allowed me to use his/her expertise	0	1	-1	0

Statement	Factor Arrays			
	Factor A	Factor B	Factor C	Factor D
and knowledge.				
5. My mentor has served as a sounding board for me.	-1	3	2	-1
6. My mentor has helped me navigate institutional politics.	-3	1	2	0
7. My mentor has helped me meet people in the field who I would not have met otherwise.	0	-2	-2	-3
8. My mentor has intervened on my behalf.	-4	2	-3	-1
9. My mentor has supported me during a personal crisis.	-2	0	1	-2
10. My mentor has provided me with a neutral perspective.	-3	-1	-3	-2
11. My mentor has talked to me about the next steps in my career.	-1	2	-3	0
12. My mentor has helped me develop and understand myself.	0	1	-2	1
13. My mentor has demonstrated trustworthiness.	0	3	1	0
14. My mentor has shown confidence in me to achieve.	0	2	0	3
15. My mentor has helped me gain desirable opportunities in the field (for example, leadership positions, committee memberships).	1	0	-3	0
16. My mentor has provided experiences where I can learn something new.	1	1	-2	2
17. My mentor has served as a confidant.	-2	-1	3	-2
18. My mentor has helped me debrief problems and consider alternative solutions.	-2	2	3	1
19. My mentor has valued my ideas and opinions.	-1	3	2	1
20. My mentor has recognized my potential for success in student affairs.	2	3	0	1
21. My mentor has taught me how to balance my personal and professional life.	-2	-3	-2	-4
22. My mentor has used his/her network in the field for my benefit.	2	-3	-4	-4
23. My mentor has created a relationship based on mutual respect.	2	0	4	2
24. My mentor has shielded me from a potentially harmful professional situation.	-4	-2	-1	-3
25. My mentor has demonstrated admirable personal qualities and values.	3	0	1	0
26. My mentor has demonstrated care and concern for me as a person and professional.	4	1	2	4
27. My mentor has given me honest feedback and support.	2	-3	4	3
28. My mentor has inspired me in how I conduct myself professionally.	4	0	0	-2
29. My mentor has created an atmosphere where I can	-3	2	0	-1

Statement		Factor Arrays			
		Factor A	Factor B	Factor C	Factor D
	be vulnerable.				
30.	My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions.	-2	-4	0	2
31.	My mentor has stood behind me on a decision I have made.	0	-2	1	2
32.	My mentor has expected excellence from me.	3	-1	-1	3
33.	My mentor has provided stability for me.	-1	0	3	-3
34.	My mentor and I have interacted socially outside the workplace.	1	-3	3	-3
35.	My mentor has influenced my career path.	3	-2	-4	-2
36.	My mentor has praised my efforts to important people in student affairs.	1	-1	-1	-1
37.	My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve.	-3	-4	-1	4
38.	My mentor has advised me during a difficult professional situation.	-1	-1	1	0
39.	My mentor has shared and formulated ideas with me.	2	-2	2	-1

Note. The number preceding the statement is the statement number.

Factor Characteristics

Table 5 presents the factor characteristics, including the number of defining variables, the reliability coefficient, the composite reliability scores, and the standard error (SE) of factor scores for the four factors identified in this study. These characteristics represent the distilled data. The number of defining variables is the number of individuals who loaded significantly and purely on each factor. For example, 14 individuals loaded on the first factor and comprise Factor A.

Reliability is the probability that participants would perform the Q sort in an identical way in any future administrations given the same conditions of instruction. High reliability also implies that the factor scores are stable, given that participants would sort in an identical manner under subsequent administrations. The reliability for a factor can

be estimated through the formula $r = 0.80/[1+(p-1)\ 0.80]$, where p is the number of persons defining a factor and .80 is their estimated reliability coefficient (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). As factor reliability increases, the degree of error related to the factor scores decreases, which leads to a greater confidence in a factor being stable and distinct. The composite reliability for the four factors in this study ranged from .95 to .98. These coefficients indicate that the factor arrays distinguish differences in a relatively stable way regarding how the four factors represent the perspectives of new college student affairs professionals" perception of their mentor.

Table 5

Factor Characteristics

	Factors			
	A	B	C	D
Number of Defining Variables	14	8	5	13
Average Reliability Coefficient	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80
Composite Reliability	0.98	0.97	0.95	0.98
Standard Error of Factor Scores	0.13	0.17	0.22	0.14

Factor Interpretation

As described earlier, the statistical procedures in Q methodology begin with correlating the sorts. The resultant correlation matrix and factor analysis helps the researcher determine which individuals bear a strong "family resemblance" (S. Brown, 1993, p. 111). The interpretation of these families is the hallmark of Q methodology. In analyzing the data from this study, four factors were identified regarding how the 55 new college student affairs professionals perceived their experiences as a protégé in a mentoring relationship.

These four factors were examined and described using three sets of data. Factor arrays help the researcher see how the relative placements of the 39 statements distinguish one factor from the other three and are the primary tool for describing and interpreting factors. Distinguishing statements allow the researcher to develop themes based on only those statements that are unique to each factor. The distinguishing statements for each factor were used because these statements represent the statements of each factor that differentiate each factor from the others at a level of statistical significance. While distinguishing statements are helpful, the anchor statements (those that occupied the +4 and -4 slots in each array) were used to expand the description of the factors because the anchor statements were the most and least representative of how the individuals composing each factor perceived their experiences in mentoring relationships. Some statements were both anchor statements and distinguishing statements. The factor arrays were also used to glean the relative importance of other statements that seemed to follow themes described by the distinguishing statements and anchor statements. These three sets of data were used to develop descriptions of the four factors.

Additionally, participants" responses to post-sort questions were used to gain more insight into the particular perspectives offered by each factor"s representation of the perspectives on mentoring relationships in college student affairs. As described in Chapter 3, these responses were collected using the FlashQ program after the Q sort was completed. Participants responded to their rationale behind selecting the statements ranked at the anchor points (-4 and +4). Although responses were collected from all 55 participants, only the responses from individuals who loaded significantly and purely

onto each factor, and whose responses can be said to represent each factor, were used in the analysis.

The four emergent factors were named: (a) Mentor as Ideal, (b) Mentor as Cheerleader, (c) Mentor as Friend, and (d) Mentor as Teacher. The four factors are described below along with selected demographics of participants within those factors, distinguishing and anchor statements, excerpts from the written responses of those participants, and other data that illuminated each of the four factors" representation of the perspectives on mentoring relationships in college student affairs.

Factor A: Mentor as Ideal

Factor A accounted for the highest amount of variance explained in this study (15%) and 17 of the 55 participants loaded onto this factor. However, as explained earlier in this chapter, 3 of these participants loaded significantly onto an additional factor. In order to gain a clearer view of the factors, the Q sorts of these 3 participants were not used during factor rotation. After factor rotation using the 14 participants, the variance explained remained 15%. Demographic information regarding the participants who comprised Factor A is provided in Table 6.

Eleven women and 3 men loaded onto this factor. Ten of the participants on this factor were Caucasian, 2 were African-American, 1 was Asian, and 1 was Hispanic/Latino. The educational level of the protégés in Factor A was varied, with 1 participant having earned a bachelors degree, 1 completing some masters-level work, 10 earning a masters degree, 1 completing some doctoral-level work, and 1 having earned a doctorate degree. Most of the participants in Factor A currently worked at large institutions, with 10 coming from institutions of 10,000 or more students. Three

participants worked at institutions with between 1,000 and 2,999 students, and 1

participant worked at an institution with between 3,000 and 9,999 students. The college

student affairs professionals who comprised Factor A worked in 10 different states:

Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio,

Pennsylvania, and Virginia. The college student affairs functional areas represented were

also varied; 2 participants worked in campus activities/student union, 2 in career services,

1 in enrollment services, 4 in housing and residential life, 1 in orientation programs, 1 in

student conduct programs, and 3 in student leadership programs. Four participants in

Factor A had less than 2 years experience, while 10 participants had between 2 and 5

years experience. Only 2 participants had been in their mentoring relationship for less

than 2 years, while 12 had been in their mentoring relationship between 2 and 5 years.

Factor A was comprised of 7 male mentors and 7 female mentors, and 3 African-

American mentors, and 11 Caucasian mentors. Regarding mentor-protégé gender, there

were 2 male mentor-protégé pairs, 6 female mentor-protégé pairs, and 6 pairs who did not

have the same gender. As for mentor-protégé ethnicity, there were 11 mentor-protégé

pairs who had the same ethnicity, and 3 pairs who did not have the same ethnicity. The

years of experience for mentors of participants in Factor A was varied, with 2 having

between 3 and 6 years, 3 having between 7 and 10 years, and 9 having more than 10

years of experience. Finally, the mentor‟s relationship to the protégé was also varied.

Two mentors were participants‟ current supervisors, 7 were former supervisors, 1 was a

colleague, 1 was a graduate school faculty member, and 3 were classified as other.

Although the intention of this study and the purpose of Q methodology was not to

extrapolate demographic trends from the person sample, the overall composition of the

participants who comprised Factor A was fairly representative of the overall person sample.

Based on the factor arrays, distinguishing statements, anchor statements, and data from the post-sort responses, the college student affairs professionals on Factor A perceived their mentor as the ideal student affairs professional. That is, the perspective expressed in Factor A described the mentoring relationship as one where the mentor is an ideal professional and someone whose behavior and values should be admired. The mentor as a role model is a common theme, and the perspectives in Factor A echoed the role model theme by casting their mentor as someone whose conduct, behavior, and personal qualities were admired by the protégé. The distinguishing statements for Factor A are provided in Table 7. Following is an analysis of how the statements and participant responses represent the perspective described above.

The participants who comprised Factor A viewed their mentor as the ideal college student affairs professional. Several statements from the factor array for Factor A described the perspective that the mentor is an ideal student affairs professional. This inclination from the protégé to model one"s behavior after the mentor is seen initially in statement #28, "My mentor has inspired me in how I conduct myself professionally." This statement was a distinguishing statement for Factor A, indicating that this statement and its position within the factor array was distinctive to Factor A alone. As well, statement #28 occupied a *+4* spot in the factor array, indicating that this statement was highly representative of the perspective of Factor A. This statement implies that a mentor"s professional conduct served as a model for the protégé"s conduct. The statement also implies that, in some instances, a mentor"s professional conduct inspires the protégé

Table 6

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor A

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
6	Female	White	Masters	10000+	KY	Orientation	<2	2 - 5	Female	White	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
7	Female	White	Masters	10000+	VA	Leadership	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor
10	Female	Asian	Masters	10000+	MO	Leadership	<2	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
19	Male	Hispanic	Masters	10000+	OH	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Former Supervisor
26	Female	White	Some Masters	1000 - 2999	MN	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
27	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	OH	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Black	10+	Former Supervisor
31	Female	White	Doctorate	10000+	MI	Conduct	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Current Supervisor
33	Female	White	Masters	10000+	MI	Career Services	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
36	Female	White	Masters	3000 - 9999	MN	Career Services	<2	<2	Female	White	3 - 6	Other
38	Male	Black	Bachelor	10000+	PA	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Black	10+	Other
39	Female	White	Masters	10000+	MD	Leadership	<2	2 - 5	Male	White	7 - 10	Faculty
46	Male	Black	Masters	10000+	MS	Enrollment	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	Black	10+	Colleague
48	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	NJ	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Former Supervisor
55	Female	White	Some Doctoral	10000+	MI	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Male	White	10+	Other

Table 7

Distinguishing Statements for Factor A and Those Non-Distinguishing at ±4

Statement	Factor A		Factor B		Factor C		Factor D	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
28. My mentor has inspired me in how I conduct myself professionally.	4	1.82*	0	-0.03	0	-0.29	-2	-0.87
26. My mentor has demonstrated care and concern for me as a person and professional.†	4	1.68	1	0.72	2	1.13	4	1.72
25. My mentor has demonstrated admirable personal qualities and values.	3	1.54*	0	0.17	1	0.63	0	0.26
35. My mentor has influenced my career path.	3	1.63*	-2	-0.97	-4	-1.62	-2	-1.14
22. My mentor has used his/her network in the field for my benefit.	2	0.48*	-3	-1.15	-4	-2.14	-4	-1.69
27. My mentor has given me honest feedback and support.	2	0.83*	-3	-1.26	4	1.52	3	1.38
34. My mentor and I have interacted socially outside the workplace.	1	0.19*	-3	-1.51	3	1.48	-3	-1.43
36. My mentor has praised my efforts to important people in student affairs.	1	0.35*	-1	-0.55	-1	-0.45	-1	-0.47
12. My mentor has helped me develop and understand myself.	0	-0.23*	1	0.69	-2	-0.94	1	0.80
13. My mentor has demonstrated trustworthiness.	0	-0.20	3	1.25	1	0.40	0	0.22
14. My mentor has shown confidence in me to achieve.	0	-0.25	2	0.74	0	0.37	3	1.04
31. My mentor has stood behind me on a decision I have made.	0	0.02	-2	-0.84	1	0.61	2	0.96
7. My mentor has helped me meet people in the field who I would not have met otherwise.	0	-0.24	-2	-1.03	-2	-0.84	-3	-1.25
11. My mentor has talked to me about the next steps in my career.	-1	-0.27	2	0.85	-3	-1.23	0	0.11
19. My mentor has valued my ideas and opinions.	-1	-0.31*	3	0.86	2	0.65	1	0.38
18. My mentor has helped me debrief problems and consider alternative solutions.	-2	-0.53*	2	0.80	3	1.15	1	0.64
30. My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions.	-2	-0.63*	-4	-1.81	0	0.19	2	0.82
29. My mentor has created an atmosphere where I can be vulnerable.	-3	-1.13*	2	0.80	0	-0.21	-1	-0.58
37. My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve.	-3	-1.07*	-4	-2.04	-1	-0.32	4	1.66
6. My mentor has helped me navigate institutional politics.	-3	-1.27*	1	0.67	2	1.03	0	-0.10
8. My mentor has intervened on my behalf.	-4	-2.11*	2	0.78	-3	-1.44	-1	-0.74
24. My mentor has shielded me from a potentially harmful professional situation.†	-4	-1.99	-2	-1.06	-1	-0.58	-3	-1.68

Note. *Statement was significant at p < .01. †Statement was not distinguishing for that factor but was rated a ±4.

to alter his/her conduct to imitate that of the mentor. The two highest loading participants (participants 6 and 10) in Factor A commented on the meaning of this statement in their post-sort responses. Participant 6, who had the highest factor loading (.7729), had less than 2 years of experience in student affairs and had been in her mentoring relationship between 2 and 5 years. Her mentor, also a female, was her former supervisor and had between 3 and 6 years of experience in college student affairs. Writing about the importance of statement #28, she wrote,

> My mentor has been a model of the professional that I want to be…she turned every opportunity at work into a learning experience, and is always sure to explain the purpose behind something rather than just telling me to do it. She always strived to make my experience the most meaningful it could be.

This participant clearly envisioned her mentor as a model, stating, "My mentor has been a model of the professional that I want to be" (Participant 6). This participant seemed to idolize her mentor and has clearly cast her mentor as the professional on whom she wants to base her professional life. Other participants echoed this viewpoint. Participant 10 had the next highest factor loading (.7599). She also had less than 2 years of experience and had been in her mentoring relationship between 2 and 5 years. Her mentor, also a female, was a former supervisor with between 7 and 10 years of experience in student affairs. Participant 10 wrote,

> My mentor has transformed student affairs on our campus, she was able to navigate through an extremely political institution and reached a high level at a very young age, something very difficult for women to accomplish at this institution.

This participant's admiration for her mentor is clear. Specifically, she wrote that she admires her mentor for her ability to transform student affairs despite a difficult political climate, her age, and her gender. Considering that Participant 10 was also a young female

student affairs professional, her admiration for her mentor is heightened by her ability to relate to her mentor.

Another distinguishing statement that demonstrated the importance of the mentor as the ideal student affairs professional was statement #25, "My mentor has demonstrated admirable personal qualities and values." This statement occupied the *+3* slot in the factor array, indicating that it was important to the viewpoint expressed by the factor. That this statement was ranked so highly further deepens the description of the perspective represented by this factor as the idealized student affairs professional.

The participants who comprised Factor A demonstrated that they admire the personal and professional behaviors of their mentors, so much so that they viewed their mentor as the ideal or model student affairs professional. Considering that they reported that they hold their mentors in such high regard, it follows that their mentors would have a significant influence over their career and professional development. Statement #35, "My mentor has influenced my career path," was distinguished from all other factors and ranked at *+3* in the factor array. This indicates that participants viewed their mentor so highly that their mentor influenced their career path, that is, the direction of their professional life. Participants in Factor A viewed their mentor as the ideal college student affairs professional. Participant 10 wrote in her post-sort response about statement #35,

> My interests in specific functional areas were developed because of the opportunities my mentor provided. She saw potential in me that I did not and allowed me to work on projects outside my primary job responsibility to see if I had a greater interest.

Participant 10 described an atmosphere where her professional interests were piqued by the opportunities granted to her by her mentor. Other participants echoed the career learning that took place in mentoring relationships. Participant 26 wrote, "My mentor and

I have talked at length about where I want to go in the area of student affairs and my career path." Additionally, Participant 36 wrote, "The interactions we have had thus far have revolved around my desire to learn more about options and career paths so that I may make some decisions about where to go from here." These responses demonstrate the importance of the mentor's opinion and career advice to the protégé.

The other *+4* anchor statement was statement # 26, "My mentor has demonstrated care and concern for me as a person and professional." This was not a distinguishing statement for Factor A because it was also selected at the *+4* slot in Factor D. However, this statement was representative of the perspective presented in Factor A, and in the context of the other statements, it bears examination. Mentors can demonstrate care and concern for a protégé in many ways. Participants in Factor A couched their interpretation of "care and concern" as developmental and supportive in nature. Two participants who responded to post-sort responses on statement #26 described how they perceived their mentors" motivations in the relationship:

> He was someone I could turn to no matter what was going on in my life. I knew he would be there to support me. He checked in on me as a person and as a professional. He always demonstrated true care and concern. (Participant 27)

> No matter the situation, he was there with his caring, supportive questions and advice. Work-related, personal, etc., didn't matter. He was pushing me to be the best I could be, and understood that it wasn't always a smooth road. (Participant 55)

These responses underscore the particular version of care and concern offered by the perspective of mentoring relationships represented in Factor A. These responses describe a certain amount of reliance upon the mentor, which accompany the emulation described by other statements in the factor. Participants in Factor A relied on their mentor not only a professional ideal, but also as support during their first tenuous steps into the student

affairs profession. Factor A had more mentors (9) with more than 10 years of experience in college student affairs than any other factor. The gap between protégés" and mentors" years of experience could explain the seeming mentor reliance represented by individuals in Factor A.

The anchor statements that occupied the *-4* were statement # 8, "My mentor has intervened on my behalf," and statement #24, "My mentor has shielded me from a potentially harmful professional situation." Many of the responses from the post-sort prompts indicated that participants ranked these statements at the *-4* slot because the opportunity for their mentor to demonstrate these behaviors had not presented itself. Regarding statement #8, Participant 36 wrote, "We have not yet had an opportunity for this to occur." Participant 46 wrote about statement #8, "I have never known my mentor to intervene in a situation on my behalf." Finally, Participant 27 wrote about statement #8, "I do not recall a time that he had to intervene on my behalf." Regarding statement #24, Participant 55 wrote, "He was not in the position to shield me from potentially harmful professional situations." Participant 27 wrote about statement #24, "I am not aware of a time he has shielded me from a potentially harmful situation."

The statements ranked in the "least like my mentoring relationship" half of the distribution do not yield any importance when interpreted singularly. However, in the context of one another, several of the statements ranked at the *-4* and *-3* levels deepen the perspective on mentoring relationships offered by Factor A. Three statements ranked at the *-3* level, statement #37, "My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve," Statement #6, "My mentor has helped me navigate institutional politics," and Statement #29, "My mentor has created an atmosphere where I can be vulnerable," all describe

specific and active mentoring functions. Statement #24, "My mentor has shielded me from a potentially harmful professional situation," was ranked at -4 and also describes an active mentoring function. These statements depict the mentor compensating for or addressing the protégé"s shortcomings in various ways. Statement #37 describes constructive criticism, while statements #6, #29, and #24 all describe a relationship where the mentor guides and protects the weaker protégé through professional difficulties and pitfalls. That these statements were ranked at the -4 and -3 levels indicated that the participants who comprised Factor A did not perceive these mentoring behaviors to align with their view of the idealized mentor.

The depiction of the idealized mentor according to the perspective represented by Factor A is free from the criticism and intervention that is characteristic of a developmental relationship. This claim is supported by the response from some participants who desired wholly positive interactions and feedback from their mentor. Regarding statement #37, "My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve," two participants wrote,

> My mentor mostly sung my praises and always focused on the good things that I was doing, rather than criticizing me and telling me what I could do to improve. (Participant 6)

> While we have talked about numerous issues within the profession, she has never told me that I needed to improve in a certain area. (Participant 46)

Some participants, however, appeared to want more intentional development in their post-sort responses. Regarding statement #37, Participant 33 wrote, "When I've asked for feedback, I was told I was doing great -- not helpful!" Similarly, Participant 7 remarked, "Because she is the content expert in our field…it"s been difficult to navigate my own path…at times." These responses, in addition to the interpretation of the placement of

statements #37, #29, #24, and #6 in the factor array, indicated that the idealized version of a mentor represented by Factor A is based more on admirable qualities, inspiration, and a caring hand than the constructive criticism that is a hallmark of professional development.

From the factor analysis and the data collected from the post-sort questions, college student affairs professionals who loaded on Factor A perceived their mentor as someone who (a) was the ideal student affairs professional, (b) influenced their career and professional development, and (c) supported them professionally and personally. Also important in the perception of the individuals who comprised Factor A is what their mentor did not represent. The individuals who comprised Factor A perceived their mentor as someone who did not actively acknowledge the protégé‟s shortcomings.

The college student affairs professionals who comprised Factor A viewed their mentor as someone who had the ideal or model professional career, conduct, and behaviors. This emphasis differentiates this viewpoint from the others in this study. Another differentiating aspect of the perspective offered by Factor A is the ability of the mentoring relationship to guide and direct their career path and professional development. Several participants commented on how they explored other areas within student affairs because of their mentoring relationship. Finally, the perspective represented by Factor A valued mentors who cared about their protégé and who supported them professionally and personally. One particular response to the post-sort questions captures Factor A nicely. Participant 7 was a female with between 2 and 5 years of experience in college student affairs. She had been in her mentoring relationship with her current supervisor for between 2 and 5 years. She wrote about her mentoring

relationship, "I think about [my mentoring relationship] often. [My mentor and I] consider ourselves each other"s family…[my mentor] is life"s example for me on how to live an authentic life." Consistently, the college student affairs professionals who comprised Factor A shared similar perspectives to Participant 7; they viewed their mentor as a model to be emulated.

Factor B: Mentor as Cheerleader

Factor B accounted for 9% of the variance explained in this study and 8 of the 55 participants loaded onto this factor. The data in this factor were not distilled any further because all 8 participants loaded purely on Factor B. After factor rotation using the 8 participants, the variance explained remained 9%. Demographic information regarding the participants who comprised Factor B is provided in Table 8.

Four women and 4 men loaded onto this factor. Six of the participants on this factor were Caucasian, 1 was African-American, and 1 was Asian. Most of the protégés in Factor B reported the same level of education, with 7 earning a masters degree and 1 completing some doctoral-level work. Most of the participants in Factor B worked at large institutions, with 5 coming from institutions of 10,000 or more students. Two participants worked at institutions with between 1,000 and 2,999 students, and 1 participant worked at an institution with between 3,000 and 9,999 students. The college student affairs professionals who comprised Factor B worked in 4 different states: North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Texas. One participant did not report a location. The college student affairs functional areas represented were also varied; 2 participants worked in academic advising, 2 in career services, 1 in health and wellness programs, 1 in housing and residential life, and 1 in service-learning programs. One

participant in Factor B had less than 2 years experience, while 7 participants had between 2 and 5 years experience. Only 3 participants had been in their mentoring relationship for less than 2 years, while 5 had been in their mentoring relationship between 2 and 5 years. Factor B was comprised of 3 male mentors and 5 female mentors, 1 African-American mentor, 1 Asian mentor, and 6 Caucasian mentors. Regarding mentor-protégé gender, there was 1 male mentor-protégé pair, 2 female mentor-protégé pairs, and 5 pairs who did not have the same gender. All 8 mentor-protégé pairs had the same ethnicity. The years of experience for mentors of participants in Factor B was varied, with 1 having between 3 and 6 years, 3 having between 7 and 10 years, and 4 having more than 10 years of experience. Finally, the mentor"s relationship to the protégé was also varied. Three mentors were participants" supervisors, 2 were former supervisors, and 3 were colleagues. Although the intention of this study and the purpose of Q methodology was not to extrapolate demographic trends from the person sample, the overall composition of the participants who comprised Factor B was fairly representative of the overall person sample.

Based on the factor arrays, distinguishing statements, anchor statements, and data from the post-sort responses, the college student affairs professionals who loaded on Factor B perceived their mentor as their cheerleader. That is, the perspective represented in Factor B described the mentoring relationship as one where a mentor"s primary role is to praise, encourage, and support the protégé. Additionally, the perspective represented by Factor B depicted mentors who avoided behaviors that were critical or challenging to protégés. The individuals who comprised Factor B perceived the mentor"s role was to support the good work being performed by the protégé. The individuals who comprised

Table 8

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor B

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
4	Female	White	Masters	10000+	NC	Advising	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
16	Female	White	Masters	3000 - 9999	NC	Career Services	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Colleague
20	Female	White	Masters	10000+	NC	Wellness	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Current Supervisor
23	Male	White	Masters	10000+	SC	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	7 - 10	Colleague
24	Male	White	Masters	10000+	ND	Advising	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
30	Female	Asian	Masters	10000+		Service	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Asian	10+	Current Supervisor
34	Male	Black	Masters	1000 - 2999	NC	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Black	3 - 6	Colleague
45	Male	White	Some Doctoral	1000 - 2999	TX	Career Services	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	7 - 10	Current Supervisor

Note. Participant 30 did not report a value for protégé location.

Factor B perceived their mentors as less developmental and critical. The distinguishing statements for Factor B are provided in Table 9. Following is an analysis of how the statements and participant responses represent the perspective described above.

The participants who comprised Factor B viewed their mentor as a cheerleader, that is, someone who fully supported and praised their work both privately and publicly. Several statements from the factor array for Factor B described the perspective represented by Factor B that the mentor is someone who encouraged, supported, and praised the protégé. The perspective that described the mentor as cheerleader is initially seen in statement #3, "My mentor praised my work and me." This statement was a distinguishing statement for Factor B, indicating that this statement and its position within the factor array were distinctive to Factor B alone. As well, statement #3 occupied a *+4* ranking in the factor array, indicating that this statement was highly representative of the perspective represented by Factor B. The statement "My mentor praised my work and me" implies that a mentor‟s support, encouragement, and acclaim were important to the participants in Factor B. The inherent approval and confidence given through a mentor‟s praise was valuable to participants in Factor B. Participant 45, a Caucasian male who worked at a small (1,000 to 2,999 student) institution, wrote about statement #3 in his post-sort responses. His mentor was a Caucasian female with 7 to 10 years of experience. She served as his current supervisor. Regarding statement #3, Participant 45 wrote,

> My mentor is a great cheerleader for me with our Vice President. She has his ear, so, in turn, I feel like I have a direct line to the top. More importantly, I feel like all of our communication is positive, which is a definite trait of my mentor.

Table 9

Distinguishing Statements for Factor B and Those Non-Distinguishing at ±4

Statement	Factor A		Factor B		Factor C		Factor D	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
3. My mentor has praised my work and me.	1	0.24	4	1.88*	0	0.08	2	0.98
2. My mentor has encouraged me to further my education or professional development.†	3	1.56	4	1.54	-2	-0.99	3	1.14
5. My mentor has served as a sounding board for me.	-1	-0.31	3	1.46*	2	0.72	-1	-0.31
13. My mentor has demonstrated trustworthiness.	0	-0.20	3	1.25*	1	0.40	0	0.22
11. My mentor has talked to me about the next steps in my career.	-1	-0.27	2	0.85*	-3	-1.23	0	0.11
29. My mentor has created an atmosphere where I can be vulnerable.	-3	-1.13	2	0.80*	0	-0.21	-1	-0.58
8. My mentor has intervened on my behalf.	-4	-2.11	2	0.78*	-3	-1.44	-1	-0.74
4. My mentor has allowed me to use his/her expertise and knowledge.	0	-0.26	1	0.70	-1	-0.56	0	0.23
23. My mentor has created a relationship based on mutual respect.	2	1.04	0	0.48	4	1.99	2	0.93
9. My mentor has supported me during a personal crisis.	-2	-0.96	0	-0.03	1	0.57	-2	-1.21
10. My mentor has provided me with a neutral perspective.	-3	-1.37	-1	-0.43	-3	-1.19	-2	-0.89
38. My mentor has advised me during a difficult professional situation.	-1	-0.29	-1	-0.84	1	0.62	0	-0.30
39. My mentor has shared and formulated ideas with me.	2	0.66	-2	-0.84	2	0.84	-1	-0.32
31. My mentor has stood behind me on a decision I have made.	0	0.02	-2	-0.84*	1	0.61	2	0.96
22. My mentor has used his/her network in the field for my benefit.	2	0.48	-3	-1.15	-4	-2.14	-4	-1.69
27. My mentor has given me honest feedback and support.	2	0.83	-3	-1.26*	4	1.52	3	1.38
30. My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions.	-2	-0.63	-4	-1.81*	0	0.19	2	0.82
37. My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve.	-3	-1.07	-4	-2.04*	-1	-0.32	4	1.66

Note. *Statement was significant at p < .01. †Statement was not distinguishing for that factor but was rated a ±4.

Additionally, Participant 24 wrote about statement #3 in his post-sort responses. Participant 24 was a Caucasian male who worked at a large (more than 10,000 students) institution. His mentor was a Caucasian female former supervisor with more than 10 years of experience in college student affairs. Participant 24 wrote, "My mentor regularly let me know things that were going well and often has gone out of her way to recommend me and my work to others on campus and in the field." The comments from both participants underscore the important role of the mentor as cheerleader. For these participants, the responsibilities of the mentor as cheerleader were to praise the protégé"s efforts not only to the protégé, but also to important people in the field or institution. In this way, the mentor was a communication piece for the protégé. Participant 45 went so far as to write, "I feel like I have a direct line to the top" and Participant 24 wrote that his mentor "often has gone out of her way to recommend me and my work to others on campus and in the field." The cheerleading offered by mentors seems to have provided support and a bit of advertising for the protégés.

An additional statement from the factor array of Factor B that contributed to the perception of the mentor as cheerleader was statement #20, "My mentor has recognized my potential for success in student affairs." This statement was ranked at the *+3* position on the factor array. This indicated that the statement"s position within the factor array was distinctive from other factors. The statement"s rank at the *+3* position in the factor array indicated that it was highly representative of the perspective offered by Factor B. Statement #20 is similar to statement #3, "My mentor praised my work and me," in that the statement connotes elements of praise and support for career advancement. Participant 4, a Caucasian female protégé who worked at a large institution (more than

10,000 students) wrote about statement #20 in her post-sort response. Participant 4 had a Caucasian female mentor who had 7 to 10 years of experience and was a former supervisor. Regarding statement #20, Participant 4 wrote,

> From the start of my graduate school experience, my mentor has been my biggest cheerleader helping me with major decisions in my career and being there for me in any circumstance. She took a meek young student and helped develop me into a better student affairs professional.

Although Participant 4 did not reference her mentor as someone who praised her work to others in college student affairs, it is clear that this participant viewed her mentor as a cheerleader, someone who was a major career support and someone who was responsible for the professional development of a new professional in college student affairs.

Additional statements helped contribute to the particular perspective offered by the participants who comprised Factor B. Statement #5, "My mentor has served as a sounding board for me" (ranked at *+3* position), statement #11, "My mentor has valued my ideas and opinions" (ranked at *+3* position), and statement #18, "My mentor has helped me debrief problems and consider alternative solutions" (ranked at *+2* position), all described the nature of the conversations in the mentoring relationships represented by Factor B. Statements #5 and #11 were distinguishing statements for Factor B, indicating that these statements and their positions within the factor array were distinctive to Factor B alone. When considered together, these statements indicated that the interactions between mentor and protégé in Factor B were marked by an exchange of ideas. Participant 23, in response to statement #18, wrote that his mentor "has been a sounding board and helped with debriefing after problems relating to the department I work in." Although the mentor"s primary role, according to the perspective represented by Factor

104

B, may have been that of the cheerleader, it is evident from these statements that another aspect of these mentoring relationships is that the interactions were governed by a mutual exchange of ideas.

Despite the support, cheerleading, and respect that may permeate the mentoring relationships depicted in the perspective represented by Factor B, an analysis of the other anchor statements exposed some shortcomings of the mentor as cheerleader. The statements interpreted for Factor B thus far have described mentors who praised the efforts of protégés and served as a mouthpiece for protégés to other people within the field or at the institution. Despite the support and cheerleading, two statements ranked at the *-4* position indicate that mentors have not challenged participants in Factor B. Statement #37, "My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve," and statement #30, "My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions," were both distinguishing statements ranked at the *-4* position. This indicated that these statements and their positions within the factor array were distinctive to Factor B alone. These statements ranking at the *-4* position indicated that these statements were highly representative of the perspective represented by Factor B. These statements indicate that although mentors provided support, praise, and encouragement to protégés, those protégés perceived their mentors as having difficulty challenging them or being honest with them about areas of improvement. Participant 20, a Caucasian female who worked at a large institution (more than 10,000 students), wrote about her experiences with her mentor, a Caucasian male with more than 10 years of experience. Regarding statement #37, "My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve," Participant 20 wrote that her mentor "rarely provides constructive criticism" and exclaimed, "I want more!" Again,

although the mentor as cheerleader excelled at applauding the efforts of the protégé, there seems to be a desire from protégés for more constructive criticism and professional growth in the relationship.

From the factor analysis and the data collected from the post-sort questions, college student affairs who loaded onto Factor B seemed to perceive them mentor as someone who (a) applauded their efforts to others within the institution and the field of college student affairs, (b) allowed a mutual exchange of ideas to govern their interactions, and (c) did not provide adequate challenge and constructive criticism. The college student affairs professionals who comprised Factor B viewed the mentor as their cheerleader. This emphasis differentiates this viewpoint from the others in this study. The mentor as cheerleader is an important perspective on mentoring relationships represented in this study.

Factor C: Mentor as Friend

Factor C accounted for 9% of the variance explained in this study and 9 of the 55 participants loaded onto this factor. However, as explained earlier in this chapter, 4 of these participants loaded significantly onto an additional factor. In order to gain a clearer view of the factors, the Q sorts of these 4 participants were not used during factor rotation. After factor rotation using the 5 participants, the variance explained remained 9%. Demographic information regarding the participants who comprised Factor C is provided in Table 10.

Four women and 1 man loaded onto this factor. Four of the participants on this factor were Caucasian and 1 was African-American. Most of the protégés in Factor C reported the same level of education, with 4 earning a masters degree and 1 completing

some masters-level work. Most of the participants in Factor C currently worked at large institutions, with 4 coming from institutions of 10,000 or more students. One participant worked at an institution with between 1,000 and 2,999 students. The college student affairs professionals who comprised Factor C worked in 5 different states: Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Virginia. The college student affairs functional areas represented were housing and residential life (4 participants) and student leadership programs (1 participant). Three participants in Factor C had less than 2 years experience, while 2 participants had between 2 and 5 years experience. Four participants had been in their mentoring relationship for less than 2 years and 1 participant had been in the relationship between 2 and 5 years. All 5 mentors represented in Factor C were female. Four Caucasian mentors and 1 Hispanic/Latino mentor comprised the factor. Regarding mentor-protégé gender, there were 4 female mentor-protégé pairs, and 1 pair who did not have the same gender. As for mentor-protégé ethnicity, there were 3 mentor-protégé pairs with the same ethnicity, and 2 pairs who did not have the same ethnicity. The years of experience for mentors of participants in Factor C was varied, with 1 having less than 3 years of experience, 1 having between 3 and 6 years, and 3 having between 7 and 10 years of experience. Finally, the mentor"s relationship to the protégé was also varied. Three mentors were participants" current supervisors, 1 was a colleague, and 1 was classified as other. Although the intention of this study and the purpose of Q methodology was not to extrapolate demographic trends from the person sample, the overall composition of the participants who comprised Factor C was fairly representative of the overall person sample.

Table 10

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor C

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
9	Female	White	Masters	10000+	GA	Leadership	<2	<2	Female	White	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
13	Male	White	Masters	10000+	VA	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	7 - 10	Colleague
25	Female	White	Masters	10000+	IL	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Current Supervisor
32	Female	Black	Some Masters	10000+	MI	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	<3	Colleague
42	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	IN	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Female	Hispanic	7 - 10	Former Supervisor

Based on the factor arrays, distinguishing statements, anchor statements, and data from the post-sort responses, the college student affairs professionals who loaded on Factor C perceived their mentor as their friend. That is, the perspective represented in Factor C described the mentoring relationship as one where a mentor's primary role is to provide stability and serve as a confidant for the protégé. Interestingly, the perspective represented by Factor C depicted mentors who avoided behaviors related to career development and progression. The individuals who comprised Factor C perceived the mentor's role was to provide a source of personal support and trust for the protégé. The distinguishing statements for Factor C are provided in Table 11. Following is an analysis of how the statements and participant responses represent the perspective described above.

The first glimpse of how the perspective represented by Factor C depicted the mentor as friend is from an analysis of the anchor statements. Statement #23, "My mentor has created a relationship based on mutual respect," was a distinguishing statement for Factor C, indicating that this statement and its position within the factor array were distinctive to Factor C alone. As well, statement #23 occupied a *+4* ranking in the factor array, indicating that this statement was highly representative of the perspective represented by Factor C. That the participants in Factor C ranked this statement highly indicates that the values that govern the relationship are important to participants in Factor C. Statement #23 is related to the interactions between the mentor and protégé and is less related to actions of the mentor or protégé. Although the statement itself does not imply friendship, it does imply that the mentor and protégé have a mutual understanding. Participant 25, a Caucasian female who worked at a large institution

Table 11

Distinguishing Statements for Factor C and Those Non-Distinguishing at ±4

Statement	Factor A		Factor B		Factor C		Factor D	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
23. My mentor has created a relationship based on mutual respect.	2	1.04	0	0.48	4	1.99*	2	0.93
27. My mentor has given me honest feedback and support.†	2	0.83	-3	-1.26	4	1.52	3	1.38
34. My mentor and I have interacted socially outside the workplace.	1	0.19	-3	-1.51	3	1.48*	-3	-1.43
33. My mentor has provided stability for me.	-1	-0.33	0	0.04	3	1.35*	-3	-1.28
17. My mentor has served as a confidant.	-2	-0.38	-1	-0.32	3	1.24*	-2	-0.83
5. My mentor has served as a sounding board for me.	-1	-0.31	3	1.46	2	0.72*	-1	-0.31
38. My mentor has advised me during a difficult professional situation.	-1	-0.29	-1	-0.84	1	0.62*	0	-0.30
9. My mentor has supported me during a personal crisis.	-2	-0.96	0	-0.03	1	0.57	-2	-1.21
30. My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions.	-2	-0.63	-4	-1.81	0	0.19	2	0.82
20. My mentor has recognized my potential for success in student affairs.	2	1.20	3	1.37	0	-0.21*	1	0.58
37. My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve.	-3	-1.07	-4	-2.04	-1	-0.32*	4	1.66
16. My mentor has provided experiences where I can learn something new.	1	0.44	1	0.66	-2	-0.83*	2	0.94
12. My mentor has helped me develop and understand myself.	0	-0.23	1	0.69	-2	-0.94*	1	0.80
2. My mentor has encouraged me to further my education or professional development.	3	1.56	4	1.54	-2	-0.99*	3	1.14
11. My mentor has talked to me about the next steps in my career.	-1	-0.27	2	0.85	-3	-1.23*	0	0.11
15. My mentor has helped me gain desirable opportunities in the field (for example, leadership positions, committee memberships).	1	0.06	0	-0.14	-3	-1.30*	0	0.21
8. My mentor has intervened on my behalf.	-4	-2.11	2	0.78	-3	-1.44*	-1	-0.74
35. My mentor has influenced my career path.†	3	1.63	-2	-0.97	-4	-1.62	-2	-1.14
22. My mentor has used his/her network in the field for my benefit.†	2	0.48	-3	-1.15	-4	-2.14	-4	-1.69

Note. *Statement was significant at p < .01. †Statement was not distinguishing for that factor but was rated a ±4.

(more than 10,000 students), wrote about her mentor, also a Caucasian female with 7 to 10 years of experience. Regarding statement #23, Participant 25 wrote,

> I interact with my mentor on almost a daily basis because we enjoy talking with each other. We have formed a friendship, but we have also formed a mutual respect for one another at work.

This participant discussed how, although the mutual respect between her and her mentor was strong, a friendship developed out of their interactions. This kind of interaction appeared to be very important to the participants in Factor C.

The other anchor statement ranked at the *+4* position was statement #27, "My mentor has given me honest feedback and support." While this statement was not a distinguishing statement, it nonetheless bears importance to Factor C because of its placement within the factor array. Similar to statement #23, the other statement ranked in the *+4* position, statement #27, is related to the type of interaction between the mentor and protégé. In light of the other statements ranked highly in the factor array for Factor C, the importance of statement #27 lies in the honesty and trust that governs the interactions between the mentor and protégé. Participant 9, a Caucasian female who worked at a large institution (more than 10,000 students) commented about her mentor, also a Caucasian female with 3 to 6 years of experience. Regarding statement #27, Participant 9 wrote, "My mentor is a great sounding board. She is honest and neutral about all things. She is supportive while helping me see things in a way I might not have otherwise." Participant 9 described an interaction based on supportive and honest conversations. This participant cast her mentor in the light of a confidant while writing about her mentor‟s neutrality.

Statement #17 specifically references the mentor as a confidant, and this statement was ranked at the *+3* position within the factor array for Factor C. This

statement was also a distinguishing statement for Factor C. Again, the nature of this statement is related to the interaction between the mentor and the protégé rather than specific actions that the mentor or protégé performed. Statement #17 stated, "My mentor has served as a confidant." Participant 42, a Caucasian female who worked at a small institution (1,000 to 2,999 students), wrote about her mentor, a Hispanic female with 7 to 10 years of experience in college student affairs. Regarding statement #17, she wrote, "In a division rife with politics, my mentor is outside my immediate department and has been a tremendous confidant for me." The response from Participant 42 depicted her mentor as someone whose confidence she needs considering her institution. The response of Participant 32 regarding statement #17 is interesting. This participant, an African-American female who worked at a large institution (10,000 or more students), negatively loaded onto Factor C. Her factor loading of -0.5474 is important, because she can be said to offer the antithesis of Factor C. She placed statement #17 in the *-4* position in the factor array, but because she loaded negatively onto the factor, she offered a "mirror image" of the factor array. A statement ranked at the *-4* position by a participant who negatively loads onto a factor is similar to ranking that statement in the *+4* position. Regarding statement #17, Participant 32 wrote, "My mentor was not my best friend. We only discussed things important to…my academic endeavors." This statement is important to Factor C because, as the antithesis of the prevailing perspective of the Factor, Participant 32"s response underscores the salient values of the factor. In her response, Participant 32 distanced herself from her mentor as a friend and also seemed to scoff at discussing any non-essential items. While the prevailing perspective offered in Factor C has been one where personal interactions governed by respect and friendship are

important, the antithesis of the factor avoids those realms entirely. Again, this only adds to the support for the mentor as friend.

Two additional statements help round out the impression of the perspective represented by Factor C depicting the mentor as a friend. Statement #34, "My mentor and I have interacted socially outside the workplace," and statement #33, "My mentor has provided stability for me," were both distinguishing statements ranked at the *+3* position. Similar to the other statements described for Factor C, the nature of statements #34 and #33 is related to the interactions between the mentor and the protégé. Statement #34 describes the interactions between the mentor and protégé extending beyond the workplace and entering into the realm of friendship. Participant 25 wrote about statement #34, "My mentor and I regularly go out to dinner, shop, and see movies together!" This response clearly described her mentor as a friend. Regarding statement #33, Participant 13, a Caucasian male who worked at a large (10,000 or more students) institution, wrote, "Our office went through some crazy transitions, but my mentor remained in her position, carried out her duties, performed them well, and did not get caught up in any of the potential drama associated with the transition. A very stable force that allowed me to do my job to the best of my ability." This participant's response described his mentor as a stabilizing force amidst institutional chaos.

Just as important to the description of Factor C are the statements that were ranked on the opposite end of the factor array. While statements that described the type of interaction the mentor and protégé had were ranked at the positive end of the spectrum, those statements that described specific career development were not ranked highly. Again, the point of view from Participant 32, who loaded negatively onto the factor, is

important. This participant stated that the interactions between her and her mentor were restricted to the realm of her research and academic endeavors. This participant, who offered a perspective antithetical to the prevailing perspective of Factor C, preferred interactions that were work-related. It should follow that the prevailing perspective of Factor C would rank statements that were related to career development on the lower end of the factor array. Statement #22, "My mentor has used his/her network in the field for my benefit," and statement #35, "My mentor has influenced my career path," were both ranked in the *-4* position. Additionally, statement #11, "My mentor has talked to me about the next steps in my career," and statement #15, "My mentor has helped me gain desirable opportunities in the field," were both ranked in the *-3* position in the factor array. All of these statements are related to specific actions on behalf of the mentor that relate to career and professional development. The placement of these statements in the low end of the sorting grid indicated that participants in Factor C did not rely on their mentor for these items.

From the factor analysis and the data collected from the post-sort questions, college student affairs professionals who loaded onto Factor C perceived their mentor as a friend. Their mentoring relationship was governed by (a) mutual respect and honesty, (b) close interactions both inside and outside the workplace, and (c) neutrality from the mentor concerning job-related issues. The demographic characteristics of Factor C are important, considering the important values of the participants. Four out of the 5 participants in the factor were female mentor-protégé pairs. Allen and Eby (2004), in a study of the effect of gender interactions of mentoring relationships, noted that the greatest amount of psychosocial mentoring occurred in these female mentor-protégé

pairs. The description of Factor C aligns with the findings of Allen and Eby. Just as important as what was characteristic of Factor C is what was not characteristic. The participants who comprised Factor C avoided interactions guided by career or professional development from their mentors. The college student affairs professionals who comprised Factor C viewed the mentor as their friend. This emphasis differentiates this viewpoint from the others in this study. The mentor as friend is an important perspective on mentoring relationships represented in this study.

Factor D: Mentor as Teacher

Factor D accounted for 13% of the variance explained in this study and 16 of the 55 participants loaded onto this factor. However, as explained earlier in this chapter, 3 of these participants loaded significantly onto an additional factor. In order to gain a clearer view of the factors, the Q sorts of these 3 participants were not used during factor rotation. After factor rotation using the 13 participants, the variance explained remained 13%. Demographic information regarding the participants who comprised Factor D is provided in Table 12.

Four men and 9 women loaded onto this factor. Nine of the participants on this factor were Caucasian, 1 was African-American, 1 was Asian, and 2 were Hispanic/Latino. The education levels for individuals in Factor D were as follows: 1 earned a bachelors degree, 10 earned a masters degree and 1 completed some doctoral-level work, and 1 earned a doctorate degree. Most of the participants in Factor D currently worked at large institutions, with 7 coming from institutions of 10,000 or more students. One participant worked at an institution with less than 1,000 students, 3 participants worked at institutions with between 1,000 and 2,999 student, and 2

participants worked at institutions with between 3,000 and 9,999 students. The college

student affairs professionals who comprised Factor D worked in 12 different states:

Alabama, Colorado, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon,

Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. One participant did not report a location.

The college student affairs functional areas represented were academic advising (1

participant), campus activities/student union (3 participants), career services (1

participant), enrollment services (1 participant), housing and residential life (4

participants), multicultural student programs (1 participant), service-learning programs (1

participant), and student leadership programs (1 participant). Five participants in Factor

D had less than 2 years experience, while 8 participants had between 2 and 5 years

experience. Eight participants had been in their mentoring relationship for less than 2

years, and 5 participants had been in the relationship between 2 and 5 years. Factor D was

comprised of 12 female mentors and 1 male mentor, 8 Caucasian mentors, 4 African-

American mentors, and 1 Hispanic/Latino mentor.

Regarding mentor-protégé gender, there were 8 female mentor-protégé pairs and

5 pairs who did not have the same gender. As for mentor-protégé ethnicity, there were 8

mentor-protégé pairs with the same ethnicity and 5 pairs who did not have the same

ethnicity. The years of experience for mentors of participants in Factor D was varied,

with 1 having less than 3 years of experience, 4 having between 3 and 6 years, 3 having

between 7 and 10 years, and 5 having more than 10 years of experience. Finally, the

mentor‟s relationship to the protégé

Table 12

Demographic Characteristics for Participants on Factor D

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
3	Female	White	Masters	3000 - 9999	MA	Activities	<2	<2	Male	White	3 - 6	Current Supervisor
15	Female	Hispanic	Masters	10000+	TX	Enrollment	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor
17	Female	White	Doctorate	10000+	ND	Activities	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Other
21	Male	Black	Masters	10000+	TN	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	Black	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
28	Female	White	Masters	10000+	MO	Advising	<2	2 - 5	Female	Black	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
35	Female	White	Some Doctoral	10000+	PA	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
37	Male	White	Masters	10000+	NJ	Leadership	2 - 5	<2	Female	Hispanic	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
40	Male	White	Masters	10000+	VA	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
41	Female	White	Bachelors	1000 - 2999	AL	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	3 - 6	Current Supervisor
43	Male	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	IO	Career Services	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor
49	Female	Hispanic	Masters	3000 - 9999		Multicultural	2 - 5	<2	Female	Black	<3	Former Supervisor
50	Female	Asian	Masters	<1000	OR	Housing	<2	<2	Female	Black	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
51	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	CO	Service	<2	<2	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor

Note. Participant 49 did not report a value for protégé location.

was as follows: 5 mentors were participants‟ current supervisors, 7 were former

supervisors, and 1 was classified as other. Although the intention of this study and the

purpose of Q methodology was not to extrapolate demographic trends from the person

sample, the overall composition of the participants who comprised Factor D was fairly

representative of the overall person sample.

Based on the factor arrays, distinguishing statements, anchor statements, and data

from the post-sort responses, the college student affairs professionals who loaded on

Factor D perceived their mentor as their teacher. That is, the perspective represented in

Factor D described the mentoring relationship as one where a mentor‟s primary role was

to provide career and professional development for the protégé. Interestingly, the

perspective represented by Factor D depicted mentors who avoided behaviors related to

their protégé‟s personal life. The distinguishing statements for Factor D are provided in

Table 13. Following is an analysis of how the statements and participant responses

represent the perspective described above.

The perspective on mentoring relationships represented by Factor D largely

describes the mentor as teacher. The participants who comprised Factor D viewed their

mentor as primarily responsible for their learning and development within the field of

student affairs. The placement of statement #37 offers the first glimpse into the

description of mentor as teacher. Statement #37, "My mentor has identified areas in

which I can improve," was a distinguishing statement for Factor D, indicating that this

statement and its position within the factor array were distinctive to Factor D alone.

Additionally, statement #37 was ranked in the *+4* position in the factor array, indicating

that it was highly representative of the perspective represented by Factor D. It is evident

Table 13

Distinguishing Statements for Factor D and Those Non-Distinguishing at ±4

Statement	Factor A		Factor B		Factor C		Factor D	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
37. My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve.	-3	-1.07	-4	-2.04	-1	-0.32	4	1.66*
26. My mentor has demonstrated care and concern for me as a person and professional.†	4	1.68	1	0.72	2	1.14	4	1.72
3. My mentor has praised my work and me.	1	0.24	4	1.88	0	0.08	2	0.98*
30. My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions.	-2	-0.63	-4	-1.81	0	0.19	2	0.82
20. My mentor has recognized my potential for success in student affairs.	2	1.20	3	1.37	0	-0.21	1	0.58*
1. My mentor has made efforts to relate to me.	0	-0.21	0	0.06	0	-0.28	1	0.56
4. My mentor has allowed me to use his/her expertise and knowledge.	0	-0.26	1	0.70	-1	-0.56	0	0.23
11. My mentor has talked to me about the next steps in my career.	-1	-0.27	2	0.85	-3	-1.23	0	0.11
6. My mentor has helped me navigate institutional politics.	-3	-1.27	1	0.67	2	1.03	0	-0.10*
39. My mentor has shared and formulated ideas with me.	2	0.66	-2	-0.84	2	0.84	-1	-0.32
8. My mentor has intervened on my behalf.	-4	-2.11	2	0.78	-3	-1.44	-1	-0.74*
17. My mentor has served as a confidant.	-2	-0.38	-1	-0.32	3	1.24	-2	-0.83
28. My mentor has inspired me in how I conduct myself professionally.	4	1.82	0	-0.03	0	-0.29	-2	-0.87
33. My mentor has provided stability for me.	-1	-0.33	0	0.04	3	1.35	-3	-1.28*
22. My mentor has used his/her network in the field for my benefit.†	2	0.48	-3	-1.15	-4	-2.14	-4	-1.69
21. My mentor has taught me how to balance my personal and professional life.	-2	-0.95	-3	-1.11	-2	-0.68	-4	-1.70*

Note. *Statement was significant at p < .01. †Statement was not distinguishing for that factor but was rated a ±4.

from statement #37 that improvement and development are central to the mentoring relationships of participants in Factor D. Participant 41, a Caucasian female who worked at a small institution (1,000 to 2,999 students), wrote about her mentor, also a Caucasian female, in her post-sort response. Regarding statement #37, she wrote, "My mentor doesn't have [a] problem with letting you know what you could do to improve. We meet on a weekly basis so that we can make sure I'm progressing well" (Participant 41). For this participant, improving as a professional is a regular topic of conversation in her mentoring relationship.

Additional statements within the factor array contribute to the perception of mentor as teacher for Factor D. Statement #2, "My mentor has encouraged me to further my education or professional development," was ranked at the *+3* position. Although it was not a distinguishing statement, it bears examination because of its position within the factor array. The encouragement of additional education and professional development is clearly aimed at improving and developing the protégé. Two participants commented on statement #2 in their post-sort responses:

> [My mentor placed a] large emphasis on discussing next steps and how to get there - all aspects of interactions incorporate time to reflect on what I have done, how it has gone, what I have learned, and how to incorporate into what comes next. (Participant 3)

> [Professional development] is the number one purpose of a mentoring relationship. A mentor should always accelerate the development of a [protégé]. If a [protégé] doesn't learn, change or grow in a mentoring relationship, then something in that relationship has gone wrong. (Participant 15)

These participants clearly viewed their mentor as someone who was focused on their advancement in the field of college student affairs. Participant 3, a Caucasian female who worked at a mid-sized institution (3,000 to 9,999 students), focused on the reflection and

processing that took place in conversations with her mentor, a Caucasian male with 3 to 6 years of experience. Participant 3 perceived her mentor as a teacher because she described the conversations that took place in the relationship as focused on reflecting on and learning from her experiences. Participant 15, a Hispanic female who worked at a large institution (more than 10,000 students), was explicit about her perception of her mentor, a Caucasian female with more than 10 years of experience. She reported that professional growth and learning were at the core of the perception of a mentoring relationship for these two participants.

Other statements that were also important to the perception of the mentor as teacher in Factor D were statement #16, "My mentor has provided experiences where I can learn something new" (ranked at *+2*), statement #27, "My mentor has given me honest feedback and support" (ranked at *+3*), and statement #30, "My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions" (ranked at *+2*). Collectively, these statements contribute to the perception represented by Factor D of the mentor as someone who is focused on the development of the protégé. Creating learning experiences, providing feedback and support, and challenging the protégé"s preconceptions are all valuable behaviors in a mentor, and behaviors that support the growth of the protégé. Two participants commented on statement #27 in their post-sort responses:

> My mentor has always given me feedback on my job performance or the conversations we have had. She also has been very supportive of me in my development. I have always felt as if she was honest and direct with me. (Participant 37)

> My mentor has often provided me with constructive criticism that has allowed me to better understand situations. (Participant 17)

From these comments, it seems that the participants perceive their mentor as someone who can critically evaluate them and focus on professional growth for the protégé. Regarding statement #30, Participant 15 also perceived her mentor as someone who challenged her to be a better professional. In her post-sort response she wrote, "[Challenging my perspectives] is just her nature. She challenges, calls you out, and expects you to defend your values" (Participant 15). These statements and the responses from post-sort questions support the perception of the mentor as someone who teaches, challenges, and critically evaluates the protégé in Factor D.

Although the challenge and criticism described by the previous 3 statements may seem harsh, the participants who comprised Factor D also perceived their mentors as being supportive and encouraging. Statement #14, "My mentor has shown confidence in me to achieve" (ranked at *+3*), and statement #26, "My mentor has demonstrated care and concern" (ranked at *+4*), depict a mentor who, despite constructive criticism, offers support throughout the relationship. Regarding statement #14, Participant 35 wrote,

> As a young professional in a new environment and position a mentor can offer vision and insight into the professional you are going to be or have the potential to be - often times confidence is a motivating factor toward success - gaining confidence is like laying a foundation for success in other areas. (Participant 35)

In this response, the participant perceived confidence bestowed by the mentor as a contributing factor for success. Challenge tempered with support and praise seemed to be very developmental for the participants in Factor D. The notion of support and praise can also be interpreted from the responses regarding statement #26, gathered from 3 participants:

> Every successful relationship should begin with care and compassion. A mentor is there to provide assistance not opinions. (Participant 15)

She has made it a point to reach out to me and it is clear that my best interests are on her mind. (Participant 21)

My mentor was my assistantship supervisor and she continually asked how I was doing with my assistantship and my classes. She went out of her way to let me know that she was there for me. She was genuine in her caring, so I knew that I wasn't just another grad student. She took the time to get to know me even when she stressed that our focus was our students. (Participant 50)

These participants perceived their mentors as genuinely caring about them. Interpreted contextually with statement #14, it is evident that compassion and support are also hallmarks of the mentor as teacher.

Several statements helped describe the perception of mentors from Factor D on the negative end of the sorting grid. The participants who comprised Factor D perceived their mentoring relationship as strictly confined to professional or work-related conversations. Several statements that were ranked low in the factor array pertained to the mentor and protégé interacting on a personal level. Statement #21, "My mentor has taught me how to balance my personal and professional life," was a distinguishing statement ranked at the *-4* position in the factor array, indicating that this statement and its position within the factor array were distinctive to Factor D alone. Regarding statement #21, many participants perceived that their mentor struggled with personal and professional balance. Participant 37 wrote, "My mentor can't practice [personal and professional balance]." Participant 49 echoed that sentiment, "My mentor struggles with maintaining that balance for herself." Finally, Participant 15 wrote in her post-sort response, "This is an area which [my mentor] is also working to improve." From these responses, it seems that the participants who comprised Factor D did not want to learn personal and professional balance from an unqualified teacher.

Two additional statements support the claim that the view of mentors represented by Factor D explicitly avoids the personal realm, instead preferring a strictly professional relationship. Statement #34, "My mentor and I have interacted socially outside the workplace" (ranked at *-3*) and statement #9, "My mentor has supported me during a personal crisis" (ranked at *-2*) both pertain to personal interactions between a mentor and protégé. Again, the participants who comprised Factor D preferred a mentoring relationship that is confined to professional or workplace discussions. This is evident from the placement of these two statements and the comments regarding these statements from the post-sort responses. In response to statement #34, Participant 15 wrote, "I have friends and family outside work that I socialize with, so I don't need my mentor to fill that aspect of my life." While Participant 15"s mentor may fill the role of professional advisor or teacher, it is clear that she perceived her relationship as confined to the workplace. Several participants commented on statement #9 in the post-sort questions:

> I have not had a personal crisis that I have had to go to my mentor with. I usually go to friends or family for this type of support. (Participant 21)

> I have not solicited her advice during a personal crisis. I rely more on my office colleague for this support. (Participant 51)

> I keep my personal life to myself. A mentoring relationship should be kept professional and the drama, if any, is best kept at home. (Participant 15)

> [I am] more likely to reach out to family during personal crisis and have never had a major one. (Participant 3)

From these responses, it is clear that the role of the mentor for the participants who comprised Factor D is not that of a friend or confidant.

From the factor analysis and the data collected from the post-sort questions, college student affairs professionals who loaded onto Factor D perceived their mentor as

a teacher. Their mentoring relationship was typified by (a) encouragement to grow and develop professionally, (b) constructive criticism and challenge, and (c) support and genuine compassion. Importantly, the relationship was confined to the professional or workplace arena and specifically avoided personal boundaries. The college student affairs professionals who comprised Factor D viewed the mentor as their teacher. This emphasis differentiates this viewpoint from the others in this study. The mentor as teacher is an important perspective on mentoring relationships represented in this study.

Summary

This chapter presented the results of this study examining new college student affairs professionals" perceptions of their mentoring relationships. Results included the correlation of the individual Q sorts, the correlation of factors, factor analysis, and the computation of factor scores. Using principal components analysis (PCA), four significant factors were identified and these four factors accounted for 46% of the total variance. Factor loadings of $|.413|$ and higher were considered significant ($p < .01$) using the standard error of a zero-order factor loading.

The resultant four factors were highly reliable with relatively low correlations between them. The presence of both high reliability and low between-factor correlations indicated that the four factors identified in this study represent stable and distinct perspectives of how new college student affairs professionals perceive their mentoring relationships. The four emergent factors were named: (a) Mentor as Ideal, (b) Mentor as Cheerleader, (c) Mentor as Friend, and (d) Mentor as Teacher. The four factors were described and interpreted along with selected demographics of participants within those factors, distinguishing and anchor statements, excerpts from the written responses of

those participants, and other data that illuminated each of the four factors" representation

of the perspectives on mentoring relationships in college student affairs. The concluding

chapter will discuss the implications of the results of this study.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion and Recommendations

This study examined the perception of mentoring relationships by protégés who were new college student affairs professionals. The study began with a description of the purpose and research question that provided the framework for this study. The purpose of the study was to explore the experiences of new professionals in college student affairs as protégés in mentoring relationships. The study was designed as an exploratory study into the types of mentoring relationships that exist among college student affairs professionals. The study addressed the following research question: What are the experiences of new college student affairs professionals as protégés in mentoring relationships? In the study, I made claims about the significance of the research and conclusions advanced. Specifically, the research and conclusions from the study may impact the profession of college student affairs and its ability to recruit, hire, train, and retain high-quality college student affairs professionals.

I examined the relevant literature that provided a context for the issue of mentoring relationships in college student affairs. I advanced a definition of the concept of a mentoring relationship and examined the different ways in which the literature has defined mentoring. I then addressed the environmental context of mentoring and the notion of formal and informal mentoring relationships. An examination of the value of mentoring relationships as discussed in the literature was included. A description of three

important aspects of mentoring followed: the phases of a mentoring relationship, the functions of a mentoring relationship, and the outcomes of a mentoring relationship. Additionally, organizational socialization was examined as the conceptual framework for the study.

The methodology used for this study was Q methodology. I described the methodological and philosophical values of Q methodology, including the typical research designs for Q methodology. The specific research design for this study was also described. I used a research design that is typical of studies that employ Q methodology. Specifically, I relied on the use of two phases during the research process. Phase 1 of the study involved the collection of concourse data and the creation of the research instrument, or Q sample. Phase 2 of the study consisted of the collection of data from participants and the Q sorts that those participants performed.

An examination and discussion of the pertinent findings for the study was the penultimate step in the study. Demographic information from participants and data that the participants reported about their mentor were provided and discussed. A complete discussion of the factor analytic procedures employed in the study was also provided. This included a description of factor rotation and extraction and the selection of the 4-factor solution used in this study. An examination of factor score stability and correlations was provided, as well as the factor arrays for each of the 4 factors. Finally, each of the 4 factors was interpreted through the use of participant demographics, factor arrays, distinguishing statements, and participants" written responses to post-sort questions and prompts. The four emergent factors were named: (a) Mentor as Ideal, (b) Mentor as Cheerleader, (c) Mentor as Friend, and (d) Mentor as Teacher. The

interpretation of the 4 factors led to the following conclusions and recommendations. A

summary of the factors can be found in Table 14.

Table 14

Summary of Named Factor Characteristics

Factor	Factor Name	Number of Participants*	Variance Explained	Features of Mentoring Relationship
A	Mentor as Ideal	14	15%	(a) Mentor was the ideal student affairs professional. (b) Mentor influenced protégé"s career and professional development. (c) Mentor supported protégé professionally and personally.
B	Mentor as Cheerleader	8	9%	(a) Mentor applauded protégé"s efforts to others within the institution and the field of college student affairs. (b) Mentor allowed a mutual exchange of ideas to govern interactions with protégé. (c) Mentor did not provide adequate challenge and constructive criticism.
C	Mentor as Friend	5	9%	(a) Mentor demonstrated respect and honesty toward the protégé. (b) Mentor and protégé had close interactions both inside and outside the workplace. (c) Mentor was neutral and unbiased concerning job-related issues.
D	Mentor as Teacher	13	13%	(a) Mentor encouraged the protégé to grow and develop professionally. (b) Mentor provided constructive criticism and challenge to the protégé. (c) Mentor provided support and genuine compassion to the protégé.

Note. *Participants who loaded purely and significantly (factor loading $> \pm .413$) onto each factor.

Conclusions of the Study

In this study, I examined the experiences of protégés in mentoring relationships.

Specifically, I explored the perceptions of new college student affairs professionals who

had experiences as a protégé in a mentoring relationship. Mentoring relationships have tremendous value for the field of college student affairs. Specifically, mentoring relationships can be a catalyst for the recruitment, development, and retention of high-quality professionals in the field of college student affairs. Mentoring can help move college student affairs into prominence as an educational profession. Mentoring relationships can be used as a tool to socialize and orient new professionals in college student affairs and, through that socialization, teach newcomers the values, norms, and expectations of the student affairs profession. Additionally, mentors can serve as exemplars to professionals who are new to the field. The perceptions gathered through the Q sorts and interpreted in the 4-factor solution are important to help understand how other new college student affairs professionals may perceive their mentoring relationships. Although the results of this study cannot be generalized to a larger population, that does not undermine the importance of the perceptions described in this study for practice and research regarding mentoring relationships in college student affairs. An analysis of the results generated by the study, contextualized within the relevant literature, resulted in the following conclusions.

Value of Personal Interaction

It was evident from an analysis of the concourse interviews and all four factors that protégés highly valued the personal interaction with their mentor. In chapter 2, several definitions of mentoring were advanced, and it was acknowledged through a review of the literature that a succinct and comprehensive definition of mentoring did not exist. Interestingly, mentoring has often been defined by the context in which it occurs. However, a common thread through all of the various interpretations and definitions of

mentoring was the presence of two individuals interacting with one another. Regardless of how one defines mentoring, mentoring cannot occur without a relationship. The teaching, learning, and development that take place between the two individuals engaged in a mentoring relationship are largely due to some concerted interaction between the two. Participants in this study clearly valued, in different ways, the interaction with their mentor.

The collection of concourse information gave valuable insight into the conclusion that student affairs professionals held their relationships with other professionals in such high regard. Consistently throughout phase 1 of this study, during which interviews were conducted for the purposes of developing the concourse, participants spoke about the value of forming a mentoring relationship with a senior professional in college student affairs. During the concourse interviews, the prevailing opinion was that those individuals who had a mentoring relationship considered themselves privileged to have had the opportunity to interact with another professional. As a result of these interviews and the data collected during phase 1 of the study, many of the 39 statements in the Q sample could be characterized as describing active interactions between the mentor and protégé.

The interpretation of the Q sorts revealed that most participants in phase 2 of the study also valued the interactions with their mentor. In three of the named factors, (b) Mentor as Cheerleader, (c) Mentor as Friend, and (d) Mentor as Teacher, the perceptions of participants who comprised these factors largely valued specific interactions with their mentor. The participants who comprised Factor B valued interactions where their mentor praised their work, participants who comprised Factor C valued interactions with their

mentor that were similar to a friendship, and participants who comprised Factor D valued developmental interactions.

The interactions that invariably accompany mentoring relationships were very important to participants in this study. The power of these interactions to affect participants in a meaningful way is an important conclusion. The college student affairs profession should foster intimate, professional relationships among colleagues so that other professionals may be positively affected.

Power of the Role Model

Just as important as the personal interactions between college student affairs professionals is the power of the role model. As protégés develop a relationship with a mentor, it is possible that they will view their mentor as a role model. Kram (1985) reported role modeling as the most frequently reported mentoring function, although Gibson (2004) claimed that mentoring and role modeling are often confused for one another and that some relationships that are merely role modeling are mistaken for mentoring relationships. Participants in this study claimed to be engaged in a mentoring relationship, and many of them perceived their mentor as exhibiting at least some behaviors characteristic of a role model. Protégés often have a window into their mentor‟s behaviors, values, and decisions that others may not have. This intimacy allowed the protégé to at least identify with, and in some cases emulate, the example set by their protégé.

The perception described by Factor A (Mentor as Ideal) clearly viewed the mentor as a role model and someone whose behavior and values were those of the ideal student affairs professional. Although the perception of Factor A represents only a portion of the

perspectives on mentoring relationships, the concept of the mentor as a role model is important in the literature and equally important in this study. Though the perspectives represented by Factors B, C, and D did not explicitly describe their mentor as a role model, there were some elements that the protégés who comprised Factors B, C, and D considered admirable in their mentor. Mentors have tremendous power to exert influence on their protégés, and this is not more evident than through their assumption of the role model function. Role modeling functions are heightened for new professionals because their mentor may be their first exposure to a high-quality college student affairs professional. If the mentor is able to be a role model in some aspect to the protégé, that increases the motivation on the behalf of the protégé to excel in the field of college student affairs. For many of the participants in this study, the mentor clearly served as a role model. The effect of a strong, positive role model on a new professional in college student affairs is powerful. From the data in the current study, mentors who are also role models seemed to have been a positive influence for their protégés.

Positive Nature of Mentoring Relationships

Through an analysis of the results of the concourse interviews and Q sorts, I concluded that the mentoring relationships represented in this study were, on balance, positive in nature. Much of the recent literature on mentoring relationships described the "dark side" of many relationships. Eby et al. (2000) noted, "the almost exclusive focus on the positive aspects of relationships paints a distorted and unrealistic picture of relational patterns and fosters the perception that any negative experience is pathological and aberrant rather than a normal aspect of relationships" (p. 13). Mentoring relationships can vary widely in quality, the amount of mentoring functions provided, and the outcomes

that are generated from a mentoring relationship. Eby and McManus (2004) conceptualized mentoring "existing on a continuum where some relationships are marginally effective, some are ineffective, and others are truly dysfunctional" (p. 256). Despite these claims by researchers, the data in the current study indicated that mentoring relationships in college student affairs are, on balance, positive in nature.

Most of the participants in this study reported overwhelmingly positive remarks about their mentor. While a few participants reported some negative aspects of the relationship, even those relationships were positive on the whole. Again, as Eby et al. (2000) noted, these negative aspects of a wholly positive relationship are likely just part of a normal human relationship. The college student affairs professionals who participated in this study reported largely positive relationships with their mentors. In post-sort questions and prompts, many of the participants wrote that it was difficult to place some of the items on the negative end of the sorting grid, because they felt that so many of the statements were characteristic of their mentor. This indicated that, for the participants in this study, their mentoring relationships were largely positive. The notion of wholly positive mentoring relationships is not unusual, as many studies on mentoring relationships have examined the positive nature of mentoring (Eby et. al, 2004; Eby & McManus, 2004; Ragins et al., 2000). However, the importance of positive mentoring relationships as noted by participants in the current study is magnified by the role of the mentor in the life of a new college professional.

Mentoring relationships can significantly influence new professionals. Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) hypothesized that a "mentor may provide critical career-enhancing functions during very early stages of a newcomer's experience in the organization" (p.

134

172). Ostroff and Kozlowski claimed that the effects of mentoring begin early in the socialization process, possibly enhancing the incorporation of newcomers into an organization. The role of a positive mentoring relationship takes on increased importance for a newcomer into a profession.

Absence of Personal Guidance

Guidance and advice for protégés during times of personal crises were largely missing from the mentoring relationships represented by the 55 participants in the study. Despite the wholly positive nature of many of the mentoring relationships described in the current study, personal guidance was altogether absent from the mentoring relationships. Kram (1985) separated the functions of a mentoring relationship into two major categories (psychosocial and career functions) and 9 subcategories. One of the psychosocial mentoring functions Kram described was counseling. In the concourse interviews, the notion of counseling behaviors in mentoring relationships was fairly consistent. Many of the participants interviewed in phase 1 of the study noted the role of their mentor counseling them through a difficult personal problem or time in their life. Although the mentor primarily served as a sounding board for professional and career aspects, for many of the participants in phase 1, the mentor also took on the role of personal counselor at times. However, the participants in phase 2 did not perceive their mentors in the same light. None of the factors highlighted personal counseling as a dominant theme.

Again, one must examine how the focus of the current study on new college student affairs professionals may have contributed to the absence of personal guidance and counseling from mentoring relationships. In her description of the phases of a

mentoring relationship, Kram (1985) noted that the cultivation stage begins about 1 year after the relationship initiation. The cultivation stage is a period of 2 to 5 years when the maximum range of mentoring functions is provided (Dougherty et al., 2007). The cultivation stage is marked by greater mutual benefit for both parties. Partly because of this, the cultivation stage is generally positive and defined by growth for both individuals in the relationship. Most of the participants in the current study reported that their mentoring relationship was in the early part of the cultivation stage. It is possible that the new professionals in the current study had not yet reached the comfort level necessary to discuss personal problems with their mentors. An additional contributing factor to the absence of personal counseling from the perspectives offered in the current study is the retrospective nature of mentoring relationships. Many of the participants from phase 1 were in the later stages of their mentoring relationships and had the luxury of reexamining the early stages of their relationships. Regardless of the possible reasons for the absence of personal counseling from the perspectives on mentoring relationships given in this study, it is an important omission. The absence of personal counseling may indicate that these participants viewed their mentors as capable of providing guidance solely on professional matters.

Developmental Nature of Relationships

An important conclusion drawn from this study is the developmental nature of the mentoring relationships described in this study. Participants in the current study viewed their mentoring relationship as an important aspect of their professional and career development. The notion of mentoring relationships as a professional development tool is highly consistent with the literature. Mentoring is widely considered a mutually

beneficial developmental relationship (Dougherty et al., 2007; Dymock, 1999; Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988) in which the mentor, protégé, and the organization benefit considerably. Protégés can expect that the mentoring relationship will help them to grow personally through an increased sense of self-worth, competence, and self-efficacy (Kram; Waters, 2004). Additionally, the protégé will likely experience career advancement and development from the mentoring relationship (Kram; Wanberg et al., 2006). Organizations will benefit from an increase in the talent and productivity of the workforce, as well as a reduction in turnover costs (Ramaswami & Dreher, 2007).

The incorporation of a mentor into a college student affair professional"s professional development is also supported in the literature. Fey and Carpenter (1996) and Cooper and Miller (1998) found that mentoring relationships were vital to the professional and career development for protégés in the college student affairs profession. The participants who comprised all of the factors described in this study relied in some way on their mentor for professional advice, guidance, and development. Participants spoke with their mentors about the next steps in their careers, honed important professional skills, and were encouraged by their mentors to further their education and professional development. Mentoring relationships are developmental relationships at their core, but it is important to note that the perceptions expressed in this study indicated that mentoring relationships are considered an integral part of a college student affairs professional"s career development.

Limitations

Two primary limitations emerged during analysis of the data that might have impacted the results of this study. Participants were self-selected into this study.

Although the study received the endorsement of two college student affairs professional associations, participation in the study was still dependent on self-selection. Despite the self-selective nature of the study, the demographics of participants were fairly diverse. Although the study drew participants from 29 different states, across a wide spectrum of student affairs functional areas and diverse mentoring relationship characteristics, the fact that participants were self-selected into the study might have skewed the participants toward those who already had elevated interests in mentoring relationships. It is also possible that the range of mentoring relationships included in the data set was more positive than the full range of mentoring relationships in college student affairs. The results of the study, and the representative views of the 55 participants, might have been different had a different person set of college student affairs professionals participated.

Another possible contributing factor to the results of this study was the method used to collect Q sort data. As discussed in Chapter 3, the participants in this study needed access to a computer connected to the Internet to complete the Q sort. Although the use of computers for distributing and collecting research data is fairly common, it is possible that some individuals who received the invitation to participate chose not to because they did not have a computer with an Internet connection. Even if potential participants had a computer with an Internet connection, they may have felt uncomfortable using the software used to complete the Q sort. Although the use of these technologies may have helped diversify the participants" background characteristics, most notably location, it may have hindered some individuals from participating. The results of this study might have been different had another data collection method been used.

Recommendations for Practice

This study explored the perceptions of mentoring relationships through the lens of new professionals in college student affairs. The exploration and interpretation of mentoring relationships in college student affairs has some implications for practitioners. Overall, it should be noted that mentoring relationships are important and valuable tools for professional development in the field of college student affairs. These highly developmental relationships can and should be used as one of the methods to recruit, hire, train, and retain quality professionals in college student affairs.

Mentoring relationships are important tools for an institution or profession, and college student affairs leaders should make an effort to promote mentoring relationships for new professionals. Mentoring relationships can be an avenue through which values, norms, and best practices are conveyed to individuals who are new to the institution or profession. Although graduate preparatory programs succeed in teaching new professionals about the college student affairs profession, mentors can welcome and incorporate new professionals into the field. Mentoring relationships reach a depth of professional development rarely attained by other methods. Stakeholders and leaders in the field of college student affairs should make a concerted effort to promote mentoring relationships within the profession.

For mentors, it is important to remain cognizant of the experiences that new professionals have in the relationship. However, mentors should not tailor or adjust their relational style to fit within one of the factors described in this study. Instead, mentors should be mindful of the important themes generated by this study. Most importantly, the relationship should be developmental and purposeful in nature. Protégés should be

learning about themselves and their career through the relationship. Additionally, mentors should make their own inquiries into what the protégé expects from the relationship. Intentional conversations regarding the progress of the relationship will likely produce a healthier relationship. Additionally, more experienced college student affairs professionals who do not have a protégé should make a concerted effort to reach out to new professionals.

Although informal mentoring relationships typically provide more mentoring functions than formal mentoring relationships (Bozionelos, 2004; Chao et al., 1992; Ragins et al., 2000), sometimes the relationship is too informally defined. Mentors and protégés should take care to define the relationship. In the concourse interviews, I found that many of the protégés suspected that their mentors might not know about their role as a mentor. Although this is not surprising, it undoubtedly limits the relationship. Mentors cannot, intentionally or unintentionally, provide mentoring functions if they do not know to provide them. Protégés and mentors alike should be more intentional in defining the roles within the relationship.

In the same vein, new professionals may enter the field of college student affairs without a mentor. From the perspectives examined in this study, mentoring relationships are highly beneficial to the professional development of new college student affairs professionals. New professionals who do not have a mentor should make a concerted effort to seek out and develop a relationship with a more experienced student affairs professional. Although informal mentoring relationships tend to be more beneficial than formal relationships (Bozionelos, 2004; Chao et al., 1992; Ragins et al., 2000), that is not to say that informal relationships cannot be intentionally initiated. New professionals who

140

are currently a protégé in a mentoring relationship should be encouraged to take an active

role in the relationship. Many of the participants in this study commented on experiences

that they were not receiving but that they desired as a part of their relationship. Protégés

should actively petition their mentors for direction in the relationship; that is, if an aspect

of the relationship is missing, the protégé should address that absence with the mentor.

Additionally, protégés should not seek to model their mentoring relationship by the

factors described in this study.

Recommendations for Research

This study was an exploratory examination of mentoring relationships among new

college student affairs professionals as protégés. My research represents only the initial

exploration of the important topic of mentoring relationships. The results of this study

indicated that college student affairs mentoring research is valuable. Three

recommendations for future research were generated from this study. First, this study

further validated the use of Q methodology as an educational research tool, specifically

for college student affairs research. The richness and granularity gained from using Q

methodology is unparalleled. Researchers in college student affairs should take note that

Q methodology can be a very useful tool for researchers who are conducting exploratory

qualitative studies. The second recommendation of this study concerns potential areas for

researchers to use Q methodology to explore mentoring relationships further. Finally, this

study also recommends potential areas for research in mentoring relationships that may

not be well suited for Q methodology but are worthwhile research endeavors.

Very few, if any, studies have been conducted in college student affairs using Q

methodology. Q methodology has been used in numerous other educational research

domains, including other areas in higher education. However, college student affairs research has been devoid of studies using Q methodology. This study validated the ability of Q methodology to explore the various dimensions of individual subjectivity. When used to examine perspectives, beliefs, and viewpoints, traditional survey research methods do not match the depth offered by Q methodology. Provided that college student affairs researchers marry the research methodology with the research questions, they should consider using Q methodology more often. Its ability to explore the granularity of perspectives on a given subjective topic far outweighs that of other traditional research methods.

Additional research is warranted in mentoring relationships. The current study used Q methodology to explore the experiences of new college student affairs professionals in mentoring relationships as protégés. The perspective offered by the study is limited to one individual within the mentoring dyad, the protégé. Within the protégé"s perspective, the study is limited to only a subset of protégés in college student affairs, the new professional. Mentoring relationships are multi-faceted and complex, and this study is limited by its scope. Unfortunately, Q methodology is limited by the selection of the person set and the condition of instruction. This study has provided an interpretation of the perspective offered by 55 new professionals in college student affairs who were protégés in mentoring relationships. Additional research, specifically using Q methodology, might be helpful to contribute to the understanding of mentoring relationships in college student affairs. Q methodology is particularly well suited to exploring mentoring relationships because the researcher can explore the intricacies of relationships more with Q methodology than with other methodologies.

Future research using Q methodology should explore the role of mentors. Again, this study has offered an interpretation of only one aspect of mentoring relationships. However, the role of the mentor is equally as important as that of the protégé. The understanding gained by this study is only partial. Only after a more thorough exploration of the role of the mentor can a more complete understanding of mentoring relationships be provided. It would be powerful to construct a Q sample that could be sorted by both protégés and mentors regarding their current mentoring relationship. The two different person sets could be compared to see if a perceptual match or differentiation exists.

Additionally, future studies could also explore the role of the protégé in more advanced career stages than those explored in the current study. Although the majority of mentoring functions are provided in the early stages of the relationships (Chao et al., 1992; Kram, 1985), it is difficult for protégés to offer any perspective on those functions while they are in the midst of the early stages of their relationship. The participants in concourse interviews were able to analyze their mentoring relationship with greater acuity than could the 55 participants in phase 2. Perhaps additional research using a person set of protégés who are in more advanced stages of their mentoring relationships would yield more insight into the value of mentoring functions. These research endeavors would contribute to a fuller view of mentoring relationships in college student affairs.

Mentoring relationships have been shown to play a role in organizational socialization (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). The current study did not explore the extent to which mentoring relationships affected the socialization of new professionals in college student affairs. Organizational socialization is important to the training, development, and retention of employees. Future studies should explore the relationship

between mentoring relationships and organizational socialization. These studies could explore protégé characteristics such as career satisfaction, career competence, and intent to leave the profession. Research in this vein could significantly contribute to the understanding of the relationship between mentoring and socialization.

Finally, it should be noted that the current study was exploratory in nature. Although additional research using Q methodology would help contribute to a comprehensive understanding of mentoring relationships, these studies would also be limited in their ability to advance hypotheses. The current study has explored the dynamics of the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the 55 new professionals in student affairs who participated in the study. Although this study has provided greater insight into mentoring relationships, the results should be cautiously generalized to other populations. Future hypotheses-testing research on mentoring relationships is warranted. R methodological studies could measure the degree of career satisfaction or feelings of career competence among those college student affairs professionals who participated in one of the various types of mentoring relationships identified and discussed in this study. The expected outcomes for both mentors and protégés have been well researched outside the field of college student affairs (Dreher & Ash, 1990). However, the research on mentoring outcomes in college student affairs is anecdotal at best. Additional R methodological research into the outcomes of mentoring relationships in the field of college student affairs is needed. Research on mentoring outcomes could help validate the need for more in-depth research on mentoring relationships in college student affairs.

Conclusion

This study used Q methodology to examine the mentoring experiences of new professionals in college student affairs from their perspective as protégés. Fifty-five college student affairs professionals from 29 different states sorted 39 statements regarding mentoring relationships on a continuum from "least like my mentoring relationship" to "most like my mentoring relationship." Following factor analytic procedures on the 55 sorts, four factors emerged that represented distinct perspectives of mentoring relationships with new college student affairs professionals as protégés. Interpretation of these factors yielded distinct themes within them leading to the identification of these factors as (a) Mentor as Ideal, (b) Mentor as Cheerleader, (c) Mentor as Friend, and (d) Mentor as Teacher. The four factors represent the scope of mentoring relationships for the study. A summary of the salient charactistics of these factors can be found in Table 14.

This study and its results carry great importance for the field of college student affairs. The college student affairs profession is still in its infancy. It is a field that has struggled to find its identity and its place within the higher education landscape since the earliest days of the profession. Additionally, staff recruitment and retention issues have plagued the profession as it struggled to find a place within higher education. Although student affairs graduate preparation programs can prepare new professionals for some aspects of life within the profession, those programs cannot fully prepare new professionals for everything they may face in the early years in the field. Mentoring relationships can help new professionals in their transition into the workplace and into the college student affairs profession. The developmental hand of a mentor can be very

145

valuable to a new professional, and protégés in mentoring relationships can learn

immensely during their first few years in the profession. The results of this study enhance

the limited existing knowledge about mentoring relationships in college student affairs.

The perspectives described and the interpretation provided in this study can greatly assist

student affairs professionals in the development of new professionals who will be the

individuals who carry the profession beyond its infancy.

Consent Agreement for Concourse Interviews

University of North Florida

Consent to Participate in Scientific Investigations

Title of Research: Shepherding the Profession: Exploring Mentoring Experiences in
                        College Student Affairs

Investigator: Matthew Clifford, M.Ed.

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read the
following explanation of this study. This statement describes the purpose, procedures,
benefits, risks, discomforts, and precautions of the program. Also described are the
alternative procedures available to you, as well as your right to withdraw from the study
at any time.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of new professionals in college
student affairs, as protégés in mentoring relationships. You qualify to participate in this
study because you have worked in the field of college student affairs for more than 3
years but not more than 10 years. Additionally, during the time that you have worked in
college student affairs, you have had a mentor. A mentor is defined as a more
experienced individual who has helped a less experienced individual learn to navigate the
workplace.

If you choose to participate in this study you will complete a short demographic data
collection form and a single interview. The interview will be audiotaped by the researcher
and later reviewed by the researcher for the purpose of data analysis. The interviews will
be conducted at a setting that is mutually agreed upon by the participant and the
researcher.

Benefits of the Study
The anticipated benefit of participation in this study is the opportunity to discuss your
experiences, feelings, and perceptions related to your mentoring relationship.

Risks of the Study
There are no risks that are anticipated from your participation in this study.

Alternative Treatments
Because this study does not involve specific treatments or procedures, there are no known
alternative treatments to participating in this study.

Confidentiality

The information gathered during this study will remain confidential in a locked drawer during this project. Only the researcher will have access to the study data and information. There will not be any identifying names on the tapes, and participant's names will not be available. The tapes will be destroyed at the completion of the study. The results of the research will be published in the form of a dissertation and may be published in a professional journal or presented at professional meetings.

Withdrawal
Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study with no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Costs and Compensation
There will be no cost for participation in this study. Also, participants will not be paid to participate in this study.

Questions
For questions concerning this study, participants should contact Dr. Kathe Kasten at 904-620-1789. For questions regarding rights as a person in this study, participants should contact Dr. A. David Kline, Chair, UNF Institutional Review Board, (904) 620-2498.

Consent to Participate
This agreement states that you have received a copy of this informed consent. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in this study.

_____   _____
　　Signature of Participant　　　　　　　　　　　　Date

_____
　　Name of Participant (printed)

_____   _____
　　Signature of Researcher　　　　　　　　　　　　Date

Appendix B

Phase 1 Institutional Review Board Approval

UNF IRB Number: 08-192
Approval Date: 2-24-09
Revision Date: _____

UNF
UNIVERSITY of
NORTH FLORIDA.

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
1 UNF Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32224-2665
904-620-2455   FAX 904-620-2457
Equal Opportunity/Equal Access/Affirmative Action Institution

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 24, 2009

TO: Mr. Matthew Clifford

VIA: Drs. Katherine Kasten and Christopher Jansen
            Education and Human Services

FROM: Dr. David Kline, Chair,
            UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Review by the UNF Institutional Review Board IRB#08-192
            "Exploring Mentoring Experiences in College Student Affairs"

This is to advise you that your project, "Exploring Mentoring Experiences in College Student Affairs," has undergone "expedited" review on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board. A stamped and dated copy of your protocol and approval letter will be electronically forwarded in the near future.

As you may know, your CITI Course Completion Report is good for 3 years. Your completion report expires on 07/02/2011. If your completion report expires soon, or has expired, please take CITI's refresher course and email us a copy of your updated completion report. If applicable, once that updated completion report is reviewed and approved, you may move forward with your research.

Your study has been approved for a period of **12 months**. If your project continues for more than one year, you are required to provide a Continuing Status Report to the UNF IRB prior to 02/23/2010. We suggest you submit your status report 11 months from the date of your approval date as noted above to allow time for review and processing.

This approval applies to your project in the form and content as submitted to the IRB for review. Any variations or modifications to the approved protocol and/or informed consent forms as they relate to dealing with human subjects must be cleared with the IRB prior to implementing such changes. Any unanticipated problems involving risk and any occurrence of serious harm to subjects and others shall be reported promptly to the IRB.

Should you have questions regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 904.620.2455.

Thank you,

Research Integrity Staff

Appendix C

Concourse Interview Demographic Questionnaire

1. Gender

_____Male   _____Female   _____Transgender

2. Ethnicity

_____ American Indian or Alaska Native
_____ Asian
_____ Black or African American
_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
_____ White
_____ Hispanic/Latino/Latina
_____ Other:_____

3. What is the size of the institution where you are currently employed?

_____ Less than 1,000 students
_____ 1,000 – 2,999 students
_____ 3,000 – 9,999 students
_____ 10,000 or more students

4. In what state is the institution where you are currently employed located? _____

5. What best describes your primary area of responsibilities in your current position?

_____ Academic Advising	_____ International Student Programs
_____ Campus Activities/Student Union	_____ Multicultural Student Services
_____ Campus Ministry	_____ Orientation Programs
_____ Career Services	_____ Service-Learning Programs
_____ Counseling Services	_____ Student Conduct Programs
_____ Disability Support Services	_____ Student Leadership Programs
_____ Enrollment Services	_____ Wellness/Health
_____ Housing and Residential Life	_____ Other:_____

6. How many years have you worked in student affairs?

_____ Less than 3   _____ 3 – 6   _____ 7 – 10

7. How many years have you been a protégé in your mentoring relationship?

_____ Less than 2   _____ 2 – 5   _____ More than 5

Appendix D

Concourse Interview Protocol

1. Describe your current mentoring relationship.

2. If I were to observe that mentoring relationship, what would I see during the course of the relationship?

3. What experiences with your mentor did you have that developed your career skills?

      i. Specifically, in the areas of:

            1. Sponsorship

            2. Coaching

            3. Protection

            4. Challenge

            5. Exposure

4. What experiences with your mentor did you have that developed your psychosocial skills?

      i. Specifically, comment on your mentor's role as the following:

            1. Friend

            2. Role Model

            3. Counselor

5. How would your mentor describe your experiences in the relationship?

Appendix E

Appendix F

Survey instrument deleted, paper copy available upon request.

Appendix G

Survey instrument deleted, paper copy available upon request.

Appendix H

Communication Concourse

1. Mentor has shared history of his/her career with you.
2. Mentor has encouraged you to prepare for advancement.
3. Mentor has encouraged me to try new ways of behaving in my job.
4. I try to imitate the work behavior of my mentor.
5. I agree with my mentor's attitudes and values regarding education.
6. I respect and admire my mentor.
7. I will try to be like my mentor when I reach a similar position in my career.
8. My mentor has demonstrated good listening skills in our conversations.
9. My mentor has discussed questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts.
10. My mentor has shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my problems.
11. My mentor has encouraged me to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from my work.
12. My mentor has conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings I have discussed with him/her.
13. My mentor has kept feelings and doubts I shared with him/her in strict confidence.
14. My mentor has kept feelings of respect for me as an individual.
15. Mentor reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of becoming a school principal or receiving a promotion.
16. Mentor helped you finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete.
17. Mentor helped you meet new colleagues.
18. Mentor gave you assignments that increased written and personal contact with school administrators.
19. Mentor assigned responsibilities to you that have increased your contact with people in the district who may judge your potential for future advancement.
20. Mentor gave you assignments or tasks in your work that prepare you for an administrative position.
21. Mentor gave you assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills.
22. Mentor provided you with support and feedback regarding your performance as an educator.
23. Mentor suggested specific strategies for achieving your career goals.
24. Mentor shared ideas with you.
25. Mentor suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives.
26. Mentor gave you feedback regarding your performance in your present job.
27. My mentor has invited me to join him/her for lunch.
28. My mentor has asked me for suggestions concerning problems she/he has encountered at school.
29. My mentor has interacted with me socially outside of work.

30. My mentor helps me attain desirable positions.
31. My mentor uses his/her influence in the organization for my benefit.
32. My mentor uses his/her influence to support my advancement in the organizations.
33. My mentor suggests specific strategies for achieving career aspirations.
34. My mentor gives me advice on how to attain recognition in the organization.
35. My mentor helps me learn about other parts of the organization.
36. My mentor "runs interference" for me in the organization.
37. My mentor shields me from damaging contact with important people in the organization.
38. My mentor protects me from those who are out to get me.
39. My mentor provides me with challenging assignments.
40. My mentor assigns me tasks that push me into developing new skills.
41. My mentor gives me tasks that require me to learn new skills.
42. My mentor helps me be more visible in the organization.
43. My mentor creates opportunities for me to impress important people in the organization.
44. My mentor brings my accomplishments to the attention of important people in the organization.
45. My mentor is someone I can confide in.
46. My mentor provides support and encouragement.
47. My mentor is someone I can trust.
48. My mentor and I frequently have on-on-one, informal social interactions outside the work setting.
49. My mentor and I frequently get together informally after work by ourselves.
50. My mentor reminds me of one of my parents.
51. My mentor is like a father/mother to me.
52. My mentor treats me like a son/daughter.
53. My mentor serves as a role model for me.
54. My mentor represents who I want to be.
55. My mentor is someone I identify with.
56. My mentor guides my personal development.
57. My mentor serves as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself.
58. My mentor guides my professional development.
59. My mentor accepts me as a competent professional.
60. My mentor thinks highly of me.
61. My mentor sees me as being competent.
62. Gone out of his/her way to promote your academic interests.
63. Conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual.
64. Conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her.
65. Encouraged you to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from your work.
66. Shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to your problems.

67. Discussed your questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers and supervisors or work/family conflicts.
68. Shared history of his/her career with you.
69. Encouraged you to prepare for the next steps.
70. Served as a role model.
71. Displayed attitudes and values similar to your own.
72. Helped you finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete.
73. Protected you from working with other faculty, lecturers, or staff before you knew about their likes/dislikes, opinions on controversial topics, and the nature of the political environment.
74. Given you authorship on publications.
75. Helped you improve your writing skills.
76. Helped you with a presentation (either within your department, or at a conference).
77. Explored career options with you.
78. Given you challenging assignments that present opportunities to learn new skills.
79. Helped you meet other people in your field at the University.
80. Helped you meet other people in your field elsewhere.
81. Challenged me to be the best professional.
82. Challenged me to go above and beyond my position.
83. Provided constant challenge.
84. Provided direction.
85. Brainstorm and formulate ideas.
86. Professional relationship.
87. Not someone I would call to hang out with.
88. Set high expectations.
89. Challenged my ideas/values.
90. Developed respect because of care/concern.
91. Cared about me as a person and professional.
92. Help me go where I want to go.
93. Rewarded and praised me.
94. Pointed out areas where I could develop.
95. Spent time with me.
96. Helped me develop as an educator, not an administrator.
97. Showed an interest in my personal life.
98. Made sure I took care of myself.
99. Made sure I spent time with my spouse.
100. Focused on what we can do to better serve students.
101. Encouraged me to think about how to do things differently.
102. Helped shape and mold me as a new professional.
103. Made a difference in my life.
104. Helped me work with parents.
105. Was focused on student learning.
106. Coached me through a difficult situation.

107. Supported me.
108. Gave me opportunities to practice my skills/try out new things.
109. Is a role model.
110. Is someone I emulate.
111. Supported me in the absence of family.
112. Encouraged me to go into student affairs.
113. Challenge and support.
114. Is proud of me.
115. First person I call about professional news.
116. Troubleshoot/problem solve.
117. Debrief problems.
118. Unbiased/Neutral/Outsider's perspective.
119. Is excited about my work.
120. Encourages me to think from multiple perspectives.
121. Process-oriented analysis with my mentor.
122. Brainstorming.
123. Friendship.
124. I put my mentor on a pedestal.
125. My mentor and I work well together.
126. My mentor asks me for help.
127. I model my interactions with students after my mentor.
128. My mentor is a confidant.
129. My mentor helped me develop as a person.
130. My mentor is willing to counsel me.
131. Seen the worst & best of me.
132. I am comfortable with my mentor.
133. Developed my leadership skills.
134. Sounding board for me.
135. Is a friend.
136. My mentor and I interact socially at conferences.
137. I admire my mentor's career and personal life.
138. People who have challenged me, particularly in a problem.
139. Bounce ideas off of them.
140. Review job postings.
141. Ease my frustrations.
142. Ask mentors about job opportunities/career advice.
143. Sounding board.
144. My mentor is fair.
145. My mentor is knowledgeable.
146. Is a friend.
147. Relationship is informal.
148. Interacted socially.
149. There is mutual respect in the relationship.
150. Respects my opinion.
151. Treats me as a professional.
152. Is honest with me.

153. Is a straight-shooter; tells it like it is.
154. Helped me think from a different perspective.
155. Recognized my accomplishments.
156. Has served as a job reference for me.
157. Has used his network to my advantage.
158. Introduced me to people at conferences.
159. Encouraged me to develop professionally (go back to school).
160. Emphasizes balance.
161. Helped me in a time of need.
162. Cared for me as a person.
163. Bounce ideas off each other.
164. Unbiased person not at my institution.
165. Nurturing.
166. Provides feedback and support.
167. Networked for me.
168. Encouraged me to get involved professionally.
169. Is interested in me getting the most out of an experience.
170. Wanted to prepare me for the next step.
171. Questioned me about other skills I needed to develop.
172. Encouraged my well-roundedness.
173. Talk about our personal lives.
174. Challenges me.
175. Keeps me focused on my goals.
176. Interact socially at conferences.
177. Encouraged me to lead within professional associations.
178. Sponsored me to get a leadership position with a professional association.
179. Networked for me.
180. Encouraged me to get Ph.D.
181. Stressed the importance of advancing education and professional development.
182. Helps me examine multiple perspectives.
183. Family role model.
184. Stresses balance.
185. I depend on my mentor in my career.
186. Having a mentor has helped me get where I am now.
187. Open and honest conversations (professional and personal).
188. I saw a lot of myself in him.
189. Similar backgrounds and cultural characteristics.
190. Helped me get an understanding of who I was and who I wanted to become.
191. Influenced or changed my career path.
192. "Positional" role model.
193. Talk with him before, during, and after the interview process.
194. Guidance/pointers during interviews.
195. Helped me articulate my skills in interviews.
196. Helped me see the big picture.
197. Provided an unbiased resource for me.
198. Provided some stability for me at times.

199. Inspires me in how I do my current job.
200. Confided in me.
201. Shared important/confidential issues with me.
202. Helped me get my current position.
203. Molded me.
204. Had faith in me to accomplish things.
205. Encouraged me.
206. Helped me be a better supervisor.
207. Championed me to be in a leadership position.
208. Emphasizes balance.
209. Is a role model in his personal life (family issues).
210. An expert in the field.
211. An "icon" in the field.
212. Communicated mostly over the phone.
213. Occasionally interacted in person (3-4 times/year).
214. Demonstrated care and concern.
215. Was invested in me personally.
216. Directed me to a different career path.
217. Coached me out of a decision that I had made.
218. Helped me understand career development in student affairs.
219. Challenged me on some preconceived notions I had.
220. I respected my mentor.
221. I believed in my mentor.
222. My mentor believed in me.
223. My mentor saw potential in me.
224. We had purposeful conversations about my career.
225. Helped me learn to be a better supervisor.
226. Challenged me to examine my identity and grow beyond who I was.
227. Challenged me to stretch my view of the world (diversity).
228. Is someone I emulate.
229. Coached me through the Ph.D. process.
230. Emulation – balance; political management; approach to work.
231. Supervisor-Mentors sponsored me for projects/committees/areas of development.
232. Valued "outside the job" opportunities that advanced me (teaching opportunities, etc.).
233. My champion.
234. Applauded my efforts publicly.
235. Nominated me for awards (outside the job).
236. Wanted me to lead.
237. Helped me navigate institutional politics.
238. Backed me up politically.
239. Challenged me on issues of diversity (majority status, what it means to be an ally, using majority status to advance multicultural issues).
240. Pushed me towards excellence.
241. Affirmed me.
242. Friend/Role Model/Counselor.

243. Is someone I connect with personally.
244. We talk about personal issues.
245. Unbiased/External sounding board.
246. Asked me good questions – what do you need to get to the next step?.
247. Challenged/criticized areas for improvement.
248. Praised me when things went well.
249. Speak about personal issues.
250. Is knowledgeable/an expert in my area.
251. We talk about my future in the field.
252. Shares job opportunities.
253. Keeps things in perspective.
254. Is dedicated.
255. Advises me on balancing work and family life.
256. Opened up opportunities for me in the field.
257. Open and honest conversations.
258. Tailors experiences for my development.
259. Talk about faith and work.
260. Encourages involvement in professional associations.
261. Helps me consider alternatives.
262. Problem solves with me.
263. Coaches me through difficult decisions.
264. Is a role model in his family life.
265. Inspiring person through faith.
266. Strong values.
267. Open lines of communication.
268. Call on them in times of need/professional crisis.
269. Assistance in transition to new job (no mentor there yet).
270. Unbiased/Third party perspective.
271. Call on them for career advice.
272. Talked about where my life was going.
273. Talked about how my mentor got where he/she was.
274. Sought advice/counsel.
275. I can be vulnerable with my mentor (be honest about my anxiety about future).
276. I can let my guard down with my mentor.
277. One-on-one meetings shift from tasky to feedback & constructive criticism (or career guidance).
278. I respect my mentor.
279. I wanted to please my mentor.
280. My mentor is invested in me.
281. I don''t want to embarrass my mentor.
282. I socialize outside the workplace with my mentor.
283. I call on my mentor when I need guidance and expertise.
284. I call on my mentor for advice in times of need.
285. I periodically check in with my mentor.
286. Challenge.
287. My mentors have confronted me (constructively) about decisions I make.

288. I trust my mentor.
289. My mentors have intervened for me.
290. My mentors have gotten opportunities.
291. My mentors have opened doors for me with other people.
292. My mentors have helped me network in professional associations.
293. My mentors have sponsored me for opportunities/committees/etc..
294. My mentor has been a champion for me.
295. Support.
296. Protector/shield.
297. My mentors have helped me think through the steps along my career path.
298. My mentors have felt comfortable disagreeing with me.
299. I have learned about how to live my family life from my mentors" examples.
300. I have contacted my mentor in a time of personal crisis.
301. Neutral sounding board.
302. Champion.
303. Keep me thinking about my future (5, 10 years).
304. Bigger picture – career.
305. Next steps for my career.
306. Convenience mentors (mentors who are close to me and are familiar with my situations).
307. Honest feedback.
308. Give and take between mentor and protégé.
309. Constantly seeking feedback.
310. What do I need to do now to set myself up for success later.
311. Encouraged me to present/publish/involvement in associations.
312. Set me up for success.
313. Intentional relationships.
314. Helping me branch out beyond my immediate job responsibilities.
315. Help me chart a course in a different career track.
316. Used my mentors" expertise.
317. My personality is similar to my mentor.
318. I admire the personal qualities of my mentor.
319. I can relate to my mentor.
320. My mentor helps me seek out opportunities in professional associations.
321. My mentor has introduced me to people.
322. My mentor has helped me understand the political/networking landscape of organizations.
323. I have met people at my institution who I would not have met otherwise.
324. My mentor helps me navigate political pitfalls.
325. My mentor has supported/stood behind me on a decision I"ve made.
326. I am captivated by my mentors.
327. We talked about the next steps.
328. My mentor was invested in my professional development.
329. My mentors helped me examine career moves/grad school.
330. My mentor encouraged me to go to grad school.
331. My mentors have helped me network.

332. Mentors have opened up opportunities for me.
333. My mentors have identified areas of development for me in my career.
334. My mentors helped me learn more about an institution"s culture.
335. My mentors are supportive.
336. My mentors have coached me through a difficult decision.
337. My mentors have offered constructive criticism.
338. My mentors approach the relationship with a learning focus.
339. My mentors have shielded me from potentially harmful situations.
340. My mentor engages me in professional associations.
341. My mentors have taken me under their wing.
342. Offered me sage wisdom.
343. Taken care when offering me guidance.

Appendix I

Q Sample

1. My mentor has made efforts to relate to me.
2. My mentor has encouraged me to further my education or professional development.
3. My mentor has praised my work and me.
4. My mentor has allowed me to use his/her expertise and knowledge.
5. My mentor has served as a sounding board for me.
6. My mentor has helped me navigate institutional politics.
7. My mentor has helped me meet people in the field who I would not have met otherwise.
8. My mentor has intervened on my behalf.
9. My mentor has supported me during a personal crisis.
10. My mentor has provided me with a neutral perspective.
11. My mentor has talked to me about the next steps in my career.
12. My mentor has helped me develop and understand myself.
13. My mentor has demonstrated trustworthiness.
14. My mentor has shown confidence in me to achieve.
15. My mentor has helped me gain desirable opportunities in the field (for example, leadership positions, committee memberships).
16. My mentor has provided experiences where I can learn something new.
17. My mentor has served as a confidant.
18. My mentor has helped me debrief problems and consider alternative solutions.
19. My mentor has valued my ideas and opinions.
20. My mentor has recognized my potential for success in student affairs.
21. My mentor has taught me how to balance my personal and professional life.
22. My mentor has used his/her network in the field for my benefit.
23. My mentor has created a relationship based on mutual respect.
24. My mentor has shielded me from a potentially harmful professional situation.
25. My mentor has demonstrated admirable personal qualities and values.
26. My mentor has demonstrated care and concern for me as a person and professional.
27. My mentor has given me honest feedback and support.
28. My mentor has inspired me in how I conduct myself professionally.
29. My mentor has created an atmosphere where I can be vulnerable.
30. My mentor has challenged my perspectives and preconceptions.
31. My mentor has stood behind me on a decision I have made.
32. My mentor has expected excellence from me.
33. My mentor has provided stability for me.
34. My mentor and I have interacted socially outside the workplace.
35. My mentor has influenced my career path.
36. My mentor has praised my efforts to important people in student affairs.
37. My mentor has identified areas in which I can improve.
38. My mentor has advised me during a difficult professional situation.
39. My mentor has shared and formulated ideas with me.

Appendix J

Post-Q Sort Questionnaire

1. Describe why the items you placed at the (+4) end of the continuum are most like your

mentoring relationship.

2. Describe why the items you placed at the (-4) end of the continuum are least like your

mentoring relationship.

3. Gender

_____Male   _____Female   _____Transgender

4. Ethnicity

_____ American Indian or Alaska Native
_____ Asian
_____ Black or African American
_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
_____ White

5. What is your educational background?

_____ Some Bachelors-level work
_____ Bachelors Degree
_____ Some Masters-level work
_____ Masters Degree
_____ Some Doctoral-level work
_____ Doctorate Degree

6. What is the size of the institution where you are currently employed?

_____ Less than 1,000
_____ 1,000 – 2,999
_____ 3,000 – 9,999
_____ 10,000 or greater

7. In what state is the institution where you are currently employed located? _____

8. What best describes your primary area of responsibilities in your current position?

_____ Academic Advising   _____ International Student Programs

_____ Campus Activities/Student Union   _____ Multicultural Student Services

_____ Campus Ministry   _____ Orientation Programs

_____ Career Services   _____ Service-Learning Programs

_____ Counseling Services   _____ Student Conduct Programs

_____ Disability Support   _____ Student Leadership Programs

_____ Enrollment Services   _____ Wellness/Health

_____ Housing and Residential Life

9. How many years have you worked in student affairs?

_____ Less than 2   _____ 2 – 5

10. How many years have you been a protégé in your mentoring relationship?

_____ Less than 2   _____ 2 – 5

11. Mentor's gender

_____ Male   _____ Female   _____ Transgender

12. Mentor's ethnicity
_____ American Indian or Alaska Native
_____ Asian
_____ Black or African American
_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
_____ White

13. How many years has your mentor worked in student affairs?

_____ Less than 3   _____ 3 to 6   _____ 7 to 10 _____ More than 10

14. Which of the following best describes your relationship to your mentor?

_____ Current Supervisor
_____ Former Supervisor
_____ Colleague
_____ Graduate Advisor/Faculty Member
_____ Undergraduate Advisor/Faculty Member
_____ None of these

15. What specific statements did you find difficult to place and describe your decision process?

16. Describe any other thoughts or ideas about mentoring relationships that emerged for you while sorting these statements.

Appendix K

Phase 2 Invitation

Dear Colleague,

Greetings! I hope that you enjoying your summer.

I am conducting research to complete the requirements for the Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Leadership at the University of North Florida. The purpose of my study is to examine the subjective experiences of college student affairs professionals participating in mentoring relationships as protégés.

Mentoring relationships are highly functioning, developmental relationships that can offer significant benefits to the mentor, protégé, and the organization. The field of college student affairs relies on mentoring relationships at least in part for the recruitment, training, development, retention, and promotion of individuals within the profession. Despite the value of mentoring to student affairs professionals, very little is known about the experiences of new professionals as protégés during the course of a mentoring relationship.

This study uses Q methodology, the central part of which consists of participants sorting and ranking a number of statements from "most like my mentoring relationship" to "least like my mentoring relationship." Participants will complete this sorting process electronically.

Participants for this study will be student affairs professionals whose full-time employment experience in the field is 5 years or less. Additionally, participants will have had previous experience(s) as a protégé in a mentoring relationship.

If you meet the qualifications listed above and would like to participate in this study, please click here. If you are unable to access the website, please type the following web address into your web browser:

http://www.unf.edu/~n00108152

Please note that the completion of this exercise will take approximately 30 minutes.

Although e-mail and electronic communication are not 100% secure, no personal information about you or any information identifying your institution will be collected or retained. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may end your participation in the study by closing your browser window at any time. There are no anticipated risks associated with completing this study.

Should you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this study, please contact Matthew Clifford by phone at (904) 256-7067 or by email at mcliffo@ju.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Institutional Review Board, University of North Florida, by phone at (904) 620-2316 or by email at irb@unf.edu, if any problems or concerns arise during the course of the study.

Thank you in advance for your participation,

Matthew Clifford, M. Ed.
Director of Residential Life
Jacksonville University
Phone: (904) 256-7067
E-mail: mcliffo@ju.edu

UNF IRB – APPROVED FOR USE
PROTOCOL #08-192
EFFECTIVE 6-16-09
EXPIRES 6-16-10

Appendix L

Phase 2 Institutional Review Board Approval

UNF IRB Number: _08-192_
Approval Date: _6-16-09_
Revision Date: _____

UNF
UNIVERSITY *of*
NORTH FLORIDA.

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
1 UNF Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32224-2665
904-620-2455   FAX 904-620-2457
Equal Opportunity/Equal Access/Affirmative Action Institution

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 16, 2009

TO: Mr. Mathew W. Clifford

VIA: Dr. Katherine Kasten

FROM: Dr. Christopher Leone, Interim Chair,
               UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Review by the UNF Institutional Review Board IRB#08-192:
               "Exploring Mentoring Relationships in College Student Affairs"

This is to advise you that your project, "Exploring Mentoring Relationships in College Student Affairs" has undergone "expedited" review on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board. A stamped and dated copy of your protocol and approval letter will be electronically forwarded in the near future.

As you may know, your **CITI Course Completion Report** is valid for 3 years. Your completion report is valid through 07/02/11.

Your study has been approved for a period of **12 months**. If your project continues for more than one year, you are required to provide a Continuing Status Report to the UNF IRB prior to 05/16/2010. *We suggest you submit your status report 11 months from the date of your approval date as noted above to allow time for review and processing.*

This approval applies to your project in the form and content as submitted to the IRB for review. Any variations or modifications to the approved protocol and/or informed consent forms as they relate to dealing with human subjects must be cleared with the IRB prior to implementing such changes. Any unanticipated problems involving risk and any occurrence of serious harm to subjects and others shall be reported promptly to the IRB.

Should you have questions regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 904.620.2455.

Thank you,

Research Integrity Staff

Appendix M

Phase 2 Consent Agreement

University of North Florida

Consent to Participate in Scientific Investigations

<u>Title of Research</u>:   Shepherding the Profession: Exploring Mentoring Experiences in College Student Affairs

<u>Investigator</u>:   Matthew Clifford, M.Ed.

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read the following explanation of this study. This statement describes the purpose, procedures, benefits, risks, discomforts, and precautions of the program. Also described are the alternative procedures available to you, as well as your right to withdraw from the study at any time. No guarantees or assurances can be made as to the results of the study.

<u>Purpose of the Study</u>
The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of new professionals in college student affairs, as protégés in mentoring relationships. You qualify to participate in this study because you have worked in the field of college student affairs for less than 5 years. Additionally, during the time that you have worked in college student affairs, you have had a mentor. A mentor is defined as a more experienced individual who has helped a less experienced individual learn to navigate the workplace.

If you choose to participate in this study you will complete a process known as a Q sort. During the Q sort you will rank-order 39 statements about mentoring according to your experiences in a mentoring relationship. Following the Q sort, you will complete a demographic questionnaire and answer a few short questions about your responses.

<u>Benefits of the Study</u>
The anticipated benefit of participation in this study is the opportunity to discuss your experiences, feelings, and perceptions related to your mentoring relationship.

<u>Risks of the Study</u>
There are no risks that are anticipated from your participation in this study.

<u>Alternative Treatments</u>
Because this study does not involve specific treatments or procedures, there are no known alternative treatments to participating in this study.

<u>Confidentiality</u>
The information gathered during this study will remain on a secure server at the University of North Florida during this project. The server has several layers of security.

Directory listings for the site are disallowed, which prevents an individual from searching for the database file. Should an individual ascertain the location of the database file, accessing the file is possible only by breaching the server's firewall and using the researcher's password. Finally, the use of an Adobe Flash web object further shields the database location from other individuals because the location and code is encrypted in the object itself. Only the researcher will have access to the study data and information. There will not be any identifying names on the Q sort, and participants' names will not be available. The Q sorts and responses will be destroyed at the completion of the study. The results of the research will be published in the form of a dissertation and may be published in a professional journal or presented at professional meetings.

Withdrawal
Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study with no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Costs and Compensation
There will be no cost for participation in this study. Also, participants will not be paid to participate in this study.

Questions
For questions concerning this study, participants should contact Mr. Matthew Clifford at mcliffo@ju.edu or 904-256-7067 or Dr. Katherine Kasten at kkasten@unf.edu or 904-620-1789. For questions regarding rights as a person in this study, participants should contact Dr. Christopher Leone, Interim IRB Chair, UNF Institutional Review Board, (904) 620-2316.

Consent to Participate
This agreement states that you have received a copy of this informed consent. By clicking "Continue" below, you indicate that you agree to participate in this study.

Q Sorting Grid

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4

Appendix O

P Set Demographic Data

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
1	Male	White	Some Doctoral	1000 - 2999	FL	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Male	White	7 - 10	Current Supervisor
2	Female	Black	Masters	10000+	SC	Housing	<2	2 - 5	Female	Black	10+	Former Supervisor
3	Female	White	Masters	3000 - 9999	MA	Activities	<2	<2	Male	White	3 - 6	Current Supervisor
4	Female	White	Masters	10000+	NC	Advising	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
5	Male	Black	Masters	10000+	GA	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
6	Female	White	Masters	10000+	KY	Orientation	<2	2 - 5	Female	White	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
7	Female	White	Masters	10000+	VA	Leadership	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor
8	Female	White	Masters	10000+	SC	Enrollment	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
9	Female	White	Masters	10000+	GA	Leadership	<2	<2	Female	White	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
10	Female	Asian	Masters	10000+	MO	Leadership	<2	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
11	Female	White	Masters	10000+	UT	Leadership	<2	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
12	Female	White	Masters	10000+	NY	Advising	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Faculty
13	Male	White	Masters	10000+	VA	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	7 - 10	Colleague
14	Female	White	Masters	10000+	FL	Leadership	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor
15	Female	Hispanic	Masters	10000+	TX	Enrollment	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
16	Female	White	Masters	3000 - 9999	NC	Career Services	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Colleague
17	Female	White	Doctorate	10000+	ND	Activities	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Other
18	Female	White	Masters	10000+	AR	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	7 - 10	Faculty
19	Male	Hispanic	Masters	10000+	OH	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Former Supervisor
20	Female	White	Masters	10000+	NC	Wellness	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Current Supervisor
21	Male	Black	Masters	10000+	TN	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	Black	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
22	Female	White	Masters	10000+	LA	Activities	<2	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
23	Male	White	Masters	10000+	SC	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	7 - 10	Colleague
24	Male	White	Masters	10000+	ND	Advising	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
25	Female	White	Masters	10000+	IL	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Current Supervisor
26	Female	White	Some Masters	1000 - 2999	MN	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
27	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	OH	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Black	10+	Former Supervisor
28	Female	White	Masters	10000+	MO	Advising	<2	2 - 5	Female	Black	3 - 6	Former Supervisor
29	Female	White	Masters	10000+	MN	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Other
30	Female	Asian	Masters	10000+		Service	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Asian	10+	Current Supervisor
31	Female	White	Doctorate	10000+	MI	Conduct	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	10+	Current Supervisor
32	Female	Black	Some Masters	10000+	MI	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	<3	Colleague
33	Female	White	Masters	10000+	MI	Career Services	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
34	Male	Black	Masters	1000 - 2999	NC	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Black	3 - 6	Colleague

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
35	Female	White	Some Doctoral	10000+	PA	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
36	Female	White	Masters	3000 - 9999	MN	Career Services	<2	<2	Female	White	3 - 6	Other
37	Male	White	Masters	10000+	NJ	Leadership	2 - 5	<2	Female	Hispanic	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
38	Male	Black	Bachelors	10000+	PA	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	Black	10+	Other
39	Female	White	Masters	10000+	MD	Leadership	<2	2 - 5	Male	White	7 - 10	Faculty
40	Male	White	Masters	10000+	VA	Activities	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	White	10+	Former Supervisor
41	Female	White	Bachelors	1000 - 2999	AL	Housing	<2	<2	Female	White	3 - 6	Current Supervisor
42	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	IN	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Female	Hispanic	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
43	Male	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	IO	Career Services	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor
44	Female	White	Masters	3000 - 9999	MA	Service	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	Hispanic	10+	Current Supervisor
45	Male	White	Some Doctoral	1000 - 2999	TX	Career Services	2 - 5	<2	Female	White	7 - 10	Current Supervisor
46	Male	Black	Masters	10000+	MS	Enrollment	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	Black	10+	Colleague
47	Male	Black	Bachelors	10000+	AL	Leadership	<2	2 - 5	Female	White	3 - 6	Current Supervisor
48	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	NJ	Housing	2 - 5	2 – 5	Male	White	10+	Former Supervisor
49	Female	Hispanic	Masters	3000 - 9999		Multicultural	2 - 5	<2	Female	Black	<3	Former Supervisor
50	Female	Asian	Masters	<1000	OR	Housing	<2	<2	Female	Black	7 - 10	Former Supervisor
51	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	CO	Service	<2	<2	Female	White	10+	Current Supervisor
52	Male	Black	Masters	10000+	VT	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Male	White	7 - 10	Faculty
53	Female	White	Masters	1000 - 2999	IL	Activities	<2	<2	Male	White	3 - 6	Current Supervisor

Sort ID	Protégé Gender	Protégé Ethnicity	Protégé Education	Protégé Institution Size	Protégé Location	Protégé Functional Area	Protégé Years in Field	Years in Relationship	Mentor Gender	Mentor Ethnicity	Mentor Years in Field	Mentor Relationship to Protégé
54	Female	White	Some Masters	1000 - 2999	NY	Housing	2 - 5	2 - 5	Female	Hispanic	3 - 6	Current Supervisor
55	Female	White	Some Doctoral	10000+	MI	Housing	2 - 5	<2	Male	White	10+	Other

Appendix P

Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1	100	23	15	10	-5	37	-17	33	42	19	18	38	32	16	28	30	22	-5	2	20	15	40	27	28	8	-1	9	17
2	23	100	38	50	16	47	1	54	41	46	33	59	37	40	26	18	39	24	49	34	0	42	31	33	16	55	17	25
3	15	38	100	47	17	35	35	19	22	27	46	32	5	48	52	8	49	34	22	27	19	32	-7	13	34	30	31	38
4	10	50	47	100	17	36	8	34	22	37	17	42	15	33	29	31	40	52	25	42	2	26	33	8	-4	49	25	23
5	-5	16	17	17	100	-5	17	10	1	-8	33	18	2	-4	9	7	19	17	35	-7	-12	35	-8	-7	28	7	41	25
6	37	47	35	36	-5	100	36	25	38	61	51	53	6	50	39	5	14	22	25	26	-5	22	14	34	-5	35	32	8
7	-17	1	35	8	17	36	100	-28	-1	22	34	10	-45	31	31	-19	-8	14	33	-6	13	-1	-19	-10	5	1	28	15
8	33	54	19	34	10	25	-28	100	40	23	25	51	53	28	6	30	29	28	7	46	1	49	17	38	34	7	1	-1
9	42	41	22	22	1	38	-1	40	100	26	42	40	33	34	-2	4	39	23	26	10	38	35	12	6	42	27	17	7
10	19	46	27	37	-8	61	22	23	26	100	23	53	26	39	16	1	3	44	45	36	-3	27	-1	50	-8	45	45	14
11	18	33	46	17	33	51	34	25	42	23	100	27	11	41	45	1	26	16	27	20	11	27	-9	17	20	25	25	-1
12	38	59	32	42	18	53	10	51	40	53	27	100	26	22	2	-6	28	25	31	20	-2	36	13	27	32	41	22	5
13	32	37	5	15	2	6	-45	53	33	26	11	26	100	5	1	33	8	6	13	40	16	32	22	29	27	20	16	10
14	16	40	48	33	-4	50	31	28	34	39	41	22	5	100	41	11	32	37	34	27	10	15	4	20	20	23	37	10
15	28	26	52	29	9	39	31	6	-2	16	45	2	1	41	100	1	18	3	13	26	2	23	22	23	-18	13	37	27
16	30	18	8	31	7	5	-19	30	4	1	1	-6	33	11	1	100	3	34	9	40	31	10	30	6	-2	10	-1	20
17	22	39	49	40	19	14	-8	29	39	3	26	28	8	32	18	3	100	22	7	-1	11	42	19	9	30	32	13	40
18	-5	24	34	52	17	22	14	28	23	44	16	25	6	37	3	34	22	100	27	29	16	32	-9	13	3	26	30	4
19	2	49	22	25	35	25	33	7	26	45	27	31	13	34	13	9	7	27	100	22	15	17	9	-4	2	49	44	14
20	20	34	27	42	-7	26	-6	46	10	36	20	40	27	27	26	40	-1	29	22	100	-6	38	4	41	-9	6	1	-4
21	15	0	19	2	-12	-5	13	1	38	-3	11	-2	16	10	2	31	11	16	15	-6	100	-11	8	-25	24	9	15	26
22	40	42	32	26	35	22	-1	49	35	27	27	36	32	15	23	10	42	32	17	38	-11	100	1	41	28	2	25	30
23	27	31	-7	33	-8	14	-19	17	12	-1	-9	13	22	4	22	30	19	-9	9	4	8	1	100	22	-33	23	-8	32
24	28	33	13	8	-7	34	-10	38	6	50	17	27	29	20	23	6	9	13	-4	41	-25	41	22	100	-20	11	5	22
25	8	16	34	-4	28	-5	5	34	42	-8	20	32	27	20	-18	-2	30	3	2	-9	24	28	-33	-20	100	1	15	7
26	-1	55	30	49	7	35	1	7	27	45	25	41	20	23	13	10	32	26	49	6	9	2	23	11	1	100	32	32
27	9	17	31	25	41	32	28	1	17	45	25	22	16	37	37	-1	13	30	44	1	15	25	-8	5	15	32	100	43
28	17	25	38	23	25	8	15	-1	7	14	-1	5	10	10	27	20	40	4	14	-4	26	30	32	22	7	32	43	100
29	33	33	32	22	33	22	3	35	48	-6	38	23	28	21	13	38	49	13	13	6	30	35	42	-3	39	14	10	37
30	-6	17	-10	-25	10	21	18	1	27	24	24	7	10	23	-9	-19	-15	-17	14	-34	24	-13	-10	-4	31	9	36	20
31	22	36	17	22	6	49	37	-4	9	32	32	3	-6	29	54	15	-12	4	30	24	-5	1	12	14	-26	35	36	22
32	-3	-21	34	16	-3	1	30	-25	-6	17	3	-4	-33	31	17	-22	12	17	2	-25	-9	-13	2	14	-12	3	15	6
33	17	43	19	22	-11	55	11	26	11	53	8	34	2	51	22	6	0	37	20	33	-20	25	18	56	-26	10	28	5
34	-18	1	-13	-32	-11	17	31	-23	16	23	28	1	-10	15	-13	-16	-47	-11	22	-20	26	-42	-27	-13	15	12	15	-19
35	19	29	55	35	12	-6	7	42	37	10	25	18	33	26	18	20	42	25	16	31	28	38	-2	13	40	8	2	26
36	30	20	34	25	15	39	33	9	8	22	29	39	-9	13	30	-15	13	-20	12	-6	-9	10	3	4	17	27	35	24
37	0	25	51	13	8	22	27	13	32	11	49	3	-4	42	28	11	40	30	27	23	22	19	10	10	15	17	16	26
38	45	40	33	23	-3	59	37	17	35	48	18	59	9	35	31	-24	9	12	25	-2	-2	19	15	26	8	28	28	12
39	36	28	46	19	31	48	33	18	35	38	51	33	5	43	45	-11	20	-2	28	-1	2	31	-12	8	37	34	62	37

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
40	6	19	30	24	17	2	24	23	24	8	31	8	12	48	33	3	26	32	16	18	21	30	10	8	27	15	12	19
41	-13	30	36	8	22	-11	20	10	10	20	19	20	-4	20	15	-7	10	27	29	12	23	23	2	25	16	23	9	28
42	4	12	-8	2	35	-1	-1	28	33	-26	5	14	15	1	-28	3	21	10	5	13	0	33	5	-14	31	-22	-2	1
43	-17	21	34	17	19	-8	9	24	-11	-7	25	-12	18	37	35	12	23	14	13	23	-4	20	19	20	4	13	8	30
44	34	33	53	35	23	41	21	37	47	28	49	30	24	33	16	33	45	17	18	35	26	40	6	19	44	18	29	41
45	16	39	32	47	-5	25	2	51	25	47	26	22	42	42	19	37	30	37	37	48	17	34	20	33	10	28	15	3
46	-5	39	30	31	21	40	25	19	7	52	13	40	12	20	22	2	17	42	38	8	-2	26	4	22	-1	44	63	34
47	11	25	39	30	-4	52	38	-2	-2	41	39	32	-26	49	46	-15	1	2	28	22	-26	-5	5	24	-19	32	25	1
48	-4	45	20	23	31	25	52	-7	14	33	32	32	9	27	31	-8	-6	11	47	10	4	18	2	12	12	25	52	17
49	24	36	34	8	32	30	20	51	39	2	56	33	23	46	35	12	31	11	23	6	32	24	13	19	44	18	18	24
50	6	26	55	48	15	20	22	23	24	6	41	21	2	45	27	26	35	41	16	22	42	17	17	2	18	22	13	34
51	18	29	59	12	20	27	31	19	17	14	50	-9	15	40	55	28	26	20	15	20	33	31	6	30	11	3	23	44
52	20	51	41	31	-1	23	12	17	32	29	34	48	12	22	5	-6	41	6	26	25	10	29	-13	13	35	42	0	10
53	35	46	19	-1	21	35	8	31	33	30	47	39	27	38	15	11	16	20	46	10	2	32	-11	19	34	46	18	0
54	-9	27	12	-20	33	-10	-1	26	18	9	15	11	17	33	-12	-8	22	9	26	-21	5	15	-5	20	46	23	23	25
55	33	16	47	31	19	31	35	10	23	40	31	43	13	18	40	-1	12	32	34	22	16	37	2	25	18	23	35	12

	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55
1	33	-6	22	-3	17	-18	19	30	0	45	36	6	-13	4	-17	34	16	-5	11	-4	24	6	18	20	35	-9	33
2	33	17	36	-21	43	1	29	20	25	40	28	19	30	12	21	33	39	39	25	45	36	26	29	51	46	27	16
3	32	-10	17	34	19	-13	55	34	51	33	46	30	36	-8	34	53	32	30	39	20	34	55	59	41	19	12	47
4	22	-25	22	16	22	-32	35	25	13	23	19	24	8	2	17	35	47	31	30	23	8	48	12	31	-1	-20	31
5	33	10	6	-3	-11	-11	12	15	8	-3	31	17	22	35	19	23	-5	21	-4	31	32	15	20	-1	21	33	19
6	22	21	49	1	55	17	-6	39	22	59	48	2	-11	-1	-8	41	25	40	52	25	30	20	27	23	35	-10	31
7	3	18	37	30	11	31	7	33	27	37	33	24	20	-1	9	21	2	25	38	52	20	22	31	12	8	-1	35
8	35	1	-4	-25	26	-23	42	9	13	17	18	23	10	28	24	37	51	19	-2	-7	51	23	19	17	31	26	10
9	48	27	9	-6	11	16	37	8	32	35	35	24	10	33	-11	47	25	7	-2	14	39	24	17	32	33	18	23
10	-6	24	32	17	53	23	10	22	11	48	38	8	20	-26	-7	28	47	52	41	33	2	6	14	29	30	9	40
11	38	24	32	3	8	28	25	29	49	18	51	31	19	5	25	49	26	13	39	32	56	41	50	34	47	15	31
12	23	7	3	-4	34	1	18	39	3	59	33	8	20	14	-12	30	22	40	32	32	33	21	-9	48	39	11	43
13	28	10	-6	-33	2	-10	33	-9	-4	9	5	12	-4	15	18	24	42	12	-26	9	23	2	15	12	27	17	13
14	21	23	29	31	51	15	26	13	42	35	43	48	20	1	37	33	42	20	49	27	46	45	40	22	38	33	18
15	13	-9	54	17	22	-13	18	30	28	31	45	33	15	-28	35	16	19	22	46	31	35	27	55	5	15	-12	40
16	38	-19	15	-22	6	-16	20	-15	11	-24	-11	3	-7	3	12	33	37	2	-15	-8	12	26	28	-6	11	-8	-1
17	49	-15	-12	12	0	-47	42	13	40	9	20	26	10	21	23	45	30	17	1	-6	31	35	26	41	16	22	12
18	13	-17	4	17	37	-11	25	-20	30	12	-2	32	27	10	14	17	37	42	2	11	11	41	20	6	20	9	32
19	13	14	30	2	20	22	16	12	27	25	28	16	29	5	13	18	37	38	28	47	23	16	15	26	46	26	34
20	6	-34	24	-25	33	-20	31	-6	23	-2	-1	18	12	13	23	35	48	8	22	10	6	22	20	25	10	-21	22
21	30	24	-5	-9	-20	26	28	-9	22	-2	2	21	23	0	-4	26	17	-2	-26	4	32	42	33	10	2	5	16
22	35	-13	1	-13	25	-42	38	10	19	19	31	30	23	33	20	40	34	26	-5	18	24	17	31	29	32	15	37
23	42	-10	12	2	18	-27	-2	3	10	15	-12	10	2	5	19	6	20	4	5	2	13	17	6	-13	-11	-5	2
24	-3	-4	14	14	56	-13	13	4	10	26	8	8	25	-14	20	19	33	22	24	12	19	2	30	13	19	20	25
25	39	31	-26	-12	-26	15	40	17	15	8	37	27	16	31	4	44	10	-1	-19	12	44	18	11	35	34	46	18
26	14	9	35	3	10	12	8	27	17	28	34	15	23	-22	13	18	28	44	32	25	18	22	3	42	46	23	23
27	10	36	36	15	28	15	2	35	16	28	62	12	9	-2	8	29	15	63	25	52	18	13	23	0	18	23	35
28	37	20	22	6	5	-19	26	24	26	12	37	19	28	1	30	41	3	34	1	17	24	34	44	10	0	25	12
29	100	9	4	-18	-4	-20	29	7	30	9	19	38	13	48	8	61	19	5	-14	3	45	36	35	12	25	19	5
30	9	100	25	-14	8	72	-11	28	6	17	47	11	3	2	-3	11	-12	15	1	26	26	-2	6	2	19	46	-16
31	4	25	100	-2	33	28	-18	44	17	37	49	26	-1	-16	9	8	2	30	53	35	16	-6	27	13	20	-6	10
32	-18	-14	-2	100	18	-4	8	19	14	27	15	18	18	-36	17	-6	15	12	49	5	-1	12	19	-1	-17	9	30
33	-4	8	33	18	100	-2	-23	11	13	38	13	-2	16	7	5	3	21	52	45	25	2	5	13	1	9	9	12
34	-20	72	28	-4	-2	100	18	10	18	10	27	-3	10	-25	-16	-1	-15	-2	22	31	17	1	-3	1	24	23	2
35	29	-11	-18	8	-23	-18	100	-2	32	9	12	32	29	2	33	42	39	-12	-14	13	35	44	37	28	15	13	33
36	7	28	44	19	11	10	-2	100	-5	41	67	8	-14	-7	3	26	11	37	48	25	15	-6	3	42	17	3	31
37	30	6	17	14	13	18	32	-5	100	4	23	27	31	8	46	42	25	12	30	9	51	53	46	11	16	28	19
38	9	17	37	27	38	10	9	41	4	100	45	23	6	6	0	13	-1	32	42	33	26	15	11	24	37	11	41
39	19	47	49	15	13	27	12	67	23	45	100	24	12	-10	15	48	13	32	46	26	41	20	33	25	45	35	35
40	38	11	26	18	-2	-3	32	8	27	23	24	100	39	16	48	12	24	1	17	12	50	36	35	27	28	30	22
41	13	3	-1	18	16	10	29	-14	31	6	12	39	100	-8	29	6	11	6	8	28	32	32	33	20	17	51	15
42	48	2	-16	-36	7	-25	2	-7	8	6	-10	16	-8	100	10	28	-14	5	-32	2	12	13	-8	4	7	13	-15

	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55
44	61	11	8	-6	3	-1	42	26	42	13	48	12	6	28	10	100	41	18	12	17	37	53	52	36	31	13	33
45	19	-12	2	15	21	-15	39	11	25	-1	13	24	11	-14	24	41	100	20	15	9	28	19	38	29	24	11	37
46	5	15	30	12	52	-2	-12	37	12	32	32	1	6	5	16	18	20	100	32	41	13	8	12	10	19	11	39
47	-14	1	53	49	45	22	-14	48	30	42	46	17	8	-32	18	12	15	32	100	28	20	21	16	27	14	-9	30
48	3	26	35	5	25	31	13	25	9	33	26	12	28	2	8	17	9	41	28	100	16	10	19	31	22	8	38
49	45	26	16	-1	2	17	35	15	51	26	41	50	32	12	42	37	28	13	20	16	100	47	52	11	48	48	31
50	36	-2	-6	12	5	1	44	-6	53	15	20	36	32	13	41	53	19	8	21	10	47	100	44	16	20	11	30
51	35	6	27	19	13	-3	37	3	46	11	33	35	33	-8	47	52	38	12	16	19	52	44	100	16	21	23	28
52	12	2	13	-1	1	1	28	42	11	24	25	27	20	4	5	36	29	10	27	31	11	16	16	100	36	7	24
53	25	19	20	-17	9	24	15	17	16	37	45	28	17	7	15	31	24	19	14	22	48	20	21	36	100	46	39
54	19	46	-6	9	9	23	13	3	28	11	35	30	51	13	39	13	11	11	-9	8	48	11	23	7	46	100	-9
55	5	-16	10	30	12	2	33	31	19	41	35	22	15	-15	9	33	37	39	30	38	31	30	28	24	39	-9	100

Appendix Q

Unrotated Factor Matrix

	Factors							
Sorts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	0.3819	-0.1273	-0.2767	-0.2956	-0.4815	0.3179	-0.0265	-0.1041
2	0.7064	-0.0547	-0.2251	-0.2641	0.1978	-0.0052	0.1159	0.0018
3	0.7065	-0.0402	0.0692	0.3773	-0.2242	-0.1861	-0.1881	0.0041
4	0.5485	-0.0741	-0.4357	0.1984	-0.1061	-0.2737	0.0093	0.3402
5	0.2982	-0.1254	0.3248	-0.0345	-0.0144	-0.4056	0.4384	-0.0518
6	0.6224	0.3860	-0.2543	-0.2061	-0.1745	0.2578	-0.0595	0.0569
7	0.3427	0.4777	0.3598	0.2833	-0.1045	-0.1118	-0.0962	0.1495
8	0.4992	-0.4649	-0.2864	-0.3019	0.1291	0.1047	-0.0520	-0.2638
9	0.5326	-0.2477	0.1176	-0.4096	-0.0938	0.1139	-0.2215	0.1461
10	0.5765	0.3995	-0.3439	-0.1938	0.2927	-0.0529	-0.1519	0.1030
11	0.6423	0.0526	0.2665	0.0203	-0.1011	0.2258	-0.1832	-0.0645
12	0.5900	0.0778	-0.2274	-0.4700	-0.0740	-0.3001	-0.1703	-0.0497
13	0.3134	-0.4294	-0.2388	-0.3902	0.2031	0.1840	0.0776	0.0134
14	0.6663	0.1196	0.0607	0.1823	0.1789	0.1955	-0.1623	-0.1070
15	0.5088	0.2385	-0.0871	0.4456	-0.2786	0.2622	0.1612	-0.1370
16	0.1999	-0.4281	-0.2774	0.0947	0.0981	0.3354	0.1809	0.4357
17	0.4828	-0.4170	-0.0047	0.1094	-0.2911	-0.2902	0.0552	-0.0777
18	0.4376	-0.1242	-0.2130	0.1992	0.3975	-0.2956	-0.1110	0.2666
19	0.5230	0.1930	0.0676	-0.0953	0.3480	-0.1653	0.0697	0.2991
20	0.3888	-0.2046	-0.5450	0.0994	0.1815	0.1808	-0.1735	0.0274
21	0.2042	-0.2768	0.3584	0.0535	0.0190	0.2326	-0.1374	0.5688
22	0.5425	-0.3399	-0.2069	-0.1261	-0.0769	-0.2472	0.1234	-0.2977
23	0.1711	-0.1716	-0.3514	0.0939	-0.0961	0.2725	0.4460	0.1098
24	0.3795	0.0429	-0.4567	0.0078	0.2208	0.1736	0.0519	-0.4765
25	0.3277	-0.3746	0.5288	-0.3597	-0.0983	-0.2289	-0.2373	-0.0974
26	0.5182	0.1865	-0.0836	-0.1212	0.1687	-0.1559	0.0848	0.2899
27	0.5193	0.3410	0.1617	-0.0543	0.0459	-0.2000	0.3747	0.2095
28	0.4230	-0.1064	0.1408	0.2067	-0.1580	-0.0733	0.5715	0.1236
29	0.4707	-0.5215	0.1646	-0.1199	-0.2670	0.1248	0.2714	0.1470
30	0.1876	0.2847	0.5660	-0.4348	0.1810	0.2725	0.1727	0.0371
31	0.4073	0.5304	-0.0571	0.0344	-0.0805	0.3803	0.2869	0.1036
32	0.1399	0.3476	0.0318	0.5290	-0.0796	-0.2347	-0.1957	-0.1919
33	0.3950	0.3544	-0.4664	-0.0235	0.2907	0.0806	0.1538	-0.1924
34	0.0448	0.4796	0.5271	-0.2630	0.3183	0.3554	-0.2593	0.2126
35	0.4622	-0.5067	0.0751	0.1914	-0.0483	-0.1256	-0.3110	0.0198
36	0.4046	0.4346	0.0623	-0.1873	-0.5071	-0.1021	0.0912	-0.0890
37	0.5131	-0.1410	0.2509	0.3776	0.1239	0.1822	-0.0759	0.0189
38	0.5264	0.3918	-0.0902	-0.2272	-0.2039	-0.0377	-0.0640	-0.1768
39	0.6493	0.3321	0.3185	-0.1652	-0.2844	0.0569	0.0955	-0.1323
40	0.4790	-0.1835	0.2438	0.2508	0.0908	0.0402	-0.0286	-0.1914
41	0.3680	-0.0844	0.2470	0.2572	0.4392	-0.1879	-0.0317	-0.1555
42	0.0881	-0.4480	0.1038	-0.3128	-0.0708	-0.1815	0.2556	-0.0537
43	0.3686	-0.2109	0.1279	0.4933	0.2464	0.0549	0.2212	-0.3349
44	0.6537	-0.2992	0.0925	-0.0645	-0.2788	0.0820	-0.0499	0.1972
45	0.5361	-0.2233	-0.3309	0.0967	0.2184	0.0698	-0.2278	0.1006
46	0.4936	0.3450	-0.1736	-0.0837	0.1617	-0.3318	0.3540	0.1281
47	0.4511	0.6335	-0.1459	0.2530	-0.1117	0.0907	-0.1468	-0.1569
48	0.4577	0.3754	0.1314	-0.0763	0.1541	-0.1940	0.1181	0.1714
49	0.6292	-0.2236	0.3801	0.0115	0.0393	0.2718	0.0066	-0.2190
50	0.5440	-0.2836	0.1617	0.3864	-0.0099	0.0314	-0.1178	0.2187
51	0.5767	-0.1586	0.1844	0.4323	-0.0239	0.3080	0.0765	-0.0624
52	0.4803	-0.0120	-0.0191	-0.1918	-0.1483	-0.2345	-0.3708	-0.0018
53	0.5557	-0.0031	0.1638	-0.3707	0.1555	0.0794	-0.1292	-0.1513
54	0.3289	-0.1403	0.5027	-0.1561	0.4563	-0.0632	0.1913	-0.3949
55	0.5566	0.1497	-0.0875	0.0977	-0.1552	-0.2278	-0.2495	0.0696
Eigenvalues	12.4897	5.2230	4.1422	3.6141	2.6230	2.4622	2.3427	2.2433
Explained Variance	23%	9%	8%	7%	5%	4%	4%	4%

References

Allen, T. D. (2004). Protégé selection by mentors: Contributing individual and organizational factors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 469-483.

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2004). Factors related to mentor reports of mentoring functions provided: Gender and relational characteristics. *Sex Roles, 50*, 129-139.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). Protégé selection by mentors: What makes the difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 271-282.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 70-89.

Belch, H. A., & Mueller, J. A. (2003). Candidate pools or puddles: Challenges and trends in the recruitment and hiring of resident directors. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 29-46.

Bolton, C. (2005). The role of mentors in our personal and professional lives. *College Student Affairs Journal, 24*(2), 180-188.

Bozionelos, N. (2004). Mentoring provided: Relation to mentor's career success, personality, and mentoring received. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 24-46.

Brown, M. (2004). *Illuminating patterns of perception: An overview of Q methodology*. Retrieved July 5, 2007, from http://www.sei.cmu.edu/publications/documents/04.reports/04tn026.html

Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brown, S. R. (1993*).* A primer on Q methodology. *Operant Subjectivity, 16*, 91-138.

Brown, S. R. (1999). On the taking of averages: Variance and factor analyses compared. *Operant Subjectivity, 22,* 31-37.

Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 15-28.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 619-636.

Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 459-484.

Cooper, D. L., & Miller, T. K. (1998). Influence and impact: Professional development in student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services, 84*, 55-69.

Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P. H., & Price, R. L., (1977). The four stages of professional careers: A new look at performance by professionals. *Organizational Dynamics, 6*, 19-42.

Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Haggard, D. L. (2007). Naturally occurring mentoring relationships involving workplace employees. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 139-158). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

Dymock, D. (1999). Blind date: A case study of mentoring as workplace learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 11*, 312-317.

Eby, L., Butts, M., Lockwood, A., & Simon, S. A. (2004). Proteges' negative mentoring experiences: Construct development and nomological validation. *Personnel Psychology, 57*, 411-447.

Eby, L., Durley, J. R., Evans, S. C., & Ragins, B. R. (2006). The relationship between short-term mentoring benefits and long-term mentor outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 424-444.

Eby, L. T., Lockwood, A. L., & Butts, M. (2006). Perceived support for mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68,* 267-291.

Eby, L., & McManus, S. E. (2004). The protege's role in negative mentoring experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 255-275.

Eby, L., McManus, S., E., Simon, S. A., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). The protege's perspective regarding negative mentoring experiences: The development of a taxonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*, 1-21.

Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Definition and evolution of mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 7-20). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B., & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: A review of the literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*, 518-540.

Ellett, T., Guram, A., Robinette, S., & Shell, L. (2006, June). *Differing visions of supervision and mentorship: When dreams do not match up between entry-level staff and supervisors.* Paper presented at Association of College and University Housing Officers-International Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Fagenson-Eland, E. A., & Baugh, S. G. (2001). Personality procedures of protégé mentoring history. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*, 2502-2517.

Fagenson-Eland, E. A., Marks, M. A., & Amendola, K. L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 29-42.

Feldman, D. C. (1988). *Managing careers in organizations.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Fey, C. J., & Carpenter, D. S. (1996). Mid-level student affairs administrators: Management skills and professional development needs. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 218–231.

Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 101-145). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Fowler, J. L., & O'Gorman, J. G. (2005). Mentoring functions: A contemporary view of the perceptions of mentees and mentors. *British Journal of Management, 16,* 51-57.

Gardner, S. K., & Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 369-387.

Gibson, D. E. (2004). Role models in career development: New directions for theory and research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 134-156.

Griffin, A. E. C., Colella, A., & Goparaju, S. (2000). Newcomer and organizational socialization tactics: An interactionist perspective. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*, 453-474.

Gruman, J. A., Saks, A. M., & Zweig, D. I. (2006). Organizational socialization tactics and newcomer proactive behaviors: An integrative study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 90-104.

Hackert, C., & Braehler, G. (2007). FlashQ[Computer Software]. Retrieved November 12, 2007, from http://www.hackert.biz/flashq/downloads/

Howe, K. R., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher, 19*(4), 2-9.

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research, 61*, 505-532.

Jahr, P. (1990). Recruitment and preparation: Our future. *Association of College and University Housing Officers International Talking Stick, 8*, 6.

Janosik, S. M., Creamer, D. G., Hirt, J. B., Winston, R. B., Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (2003). *Supervising new professionals in student affairs.* New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.

Janson, C. (2007). High school counselors' perceptions of their educational leadership behaviors: A Q methodology study. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68,* Publication No. AAT 3279202.

Johnson, W. B. (2007). Student-faculty mentorship outcomes. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 189-210). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jones, D. (2002). College housing professionals at the crossroads. *Journal of College and University Housing, 31*, 8-12.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundations of behavioral research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Komives, S.R. (1992). The middles: Observations on professional competence and autonomy. *NASPA Journal, 29*, 83-90.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Levesque, L. L., O'Neill, R. M., Nelson, T., & Dumas, C. (2005). Sex differences in the perceived importance of mentoring functions. *Career Development International, 10*, 429-443.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The season of a man's life.* New York, NY: Knopf.

Long, J. (1997). The dark side of mentoring. *Australian Educational Researcher, 24*, 115.

McKeown, B. F., & Thomas, D. B. (1988). *Q methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quaterly, 33*(3), 161-173.

Mullen, E. J. (1998). Vocational and psychological mentoring functions: Identifying mentors who serve both. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9*, 319-331.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assignned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 457-479.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42,* 170-183.

Pollock, R. (1995). A test of conceptual models depicting the developmental course of informal mentor-protégé relationships in the work place. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46,* 144-162.

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 1177-1194.

Ragins, B. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1990). Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37*, 321-339.

Ramaswami, A., & Dreher, G. F. (2007). The benefits associated with workplace mentoring relationships. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 211-232). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Robbins, P., & Krueger, R. (2000). Beyond bias? The promise and limits of Q method in human geography. *Professional Geographer, 52*, 636-648.

Rosser, V. J., & Javinar, J. M. (2003). Midlevel student affairs leaders' intentions to leave: Examining the quality of their professional and institutional work life. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 813-830.

Scandura, T. A. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. *Journal of Management, 24*, 449-467.

Scandura, T. A., & Pellegrini, E. K. (2007). Workplace mentoring: Theoretical approaches and methodological issues. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 71-92). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2001). An investigation of the moderating effects of gender on the relationships between mentorship initiation and protege perceptions of mentoring functions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 342-363.

191

Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2004). Mentoring and transformational leadership: The role of supervisory career mentoring. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 448-468.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schmolck, P. (2002). PQMethod 2.11 [Computer software]. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~schmolck/qmethod/downpqx.htm

Sosik, J. J., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 365-390.

Taub, D. J., & McEwen, M. K. (2006). Decision to enter the profession of student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*, 206-216.

Tenenbaum, H. R., Crosby, F. J., & Gliner, M. D. (2001). Mentoring relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 326-341.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*, 1-16.

Tonidandel, S., Avery, D. R., & Phillips, M. G. (2007). Maximizing returns on mentoring: Factors affecting subsequent protégé performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*, 89-110.

Tull, A. (2006). Synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*, 465-480.

Underhill, C. M. (2006). The effectiveness of mentoring programs in corporate settings: A meta-analytical review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 292-307.

Van Exel, J., & de Graaf, G. (2005). *Q methodology: A sneak preview.* Retreived July 5, 2007, from http://www.qmethodology.net/index.php?page=1&year=2005

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: Vol. I* (pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Wanberg, C. R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and protégé predictors and outcomes of mentoring in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 410-423.

Wanous, J. P. (1980). *Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, and socialization of newcomers.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Waters, L. (2004). Protege-mentor agreement about the provision of psychosocial support: The mentoring relationship, personality, and workload. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 519-532.

Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2005). Doing Q methodology: Theory, method and interpretation. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2*, 67-91.

Winston, Jr., R. B., & Creamer, D. G. (1997). *Improving staffing practices in student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, Jr., R. B., Torres, V., Carpenter, D. S., McIntire, D. D., & Petersen, B. (2001). Staffing in student affairs: A survey of practices. *College Student Affairs Journal, 21*, 7 – 25.

Vita

Matthew Clifford

<u>Education</u>

2009	Doctor of Education	University of North Florida Educational Leadership

2004	Master of Education	University of South Carolina Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration

2001	Artis Baccalaureate	Davidson College English

<u>Professional Experience</u>

2006-2009	Director of Residential Life	Jacksonville University

2005-2006	Assistant Director of Residential Life	Jacksonville University

2004-2005	Coordinator of Residential Life	Jacksonville University

2003-2004	Resident Manager	University of South Carolina

2001-2003	Residential Life Programs Assistant	Massachusetts Institute of Technology

<u>Selected Honors</u>

2001	Phi Beta Kappa	Davidson College
2001	Omicron Delta Kappa	Davidson College

<u>Selected Presentations</u>

Clifford, M. (2009, June).   *Q methodology in educational settings*. Presented at the annual University of North Florida Doctoral Symposium, Jacksonville, FL.

Gover, K., & Clifford, M. (2008, November). *Racial differences in alcohol use.* Presented at the annual Southern Association for College Student Affairs Conference, Hilton Head, SC.

Clifford, M., & Gover, K. (2009, November). *Turning conversations into research: An introduction to Q methodology*. Presented at the annual Southern Association for College Student Affairs Conference, Hilton Head, SC.

Clifford, M. (2008, February). *Making Q–sorting available to the masses*. Presented at the annual Southeastern Educational Research Association Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Clifford, M. (2004, March). *Effective communication among student organizations*. Presented at the annual Georgia Collegiate Leadership Conference, Athens, GA.

Clifford, M. (2003, May). *Mission statements and strategic planning*. Presented at the annual Massachusetts Institute of Technology Student Leadership Summit, Rindge, NH.