

**SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING:
THE EXPERIENCES OF PROTEGES AND MENTORS**

by

JILLIAN DALE MORGAN

B.A. (Hon.), Queen's University at Kingston, 1987

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS**

in

**THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction)**

**We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard**

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

January 1997

© Jillian Dale Morgan, 1997

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Centre for
Department of *the Study of Curriculum and Instruction*

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date *February 20, 1997*

ABSTRACT

This study was based on the experiences of seven proteges and seven mentors in a school-based mentoring program for at-risk students. The purpose of the study was to gain insights into the experience of school-based mentoring relationships from the perspectives of proteges and mentors, the relevance of a school-based mentoring program and the program design. The data were collected through semi-structured ethnographic interviews which included the construction of a narrative account and the recalling of critical incidents (Flanagan, 1954). Interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. Data analysis was based on the empirical phenomenological psychological method (Karlsson, 1993). The results obtained from the data analysis were presented in terms of common themes, reflecting the proteges' and mentors' experience of their mentoring relationships.

The findings of this study led to the general conclusions that (1) school-based mentoring relationships can facilitate the learning of new knowledge for both proteges and mentors (2) school-based mentoring relationships can be positive experiences for both proteges and mentors and (3) school-based mentoring relationships can be mutually beneficial providing proteges with a significant adult in their lives and mentors with the opportunities to share experiences and have a positive impact on at-risk youth. In addition to these three general conclusions, the findings of this study identify several important characteristics of positive mentoring relationships from the perspectives of both mentors and proteges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	page ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale for the Study	2
Purpose of the Study	5
Overview of the Methodology	6
Overview of the Study	8
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	9
At-Risk Students: Definitions and Characteristics	9
Mentoring in a Historical Context	11
Mentoring in the School Curriculum	13
Mentoring: A Theoretical Framework	13
The Constructivist Paradigm	14
The Theory of Resiliency	16
Mentoring and Adolescents	17
Mentoring At-Risk Students	19
Support for Mentoring At-Risk Students within the Context of Comprehensive Intervention Programs	20
Support for Community-Based Mentoring Programs for At-Risk Students	23
Support for School-Based Mentoring Programs for At-Risk Students	35
Summary	41
CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	46
Context of the Study	46
The School	46
Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program	47
Description of the Study	58
Design	58
Entry into Field	62
Researcher's Role	63
Participants	63
Data Collection and Analysis	63
Establishing Trustworthiness	69
Credibility	69
Transferability	70
Dependability	70
Confirmability	71

CHAPTER FOUR	RESULTS	72
Proteges' Common Themes		73
Sustained Contact Between Mentor and Protege Category		74
Mutual Commitment		74
One-on-One Contact		76
Accessibility of Mentor		76
Frequency of Meeting		77
Length of Meeting		78
Mentoring Relationship as a Friendship Category		80
Friendship		80
Understanding		81
Mutual Interests		82
Future Oriented Mentoring Relationship		83
Mentor as a Listener and Contributor Category		85
Mutual Sharing		85
Problem Solving		87
Activity-Based Mentoring Relationship Category		89
Extension of Mentoring Relationship Beyond the		
Mentoring Program and School Setting		90
Opportunity to Learn and/or Teach a New Skill		91
Enjoyment of Activities		93
Mentors' Common Themes		94
Sustained Contact Between Mentor and Protege Category		95
Mutual Commitment		95
One-on-One Contact		97
Accessibility of Mentor		99
Frequency of Meeting		100
Time Commitment		102
Mentoring Relationship as a Friendship Category		103
Mutual Interests		103
Multiplicity of Roles		105
Future Oriented Mentoring Relationship		107
Mentor as a Listener and Contributor Category		109
Openness		110
Mutual Sharing		111
Problem Solving		113
Positive Impact		119
Activity-Based Mentoring Relationship Category		120
Mentoring Group Activities		121
Extension of Mentoring Relationship Beyond the		
Mentoring Program and School Setting		122
Summary		124
CHAPTER FIVE	DISCUSSION	126
Mentors' and Proteges' Common Themes		128
Proteges' Common Themes		132
Mentors' Common Themes		134
Conclusions		136
Limitations of the Study		138
Implications for Practice		139
Implications for Further Research		142
REFERENCES		144

Appendix A: Emily Carr Mentoring Program Proposal	149
Appendix B: Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program Mentoring Volunteer Information Sheet	151
Appendix C: Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program Mentoring Partner Information Sheet	153
Appendix D: Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program Partner/Parent Information Sheet	156
Appendix E: Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program Parental Release Form for Mentoring Partners	158
Appendix F: Mentoring Activity - Workshop No. 1	159
Appendix G: Mentoring Partner Activity - Workshop No. 1	160
Appendix H: Bridging Activity #1	162
Appendix I: Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program Mentoring Partner Contract	163
Appendix J: Giving and Receiving Feedback	164
Appendix K: Emily Carr Mentoring Program Log	165
Appendix L: Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program Personal Reflection Activity	166
Appendix M: Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Listening Activity - Feedback	167
Appendix N: Emily Carr Junior Secondary Problem Solving Activity	168
Appendix O: School Board Consent Form	169
Appendix P: Initial Letter of Contact - Staff	171
Appendix Q: Initial Letter of Contact - Students	173
Appendix R: Staff Consent Form	175
Appendix S: Student Consent Form	177
Appendix T: Parental Consent Form	179
Appendix U: Interview Protocol - Mentors and Proteges	181

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Summary of Proteges' Common Themes	74
Table 2	Summary of Mentors' Common Themes	94
Table 3	Summary of Themes Common to Protege and Mentor Groups	127

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following people in making this thesis possible. I would like to thank Trevor, my husband, and Darleen, my mother, for their patience, support and love. I am also thankful for the inspiration of my daughter, Erin.

I have appreciated the encouragement, feedback and time of Dr. Richard Young and Dr. Tony Clarke. I would like to thank Dr. Jon Shapiro for his feedback on the final document.

I would also like to thank the proteges and mentors in this study who shared their experiences with me.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Addressing the needs of at-risk adolescents is currently a focus of research and public discussion in Canada and other developed countries. The term at-risk is often used when referring to students at-risk of leaving school prior to graduation. However, it is also used to refer to high risk behaviours such as delinquency, substance abuse, adolescent pregnancy, school failure and drop out. In this study, the term at-risk youth will refer to "young people at-risk of not maturing into responsible adults" due to the presence of at least one high risk behaviour (Dryfoos, 1990, p.4).

Given the current levels of adolescent delinquency, pregnancy, substance abuse and early school leaving, it is not surprising that governments, school boards and advocacy groups are acknowledging that pervasive school reforms must be accompanied by a variety of specific measures which target the at-risk population (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1993; British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 1993; Dryfoos, 1991; Morris, Pawlovich, and McCall, 1991; Radwanski, 1987). The question most governments and school districts face is not whether to implement specific measures targeted at at-risk youth, but rather which one or ones to choose.

The literature on intervention programs aimed at at-risk youth is extensive. While no single approach or combination of approaches has been demonstrated as most effective, the literature does point to the program component of individual attention as being important to the success of such intervention programs (Dryfoos, 1990). One intervention program which utilizes this component is mentoring. Mentoring is often defined as an on-going one-on-one relationship between a caring unrelated adult and a youth

in which the mentor nurtures and guides the protege in an area(s) of need (Smink, 1990).

In this chapter, the rationale, purpose, and methods used in this study will be outlined. An overview of the study will also be included.

Rationale for the Study

Historically, mentoring has always existed in its natural form. Planned or formal mentoring was used in educational settings prior to its adoption by the skilled trades, fine arts and business. Within educational settings mentoring has been used with promising or gifted students. More recently it has been adopted as an intervention strategy or program for at-risk students.

Mentoring programs for at-risk students should be viewed as part of a school's extra-curriculum for several reasons including the fact that mentors are viewed as guides rather than instructors and participation is voluntary. Identifying mentoring as an extra-curricular activity, however, should not undermine its importance.

Support for mentoring with at-risk students can be found within the constructivist paradigm, which states that learning takes place when the learner can integrate new knowledge with prior knowledge or experience. Learning is also most likely to take place when learning environments provide students with opportunities to construct this knowledge in a social context. Mentoring with its emphasis on a meaningful relationship between a caring adult and a protege is intended to provide both the protege and mentor with opportunities for listening and sharing, inquiry and reflection, leading ultimately to the acquisition of new knowledge.

Support for the use of mentoring with at-risk students can also be found in the theory of resiliency. The theory of resiliency distinguishes between at-

risk students who become involved in risky behaviours and those at-risk students who can be described as competent and resilient. Specifically, the theory of resiliency holds that competent and resilient at-risk adolescents have protective factors including the existence of at least one significant person in their lives. The theory of resiliency, then also supports the use of mentoring.

Research findings also support the use of mentoring with at-risk students. First, descriptive and evaluative findings regarding mentoring, within the framework of comprehensive intervention programs, have been positive. Comprehensive intervention programs are defined here as intervention programs which utilize more than one intervention strategy. Mentoring is consistent with findings regarding individual attention and at-risk students. Individual attention has been shown to be an important component in programs aimed at at-risk students (Dryfoos, 1991). Mentoring, identified by Larrivee and Bourque (1991), incorporates individual attention and has been shown to have a positive effect on measures such as academic grades and attendance.

Second, descriptions of community-based mentoring programs, with community members as mentors, have revealed some of the important qualities of mentors and proteges and the critical components of mentoring relationships. For example, extensive interviews with the program directors of 21 community-based mentoring programs in New York City identified the characteristics of a good mentor and a good protege (Flaxman and Ascher, 1992). According to the directors interviewed, a good mentor has "motivation, personal commitment, realistic or high expectations, flexibility, respect for the individual, firmness, supportive tendencies and good listening skills" (p. 14). The qualities of a good mentee include "motivation, the wish to explore

and have fun and being open to new experiences" (p. 16). The good mentee should also possess interests similar to his/her mentor. Through interviews with mentors, mentees and their parents, Hamilton and Hamilton (1992) revealed that the number of times mentors and mentees met every month was critical to the success of the mentoring relationships. Huisman (1992a, 1992b) also interviewed mentees who participated in a community-based mentoring program. Mentee interviews revealed that they appreciated their mentors. Some of the roles mentors played for these mentees included tutor, friend and counsellor. Mentor questionnaires revealed that they felt that their mentees learned about the world outside their own neighbourhoods, gained self-confidence and developed an awareness of their college potential. In the same questionnaires, mentors revealed that they felt that they learned about themselves, their mentees' social circumstances, how to see things from other peoples' points of view and how to maintain a relationship under sometimes difficult circumstances.

Third, a description of Teachers Achieving Success with Kids, a school-based mentoring program with staff as mentors, documented the perceptions of proteges and mentors at the end of a 12 week mentoring program. According to Abcug (1991), proteges significantly changed their attitudes about school fairness and the caring nature of their teachers. At the same time, Abcug stated that mentors wanted to continue working with their proteges and cared about their proteges. However, the mentors, who were teachers, also stated that the mentoring program was too time consuming.

Fourth, three descriptive studies of community-based mentoring programs, all claim that mentoring had a positive effect on the mentees. Specifically, Salz and Trubowitz (1992) and Cahoon (1989) both claim that mentoring had a positive effect on the mentees' attitudes toward school. Both

Salz and Trubowitz and Glass (1991) found that mentoring expanded the worlds of their mentees. Fifth, in the evaluative studies of community-based mentoring programs, mentoring was shown to have a significant effect on proteges' grade point average (Huisman, 1992a, 1992b), attendance and report card grades in English (McPartland and Nettles, 1991), and on their attitudes toward school (Turkel and Abramson, 1986).

Lastly, in three evaluative studies of mentoring programs utilizing school staff, mentoring was found to have a positive impact on the dropout rate (Slicker and Palmer, 1993), academic achievement (Slicker and Palmer, 1993; Abcug, 1991; Wake County Public School System, 1989), daily attendance and behaviour (Abcug, 1991; Wake County Public School System, 1989), and attitudes toward school (Abcug, 1991).

While there is support for the use of mentoring with students at-risk, several aspects of mentoring at-risk adolescents require further investigation. First, there is a need for longitudinal studies. Second, the mentoring component within comprehensive intervention programs requires further research. Third, evaluative research using comparable variables is required. Fourth, program descriptions and case studies based on mentoring programs need to be completed. Fifth, mentoring programs need to be examined from the perspectives of both mentors and proteges. Sixth, school-based mentoring programs which utilize school staff as mentors require further research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to gain insights into the experience of mentoring relationships from the perspectives of proteges and mentors, within the context of a school-based mentoring program. Specifically, the

purpose was to describe both the context, the school-based program, and the experiences of the program's participants, mentors and proteges. It is hoped that insights into the relevance of the program and the overall design of the program can be formed. It is also hoped that the results of this study will help schools and school districts wishing to design and implement school-based mentoring programs for at-risk students.

The question that provided an initial focus for the study was:

What sense do participants, mentors and proteges, make of a school-based version of the Canadian Stay-In-School (CSIS) Mentor Strategy?

For Guba and Lincoln (1989), emergent design is one of the central elements of the methodology of constructivism. As the study progresses, "the constructivist seeks continuously to refine and extend the design--to help it unfold" (p. 180). As the present study progressed, it was not surprising, then, that the focus on above question was refined and two more specific questions emerged:

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the proteges?

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the mentors?

Overview of the Methodology

Data were collected through interviews with seven proteges and seven mentors to ascertain the experience of their mentoring relationships, within the context of a school-based mentoring program. After a preliminary literature review, a general question emerged which became the initial focus for the study. This question was later refined into two questions. A tentative plan for sampling, data collection, data analysis and establishing *trustworthiness* was initially developed to guide and set parameters for the

inquiry. (*Trustworthiness* is defined here as the quality of the research design and data.) Sampling was purposeful, with seven mentors and seven proteges, involved in the program, being selected. Interviews were the method of data collection. Interview protocols were of a semi-structured ethnographic nature in which the researcher prepared questions as a guide to focus the conversation and generate "rich" descriptions related to the two research questions. Interview protocols were refined and extended following the initial interviews. The construction of a narrative account and recalling of critical incidents (Flanagan, 1954) were the two main components of the interview protocol. Interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. An arbitrary decision was made to analyze the proteges' interviews prior to the mentors' interviews. Data analysis was based on the empirical phenomenological psychological method --EPP-method (Karlsson, 1993). Briefly, interviews were divided into meaning units. Each meaning unit was synthesized and presented in the form of a synopsis. The synopses in each interview were examined for themes related to the research question pertaining to the experience of the mentoring relationship for the proteges. When a theme emerged from the data, the attributes of the theme were identified and a tentative name was assigned. All of the themes were then condensed into one general structure, a table, and common themes were identified. The results obtained from this process were presented in terms of common themes, reflecting the experiences of the participants. These themes were then classified into categories. An identical process was undertaken with the mentors' interviews. Throughout this process, *trustworthiness* was established through activities such as *peer debriefing* and *member checks* aimed at achieving *credibility*, *transferability*, *dependability* and *confirmability*.

Overview of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter one introduces and briefly outlines the study in terms of its rationale, purpose and methodology. Chapter two reviews relevant literature on at-risk youth and mentoring which informed this study. Chapter three describes the methodology of the study including the context of the study and description of the study. In Chapter four, the proteges' and mentors' experience of their mentoring relationships are analyzed in terms of their common themes. In Chapter five, issues are discussed, conclusions are formed, limitations of the study are considered and implications for practice and further research are identified.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Mentoring is not a new concept. A mentor, a term originating in the classical Greek period, has traditionally been defined as a wise and trusted counsellor or teacher (Random House, 1991). "A mentor encourages, listens, gives advice, advocates, acts as a role model, and shares information and expertise" (Smink, 1990, p. 1). Mentoring relationships can focus primarily on the establishment of a constructive relationship or on a formal objective such as "learning a skill, choosing a career, or providing knowledge or information about a specific topic" (de Rosenroll, Saunders and Carr, 1993, p. 21).

Mentors have been used in many areas including business and university settings. Within schools, mentoring has been most often utilized as a strategy to meet the needs of gifted students. Recently, mentors have been utilized, in conjunction with other strategies, to address the problems of at-risk students. The use of a mentor as a guide and nurturer with students at-risk has been shown to have positive impacts.

At-Risk Students: Definitions and Characteristics

As the terms at-risk youth and dropout are prevalent in the literature both terms will be defined. Although the term dropout has had wider usage, there is a lack of consensus on the definition. Hahn (1987) identifies some of the common definitions found across U.S. school districts:

...pupils leaving high school before graduation without transferring to another school.

...students reported withdrawn before completing grade 12.

...any person who has legally left school for reasons other than graduation, transfer to another school or comparable program, enrollment in the armed service, marriage, or illness (p. 267).

In Ontario, the Radwanski report (1987) defines the term dropout as any student who leaves school before having obtained his or her graduation diploma.

The term at-risk has a shorter history than dropout. Being a relatively new term, the definitions of at-risk youth vary considerably. Often the term at-risk youth is used as a synonym to potential dropout (Slicker and Palmer, 1993). However, Cahoon (1989) defines at-risk children as "children having difficulty fulfilling their potential due to circumstances not of their own making" (p. 64). For Dryfoos (1990), the term at-risk youth refers to "young people at risk of not maturing into responsible adults" (p. 4). For the purposes of this study, Dryfoos' definition of at-risk will be used.

High risk behaviours associated with at-risk youth include delinquency, substance abuse, adolescent pregnancy, school failure and dropping out. Dryfoos (1990), in a review of the literature on high risk behaviours, claims that:

In many diverse ways, delinquency, early initiation of smoking and alcohol use, heavy drug use, unprotected sexual intercourse, early childbearing, school failure, and dropping out are interrelated. Every young person who has sex at 12 does not become a drug addict or a felon, but most drug addicts experienced early sexual encounters and some form of delinquent behavior (p. 108).

Six common characteristics or antecedents of the above high risk behaviours identified by Dryfoos are:

Age: Early initiation or occurrence of any behavior [negative] predicts heavy involvement in the behavior and more negative consequences.

Expectations for education and school grades: Doing poorly in school and expecting to do poorly in school

General behavior: Acting out, truancy, antisocial behavior, and other conduct disorders

Peer influence: Having low resistance to peer influences and having friends who participate in the same behaviors

Parental role: Having insufficient bonding to parents, having parents who do not monitor, supervise, offer guidance, or communicate with their children, and having parents who are either too authoritarian or too permissive

Neighborhood quality: Living in a poverty area or an urban, high-density community.... (p. 94-95).

Mentoring in a Historical Context

Historically, mentoring has always existed in its natural form. The earliest references to mentoring are from the era of classical Greece. In the *Odyssey*, "Mentor" was a loyal advisor and trusted counsellor to Odysseus who was entrusted with the education of his son, Telemachus (Random House, 1991). Mentor was charged by Odysseus with directing his son's physical, intellectual, spiritual and social development (Clawson, 1980). Beginning with the *Odyssey*, then, mentoring has referred to an individually delivered process for developing promising individuals into leaders (Scott, 1992).

The use of formal or planned mentoring began in education. In the past, dons or tutors at Oxford University, like many European universities, served as mentors living with students and assisting them in academic, social

and personal matters. Currently, Oxford and other top universities use mentoring relationships to guide their most promising students (Scott, 1992). In keeping with the traditions outlined above, gifted adolescents have usually been the focus of mentoring relationships within the secondary school.

Mentoring relationships also have a long history in fields other than education. Many of the trades use the apprenticeship system, which is similar to a mentorship. Students in the performing or fine arts often work under the guidance of a master artist. Similarly, in business, mentoring has been viewed as a way for executives to accelerate progress and promotion within a firm (Scott, 1992).

While mentoring continues to be used in the settings identified above, it has been more recently used in schools to support at-risk students. Mentoring has been utilized both as part of a comprehensive program targeting at-risk students and as a program in itself. In the United States, mentoring programs for at-risk students became increasingly prevalent in the 1980s (Brown, 1995). At present, government sponsored mentoring programs exist at the national, state, city, community, university and school levels (Smink, 1990). In some instances, private companies, have also sponsored mentoring programs for at-risk youth.

Mentoring programs for at-risk students in Canada have had support at the federal, school board/district and school level in the last ten years. At the federal level, The Canadian Stay-In-School Mentor Strategy: Program Development Resource Kit, was published in 1993. The CSIS Mentor Strategy kit, approved by the Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association, has been used in training sessions across Canada for school counsellors and teachers. The theoretical framework of the CSIS Mentor Strategy is the Bridging Model of Mentoring which aims to have mutually beneficial mentoring relationships

for mentors and proteges "form a bridge between being at-risk in our community to being a part of our community" (de Rosenroll et al, 1993, p.29). Connect: The Surrey Mentorship Program, developed in 1992 in Surrey, British Columbia, is an example of a school board/district level program. "Mentoring for Adolescents", developed by the staff at M. M. Robinson High School in 1989 in Burlington, Ontario, is an example of a school level program.

Mentoring in the School Curriculum

Although a mentoring program might be considered as part of a school's curriculum, it is probably more accurately viewed as an extracurricular activity. Extracurricular programs respond to the divergent needs of a school's population. Due to the one-on-one nature of mentoring, it can be used to address a variety of needs within the public school context including groups of gifted, fine arts and at-risk students. According to Berk (1992), mentoring meets the four generally agreed upon criteria which differentiate extracurriculum programs from curricular programs. First, mentoring relationships are usually more social than cognitive in orientation. Second, mentoring relationships are student driven with the mentor acting as a guide rather than as the planner or instructor. Third, mentoring often takes place outside of school hours. Finally, participation is voluntary rather than required, "leading the extracurricular program to be a domain of schooling that is especially responsive to individual differences in student interests and abilities" (Berk, 1992, p. 1002).

Mentoring: A Theoretical Framework

The use of mentoring with at-risk students is consistent with a constructivist paradigm. At the same time, the theory of resiliency provides strong support for the use of mentoring with at-risk students.

The Constructivist Paradigm

For Guba and Lincoln (1989), a paradigm is "a basic set of beliefs, a set of assumptions we are willing to make, which serve as touchstones in guiding our activities" (p. 80). Daily life requires that one operate within several different paradigms simultaneously. Economic, social, psychological and theological paradigms, among others, guide our lives. Unlike theories which should provide means for verification and revision, paradigms are belief systems which cannot be proven or disproven. However, they are fundamental to human existence.

The constructivist paradigm, also called the naturalistic, humanistic, hermeneutic or interpretive paradigm, has been in existence for several hundred years. According to Von Glaserfeld (1984), the first true constructivist was Giambattista Vico who in 1710 stated that:

As God's truth is what God comes to know as he creates and assembles it, so human truth is what man comes to know as he builds it, shaping it by his actions. Therefore science (scientia) is the knowledge (cognitio) of origins, of the ways and the manner how things are made (p.27).

For Piaget, a constructivist of this century, who wrote extensively on the topic of cognition, individuals construct knowledge by interacting with the environment (Kamii, 1991). Other constructivists of this century include Dewey, Bridman and Ceccato.

The constructivist approach is often contrasted with the scientific or positivist paradigm in which knowledge is viewed as a single reality, independent of the individual. "To the realist, the world is viewed as containing information or patterns existing prior to the organizing activity of the person" (Wheatley, 1991). The constructivist paradigm holds that there are

multiple realities constructed by individuals (and groups) in response to new phenomena in their environment (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). These constructions are developed by individuals as they attempt to make sense of their experiences. Individuals and groups integrate new information with prior experience or knowledge to construct new knowledge. According to Guba and Lincoln (1989) constructions are often commonly held, that is, there is consensus. There is no objective reality:

... "truth" (and note the use of quotation marks to indicate the problematic nature of the term in this case) is defined ... simply as that most informed and sophisticated construction on which there is consensus among individuals most competent (not necessarily most powerful) to form such a construction (p.86).

Learning, within a constructivist paradigm, is a very personal matter which requires the active participation of the learner (Wheatley, 1991). Viewing knowledge as a learner activity rather than an objective body of knowledge is also consistent with a transformation curriculum. Rather than identifying knowledge to be transmitted to students, educators should instead establish learning environments which provide students with opportunities to construct their own knowledge.

In addition, learning does not always and perhaps should not take place in isolation from others. The construction of new knowledge takes place within a social context. As learning has a social dimension, learning environments should also involve talking with others. Learning environments, then, should give learners opportunities to coconstruct meaning through negotiation until a consensus is reached (Wheatley, 1991).

Mentoring, with its emphasis on the formation of a relationship to meet the needs of a protege, is consistent with the constructivist paradigm,

particularly when the relationship focuses on enabling the protege to construct meaning, integrating new knowledge with prior experience. Mentoring, then, within a constructivist paradigm, is not simply the transmission of knowledge from an adult to a younger person. Instead, a mentoring relationship should provide both the protege and mentor with opportunities for listening and sharing, inquiry and reflection, leading ultimately to the acquisition of new knowledge.

The Theory of Resiliency

The theory of resiliency also underlies most formal mentoring programs. Resiliency, according to Finley (1994), is the quality in children which allows them to become healthy adults despite exposure to significant stresses in their lives. The construction of resiliency emerged from longitudinal studies on at-risk children. These studies revealed that:

While a certain percentage of these high-risk [at-risk] children developed various problems (a percentage higher than in the normal population), a greater percentage of the children became healthy, competent young adults (Benard, 1991, p. 2).

Benard (1991), following an extensive review of the literature, found that resilient children display social competence, including "responsiveness, flexibility, empathy and caring, communication skills, a sense of humour and any other prosocial behavior" (p.3). They also display problem solving skills, autonomy and a sense of purpose and future. Conversely, studies on children who are less resilient reveal a lack of these qualities.

Resilient and nonresilient children may both be perceived as being at-risk, though, the resilient child will be able to overcome the negative or destructive aspects of their life (de Rosenroll et al, 1993). Benard suggested

that there is a relationship between a young person's level of resiliency and 'protective factors' found in the family, school and/or community. For Benard, the family, school and/or community must provide children with caring and support, high expectations and opportunities to be active participants in all three environments. To develop resiliency in the child at least one significant person in one of these key environments must express these feelings to the child. The changing composition of family, school and community has made the need for at least one significant person in a child's life more important. Hence the need for interventions which provide each at-risk youth with at least one significant person in their life.

Research on resiliency has identified mentoring as one of the strategies which could provide the three protective factors of support, high expectations and participation through a significant adult (Benard, 1991). Mentoring relationships, then, have the potential to develop resiliency in at-risk youth, particularly where no significant adult exists in the youth's life:

... individuals who have succeeded in spite of adverse environmental conditions in their families, schools, and/or communities have often done so because of the presence of environmental support in the form of one family member, one teacher, one school, one community person that encouraged their success and welcomed their participation (Benard, 1991, p. 18-19).

Mentoring and Adolescents

Drawing on the 1930s work of the Soviet psychologist Vygotsky, Hamilton and Darling (1996) stated that:

If mentors engage in activities with adolescents that expand their competence, encourage them to engage in other such activities, and

extend the range of people with whom they interact, then mentors should have a positive impact on adolescents' development (p.199).

In a review of the literature, Hamilton and Darling identified teacher, challenger and role model as three important functions of mentors with respect to adolescent proteges. In the function of teacher, the teaching could be formal or informal and be related to knowledge or skills. It could also extend or expand the adolescent's perspective on new or familiar areas of knowledge. In the function of challenger, the mentor could assist proteges in setting high goals and reaching those same goals. As a role model, the mentor should behave in such a way that the protege thinks of him/her as a role model. Three important components of the function of role model are:

1. Mentors behave in a manner that they would wish their proteges to emulate. ...
2. Mentors tell their proteges about challenges, moral dilemmas, and difficult situations they have faced. ...
3. As they interact with their proteges, mentors exemplify how mature, thoughtful adults think about issues, solve problems and confront challenges (p. 203).

In a study of the mentoring experiences of 127 college students and 74 high school students, Hamilton and Darling's results led them to several important conclusions about naturally occurring mentoring relationships. Relevant to this study is the finding that parents fulfilled the functional role of mentor for most adolescents. That is, unrelated adult mentors appeared to complement rather than substitute for parents. The incidence of unrelated mentors was no greater for adolescents from divorced families than for adolescents from intact families. According to Hamilton and Darling, parents are the most important people in adolescents' lives and substitutions are not

easily accomplished. They do suggest that mentors could be introduced to adolescents whose parents are absent or unavailable as part of a formal mentoring program.

Mentoring At-Risk Students

The literature on mentoring and at-risk students reveals a lack of consensus on the definition of mentoring. In a number of instances, programs which purported to be mentoring programs were on closer examination group counselling programs, peer tutoring programs, group mentoring or teacher advocacy programs. Five studies which describe and/or evaluate group mentoring programs are reported by Coppock (1995), Gittman and Cassata (1994), Fehr (1993), Morgan (1993) and White-Hood (1993). As mentioned previously, mentoring is defined here as an on-going one-to-one relationship between a caring adult and a protege in which the mentor nurtures and guides the protege in (an) area(s) of need (Smink, 1990). This study, then, will be limited to an examination of mentoring programs which adhere to the above definition.

The literature on mentoring and at-risk students involves not only mentoring programs but also mentoring as a component of comprehensive intervention programs. An examination of the literature on mentoring within comprehensive intervention programs will be followed by an examination of community-based mentoring programs which use mentors from the community and school-based mentoring programs which use school staff as mentors.

Support for Mentoring At-Risk Students Within the Context of Comprehensive Intervention Programs

Dryfoos (1991) attempted to identify the components of successful programs for at-risk students. While Dryfoos makes it clear that no single approach or component has been demonstrated as most effective, she did find that one feature, individual attention, stood out in the literature:

This should not come as big news to anyone who has followed the ongoing youth-at-risk dialogue, in which educators and service providers all state and restate that children who have problems need personal care. The remarkable fact is that so many different kinds of programs can demonstrate that individual attention produces behavioural changes. ... Whether individual counselling and support was offered in preschool settings, in school classrooms ...the common component empowered a caring adult to support and act as an advocate for one or more at-risk children (p. 124).

As individual attention, in the form of a one-on-one relationship, is a key component of most formal mentoring programs, Dryfoos' finding is encouraging for those advocating mentoring as an intervention strategy for at-risk youth.

A program to reduce the alternative-school placement of at-risk students included the containment of the students in one classroom for the entire school day and mentoring of the students by former students attending a local community college (Everett, 1992). At the end of the 12 week program, transfers to alternative-schools had been reduced from 15 to 2. Everett concluded that both treatments, containment of the students and mentoring of the students, contributed to this short term impact. Everett claimed that the mentoring component of the program was a "tremendous success" as measured

by teachers' comments about the improvement in students' behaviour when the mentor was present in the classroom. Although no additional measures related specifically to the mentoring component were reported, Everett concluded that "when at-risk children are given the attention and supervision that they have not received at home, only positive results could emanate" (p.38).

Tuck (1991) evaluated the second year of the Junior High School Intensive Care and School Involvement Program (JHSICSIP), District of Columbia. Short-term outcomes were improved achievement and attendance among at-risk students (Tuck, 1991). The program's long-term outcome was dropout reduction. The comprehensive program's components included an Affective Team of counsellors, Extended Day tutorial and Congressional Mentorship. These components were implemented within the context of both a School Involvement plan to involve all students in activities aimed at improving school climate and a summer work study program aimed at stimulating interest in post-secondary education. Findings showed that the majority of students showed improvements in achievement and attendance and nearly two-thirds of the students remained in the school system. Tuck (1991) recommended an earlier start to the Congressional Mentorship component and arrangements for increased student participation. Tuck held that the Congressional Mentorship component would also enhance U.S. policymakers' understanding of at-risk students in the District of Columbia. In an earlier evaluation of JHSICSIP, Stevenson (1990) stated that the mentoring component could not be validly assessed at the time of evaluation. However, like Tuck he recommended the continuation of the mentoring component.

Cave and Quint (1990) evaluated the short-term and long-term impact of the 1987/88 Career Beginnings program. The Career Beginnings program was

designed to assist urban high school students from low-income families who demonstrated average academic performance in completing high school and could subsequently attend a two to four year college program. The Career Beginnings program was provided to students at 24 sites and included the following components: collaboration between a college, the public schools and the business community, summer employment between the students' junior and senior years, a workshop on the process of applying to college, counselling and mentoring by a community adult. Over 1500 students who qualified for the program were assigned randomly to the experimental or control group. The control group members could still access many of the above services outside of the Career Beginnings program. Cave and Quint reported that control group members received more support services than anticipated, though program participants received slightly more services. Program participants attended college at a higher rate and had higher educational aspirations than control group members. Cave and Quint also reported that sites varied in their implementation of the program. The impact of Career Beginnings also varied greatly across sites. Assessment of the mentoring component of the program was not reported.

Hahn's (1987) review of the research on dropouts led to one major conclusion:

An effective dropout program at the high school level cannot be based on one single element, such as remedial instruction or the provision of social services. To succeed dropout prevention for older youths requires a cohesive, integrated effort... (p. 260).

The first of eight components specified by Hahn was mentoring.

Raywid (1987; 1985) identified eight characteristics of effective dropout programs as important in the the overall design of an environment that

addresses the diverse needs of students. At the top of her list were two characteristics which are consistent with the mentoring strategy:

1. A personalized environment that generates a strong sense of loyalty and affiliation;
2. Choice of program membership that acknowledges student and teacher preference (p. 17).

Support for Community-Based Mentoring Programs for At-Risk Students

Salz and Trubowitz (1992) examined the Big Buddy Program at Queens College in Flushing, New York. This program paired 20 college students with 20 homeless children, aged 5 to 12 years, who lived in one of two hotels in the Queens College area. The purpose of the pairing was for the Big Buddy to serve as a friend, educational and cultural guide, confidant and role model for the child. Each weekend, the Big Buddy and his/her child spent a full day together, participating in a wide range of mutually chosen educational, cultural and recreational activities.

The 20 college students were selected on the basis of an interview conducted by faculty members at Queens College. The 20 college students attended a one day training session organized by the faculty and representatives of the Crisis Intervention Service (CIS) of the Human Resources Administration of New York City. The children were recruited by the CIS. The Big Buddies and the children attended a joint one day orientation session on a Saturday in early September 1989. Beginning the following weekend, the Big Buddies and the children met from 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. for one day every weekend for the rest of the school year. The weekend meetings usually consisted of activities such as visiting the Central Park Zoo,

visiting a public library or roller skating. The faculty also organized some special group activities where all of the Big Buddies, children and some parents attended.

A special project within the program was the joint creation of a photo essay by each pair. Each of the Big Buddies was given a Polaroid camera and film. The Big Buddies and children were instructed to photograph the highlights of their weekend, mounting the photographs in an album. As with many of the activities, this encouraged language development by having the child write a caption under each photo or a short account of each weekend event.

The Big Buddies, while unpaid, did receive two college credits each semester for their participation. They also received 14 dollars per week to cover expenses.

The project was coordinated by one paid person who had previously worked as a teacher in the New York public schools and had a background in social work. She spent one day each weekend at one of the two hotels, supervising the pick-up and return of the children and counselling the parents. Three members of the faculty committee contributed their time voluntarily.

The program was tracked by the project coordinator. Although, no evaluation of the program was reported, the project coordinator recorded her own impressions of the program when she visited the hotels once every weekend. She also had access to the weekly journals the Big Buddies kept. In the journals the Big Buddies were instructed to describe the events of the day, reflect on the child's reactions to the trip, comment on the development of the relationship and note any highlights or problems. Salz and Trubowitz also report that the mothers of the children were interviewed twice in the spring

and the Big Buddies once. While the sources of data were revealed and the study's conclusions have surface validity, Salz and Trubowitz make no attempt to explain how they reached the following conclusions regarding the achievements of the program:

1. Providing a secure environment.
2. Building a positive relationship.
3. Expanding their world.
4. Improved attitudes toward school
5. Impact [positive] on college students (p. 554-5).

Flaxman and Ascher (1992) examined the operation of 21 mentoring programs in New York City. In-depth open-ended interviews were used to collect the data on the experiences of the organizers or directors of the 21 programs. Flaxman and Ascher's research showed that mentoring usually involves a one-on-one relationship between an adult and a youth which continues over an extended period of time. However, they acknowledged that not all of the mentoring programs examined adhere rigidly to the one-to-one ratio.

With respect to mentors, the researchers found that they were often chosen because they were available rather than because they are ideal candidates. Mentors also brought to their new role their own attitudes and ways of dealing with youth. Most training programs were not designed to address mentors' preconceived ideas about youth. The researchers also found that mentors were often unclear about what is expected of them and assumed responsibilities which they could not fulfill. As a result of committing too much time, they sometimes dropped out of the program. Lastly, the researchers found that mentors may also lose interest or drop out of the program if they do not find their mentoring relationship rewarding.

A good mentor, according to the researchers, has "motivation, personal commitment, realistic or high expectations, flexibility, respect for the individual, firmness, supportive tendencies and good listening skills" (p. 14). Commitment was one of the above terms most frequently referred to in interviews, with respect to a good mentor, and was the one factor which correlated with a successful mentoring relationship. The program directors also stated that a mentor's ability to plan activities and/or set achievable goals was also important in engaging youth.

Flaxman and Ascher stated that it is important to distinguish between those who can benefit from a mentoring relationship and those who need a variety of support services, possibility including mentoring. In selecting mentees for mentoring programs, program directors generally agreed that mentees should have the potential to benefit from a one-to-one relationship. Students who have behaviour problems, are too defensive or too aggressive were viewed by program directors as unlikely candidates for a mentoring relationship. However, the researchers also noted that

program directors were often hesitant to rule out potential mentees, in part because so little is known about what can work with whom, and in part because of the egalitarian attitude that mentoring has something in it for everyone (p.19).

In addition, Flaxman and Ascher found that although program directors and organizers were often clear about the type of youth targeted for their programs, those implementing their criteria were not. As a result, the youth for which the programs were designed were not always the youth being served.

A good mentee, according to Flaxman and Ascher, wants the mentoring relationship and the activities offered by the program. Program coordinators

made reference to the following mentee qualities "motivation, the wish to explore and have fun and being open to new experiences" (p. 16). The good mentee should also possess interests similar to his/her mentor.

A study by Hamilton and Hamilton (1992) examined the mentoring program, Linking Up. The researchers evaluated the program in two communities over a two year period. The number of pairs actively participating at one time never exceeded 30 in either of the two communities. The target for mentoring pairs was two or three meetings per month. Telephone interviews with mentors, at-risk youth and their parents revealed that only half of the pairs met at least once a month. An analysis of the interviews and reports by mentoring program staff revealed that the critical factor, as measured by the number of meetings, was the mentor's understanding of the purpose of the relationship.

Although Hamilton and Hamilton concluded that mentoring can be a powerful strategy in working with at-risk youth, their report leaves two important questions unanswered. First, they give no indication of the characteristics of either the mentors or the proteges. Second, they did not report a measure of satisfaction with the relationship by the mentor, youth or parent.

Despite this, Hamilton and Hamilton made eight recommendations for readers contemplating the creation of a mentoring program:

1. Employers and organizations that are willing to take on the task of finding volunteers within their ranks are a more promising source of mentors than one-at-a-time recruitment.
2. Mentoring programs should concentrate on youths in need.
3. Mentors need clear goals.
4. Building competence is the most functional goal for mentoring.

5. Mentors need continuing support.
6. Mentoring programs are rooted in a paradox.
7. Mentoring needs a context.
8. Mentoring is worthwhile (p. 549-550).

Huisman (1992a, 1992b) reported on the Oregon Community Foundation's Student Mentoring Program (SMP) which paired approximately 180 college student mentors from four private universities and eighth grade mentees from four middle schools in mentoring relationships.

The SMP operated over a three year period. The SMP began with 38 mentor/student pairs in 1989-90, 85 pairs in 1990-91 and was held to 65 pairs in 1991-92. Students included in the program were initially identified by eighth grade teachers according to a "fairly vague" description. This led to the inclusion of students both suited to the program and those who needed more assistance than the program could provide. In the second year, the four middle school contacts met and defined exactly who the program could serve. They also decided that the seventh grade teachers would be better at identifying potential mentees at the end of the year than eighth grade teachers at the beginning of the year. In addition, the term "at-risk," viewed as objectionable and too inexact, was later changed to students who had the potential to go to college.

Mentors were initially recruited through student-life and volunteer-services staff. In the second and third years, the majority of mentor applicants had heard about the program through friends. Mentors were asked to make a one year commitment and application forms were designed to help applicants decide if they could make that commitment. Interviews were also performed in some cases and were helpful in giving applicants a better idea of what was expected of them, and in some cases helped to identify more

committed mentors. As prospective mentees were from a variety of ethnic groups and of both sexes, efforts were made to recruit the same. However, the mentors were overwhelmingly white and female.

Pairings were always same sex and based on the needs of the mentee and the requests of the mentors. A comprehensive training session was arranged at the beginning of the year, decreasing in time during the second and third years due to some mentors deciding not to attend. Support meetings, held every two to three weeks, were attended by some mentors and not others. The reasons given for non-attendance included term paper deadlines, the fact that their mentoring relationships were going well and they didn't need support and the reverse -- their mentoring relationships were not going well and they were embarrassed to admit that they hadn't seen their mentees in several weeks. Mentors involved in the program for course credit were the most committed. Mentors were also encouraged in the first weeks of the program to visit their mentee's school to find out more about the mentee's referral.

Following an introductory meeting for mentors, mentees and parents, program activities were predominantly unstructured. Pairs and groups of pairs went on field trips together all over the city and to the beach, mountains and each other's homes. Mentors felt that these field trips were the best interactions they had with their mentees. Attempts to provide structured activities, recreational or career oriented, were unsuccessful due to scheduling difficulties and different ideologies.

Most of the evaluation was carried out by the coordinator, Huisman. The evaluation used several repeated measures in an attempt to detect short-term effects on participants. Attendance records showed no significant change from seventh to eighth grade over the three year period. Average GPAs for all of the mentees at two of the four middle schools improved significantly over

the first two years. In the third year, average GPAs improved significantly for five mentees identified at each school as having strong mentoring relationships.

Mentee interviews revealed that many mentees appreciated their mentors. Mentors' roles included friend, counsellor and/or tutor. On the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, only those mentees identified as having strong mentoring relationships showed significant positive change, and only on the self-satisfaction and personal self scales. Although few teacher and parent questionnaires were collected, those that were showed a slightly positive trend in mentees' behaviour. Interviews and structured statements with middle school contacts revealed that they viewed the program as addressing a need in their school:

In particular it served students who would not otherwise be noticed and/or who would not otherwise have had a realistic expectation of what it takes to go on to college (Huisman, 1992b, p. 5).

Mentor questionnaires revealed that best interactions occurred during unstructured activities like playing sports, cruising the mall and going to the beach. Four general categories of responses were generated from the mentor questionnaires regarding what they had learned from their mentoring relationships about themselves, their mentees social circumstances, how to see things from other peoples' points of view and how to maintain a relationship under sometimes difficult circumstances. Three general categories of responses were generated in terms of mentors' perceptions about what their mentees learned from their mentoring relationships about the world outside their own neighbourhoods, self-confidence, and their college potential. Three suggestions which were incorporated into the third year of the program based on mentors' questionnaires were more planned group

activities, reassignment of mentor-mentee pairings who were experiencing difficulties in the first two weeks and the use of the challenge course early in the program to help the pairs form.

Glass (1991) examined the Mentoring Incorporated program in the District of Columbia through the personal stories of the mentors and proteges. According to Glass, the mentors were mainly recruited through community and business organizations. The mentors were required to sign a contract which committed them to the program through the student's graduation years, normally a two and a half-year commitment. After an initial orientation mentors were instructed to develop academic, social and financial goals with their proteges. The professional staff at Mentoring Incorporated assisted mentors in setting monthly goals including academic skills like notetaking, resume writing, and college entrance applications. Every mentor was called once a month by the staff to address existing and potential problems.

Although the proteges' recruitment process was not described in the article, it is clear that the proteges were at-risk high school students.

Information on the number of mentoring pairs, sources of data and forms of analysis were not revealed. However, brief biographical sketches and anecdotal comments by each mentor and/or protege were reported which indicate the influence of the program:

"That was a wonderful experience to find out what goes on in their countries," Tarika says. There were people there who had never seen snow." "They asked me what college I planned to go to. That's what really started to convince me about going to college and furthering my education so that I could get a good job and have the same things they have" (Glass, 1991, p. 26).

McPartland and Nettles (1991) report on an ambitious mentoring program called Project Raise. Project Raise matched at-risk students from seven middle schools with mentors from seven different community sponsors. The goals of Project Raise were to improve students' self-esteem and school-related behavior and progress, and to reduce high-risk behaviours such as substance abuse and teenage pregnancies. Mentors were provided with orientation and ongoing training by Raise staff and given regular information about their students' programs and performance in school and elsewhere. Each mentor was instructed to monitor his/her student's attendance, grades and behaviour, build a relationship of trust, and help the student with his/her individual needs. One of Project Raise's criteria for selecting mentors was that the mentors would agree to at least one year of weekly contacts that included at least one face-to-face meeting per week.

The results of this study demonstrate the difficulties inherent in assessing the over-all effectiveness of a program implemented by different people in different settings. Specifically, the researchers claimed that the results were affected by deviations from the Project Raise design in particular project sites. For example, in some sites mentors were matched with a group of students as opposed to one individual student. No significant difference was found on the following measures: report card grades in math, grade point average, on-grade promotion and reading and math standardized test scores. They did find, however, a significant difference between Raise and non-Raise students in student attendance and report card grades in English.

Turkel and Abramson (1986) examine the effects of mentoring for at-risk youth. The mentoring program under study was a collaborative venture between the City University of New York and the New York City Board of Education. The program was aimed at potential dropouts in the ninth grade.

The mentors were university students who acted as role models providing the ninth graders with advice, a personal relationship, and academic skill development.

The mentors were recruited and selected by the university coordinator. The university coordinator also provided weekly supervision, incorporated the work of mentors into college course assignments, and conducted bimonthly feedback sessions. Mentees were recruited and supervised by the high school coordinator who was responsible for the day-to-day administration of the program. Both coordinators matched the mentors with the mentees, monitored their progress and made reassignments where necessary.

The 10 mentoring pairs involved in the study were encouraged to meet once a week for 60-70 minutes at school. Some of the meetings took place after school or on Saturdays at the university. On average the pairs met 6.5 times during the 10 week data collection period. The content of the mentoring sessions was largely left to the discretion of the mentor and mentee, with the mentee driving the content of the sessions. The majority of the sessions, according to the mentors, dealt with personal, social and/or academic concerns, with an emphasis on the latter.

The three variables which Turkel and Abramson measured were: attitude toward school, attendance and grade point average. To examine the mentees' attitudes toward school, the Quality of School Life Scale (QSL) was administered on a pre-test post-test basis to the mentee group. The QSL (1978) is a measure of student reaction to school, class work and teachers. There was a significant difference for the mentee group, indicating that their attitudes toward school had improved from the beginning to the end of the mentoring experience. The mentors completed a 10 item Likert type questionnaire that asked them to rate their perceptions of the mentees' attitudes and abilities

after their first few sessions and again at the end of the program. The mentors rated the mentees significantly higher at the end of the program on both their attitudes and abilities. The short time line and possible leading questions require closer examination.

Attendance and GPA were obtained for the mentee group and a comparison group of ninth-grade potential dropouts who were not being mentored but were receiving the same school guidance and instruction. Although the mentee group had higher attendance and grade point averages than the non-mentored group, the differences were not significant. However, given the short time line of the experiment, these findings are not surprising.

In another study, Cahoon (1989) describes a mentoring program which matched at-risk fourth and fifth grade students with students from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The university students met weekly with the elementary students to help improve their social and academic skills and develop positive attitudes to self and work. After participating in an initial orientation and receiving a folder detailing the elementary student's academic difficulties and suggested activities, the university student met with elementary student every Thursday for 90 minutes. The partners also contacted each other outside of school hours and sometimes went on outings in the community.

The characteristics of participants, sources of data and data analysis were not clearly outlined in Cahoon's study. However, she did indicate the following successes:

At the end of the first year, 22 student participants felt the venture had helped them improve their grades and attitudes about school. Warm friendships had developed between the university students and their charges, and many students asked if the Ambassadors [university

students] could come more frequently. Enthusiastic about their students' progress, the teachers requested that the program be continued the next year. Parental involvement also increased (p. 64).

Support for School-Based Mentoring for At-Risk Students

Slicker and Palmer's (1993) study on mentoring provides support for the use of mentoring as a dropout intervention strategy with at-risk students within the context of a school-based mentoring program. The three questions Slicker and Palmer posed were:

1. Does mentoring reduce the dropout rate of at-risk students over those who are not mentored?
2. Does mentoring of at-risk students improve their self-concept over that of non-mentored students?
3. Does mentoring of at-risk students improve their academic achievement over that of non-mentored students?

Based on criteria set by the district, including low standardized achievement test scores and failure in two or more courses in the most recent semester, 86 at-risk students were identified at two large suburban Texas schools. Due to ethical and practical constraints, the mentoring steering committee abandoned the random selection of students for experimental and control groups. The steering committee felt that depriving certain highly at-risk students of the experimental condition would be unethical. As a result, the thirty-two most needy at-risk students were selected for the experimental group and assigned a mentor. An attempt was made to match the control group students with the experimental group students in terms of sex, racial-cultural background, age in grade and grade point average (GPA) at the end of the last

semester. The control group students were not given mentors. The study was conducted over a six month period.

Mentors were recruited from and limited to school personnel, including teachers, principals, counsellors and secretaries, and instructional aids. The 32 mentors recruited were given a one-hour training session by the mentoring supervisor. Mentors were given guidelines for the mentoring pairing experience including a minimum of three contacts per week, recognition of achievement and a focus on meetings or activities which could take place at school during school hours. The main aspects of the experimental condition were the maintenance of confidentiality to build trust, encouragement to build academic progress and special attention to build improved feelings of self-worth.

To answer their research questions, Slicker and Palmer used the following measures: a pre and post-test of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, an initial questionnaire collecting educational history and other pertinent information, a follow-up questionnaire concerning the mentoring relationship, the students' GPA, the students' dropout status and the mentors' logs. The results of the study showed no significant differences between the experimental and control groups in terms of dropping out or achievement. However, there was a significant difference in terms of self-concept for the control group.

Slicker and Palmer concluded that the non-random assignment of the students had affected the results. In addition, they felt that the treatment condition was not heterogeneous, based on the follow-up questionnaire and the mentors' logs. Specifically, some mentors spent many hours with their mentees while others only met with them once during the six month experimental period. As a result, Slicker and Palmer, implemented a post-hoc

analysis. They divided the 22 students, who remained in the experimental group at the end of the experiment, into those who were effectively mentored and those who were not effectively mentored. Slicker and Palmer found that at-risk students who were mentored effectively were significantly less likely to dropout of school and had higher academic achievement than those who were mentored ineffectively or were not mentored at all. They found no significant difference between the two groups in terms of self-concept.

Abcug (1991) evaluated a teacher-student mentorship program for at-risk students, entitled "Teachers Achieving Success With Kids" (TASK). The site for the program was a public middle school where approximately half of the students were identified as at-risk. Students in this school district were identified as at-risk if they were performing at least two years below grade level; they were eligible for financial assistance; they had been retained at least one grade; and/or they were not encouraged by their families to be successful in school. The goal of the TASK program was to "develop a one-to-one caring relationship between teacher volunteers and students who have a history of being unmotivated and uninterested in school" (p. 14-15). Teachers who volunteered for the program, instructional team leaders, counsellors and administrators worked together to generate a list of students who would benefit from the program. Twenty-five at-risk students in sixth, seventh and eighth grades were matched with 25 teachers. Initial questionnaires were completed by both volunteer teachers and students.

The TASK mentorship program was implemented over a period of 12 weeks. Teachers who volunteered participated in two training sessions. The first session explained how to promote a trusting relationship with a student outside of the classroom. The second session focussed on how to teach critical thinking skills since Abcug's research revealed that at-risk students tend to

lack decision making and problem solving skills. Over the next 10 weeks, teacher-student pairs met for a few minutes daily, and once a week for a longer period of time, to develop their mentoring relationships. Volunteer teachers completed weekly progress reports. Volunteer teachers also met regularly with the TASK coordinator to evaluate progress, make necessary adjustments in the program and address individual concerns. At the end of the 10 week period, volunteer teachers and students completed follow-up questionnaires.

For Abcug, student attendance, discipline and academic progress were measurable indicators of student attitudes. Daily attendance for the 25 students rose from 70% to 88% and 11 of the 14 students who were consistently tardy to school came consistently on time. By the end of the fifth week, there was a 35% decline in discipline referrals to the office which the researcher attributed to the TASK program as all of the students who participated in the program had a history of discipline problems at the school. The median grade point average of the students was below 1.5 before the program and above 2.75 after the completion of five weeks of the TASK program.

Entry and exit questionnaires were used to measure changes in students' attitudes towards school. Twenty-two of the students planned to graduate from high school before and after taking part in TASK and 23 of the students consistently wished their grades were better. However, the number of students who agreed that the rules and discipline consequences at school are usually fair increased from 9 to 16. Another change in students' attitudes towards school was reported in response to the statement, "Some of my teachers try hard to make school interesting" (p. 25). The number of students responding affirmatively to this statement rose from 14 to 23. The largest change in attitude was reported in response to the statement, "My teachers

really don't care about me" (p.25). The number of students who disagreed with this statement increased from 8 to 25.

Teachers' attitudes towards their student and the program were also measured. After completing the 12 week program, 19 of the teachers agreed with the statement, "I would like to continue working with my student friend even when the program is over" (p. 25). All of the teachers strongly agreed with statement, "I genuinely care about my student friend" (p.25). All of the teachers also agreed that TASK was a worthwhile program which should be implemented again. On the negative side, all of the teachers agreed that TASK was too time consuming.

The Wake County Public School System in Raleigh, North Carolina (1989) reported on a mentoring program called School/Community Helping Hands Project. Black male role models first from schools and then from the community were matched with at-risk black male students in grades six to eight. Black male students selected for the program had the following characteristics:

declining CAT scores or scores at or below the 40th percentile in reading or math, strong potential for greater success in school as shown by early school performance, teacher recommendations, or other positive signs, evidence of personal strength to resist negative influences which lead to inappropriate behaviour (p. 8).

Students were identified during the spring of their fifth year. School officials met with students' parents to discuss the project and to obtain parental permission. A maximum of 80 students were matched each year.

Students selected were matched with black male educators (teachers, counsellors, administrators) during their sixth grade year. The educators were

required to spend at least 20 hours per month with their assigned students.

Educators' responsibilities included:

Holding activities to "bond" them with their student partners

Visiting and communicating with the student's parents throughout the year.

Visiting the student's school, meeting with his teachers and developing an individualized plan for school work to tackle deficiencies in the student's school work (p. 9).

Educators and their students attended a number of countywide sessions including breakfasts, an olympiad of academic and athletic activities, an achievement banquet and awards ceremonies.

When the students entered seventh grade they were matched with black male community mentors. Community mentors were assigned one or two students. Community mentors were also assigned to the students' educator mentors. The community mentors were required to spend 12-15 hours per month with their assigned students. During the year with the community mentor, home, school and child were the foci.

Results from the first year of the program in which students were matched educators were overwhelmingly positive as shown below:

88% of the student partners maintained enrollment and regular attendance in the program as evidenced by monthly logs of attendance;

87% maintained or improved conduct grades, indicating growth in the areas of self-worth and respect for others;

88% identified and met one or more behaviour and/or performance goals weekly as shown by the individualized school plans maintained by personal models;

95% attained school attendance rates of 90% or better in average daily attendance, representing an average increase of 13 percent; 65% maintained or improved letter grades of classroom performance (p. 6).

Summary

Mentoring, as shown above, is one strategy which has received support in the literature. First, mentoring is consistent with the constructivist paradigm. Second, it is grounded in the theory of resiliency. Third, descriptive and evaluative findings regarding mentoring, within the framework of comprehensive dropout programs, have been positive. One finding of particular importance to this study is that individual attention is one of the most important components of intervention programs including mentoring programs (Dryfoos, 1990).

Fourth, descriptions of existing community-based mentoring programs have revealed some of the important qualities of mentors and proteges and the critical components of mentoring relationships. These findings are also of particular importance to this study. For example, extensive interviews with program directors of 21 community-based mentoring programs in New York City identified the characteristics of a good mentor and a good protege (Flaxman and Ascher, 1992). According to the directors interviewed, a good mentor has "motivation, personal commitment, realistic or high expectations, flexibility, respect for the individual, firmness, supportive tendencies and good listening skills" (p. 14). The qualities of a good mentee include "motivation, the wish to explore and have fun and being open to new experiences" (p. 16). The good mentee should also possess interests similar to his/her mentor. Through interviews with mentors, mentees and their

parents, Hamilton and Hamilton (1992) revealed that the number times mentors and mentees met every month was critical to the success of their mentoring relationships. Huisman (1992a, 1992b) interviewed mentees who participated in a community-based mentoring program. Mentee interviews revealed that they appreciated their mentors. Some of the roles mentors played for these mentees included tutor, friend and counsellor. Mentor questionnaires revealed that they perceived that their mentees learned about the world outside their own neighbourhoods, self-confidence and their college potential. In the same questionnaires, mentors revealed that they felt that they learned about themselves, their mentees' social circumstances, how to see things from other peoples' points of view and how to maintain a relationship under sometimes difficult circumstances.

Fifth, three descriptive studies of mentoring programs utilizing community mentors, all claim that mentoring had a positive effect on the mentees. Specifically, Salz and Trubowitz (1992) and Cahoon (1989) both claim that mentoring had a positive effect on the mentees attitudes toward school. Both Salz and Trubowitz and Glass (1991) found that mentoring expanded the worlds of their mentees.

Sixth, a description of an existing school-based mentoring program, called Teachers Achieving Success with Kids, revealed perceptions of proteges and mentors at the end of a 12 week mentoring program. According to Abcug (1991), proteges significantly changed their attitudes about school fairness and the caring nature of their teachers. At the same time, Abcug stated that mentors wanted to continue working with their proteges and cared about their proteges. However, the mentors, who were teachers, also stated that the program was too time consuming. Abcug's findings are also particularly relevant to the present study.

Seventh, in the evaluative studies of community-based mentoring programs, mentoring was shown to have a significant effect on proteges' grade point averages (Huisman, 1992a, 1992b), attendance and report card grades in English (McPartland and Nettles, 1991), and on their attitudes toward school (Turkel and Abramson, 1986).

Lastly, in three evaluative studies of mentoring programs utilizing school staff, mentoring was found to have a positive impact on the dropout rate (Slicker and Palmer, 1993), academic achievement (Slicker and Palmer, 1993; Abcug, 1991; Wake County Public School System, 1989), daily attendance and behaviour (Abcug, 1991; Wake County Public School System, 1989) and attitudes toward school (Abcug, 1991).

As demonstrated above, mentoring shows promise as a strategy to work with at-risk students. However, research needs in this area remain extensive. There are a number of inter-related research needs. First, there is a lack of commonly held definitions. Second, many mentoring programs are never examined. According to Flaxman (1992), most program directors would rather channel their funds into programs as opposed to evaluations. In addition, he found that program directors do not support program evaluations until they feel that their program is operating optimally and will therefore receive a favourable evaluation. Third, a number of evaluations are not published (Fortune, Bruce, Williams & Jones; 1991).

Fourth, with respect to the studies which are published, there is a dearth of longitudinal studies. Flaxman (1992) stated that as most mentoring programs have existed for only a few years, determining long-term results is problematic. In addition, he stated that evaluators

have to determine whether they are looking for short-term results for the youth, like higher test scores, better school attendance, or fewer

anti-social acts, or for long-term results, like sustained academic improvement and educational persistence over time (p. 3).

Fifth, when mentoring is implemented within the context of comprehensive intervention programs, the mentoring component often cannot be validly assessed (Flaxman, 1992).

Sixth, as in many areas in the field of education, the problems of at-risk students do not lend themselves to true experimental research due to the complexity of the phenomena. There are also ethical concerns about choosing which at-risk students to assign to the experimental group and which students to assign to the control group. Moreover, when one does encounter evaluative research, the variables measured differ from study to study making comparisons with other studies difficult.

Seventh, there is also a lack of process evaluations, as opposed to impact evaluations. Impact evaluations explain the effects of a program while process evaluations reveal what is happening in the program that contributes to these effects (Flaxman, 1992). Anecdotal and observational evidence about mentoring programs needs to be augmented with process evaluations which include detailed program descriptions and case studies. Moreover, there is a need for process evaluations, to describe and evaluate mentoring programs from the perspectives of both the mentors and the proteges. Mentoring programs which utilize school mentors, as opposed to community mentors, also require further research.

As shown above, there is a need to investigate several aspects of mentoring programs which target at-risk students. The mentoring program under study was a school-based mentoring program. The purpose of this study was to gain insights into the experience of mentoring relationships from the perspectives of proteges and mentors, the relevance of a school-based

mentoring program and the overall design of the program. It is hoped that the results of this study will help schools and school districts wishing to design and implement school-based mentoring programs for at-risk students.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study was to gain insights into the experience of mentoring relationships from the perspectives of proteges and mentors, within the context of a school-based mentoring program. This chapter is comprised of two components: the context of the study and the description of the study. The context describes where the program took place and the characteristics of the program. The description of the study will address the design, the entry into field, the researcher's role, the participants, the data collection and analysis and establishing *trustworthiness*.

The Context of the Study

This section describes the school and the characteristics of the school-based mentoring program.

The School

Emily Carr Junior Secondary School is located in Norfolk, a medium-sized urban school district in British Columbia. (The name of the school and school district has been changed to maintain confidentiality. Other place names which appear in Chapters three through five have also been changed to maintain confidentiality.) During the 1994-95 school year, Emily Carr Junior Secondary School had a staff of 45 teachers, 5 classroom assistants, a teen support worker, a part-time nurse, a police liaison officer and 14 support staff. There were approximately 850 students at the school. The student population was half male and half female. There were less than 10 First Nations students attending the school. Approximately four percent of the students were identified as special needs students. A significant number of

English as a Second Language students attended the school. The socio-economic status of the students was predominantly high to middle. Students from low socio-economic status homes comprised less than 10 percent of the school's population.

Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program

During the 1993-94 school year Peer Systems Consulting Group offered Canadian Stay-In-School (CSIS) workshops for both school and community personnel interested in the use of mentoring with at-risk youth. The three day sessions were offered at a variety of locations across Canada. The workshop was called Mentor Program Development Training for Trainers. In March 1994, two teachers and one classroom assistant, from Emily Carr Junior Secondary School attended the three day training session. The researcher was one of the teachers who attended the three day training session.

After attending the three day training session, the three staff from Emily Carr held an information meeting to ascertain staff interest in a school-based mentoring program in May, 1994. At that time, administrators, teachers and classroom assistants showed interest in a mentoring program incorporating staff as mentors. The administrators also stated that funding would be available for the program.

As a result of staff changes, the researcher was the only teacher who had taken the Mentor Program Development Training for Trainers workshop and remained in the school for the 1994-95 school year. A new staff member in September 1994, though, was a teen support worker whose mandate was to support at-risk students and liaise with their teachers and parents. The teen support worker and I decided to develop and coordinate the program together,

basing the program on the CSIS Mentor Strategy as outlined in the Development Resource Kit (de Rosenroll et al 1993).

The theoretical framework for the CSIS Mentor Strategy is the Bridging Model of Mentoring:

A quality (effective) mentoring relationship must offer at-risk youth and the adult volunteers concrete experiences which include (1) enhancement of relationship [with mentor/mentee, family , friends, community] ; (2) enrichment of life perspective [values, careers, education] ; (3) empowerment of potential [as contributor, help giver, participant] . These three experiences combine to form a bridge between being at-risk in our community to being a part our community - a bridge from being reactive to our environment to being proactive within our environments. ... As one would expect, then, from a mutually beneficial, horizontal relationship, both partners will grow and change as a result. ...

The principle focus of mentoring partnerships, whatever the context of the association (career exploration, building specific skills, increasing knowledge), is on the quality of relationship between volunteers and their partners. Just as relationships become the foundations for growth and change, interpersonal behaviours that express caring, support, commitment, respect and trust are the cornerstones to quality relationships. Although the desired outcomes within these relationships include the partners reciprocating in like manner, the onus is on the volunteers to model these behaviours and to express these values. ... (p.29)

To achieve the above quality mentoring relationship, de Rosenroll et al. (1993) believe that arbitrarily matching a mentor and a protege is

insufficient. Instead, they advocate mutual training for proteges and mentors. In addition, in an attempt to alter the traditional hierarchical relationship to reflect a more egalitarian relationship where both parties are more equal contributors to the relationship, the orientations and workshops incorporate an experiential approach where both mentoring volunteers (mentors) and partners (proteges) "reflect on experiences in order to find personal meaning and incorporate their learning into their lives" (p. 34). de Rosenroll et al. chose the terms mentoring volunteer and mentoring partner to refer to mentor and protege respectively because they felt that they reflected a more egalitarian relationship.

The program development section of the manual is designed to assist mentor program coordinators in developing a mentoring program which meets the needs of their particular community. The program development section is divided into eight sub-sections: Introduction, Building a Support Base, Community Needs and Program Goals, Selecting Volunteer and Partners, Workshop Framework, Support and Follow-up, Assessing Program Effectiveness, Program Checklist. Each of the eight sub-sections includes key points and several processing questions. In the appendix to the manual are six sequential workshop outlines, which like the program development section, are designed to assist program coordinators in developing a set of workshops to achieve their program goals. In addition to separate orientation workshops for both mentoring volunteers and partners, joint workshops on: (1) expectations, concerns and goals, (2) feedback and relationship rules, (3) listening to your partner, and (4) problem solving are outlined in terms of process and content.

Using the CSIS Mentor Strategy Program Development Resource Kit, the teen support worker and I, designed the following components of our school-

based mentoring program. As the program development section of the resource was not prescriptive, we were able to follow the program development sequence from proposal to workshops to evaluation, modifying where necessary. First, we drafted a program proposal to submit to the school's administration. Following the acceptance of the program by the school's administration, the next task was to hold a second meeting with school staff to confirm the level of support for the program during the 1994-95 school year. We held an information meeting, at the end of October 1994, distributing a revised program proposal for the Emily Carr Mentoring Program (Appendix A). In the revised program proposal, sections which we viewed as extraneous to our mentoring volunteer audience were eliminated. After attending the second meeting and reading the mentoring proposal, 17 teachers and classroom assistants offered to be mentors for the period from November 1994 - June 1995. Each staff person was requested to complete an information sheet (Appendix B), which included CSIS Mentor Strategy suggested questions.

After I explained the definition of at-risk students and the nature of the program at a staff meeting, administrators, counsellors and teachers were asked to submit names of at-risk students who they thought would benefit from a mentoring relationship with a school staff member. The teen support worker and I also had a list of names of incoming grade eight students who the counsellors and resource teachers identified as at-risk students who could benefit from a mentoring relationship. (The counsellors and resource teachers had made the list the previous June, after meeting with teachers and counsellors at the elementary feeder schools.) Lastly, the teen support worker met with several at-risk students during the first two months of school and made a list of those students he felt would benefit from a mentoring relationship with a staff person. Taking into account all of students on the

above lists, the teen support worker and I had a list of over fifty recommended students. Using the information sheets and the list of recommended students we created some possible same-sex matches based on mutual interests. The decision to create only same-sex matches was based on feedback from prospective mentoring volunteers and the school's administration. Having decided to limit the size of the program in its introductory year, the coordinators made 10 matches. Each mentoring volunteer was approached regarding the student who had been chosen as a match. In 9 of the 10 cases, mentoring volunteers agreed with our matches. In the tenth case, another match was made.

Preliminary discussions were then made with the mentoring partners. When the teen support worker approached the prospective mentoring partners, nine matches were finalized. The tenth match was made after consultation with the mentoring volunteer and a different mentoring partner. Each mentoring partner was then interviewed using an interview schedule (Appendix C), developed using the CSIS Mentor Strategy suggested questions. At the same time, the mentoring partners were given a partner/parent information sheet (Appendix D). The partner/parent information sheet was based on the original mentoring proposal, modified to meet the needs of the intended audience. In addition, the teen support worker and I, after discussions with administrators and teachers, decided that the term "at-risk" had negative connotations. As a result, potential mentoring partners were identified as students "who feel they could benefit from a mentoring relationship with a staff person." A parental release form (Appendix E), modelled after the parental release form in the CSIS Mentor Strategy was also given to each mentoring partner.

At the beginning of the program there were 10 mentoring partnerships--6 female and 4 male. Seven of the volunteers were classroom teachers and three were classroom assistants. Three of the partnerships were between grade 10 students and staff persons, one was between a grade 9 student and a staff person, and six were between grade 8 students and staff persons.

Following the completion of the mentoring partner interviews and return of the parent release forms, separate orientations for mentoring volunteers and partners were held. To reduce teacher-on-call costs, the orientation for mentoring volunteers was held during the school-wide professional development block and after school on November 22. The workshop was based on the "Orientation for Mentoring Volunteers" in the CSIS Mentor Strategy. As the mentoring volunteers had had two previous information meetings, were acquainted and had requested information from the British Columbia Teachers Federation (B.C.T.F.) on safety issues related to one-on-one relationships, the "Orientation for Mentoring Volunteers" format was substantially modified. The workshop focused on mentoring volunteers past mentoring experiences; their personal qualities, expectations and concerns; and their partner's personal qualities, expectations and concerns (Appendix F). Their safety concerns regarding one-on-one relationships were also discussed. Mentoring volunteers were also given a list of mentoring partners and volunteers.

Following the workshop the teen support worker and I met to discuss our reflections and the feedback from the mentoring volunteers and B.C.T.F. representatives. Specifically, mentoring volunteers stated that information from the B.C.T.F. representatives was important in focussing their attention on safety issues regarding one-on-one situations at school and off school

property. In response to mentoring volunteer concerns, a log book was designed so that mentoring volunteers could record parental permission for activities and summarize activities with their mentoring partners. The setting of the workshop, which was a classroom, was viewed as too formal. It was decided to move the workshops to the library which had more flexible seating.

Within the same week, an orientation for the mentoring partners was held during the two afternoon blocks. Although the workshop followed the "Orientation for Mentoring Partners" closely, modifications were made to incorporate breaks and cooperative learning activities. The workshop focused on the mentoring partners getting to know one another; group interaction guidelines; the terms mentor and mentoring; their personal qualities, expectations and concerns; and their volunteer's personal qualities, expectations and concerns (Appendix G). Mentoring partners were also given a list of mentoring partners and volunteers.

Following the workshop, the teen support worker and I met to discuss our reflections and the feedback from the mentoring partners including the length of the session which was two-and-one half hours. Based on feedback from the mentoring partners we decided that one-and-a-half hours would be the maximum length for any workshop. Second, the setting of the workshop, the school library, was viewed as having too many distractions. Another setting would have to be found. Third, the CSIS Mentor Strategy workshop activities which require the mentoring partners to write extensively, would have to be modified. Fourth, it was decided that Friday was not the best day for a workshop, as students are often tired and/or focussed on their weekend activities. Fifth, we realized that although the interaction between students at the workshop was predominantly positive, students would have to be sensitized to each other's feelings. Lastly, the breaks and cooperative learning activities

incorporated into the workshop were viewed positively by the coordinators. One mentoring volunteer and partner dropped out of the program prior to the second workshop for reasons related to the time commitment involved.

The second workshop, held the following Tuesday during the school-wide professional development block and after school, brought the mentoring volunteers and partners together formally. Although the workshop followed the CSIS Mentor Strategy "Expectations, Concerns and Goals" workshop closely, modifications were made to incorporate suggestions from both the mentoring volunteers and partners, breaks and cooperative learning activities. The first activity focused on getting to know one another, though in a few cases mentoring volunteers and partners had met previously. The next section had each mentoring pair focus on combining their expectations, concerns and assumptions. Lastly, each pair discussed when they would meet to complete "Bridging Activity #1" (Appendix H). The mentoring volunteers and partners were given two weeks in which to meet and complete "Bridging Activity #1." The coordinators reminded both mentoring volunteers and partners that they were available for consultation if needed.

Following the workshop the teen support worker and I met to discuss our reflections and the feedback from the mentoring volunteers and partners. The workshop had a positive atmosphere, was well paced and the new location, the Carson Community Centre, was viewed as conducive to interaction and discussion. The circular seating arrangement was also viewed positively. Lastly, having a choice of refreshments was important to the mentoring partners. One mentoring volunteer and partner dropped out of the program prior to the third workshop because the mentoring partner felt that she did not have time to devote to the program. The mentoring volunteer was not matched with another student.

Between the second and third workshop, the teen support worker met briefly with each mentoring volunteer and partner to receive individual feedback on the status of their mentoring relationship and provide assistance if needed. For the remainder of the program, the teen support worker and I had on-going contact with mentoring volunteers and partners to receive individual feedback on the status of their mentoring relationship and provide assistance if needed.

Although the third workshop, held on December 14, followed the CSIS Mentor Strategy "Feedback and Relationship Rules" workshop closely, modifications were made to incorporate suggestions from both the mentoring volunteers and partners, breaks and cooperative learning activities. The third workshop began with a whole group discussions of the "Bridging Activity #1" and of meetings/outings undertaken by mentoring pairs. Some mentoring volunteer and partner pairings stated concerns about arranging meeting times. Mentoring volunteers and partners who were not having difficulty meeting discussed their experiences. The partnership contract (Appendix I), which both mentoring volunteers and partners were required to read and sign, gave participants the opportunity to discuss their relationship expectations, concerns and goals. The remainder of the workshop focussed on giving and receiving feedback (Appendix J) and the format and use of the Emily Carr Mentoring Program Log (Appendix K). At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to meet on a weekly basis prior to the next activity.

Following the workshop the teen support worker and I met to discuss our reflections and the feedback from the mentoring volunteers and partners. First, further modification of the activities in the CSIS Mentor Strategy would have to be made as mentoring volunteers and partners felt they required too

much writing and were too theoretical. Feedback from mentoring volunteers and partners also directed us to plan additional group gatherings which allowed mentoring volunteers and partners to participate as a pair. As a result, in addition to the two remaining workshops, listening and problem solving, we decided to add three additional group meetings/outings so that mentoring volunteers and partners could meet as a pair within the group. Third, as some mentoring pairs were having difficulty meeting, we decided to distribute blank calendar sheets to facilitate planning. Fourth, we decided to incorporate personal reflection activities at the beginning of the two remaining workshops and any group meetings (Appendix L).

The next time the group met, in January, was for a group meeting as opposed to a formal workshop. The group meeting included an activity on goal setting/projects and a team board game. Participants also discussed future group meetings and outings. At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to meet on a weekly basis for the next three weeks, prior to the next workshop.

Although the fourth workshop followed the CSIS Mentor Strategy "Focus on Listening to Your Partner" workshop closely, modifications were made to incorporate suggestions from both the mentoring volunteers and partners, breaks and cooperative learning activities. The workshop began with a personal reflection activity and discussion of meetings/outings undertaken by mentoring pairs. A mentoring word association game was followed by a listening activity (Appendix M). Friday breakfast meetings and a group outing the next month were also discussed. At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to meet on a weekly basis, prior to the next activity.

Following the workshop the teen support worker and I met to discuss our reflections and the feedback from the mentoring volunteers and partners.

Together with the participants, we decided that early morning breakfast meetings would be held every second Friday, on a trial basis. The breakfasts were held every second Friday, beginning March 3.

The group also decided that Laser Tag would be the group activity in March.

In late March, then, the mentoring volunteers and partners met at a commercial venue to play Laser Tag, a game they thought they could play in pairs. However, the game actually required two teams so the mentoring partners challenged the mentoring volunteers. Feedback from both the mentoring volunteers and partners was positive. Both felt that it was fun activity, though there was little time for interaction. At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to meet on a weekly basis prior to the next workshop.

Although the fifth workshop followed the CSIS Mentor Strategy "Problem Solving" workshop closely, modifications were made to incorporate suggestions from both the mentoring volunteers and partners, breaks and cooperative learning activities. The workshop began with a personal reflection activity and discussion of meetings/outings undertaken by mentoring pairs. Participants were then asked to use one word to describe their mentoring relationships to the group. A problem solving activity was modelled after CSIS Mentor Strategy activities (Appendix N). Friday breakfast meetings and a year end group outing in May were also discussed. At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to meet on a weekly basis, prior to the next activity.

Prior to the May activity, the teen support worker and I met with the mentoring volunteers to discuss the future of their mentoring relationships and the mentoring program. In an attempt to give mentoring pairs direction and freedom, we proposed three possible options for the mentoring pairs. If

both members of a relationship wanted to continue, they could be involved in the program in terms of outings but not workshops as they would be redundant. The second option entailed mentoring pairs continuing their mentoring relationship on an informal basis without support from the mentoring program. Lastly, if a staff person and student wanted to end their mentoring relationship, the staff person could pursue a new mentoring relationship for the 1995-96 school year. We explained the need for each mentoring volunteer to initiate a conversation about the direction of their mentoring relationship with their partner. We suggested to the mentoring volunteers that the Pitch and Putt Celebration could be a time to discuss the future of their mentoring relationship or a time to set up a meeting.

In late May, the mentoring volunteers and partners met at a local pitch and putt golf course. The Texas Scramble format chosen by the participants required the mentoring volunteers and partners to play as teams, always hitting the best ball. Feedback from both the mentoring volunteers and partners was positive. Mentoring pairs felt that it was fun activity and a time when they could interact with each other and other participants. At the end of the workshop, participants were requested to meet on a weekly basis until the end of school year, in June.

Description of the Study

This section describes the design, the entry into field, the researcher's role, the participants, the data collection and analysis and establishing *trustworthiness*.

The Design

In research, it is the questions asked which should determine the research design. The research questions which guided this study were:

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the proteges?

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the mentors?

A qualitative research design was determined to be the appropriate design for the above questions. Specifically, the constructivist paradigm was the philosophical and methodological approach most relevant to the present inquiry. As Guba and Lincoln (1989) so aptly state, "the constructivist paradigm provides the best 'fit' whenever it is human inquiry that is being considered" (p. 82). In this study, the utilization of the constructivist paradigm enabled the researcher to describe the findings relevant to the two research questions with rich, contextual information.

As revealed earlier, the constructivist paradigm holds that there are multiple realities constructed by individuals (and groups) in response to new phenomena in their environment (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). According to Guba and Lincoln (1989) constructions are often commonly held, that is, there is consensus. "Truth," for the constructivist, is the construction or constructions which meet the "most informed and sophisticated" criterion at any given time (Guba and Lincoln, 1989).

Epistemology, according to Guba and Lincoln (1989) is concerned with the origin, nature and limits of human knowledge. The epistemological question is "What is the relationship of the knower to the known (or the knowable)?" or "How can we be sure we know what we know?" (p. 83). In a constructivist paradigm, "an inquirer and the inquired-into are interlocked in such a way that the findings of an investigation are the literal creation of the inquiry process" (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 84). For the constructivist, then, inquiry cannot be objective and value-free. The phenomenon being studied cannot be separated from the values held by the inquirer and other

stakeholders. It is the interaction between the inquirer, the stakeholders and the phenomenon which creates the data.

Methodology, according to Guba and Lincoln (1989) is concerned with the methods, systems and rules for conducting inquiry. The methodological question is "What are the ways of finding out knowledge?" or "How can we go about finding out things" (p. 83). A hermeneutic methodology, consistent with the constructivist paradigm asserts that:

the inquiry must be carried out in a way that will expose the constructions of the variety of concerned parties, open each to critique in the terms of other constructions, and provide the opportunity for revised or entirely new constructions to emerge (p. 89).

Utilizing the hermeneutic methodology in human inquiry should lead to "successively better understanding" that makes sense of phenomenon under study. According to Guba and Lincoln (1989) four entry requirements must be met for a study to be meaningful in constructivist terms. First, the study must be pursued in a natural setting so that the same time/context frame is open to the inquirer. Second, the human being is the instrument of choice for the constructivist due to humans' capacity for learning and adapting to situations as they arise. That is, constructivists begin inquiry as learners, not knowing what they don't know. As the study progresses they rely on their ability to interpret and focus. Third, as humans collect information best through the use of their senses, qualitative methods should be employed. Fourth, the constructivist must use his/her tacit knowledge, particularly at the beginning of an inquiry. Tacit knowledge, as defined by Guba and Lincoln (1989), "is all that we know minus all that we can say" (p.176). Without the use of tacit knowledge, the constructivist is not utilizing all salient information available to him/her. In this study, these four entry requirements were met. In

addition, methods which were consistent with the constructivist paradigm were used. Below is a brief overview of the methods utilized.

After a preliminary literature review, a general question emerged which became the initial focus for the study. This question was later refined into two questions. A tentative plan for sampling, data collection, data analysis and establishing *trustworthiness* was developed to guide and set parameters for the inquiry. Sampling was purposeful, with seven mentors and seven proteges, involved in the program, being selected. Interviews were used to collect the data. Interview protocols were of a semi-structured ethnographic nature in which the researcher prepared questions as a guide to focus the conversation and generate "rich" descriptions related to the two research questions. Interview protocols were refined and extended following the initial interviews. The construction of a narrative account and recalling of critical incidents (Flanagan, 1954) were the two main components of the interview protocol. Interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. Data analysis was based on the empirical phenomenological psychological method --EPP-method (Karlsson, 1993). An arbitrary decision was made to analyze the proteges' interviews prior to the mentors' interviews. Each interview was read until a satisfactory understanding was obtained and a brief summary could be written. The protocol was then divided into meaning units. Meaning units were then interpreted and meaning assigned to each. Next each meaning unit was synthesized and presented in the form of a synopsis. All of the protocols were then condensed into one general structure and synopses were analyzed for themes related to the research questions. A return to the protocol summaries and protocols themselves was undertaken to ensure that important meaning units were not overlooked. The results obtained from this process were presented in terms of themes, reflecting the experiences of the

participants. These themes were then classified into categories. An identical process was undertaken with the mentors' interviews. Throughout this process, *trustworthiness* was established through activities such as *peer debriefing* and *member checks* aimed at achieving *credibility*, *transferability*, *dependability* and *confirmability*.

Entry into Field

Prior to the recruitment of participants, consent to undertake the study was obtained from the Norfolk School District (Appendix O) and the University of British Columbia Behavioural Sciences Screening Committee for Research and Other Studies Involving Human Subjects. After consent was obtained, the participants in this study were recruited through contact at the problem solving workshop in April and/or through personal contact at appropriate junctures in the school day. The participants for this study were recruited from among the eight dyads of mentors and proteges involved in the Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program during its introductory year, 1994-95. The information pertinent to the study (purpose, potential benefits, methodology, confidentiality, and informed consent) was described in a letters of initial contact. Separate letters of initial contact were composed for the staff and the students (Appendix P and Appendix Q). Interested participants were requested to complete and return a consent form. Separate consent forms were composed for the staff and the students (Appendix R and Appendix S). As written parental consent is always required for research in schools, a separate parental consent form was designed (Appendix T). All eight mentors volunteered to participate in the study by returning their signed consent form. Seven of the eight proteges volunteered to participate in the study returning their own and their parent's consent forms. Selection was

initially based on the participant volunteering for the study as indicated by a signed consent form(s). From this list, participants were then chosen if both protege and mentor volunteered for study.

Researcher's Role

In this study, one researcher was involved in collecting and analyzing the data. I was also one of the coordinators of the program. I designed the interview protocols, conducted the interviews, analyzed the data and documented the findings.

Participants

Fourteen participants were recruited for this study. Seven of the participants were mentors and seven were proteges. Pseudonyms were selected for each participant to ensure confidentiality. Within the mentor group, four were male and three were female. All seven of the mentors (Fred, Lemon, Gerry, Kerri, Jo, Jan and Simon) were teachers. Within the protege group, four were male and three were female. Six of the proteges (Natasha, Frank, Christina, Helen, Tin Tin and Kurt) were in grade eight while one (Bob) was in grade ten. The proteges ranged in age from 13 to 16 years. All seven of the proteges were identified as at-risk by school staff. The at-risk behaviours exhibited by the proteges included delinquency, substance abuse, adolescent pregnancy, school failure and dropping out. In addition to being identified as at-risk by school staff, the proteges themselves felt that they could benefit from a mentoring relationship with a staff person.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were gathered through ethnographic interviews. Given this study's purpose which was to gain insight into mentors' and proteges'

experience of their mentoring relationship, this methodology, consistent with the constructivist paradigm, was seen as the best way to obtain in-depth information. Ethnographic interviews are composed of open-ended questions which are designed to obtain data of *participant meanings*. McMillan and Schumacher (1989) define *participant meanings* as the ways "individuals in social scenes conceive of their world and how they explain or "make sense" of the important events in their lives" (p. 405). According to Weber, Miracle and Skehan (1994), there are two reasons for using open-ended questions, when interviewing adolescents. First, it is often easier to simplify an open-ended question, avoiding terminology the adolescent does not understand. Second, it allows the adolescent to respond in familiar language, as opposed to choosing from the options provided in some complex closed-ended questions.

Descriptive questions were used in the interview protocol. Descriptive questions, according to Spradley (1979), are designed to elicit lengthy responses by participants. The questions were designed to focus rather than limit the discussion. In an attempt to reduce apprehension on the part of the participants, the interview protocol began with the demographic information questions, followed by the most general open-ended questions. Toward the end of the interview, the questions, though still open-ended, were more specific in nature.

The interview protocol began with a general introduction, reiterating information pertinent to the study regarding purpose, potential benefits, methodology, confidentiality, and informed consent (Appendix U). The general introduction also informed participants about the general direction of the interview and invited them to comment freely throughout the interview. Following the introduction, participants were asked to choose a pseudonym.

The first descriptive question elicited a narrative account of participants' mentoring relationships. Participants were asked to tell the researcher a story about their mentoring relationship, beginning with their introduction to the mentoring program and ending with the day of the interview. Probes were used to elicit elaboration and clarify responses.

Following the narrative question, participants were asked a series of questions based on the critical incident technique (Flanagan, 1954). The critical incident technique was developed by John Flanagan for the selection and classification of aircrews during World War II. According to Flanagan (1954):

The critical incident technique consists of a set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behavior in such a way as to facilitate their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles. ... By an incident is meant any observable human activity that is sufficiently complete in itself to permit inferences and predictions to be made about the person performing the act. To be critical, an incident must occur in a situation where the purpose or intent of the act seems fairly clear to the observer and where its consequences are sufficiently definite to leave little doubt concerning its effects (p. 327).

Later used in industry and to a lesser extent in psychological research, the critical incident technique is an exploratory method which generates comprehensive and detailed descriptions (Woolsey, 1986). The critical incident technique, according to Flanagan (1954), is most effective when the incidents occurred recently and were directly observable. Incorporating the critical incident technique into this study required the inclusion of a series of questions that established the aim of the inquiry in terms of focus and context.

Once focus and context were established, questions were asked to elicit critical incidents. The following question was included in the interview protocols: "Think of a particular time in your mentoring relationship which was really important (stood out). Describe the moment or incident. " This question, or variants on this question, were asked until the participant could no longer add any additional critical incidents. Probes were used to elicit elaboration and clarify responses.

At the end of the interview, questions were asked regarding the future of the participant's mentoring relationship, the participant's future participation in the mentoring program, whether they would recommend the program and any additional comments. Participants were informed of the focus groups which would be held after the analysis of the data. They were also reminded that the researcher welcomed questions at any time.

One interview was conducted with each of the 14 participants. The interviews took place in May and June 1995. All interviews were prearranged between the researcher and the participant and each lasted between 40 to 65 minutes, with an average of 50 minutes. In general, protege interviews were shorter than mentor interviews. The interviews were conducted before, during or after the school day. Interviews took place in empty classrooms or offices to minimize distractions and interruptions.

Consistent with the constructivist paradigm and the ethnographic methodology, alterations were made to the interview protocol, throughout the data collection process, as required. A trial interview was completed prior to interviewing the participants. This led to important refinements. The person interviewed in the trial interview was a mentor who had been involved in the program until December, 1994. My observations and her feedback regarding the interview led to several important refinements. Following the first two

interviews with proteges, my thesis supervisor and I discussed the questions which led to additional changes which simplified and clarified the questions in the interview protocol.

The interview was viewed as an interactive process between the researcher and the participant. For Mishler (1986), the questions and responses in an interview are contextually grounded and jointly constructed by the researcher and the participant. Variations across interviews are not viewed as errors but as data for analysis (Mishler, 1986). I felt that the record of the interview protocol and notes regarding a participant's responses would not have been sufficient data for the present study. Rather, my questions and the respondent's answers were audio taped and then transcribed verbatim to facilitate my understanding of the mentor/protege expression.

Data analysis was based on the empirical phenomenological psychological method--EPP-method (Karlsson, 1993). Prior to analysis, the interviews were divided into mentor interviews and protege interviews. An arbitrary decision was made to analyze the proteges' interviews prior to the mentors' interviews. First, each interview was read until a satisfactory understanding was obtained. A summary was then written. Second, the interview protocol was divided into meaning units. Meaning units or constructions were the created realities which emerged from the interaction between the researcher and the participant during the interview. The division between meaning units was based on shifts in meaning, not linguistic or grammatical rules (Karlsson, 1993). In some cases, sentences contained more than one meaning unit. By isolating a few words in this way, the significance of the meaning unit was not overlooked. Third, meaning units were interpreted and meaning assigned to each. The language of the participant was transformed into my language (Karlsson, 1993). Fourth, each

meaning unit was then synthesized and presented in the form of a synopsis. Fifth, the synopses in each interview were examined for themes related to the research question pertaining to the proteges. A theme was identified as an important claim, concern or issue for the participant. When a theme emerged from the data, the attributes of the theme were identified and a tentative name was assigned. Sixth, all of the themes were then condensed into one general structure, a table, and common themes were identified. Commonality across participants was the criterion used to determine if a theme was common. Specifically, if the theme was evident in five of the seven interviews, it was identified as a common theme. Five was chosen as it indicated that the majority of participants discussed the theme. A return to the protocol summaries and protocols themselves was undertaken to ensure that important meaning units and themes were not overlooked. The results obtained from this process were presented in terms of common themes, reflecting the experiences of the participants. These themes were then classified into categories. An identical process was undertaken with the mentors' interviews.

Following the analysis of the data, focus groups were held with the mentors and proteges separately. The focus group for the mentors included five of the seven mentors as two of the mentors had left the school to teach in foreign countries. The focus group for the proteges included five of the seven proteges as two of the proteges had transferred to other schools. The data analysis was explained to each of the groups. Themes were then presented and feedback requested.

The proteges' themes and the mentors' themes are described in Chapter Four. Woven through the description of the themes are the individual stories of the participants.

The collection and analysis of the data as outlined above was a complex process. The researcher was, at all times, a learner during this process.

Establishing Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is defined here as the quality of the research design and data. When inquiry is undertaken within the positivist paradigm, internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity are the appropriate criteria upon which the inquiry is judged. These criteria, however, are not applicable to inquiry undertaken within the constructivist paradigm. Guba and Lincoln (1989) outline four parallel criteria upon which *trustworthiness* can be ascertained. These four criteria are *credibility*, *transferability*, *dependability* and *confirmability*.

Credibility

Credibility parallels the positivist criteria of internal validity. *Credibility* is defined as the match between the constructed realities of the participants and the reconstructions of the researcher (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). The techniques for assessing *credibility* that were incorporated into this study were *prolonged engagement*, *peer debriefing*, *progressive subjectivity*, and *member checks*. *Prolonged engagement* is defined as sufficient involvement at the site of the inquiry to minimize the effects of distortion, build rapport with the participants and facilitate immersion into the context of the study (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Although each participant was interviewed only once, the researcher, also one of the coordinators of the Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program, was sufficiently familiar with the site and had developed a rapport with the 14 participants.

Peer debriefing involved discussing all aspects of the inquiry with peers. The researcher discussed the present inquiry, particularly the

methodology and results, with the thesis committee. *Progressive subjectivity*, the process of monitoring the researcher's analysis of the data, was achieved by frequently revisiting the interview protocols and raw data and sharing the analysis with the thesis committee for comments and guidance. *Member checks*, the process of checking the emergent findings with members of stakeholding groups, was achieved through focus groups. Separate focus groups were held for the mentors and proteges following the data analysis. The majority of mentors and proteges attended the focus groups. The data analysis was explained to each of the groups. Themes were then presented and participants were requested to verify that these were the constructions that they offered through their interviews. Participants' reactions were unanimously positive and as a result no changes were required.

Transferability

Transferability parallels the positivist criteria of external validity or generalizability. *Transferability* is defined here as the "similarity between sending and receiving contexts" (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). In order to allow the reader to decide whether the findings of this study can be transferred to his/her own context, the research questions were articulated at the outset and the context of the study was described extensively.

Dependability

Dependability parallels the positivist criteria of reliability. *Dependability* refers to the "stability of the data over time" (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Unlike positivist inquiry, constructivist inquiry welcomes methodological changes and shifts in meaning making. However, these shifts must be documented. In this study, revisions to the research questions,

interview protocols and emergent themes were recorded. The revisions were also discussed with the thesis committee.

Confirmability

Confirmability parallels the positivist criteria of objectivity.

Confirmability "is concerned with assuring that data, interpretations, and outcomes of inquiries are rooted in contexts and persons apart from the evaluator" (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). In this study, the thesis committee lent *confirmability* to the findings by critiquing the work in progress. Specifically, the thesis committee reviewed the data collection and analysis from the interview protocols to the organization of the mentors' and proteges' themes.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The seven proteges' and seven mentors' experiences of their mentoring relationships are explored in terms of their common themes. As described in Chapter three, the 14 interview protocols were divided into mentor interviews and protege interviews. The analysis of the proteges' interviews preceded the analysis of the mentors' interviews. Data analysis was based on the empirical phenomenological psychological method--EPP-method (Karlsson, 1993).

Briefly, interviews were divided into meaning units. Each meaning unit was synthesized and presented in the form of a synopsis. The synopses in each interview were examined for themes pertaining to the experience of the mentoring relationship for the proteges. When a theme emerged from the data, the attributes of the theme were identified and a tentative name was assigned. All of the themes were then condensed into one general structure, a table, and common themes were identified. Commonality was the criterion used to determine if a theme was common. The results obtained from this process were presented in terms of common themes, reflecting the experiences of the proteges. Fourteen themes were identified as common to the proteges. These common themes were classified into four categories. An identical process was undertaken with the mentors' themes. Fourteen themes were identified as common to the mentors. These common themes were then classified into four categories. The common themes identified for the proteges and mentors relate to the two research questions addressed by the study:

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the proteges?

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the mentors?

The first part of the chapter focuses on the common themes of the proteges while the second part focuses on the common themes of the mentors. Woven through the description of the themes are the individual stories of the participants.

Proteges' Common Themes

The common themes of the proteges were ascertained from the analyzed data of the seven interviews. From the emergent meaning units in each of the proteges' interviews, 14 themes were identified as common to the proteges. These common themes were then classified into four categories. The four categories were sustained contact between mentor and protege, mentoring relationship as a friendship, mentor as a listener and contributor and activity-based mentoring relationship. Table 1 shows the proteges' common themes in terms of their categories.

Table 1 Summary of Proteges' Common Themes

Categories	Common Themes
sustained contact between mentor and protege	mutual commitment
	one-on-one contact
	accessibility of mentor
	frequency of meeting
	length of meeting
mentoring relationship as a friendship	friendship
	understanding
	mutual interests
	future oriented mentoring relationship
mentor as a listener and contributor	mutual sharing
	problem solving
activity-based mentoring relationship	extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting
	opportunity to learn and/or teach a new skill
	enjoyment of activities

Two themes which did not meet the commonality criteria but were present in three or more interviews were encouragement and multiplicity of roles.

Category - sustained contact between mentor and protege

The category of sustained contact between mentor and protege is defined here as the necessary interaction to maintain a mentoring relationship throughout the mentoring program. The category of sustained contact between mentor and protege was described by proteges in terms of five common themes: mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor, frequency of meetings and length of meetings.

Common theme - mutual commitment

For all seven proteges, mutual commitment was an important theme related to their mentoring relationships. In five of the seven mentoring

relationships the presence of mutual commitment was viewed positively while in two of the seven mentoring relationships, its absence was viewed negatively. In the case of Bob, both he and his mentor, Fred, initiated activities through brief meetings at school and home based telephone conversations. In all incidents except one, both Bob and Fred followed through on their plans:

Lately, we've been going like biking every week ... We just usually see each other all the time cause we go biking and stuff like that.

Natasha and her mentor, Lemon, consistently made the effort to meet with each other:

You know we're always going out and having fun. Just talking about something and ... what are we going to do next week....

Natasha was particularly impressed by her mentor's acknowledgement of her birthday with a card and present.

Like Natasha, Frank and Christina expressed the theme of mutual commitment. Frank and Christina stated that they and their mentors consistently made an effort to meet with each other.

For Helen and her mentor, Jo, mutual commitment was evident in their planning:

When we like, when we meet at lunch that, that was good too. ... It's not that long but it's good anyway cause like we talk about when we are going to meet again and we have a calendar with the months and like we plan what we are going to do in that month.

In the case of Tin Tin, he and his mentor, Jan, had scheduling problems which they had difficulty overcoming:

...we'd take days and see what day we could meet and we'd keep trying to get together on these certain days and ... then I'd have Oklahoma [the musical] , he'd have sports, it just kind of, I don't know, it just kept getting mixed up.

In the case of Kurt, it was him and not his mentor, Simon, who had difficulty maintaining contact, indicating a lack of mutual commitment:

... I was always, I wasn't really with it. I was kind of letting him down and, you know, and he was always making the effort and putting out the time and then there's me who never would put out the time or anything.

Common theme - one-on-one contact

The theme of one-on-one contact was present for all of the proteges. All of the proteges viewed the presence of one-on-one contact positively. The amount of one-on-one contact proteges experienced varied. In addition, one-on-one contact took place under a variety of conditions--as a pair, with another mentoring pair or within a group setting. For Bob an important time in his mentoring relationship was when he realized that he could telephone his mentor, Fred, and ask him to do an activity which would involve one-on-one contact:

It would have been like [yesterday] cause it would have been just both of us going, on like a really, really big ride. Better than really good. And like knowing ... I can like call him up and like ask him to go like biking.

Natasha also made numerous references to activities when she and her mentor experienced one-on-one contact:

We just talked and stuff. We had fun. We went to McDonald's, we went ... to the dike, we had ice cream.

After being matched by Jim, the teen support worker, Frank recalled one-on-one contact with Gerry:

He [Jim] ... teamed me up with ... Mr. Mantis [Gerry]. And we got to know each other. We did stuff and we went out and stuff like that.

The theme of one-on-one contact was also evident throughout Christina and Helen's interviews and to a much lesser extent in Tin Tin and Kurt's interviews.

Common theme - accessibility of mentor

Due to the school-based nature of the mentoring program, all of the proteges' mentors were at the school during school hours. However, some

mentors were more accessible to their proteges than others. Bob and Tin Tin's mentors did not have permanent classrooms but were accessible to them in the hallways and near the gym during the school day and after school. Tin Tin stated that he would initiate a conversation with his mentor if he saw him in the halls. Bob's mentor was accessible to him as they were in the gym at the same time. Bob's mentor was also accessible to him outside of school hours on the telephone.

Natasha, Frank and Kurt's mentors had permanent classrooms and were accessible to them after school. Natasha and her mentor often met in her classroom to talk:

Most of the time actually we'd just go, I'd, I'd go to her room after school and we'd just talk.

Similarly, Frank stated, "I went to his ... room maybe once every week or something like that." Neither Natasha nor Frank mentioned whether they saw their mentors in the hallways during school hours. Kurt often met his mentor, Simon, on his walk to school.

Christina's mentor was one of her teachers and was accessible to her during class time. Christina also saw her mentor in the hallways and met with her at lunch in her classroom:

Well, we saw each other all the time cause like we would always like see each [other] in my class with her and then we'd always [see] each other ... in the hallways....

Helen's mentor was one of her teachers and was accessible to her during class time. Helen also met with her mentor before school, at lunch and after school in her classroom.

Common theme - frequency of meetings

The theme of frequency of meetings was expressed by all seven proteges. For Bob, Natasha, Frank, Christina and Helen the presence of

frequent meetings was viewed positively, while Tin Tin and Kurt viewed the absence of frequent meetings negatively.

Frequency of meetings was evident in Bob's comments regarding his on-going contact with his mentor. In his case, he saw his mentor every day if only to say "hi." In addition, Bob and his mentor met for activities on a weekly or bi-weekly basis throughout the year. Natasha met with her mentor at least once, though sometimes as often as three times a week. Frank met with his mentor weekly or bi-weekly, in the computer lab. Christina had her mentor as a teacher so she interacted with her mentor every second day for the entire year. In addition, Christina and her mentor met bi-weekly for activities. Helen also had her mentor as a teacher which facilitated constant interaction. Helen met with her mentor once or twice a week outside of class:

Well, sometimes it would be between classes when I would have her. Sometimes we would meet after school. Sometimes at lunch. Even sometimes in the morning too.

Although Tin Tin often saw his mentor briefly in the halls, they did not meet on a regular basis. At the beginning of the year, Kurt often met his mentor on his walk to school. Kurt, though, only met his mentor sporadically outside of the impromptu meetings on his walk to school.

Common theme - length of meetings

The theme of length of meetings was expressed by six of the seven proteges. For Bob, Natasha, Frank, and Helen the presence of the theme of length of meetings was viewed positively while Tin Tin and Kurt were neutral about the theme. Bob expressed the importance of lengthy interactions when he described a bike ride he and his mentor had planned. He felt very positive about the extended length of time he and his mentor were going to devote to the ride.

Natasha distinguished between meetings at school which were times to "just sit down and talk" and activities which were outside of the school:

... when we go out it's like an hour and a half and meetings were only like forty-five minutes and you just sit down and talk ... But ... when we go outside it's an hour and a half. Like yesterday was from one-thirty, one forty-five till three-thirty or so.

When Frank and his mentor Gerry met in the computer lab, it was usually for an hour or an hour and a half. According to Frank, there was one meeting which lasted for two hours, "until 5 o'clock."

Helen reflected on the impact of length of meetings in her interview on two occasions. Specifically, Helen commented on length of meetings when she described an outing with her mentor where they went ice skating:

Oh, we went after school. I think we spend an hour and a half on the ice. It was pretty good. ... I think I met her twice before and I guess we really got together and did something together like something long and stuff.

She also referred to length of meeting in her description of bike riding with her mentor:

...last week when we went bike riding, that, that was really nice. ... I guess because I spent a lot of time with her that day.

Tin Tin referred to the theme of length of meeting when he described his brief interactions with Jan in the hallways. According to Tin Tin, these meetings were two to three minutes.

Although Kurt and his mentor met infrequently, Kurt did state that their meetings in Simon's classroom lasted about an hour. Kurt did not state the length of their conversations on the way to school.

Category - mentoring relationship as a friendship

Friendship is defined here as personal regard for another person. The category of friendship was described by proteges in terms of the four common

themes of friendship, understanding, mutual interests and future oriented mentoring relationship.

Common theme - friendship

For six of the seven proteges the theme of friendship was evident in their interviews, though to a lesser extent for Frank and Tin Tin. The theme of friendship was absent in Kurt's interview. Bob made several direct references to being friends with his mentor:

I don't know. I just thought that the program was really cool. It was really just, just being friends with a teacher, I guess.

And we just hang around and be friends and like ski or do some stuff like that. That's basically it.

And like we were more friends than pals. Maybe he could like take me rock climbing or stuff like that.

But to actually do something like friends, cause he called just, I think he called to set up like skiing or something like that. Yeah. That was really, that kind of felt really good cause like it was more like being friends, cause we could call each other up to ski

Natasha, like Bob, felt positive about her friendship with her mentor.

Natasha's experience of friendship was also expressed in her interview:

... it's like you know we're like really good friends now. Like, we talk to each other all the time and stuff. Cause like, I don't like, I don't talk with teachers, teachers like that right. Oh don't go up to them and say, "Hey man, what's up?" Right. But to her it's like easy. When I go up to her and say look because I like know her and stuff. It's better to know, like a teacher and talk to them normally like you talk to a person right, like a kid.

Similarly, Christina felt positive about her friendship with her mentor:

It was, like, it was nice cause you, like you know like you're friends with a teacher and stuff. And most people aren't friends with their teachers.

Although Helen did not use the terms friend or friendship, the theme of friendship is apparent in her description of her partner:

Well, well she's a good partner and I like her and if we are going to do it next year, I would like to do it like next year too with her.

Although Tin Tin did refer to the presence of friendship in his relationship, some of his feelings regarding his friendship with Jan were negative:

... it seemed like we [were] just friends going out to play golf

Sometimes it felt like we were just, we were friends and all that, we would talk and everything, but then sometimes it just feels like who is that guy. Like we don't really talk so we, so we never felt like we had anything there.

While there was a sense of the theme of friendship in Frank's interview, he never clearly expressed the experience.

Common theme - understanding

The theme of understanding is defined here as being tolerant, flexible, respectful and/or sympathetic toward the needs, feelings or views of another. The theme of understanding was expressed by five of the proteges. In the cases of Bob and Natasha, they were the recipients of understanding while Christina, Helen and Kurt were the providers of understanding. Fred expressed understanding to his protege Bob at the outset of Bob and Fred's mentoring relationship:

... me and my friend were going to like skip school one time and, and Mr. Morris [Fred] like caught us and we said that we had like permission from our parents.. And then he said that, "Okay well I'll go check in the office." ... And then I said okay, whatever, and then we, we were about to leave but then we didn't. We went back and we said that we were lying And then I talked to Mr. Morris about that and he said, "We'll, we'll just forget about this. That's okay."

And then after that I didn't lie to him again.

Mr. Morris just told me to like forget about it and we could start over fresh. So I think it was like ... just starting completely fresh.

I don't know. It made me feel pretty good that like, that he wasn't going to quit just because I lied to him or something like that.

Natasha's experience of understanding occurred when her mentor asked her to assist with a school fashion show which Natasha didn't want to be involved in. Natasha was relieved when her mentor told her, "It's up to you."

In the end, Natasha decided to help her mentor with the fashion show.

Christina expressed the theme of understanding with respect to her mentor, Kerri, when the other students in her Physical Education class were becoming annoyed about an incident concerning an activity:

Because like, like I know the whole story and they don't know the whole story so and they're just, they're like getting ... [annoyed] ... like, it's not that bad. Like it's not her fault.

It's just like, like other people. That's it. Cause the, they like cause sometimes, they do mean things to the teacher and you're like what the hell.

Helen expressed the theme of understanding when her mentor explained that she had been absent from school because her uncle died:

Like, it [I] was sad for her like because like her uncle died and it was sad for me because like I felt like sorry for her and stuff.

For Kurt, the experience of understanding occurred as a result of not meeting his mentor as planned:

I felt bad for him, for, for Mr. Simpson [Simon] more than myself.

I was kind of letting him down and, you know, and he was always making the effort and putting out the time and then there's me who never would put out the time or anything.

Common theme - mutual interests

One of the factors used to match proteges and mentors in the mentoring program was mutual interests. For five of the seven proteges, mutual interests was a positive theme related to their mentoring relationships. The theme of mutual interests was clearly expressed by Bob as one of the important components of his mentoring relationship with Fred:

Well I think just meeting him and finding out that like, he liked the same stuff that I did. And even finding out that there was a teacher in the school that I would like, young, and like skied, I mean snow boarded and like mountain biked and did sports ... like I was interested in I think that was just one of the good things.

The theme of mutual interests was expressed to a lesser extent by Frank, Christina, Tin Tin and Kurt. A frequent focus of discussion and activity for Frank and his mentor, Gerry, was their mutual interest in computers, computer games, and the Internet. Christina and her mentor discussed their mutual interest in college sports and sports related careers. Christina was initially interested in women's basketball at the university level. She found her mentor a good source of information regarding the requirements for university sports scholarships.

For Tin Tin and his mentor, Jan, professional sports teams and biking were two mutual interests that were often discussed:

What's your team of this or who do you think's going to this or what kinds of sports do you play, which one's your favourite? He say[s] he likes biking. He bikes to work ... and I told him I was getting a bike. And maybe we could go biking some time.

Kurt and his mentor, Simon, discussed types of music which was a mutual interest. And while it appeared that Natasha and Helen and their mentors engaged in mutually enjoyable activities, the construction of mutual interests was absent from their interviews.

Common theme - future oriented mentoring relationship

The common theme of future oriented mentoring relationship is defined here as a mentoring relationship that will continue past the current school year. For all seven proteges, future oriented mentoring relationship was identified as an important theme. For three of the seven mentoring relationships the presence of future oriented mentoring relationship was viewed positively, in two cases its absence was viewed negatively and in two cases the proteges were unclear about its presence or absence.

The theme of future oriented mentoring relationship was evident in Bob's interview. He made several references to a "lasting friendship" with his mentor and how he hoped they would always be friends:

I just kind of hope that it goes on like maybe through the summer, like maybe we could go biking or something like that. And next year I know he's going to be there ... We already know that we are just going to be friends next year too ...

Natasha expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship throughout her interview. She had discussed the future orientation of her relationship with her mentor:

She [Lemon] asked me about am I going to do it next year? And I told her, "Yeah, I am." She goes, "Really, I'm going to be there too right."

Although she acknowledged that things could change over the summer, Natasha was looking forward to a closer mentoring relationship or friendship next year:

Next year's going to be way better. Like, like, it's gonna be like we're gonna do stuff like more often than this year because like we know each other. It's like she's gonna be one of [my] friends right. So, it's like Christina, like, for example, she's my friend. I go everywhere places with her right. It's going to be like her right. Sometimes we go to the mall, we can go to downtown, and look, like more there. We can do more, I think we're gonna do more stuff than we do like this year. Because we're gonna be like way closer together.

Although Frank clearly felt positive about his mentoring relationship with Gerry, he was unclear about whether his mentoring relationship was future oriented and how he felt about that:

I, I don't know. I might go see him sometime, sometimes ... next year and see if I can keep in touch with him in the summer.

Like Frank, Helen clearly felt positive about her mentoring relationship, though uncertain about whether it would continue:

Well, I'm not sure if we're gonna do it next year but if we're gonna do it I think it's gonna ... [be] good, getting like better and better day by day or week by week

Christina expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship. She thought it would stop over the summer and then continue when the next school year began. She felt positive about the prospect of continuing her mentoring relationship.

Tin Tin knew that he was moving the next year so continuing his mentoring relationship was not an option. However, he did say that if he were remaining at Emily Carr he would continue with his mentoring relationship because he and his mentor would have established a basis upon which to build a relationship. He did add that both he and his mentor would have to coordinate their schedules to make it work.

In the case of Kurt, his mentoring relationship with Simon ended before the end of the year. Kurt explained that he did not have enough time to dedicate to his mentoring relationship because of his family situation:

... I'm not, just no, I, I don't have enough time. That is the problem. Not dedicated enough to it.

... things at home, lots of, yeah, there's just everything always happening at home. So, I've got to be there. I got something to do.

Category - mentor as a listener and contributor

The category of mentor as a listener and contributor was described by proteges in terms of two common themes: mutual sharing and problem solving. Proteges' descriptions of their experiences related to these two themes were very detailed.

Common theme - mutual sharing

Mutual sharing is defined here as the exchange of information related to their personal lives. The theme of mutual sharing was expressed by all seven of the proteges, though to a lesser extent by Tin Tin and Kurt. While

conversations between Bob and Fred usually focussed on the activity being undertaken, Bob did make reference to the mutual sharing which took place:

Just knowing that you know, like a teacher and like you can like talk to him and stuff. It's pretty good.

Well in the workshops [mentoring] we always talk about like our past and stuff like that, right. And Mr. Morris always tells like, tells like stories towards like why trails were like named stuff like that or what happened to his friends or something like that.

Like Bob and Fred, Natasha and Lemon's conversations were often activity-based. Family was the other major topic of conversation for Natasha and her mentor. Frank and his mentor, Gerry, both shared information on computers, vacations and weekend activities.

Christina and her mentor shared information on their family life and holidays:

... like Christmas time and like how ... I go to Banff every Christmas I don't know, like her husband's coming back from Peru or whatever. Like he's got business or whatever in a that place and things they did at home or something like that. ... just like Christmas things, the good things.

Christina also described an incident where her mentor shared a mistake she made:

She was telling me how like she forgot and she ate her breakfast and then she came [to the mentoring breakfast].

Helen frequently expressed the theme of mutual sharing in her interview. Topics of conversation included origins, family and weekends:

[We talked] like about ... how does she teach? How does she get into teaching and ... where does she live and that kind of stuff. ... And then I talked. Then, she asked me questions about me and how I came from Greece and stuff.

Well, we talked about the dog, her dog and ... her cats. And how they play and stuff. And ... when we are going to meet again and and just if, if I have a dog and stuff.

Well, we talked about, ah, well we talked about my family, her family....

Oh, we talked about her family and how did she come from....

Well we were looking at the houses around there. The [how] beautiful they are. We talked about ... what we did on the weekend. And I went camping. And so we talked about that. And she went to Victoria and that's about it. Oh yeah. And her dog got hurt. That's it.

.... yeah we talked about her uncle, like what happened to him. How come that he died. And ... we talked when we were going to have the meeting with the whole group. ... Like do you feel comfortable in the group....

Well, we talked about my brother, that's it. Cause she has my brother in one of her classes

Although Tin Tin and Kurt did not meet with their mentors as often as the other proteges, mutual sharing was evident in their interviews. Tin Tin and his mentor, Jan, shared information about sports, school and family:

Just about sports and what happened this day and that day what's going on at home and there and stuff. And I'd ask him what going on with him and how he's doing and stuff.

School, sports and life. I guess friends, family... what's going on in school ... and just sports like what, who do you think will win this or something?

Kurt and his mentor, Simon, shared information about their families, weekends, holidays and music.

Common theme - problem solving

Six of the seven proteges expressed the theme of problem solving. The theme of problem solving is defined here an incident where the mentor assists the protege with problem solving related to his/her personal and/or school life. In the case of Bob, he and his mentor discussed incidents where he had been in "trouble". Bob felt that these discussions in specific, and his mentoring relationship in general, kept him out of further trouble:

... I remember on the way up to rock climbing we were talking about ... how I went to Peru and how like I got out of all the troubles and stuff like that. Talking about that and how I don't do anything anymore.

[Mentoring program] kind of kept me out of trouble. It did, I know.

Natasha expressed the theme of problem solving in a description of a problem with a boy and a rumour:

... I just went over to her classroom and I just started talking to her [Lemon]. Because I had like tons of problems with this guy and then she tried to help me out and stuff. ...

The really like most important part in the mentoring is when there was a rumour going on that there was this guy who raped me, right. A rumour. And she's like, "Oh my God this is like really serious." ... And she's like helping me out and I like and like that guy had counselling and detentions and stuff.

Natasha also made several references to the theme of problem solving as it related to her progress at school. For Natasha, Lemon was able to assist her in raising her grades:

Sometimes she asks me, "Oh yeah, do you have any problems or stuff?" And sometimes I do and I tell her like my problems like, like boys and school and everything right.

And then she's like helping me out and stuff. Like I used to have an "E" in my math and ... an "E" in my science. Now I have a "C+" in math and like almost a "C" almost a "C+" in my science right. She's like helping me out, talking to the teachers and stuff.

... the last time we're [talking] about like if I'd [have to go to] summer school, I'm gonna have like bad news.

Christina also expressed the theme of problem solving as it related to her progress and behaviour at school. In addition to discussing Christina's grades, her mentor was able to give her a specific strategy for getting along with her teachers:

... we talked about like school and stuff. ... like my teachers and like my grades and all that.

... like say like I have a problem in school or something. Or I have a problem with one of my teachers. Then, like she would just like talk to me about how you could solve it or something.

Sometimes I don't like my teachers and stuff. And we'd like talking about that. And like we'd test our teachers sometimes. Like, I went to my teacher's classroom and then I, if I see'd if I was like absolutely good for one day, if he would yell at me or not. Things like that.

Helen spoke to her mentor about several aspects of her school program including homework, English as a Second Language [ESL] classes and math:

We talk ... like if you have homework.... Like how do you like, like what courses you have and that kind of stuff.

Well, we talked about ESL [English as a Second Language] Is it hard or do you understand or that kind of stuff? Or ... how is math or is it getting better....

Tin Tin expressed the theme of problem solving related to his progress and behaviour at school. His mentor would also try to give him strategies to improve his grades and his behaviour:

He asked how like my grades were and like how I was doing in those classes, if I needed help in certain subjects and told me what I should be doing to get them [my marks] back [up] I never really talked about anything but except for the grades and that. He says, one thing is you got to be on time, that helps.

And then, if I was ... talking in class He'd try to give me a way to ... get around it and not do it. I'd just say, "I can't help it. It just happens, when I talk out."

Kurt made only a brief reference to the theme of problem solving when describing topics of conversation:

Ahh, you know, what we did on the weekend. What's going to happen, you know, how to solve problems.... Almost everything in our life.

Category - activity-based mentoring relationship

Activity-based mentoring relationship is defined here as a mentoring relationship for which activities are central to the relationship. The category of the activity-based mentoring relationship was described by proteges in terms of three common themes: extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting, opportunity to teach and/or learn new skill and enjoyment of activities.

Common theme - extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the mentoring program involved group workshops, meetings and activities which were organized by the coordinators. Group workshops and meetings took place on school property while group activities usually took place in the community. The proteges took part in group activities like golf and laser tag which occurred off school property.

For six of the seven proteges, extending the mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting was an important theme. In four of the six cases, Bob, Natasha, Christina, and Helen, the presence of the theme was viewed positively. Kurt was neutral about the extension of his mentoring relationship beyond the program and school setting while Tin Tin viewed its absence negatively. In some cases, the proteges and their mentors did activities together as a pair. In other cases they did activities as a pair within a school group or with another mentoring pair. Although Bob and his mentor had contact at school, the focus of their mentoring relationship was activities which took place beyond the mentoring program and school setting:

I think the first thing we did was go to McDonald's Well, we went to ... Seymour, back to Cypress and Blackcomb and Whistler, I think. Yeah. ... I think we skied them a couple of times.... We went rock climbing with Mr. Johnson. Oh yeah, Mr. Morris [Fred] asked him to take both of us up.

Natasha and her mentor Lemon often extended their mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting:

We went to McDonald's. We went to the dike most of the time. We went to see ... houses and just drive around. We went ... to Dairy Queen. We went to Geraldton. We went to the beach.

Christina and her mentor, Kerri, also extended their relationship beyond the school setting:

...went out places together like we went ... [to] McDonald's and stuff ... We went to bowling and we made ... Christmas cookies for Christmas.

Helen and her mentor, Jo, extended their mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting on a number of occasions:

Once we went skating, ice skating. ...I think we had the cookie thing. Then, we went for a walk. ... And last week we went ... bike riding. And the week after we went with the dog outside.

Kurt and Simon met a limited number of times beyond the school setting as they both walked to school. The meetings, though spontaneous, were opportunities for short discussions.

Tin Tin's mentoring relationship never extended beyond the mentoring program and the school setting. He enjoyed participating in the mentoring group activities, like golf and laser tag, with his mentor. He indicated that he would have liked to have extended their relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting.

Common theme - opportunities to learn and/or teach a new skill

For six of the proteges, the experience of their mentoring relationships involved opportunities to learn and/or teach a new skill. All six proteges viewed the experience of learning and/or teaching a new skill as positive. For instance, Bob had the opportunity to learn how to rock climb:

We went rock climbing with ... Mr. Johnson. ... Mr. Morris [Fred] asked him to take both of us up. ... It was really fun cause like we learned how to do all the ropes and stuff. Now I can like just go to Rock House and not pay full fee. It's pretty good. Yeah. I had a good time.

He also had the opportunity to teach his mentor how to do particular rock climbing maneuvers:

Like how to balaid and how like [to] bring a person down. And how to rappel down, [that] sort of thing. ... He [Fred] didn't quite get it the first time. But I kept, told him how to do it.

Natasha enjoyed golfing for the first time with her mentor during a mentoring program group activity:

Well, I kind of like that golfing thing because like it was like the first [time] I was golfing. She kept on supporting me. She kept on saying, "Oh that's really good Natasha, you did pretty good, you know that's good." And I'm like, I'm not really getting, she wants me to feel happy and stuff. So she's always like, "Oh that's really good, that's really good. You did pretty great for the first time. I'm like, "Thank you and stuff like that." And she's like really nice to me when I'm playing golf because it's my first time and like, they're all good right but I'm not good. I'm not really good. And then she goes, "Oh, that's okay and stuff."

She also looked forward to the exchange of skills. She wanted to teach her mentor how to play basketball, while her mentor wanted to teach her how to play tennis.

While Frank did not mention any instances of learning and/or teaching a new skill directly, he and his mentor did inform each other about new computer games and changes on the Internet.

Like Natasha, Christina enjoyed learning how to golf with her mentor. She stated "... like I didn't know the game at all. Like that was my first time going. So it was a fun game. I used to think it was so boring."

Helen had the opportunity to teach her mentor how to use some equipment when they were baking cookies:

Once we made cookies. ... She [Jo], says she doesn't know how to bake that good cause like she gets off work ... late and she's got lots to do. ... she said ... she doesn't know how to make cookies. She just asked me ... some questions, questions. If I know how to cook and ... how to ... use equipment. And I remember once one equipment, like she never saw it before. And I'm not sure if she was joking or not but it was funny because like I have that equipment ... I know how it works.

Kurt's mentor, Simon, taught him how to type on the computer.

Common theme - enjoyment of activities

The theme of enjoyment of activities was expressed by all of the proteges. As shown above, Bob enjoyed the time he and his mentor went rock climbing. He also enjoyed skiing and mountain biking with his mentor:

Well we went out like to local trails and stuff with like other people too. Part of the mountain biking club too. ... this was just pure fun, I guess.

Natasha frequently expressed enjoyment of activities in her interview. She described a walk with her mentor through a riverside community in Geraldton:

It was like so funny and it was just, I don't know, it was just ... fun. We talked and we had fun and we laughed and stuff. It was pretty fun.

Frank enjoyed being shown vacation slides by his mentor:

Once he pulled out this projector, after he went on vacation. I think it was to, ... either Australia or Florida. ... Mostly wildlife and that was neat. ... It's a nice thing and it was really interesting.

Among the activities Christina and her mentor engaged in, she expressed enjoyment at making cookies at Christmas, bowling and golfing:

And we were having a fun time but like we weren't really talking. Like we'd just look at each other and smile and stuff. It was like that.

Helen frequently expressed enjoyment of activities with her mentor.

Ice skating was one of the activities she really enjoyed:

Well she [Jo] did go but not to this arena and stuff. ... And it was fun because she didn't know how to skate, like she said actually she didn't know how to skate. But when she got on the ice, she was like really good at it. And it was fun. Yeah. It was fun.

Although Tin Tin and his mentor did not organize any activities on their own, Tin Tin did enjoy the golfing activity organized by the mentoring coordinators:

Yeah, and it was pretty good, I guess and we play[ed] as team mates and all that, just change, picking the ball and took turns doing that... It was fun.

Kurt expressed enjoyment regarding the time his mentor was teaching him keyboarding skills:

Well, I kind of enjoyed it [keyboarding] more because I was able to, you know, it just, it wasn't like in a classroom, it was more just him and me and that was it. So we were able not only to do the work but talk about other stuff too all the time.

Mentors' Common Themes

The common themes of the mentors were ascertained from the analyzed data of the seven interviews. Fourteen themes were identified as common to the mentors. These common themes were then classified into four categories. The four categories were sustained contact between mentor and protege, mentoring relationship as a friendship, mentor as a listener and contributor and activity-based mentoring relationship. Table 2 shows the mentors' common themes in terms of their categories.

Table 2 Summary of Mentors' Common Themes

Categories	Common Themes
sustained contact between mentor and protege	mutual commitment
	one-on-one contact
	accessibility of mentor
	frequency of meeting
	time commitment
mentoring relationship as a friendship	mutual interests
	multiplicity of roles
	future oriented mentoring relationship
mentor as a listener and contributor	openness
	mutual sharing
	problem solving
	positive impact
activity-based mentoring relationship	mentoring group activities
	extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and/or school setting

Four themes which did not meet the commonality criterion but were present in more than two interviews were friendship, opportunity to teach and/or learn a new skill, enjoyment of activities, and understanding of adolescents.

Category - sustained contact between mentor and protege

The category of sustained contact between mentor and protege is defined here as the necessary interaction to maintain a mentoring relationship throughout the mentoring program. The category of sustained contact between mentor and protege was described by mentors in terms of five common themes: mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor, frequency of meeting and time commitment.

Common theme - mutual commitment

For all seven of the mentors mutual commitment was an important theme related to their mentoring relationships. In six of the seven mentoring relationships the presence of mutual commitment was viewed positively while in one case its absence was viewed negatively. In the case of Fred, both he and his protege Bob were committed to their mentoring relationship, organizing activities on an on-going basis at school and over the telephone.

According to Lemon, she and her protege Natasha experienced mutual commitment as they built their mentoring relationship together. Lemon noted that there was initiative on both sides:

And knowing things were working out I guess too because we would hear in group sessions that sometimes people had trouble getting together and we knew that we didn't have any trouble with that and we were proud of ourselves.

So there was always this connection and I didn't have to put too much effort into it because she tended to find me a lot and, and I felt like it [mentoring relationship] wasn't a lot of work.

Similarly, Gerry and his protege Frank both initiated contact, meeting in Gerry's computer lab.

With a few exceptions, Kerri and her protege Christina were able to follow through on their plans to meet:

... we had a few when we'd arrange to meet Like one time it snowed and so she wanted to go out and play in the snow which, I mean, that makes sense. ... I didn't want it to be something where she hated, felt like she had to come and talk to this teacher when she didn't want to. So we had a few times umm that we met just for short times and a few times that fell through when we were supposed to get together.

For Kerri, her protege's enthusiasm for doing activities with her was very positive:

... any activities that we did she was so keen and so happy and so she's just so full of energy and vibrant and you know it's really, it's most, most teenagers her age don't react the same way and so it's really refreshing to have someone who's so keen to, you know she was up for doing anything. She was really, seemed very keen about it. So that was positive.

Jo and her protege Helen were committed to their mentoring relationship though their schedules were busy and conflicting. They resolved this problem by getting together approximately once a month to make a schedule:

We would plan for a month and then after the month was over we'd say okay we need to sit down and do the next one and that would take two weeks instead [of] one meeting. ... we tried to stay with that system and it worked but we had gaps in between. ...so that was a good system for us.

Jan and his protege Tin Tin experienced mutual commitment to a much lesser extent due to scheduling difficulties and because Tin Tin did not always follow through on their planned meetings. Jan tried to facilitate their meeting by using his previous experience with UBC students:

We talked about when could we get together because myself and perhaps him were frustrated that we, you know, ... the program was going and there were certain not expectations but suggestions as far as time with [each other]. ... So it was how can we work on getting together. So we thought let's try breakfast. Because it had worked in my, my experience

at UBC working with students. We had weekly [meetings] at seven for breakfast to go over [their] program each week. So okay great. We set up a time at quarter to eight. Not a huge time difference from anyone's schedule we thought. And the first two mornings of the first two weeks he never made it. ... he was actually late at school. ... so ... a staff member suggested, who was aware of what was going on, suggested ... why doesn't he bring it. ... And, and it was presented to him and he thought okay I can do that. So he did. He brought, brought breakfast. He made it here about eight o'clock as opposed to quarter to. But at least he got here....

It got him here on time first of all. It showed some responsibility and accountability for, for contributing to the, the act of getting together.

... it was the two of us making an effort.

Although Simon felt committed to the relationship, he did not feel that his protege Kurt was committed:

.. it just felt very strained at the end where we were trying to make it work but there was nothing that, that, that was sustainable that we could keep going on with.

I don't know what she [Kurt's grandmother] thought, or maybe Kurt just wasn't even asking his grandmother ... and just used that as an excuse cause he didn't want to do any of this stuff. But I wanted to go to the dike or go to fishing on some place in Geraldton and things like that.

Common theme - one-on-one contact

The theme of one-on-one contact was present in all of the mentoring relationships. For Fred, Lemon, Gerry, Kerri and Jo the presence of one-on-one contact was viewed positively. Jan and Simon had mixed feelings about the presence of one-on-one contact. One-on-one contact for Fred and his protege Bob was present, though limited. While, he did meet with Bob on his own, Fred explained that he and Bob usually did activities with other students and teachers. And within those small group settings, he and Bob had a limited amount of one-on-one contact.

Within the school setting, Lemon and Natasha had on-going one-on-one contact as they met for discussion purposes. However, when they did activities beyond the school setting they usually did them with another mentoring pair

or within the mentoring group as requested by Natasha's parents. Like Fred, Lemon had one-on-one contact with her protege during the small group activities, though to a more significant extent. Lemon stated that she found getting to know a student, as an individual, very enjoyable.

Gerry made reference to the theme of one-on-one contact when he discussed his weekly meetings with his protege, Frank, in the school computer lab. Gerry and Frank had a significant amount of one-on-one contact, though the room was often filled with students.

Kerri and her protege, Christina, experienced one-on-one contact within and beyond the school setting. Within the school setting they experienced a significant amount of one-on-one contact when they met on their own to discuss or bake cookies. Beyond the school setting they also experienced a significant amount of one-on-one contact when they did activities on their own, with other mentoring pairs and within the mentoring group. For Kerri, one-on-one contact was a positive aspect of their mentoring relationship:

... I think you ... get a chance obviously to know one student much better. I think you can have a big influence on the, on the students. ... And so I think, if, if a teacher wants to be [a mentor] I mean that's why we're in teaching, it's a good opportunity to ... make a difference for one, one student.

Jo and Helen experienced constant one-on-one contact when they met on a one-on-one basis within and beyond the school setting. For Jo, the one-on-one aspect of her mentoring relationship with Helen was very "satisfying":

You get to know the kid. Like I think that's all, why we're, most of us are in the profession. ... because of money and budget we don't get a chance to, to do what we want to do. You know, we get huge numbers and have to get across in a certain amount of time, a certain amount of information. ... the mentoring relationship isn't like that.

Jan and Tin Tin experienced one-on-one contact when they met for discussion purposes within the school setting. They also experienced one-on-one contact when they met during mentoring group activities, though it was limited. Jan explained that one of the reasons why he had limited one-on-one contact with Tin Tin was his own apprehension:

And I'm also sensitive to going off the school [property] ... one-on-one with a student. It's like meeting a student in your room. The doors are open, the windows are open and, and you're very much open to what's going on just so people know that you're in there. I think it's the same attitude, unfortunately, but you know off the school grounds.

Simon and Kurt experienced limited one-on-one contact within and beyond the school setting. Simon often found this contact a negative experience due to their lack of compatibility and Kurt's immature behaviour. Like Jan, Simon was apprehensive about one-on-one contact:

... going through the teacher education program at U.B.C. and being a male teacher and just remembering the things that [when] we were taught. Keep your doors open when you have students after school or whatever. Because you hear all this sexual harassment So that was at the back, that was [at] the front of my mind. ... But I never wanted the relationship to be one-on-one.

Common theme - accessibility of mentor

Six of mentors expressed the theme of accessibility in their interviews.

Fred acknowledged that it was difficult to meet with his protege during school hours. However, he and his protege were accessible to each other on the telephone:

He does call me at home. I'll call him at home. Usually regarding, always regarding preparing for activities. ... And it's, it's probably good because it's hard to sometimes, it's hard to get a hold of each other during school.

Lemon was accessible to her protege after school and at times during class time:

...after school and if it was busy, like sometimes there would be other students there with another teacher, then we went in, I remember going into the library at least once.

I don't know whether this is good but she would get out of class sometimes and talk to me. ... I always thought well you really shouldn't be wandering the halls but I guess if you're talking to a teacher it's not quite so bad.

Gerry was accessible to his protege, Frank, at lunch time and after school in the computer lab. Although Kerri was accessible to her protege at lunch and after school, she felt that working part time made her less accessible than she would have liked. She also felt that teaching Physical Education meant that she could be in one of several places which also made her less accessible to her protege.

Jo was accessible to her protege, Helen, in her classroom at lunch and after school. In addition, as she taught Helen, she was also accessible to her during class time:

... there [were] times that Helen and I talked ... in the classroom. ... sometimes when the students were working, Helen would really need to talk about an issue and we would go outside the portable and talk.

Jan was accessible to his protege, Tin Tin, during school hours as they would often meet in the hallways or gym area. Jan commented that he would make a conscious effort to look for Tin Tin if he had missed their breakfast meeting. Jan was also accessible to his protege in the morning before school.

The only references Simon made to accessibility were that he met with Kurt after school on two occasions.

Common theme - frequency of meeting

For all seven of the mentors, frequency of meeting was an important theme related to their mentoring relationships. Fred made a brief reference to the theme of frequency of meeting stating that he and his protege met once a week. Except for the month of April, Lemon and her protege, Natasha, met

with each other once a week during class time and once a week outside of class time. During the month of April, which Lemon describes as a "lull" they met once during class time and twice after school. Lemon accounted for the "lull" by stating that Natasha went on a trip to Los Angeles and that the beginning of spring is a busy time.

Gerry made several references to frequency of meeting. He stated that he met with Frank once a week or once every week and a half. Kerri stated that although she met with Christina once a week at the beginning of the program, their meetings became less regular toward the end. She also stated that at the beginning she and Christina met once a week in addition to mentoring program meetings, workshops, breakfasts and outings. Later, she counted mentoring program activities as their weekly contact.

Jo expressed frequency of meeting on several occasions. According to Jo, she met with her protege once a week "fairly consistently." They accomplished their goal of weekly meeting by concrete planning:

... we took the guidelines that we were supposed to meet once a week and we took her constraints. Like she had ... a couple of programs she was involved in after school and the days she had to be home early for her parents and I took what I was involved with after school and we eliminated those days and the days we had open together we planned our once a week.

Jan and Tin Tin attended scheduled mentoring activities throughout the program. They also met once or twice a day to once every two days informally in the hallways. Scheduling difficulties for Jan and Tin Tin led to infrequent meetings, apart from the above. Tin Tin was involved in a demanding drama production and Jan had coaching and family responsibilities. They did meet four times in the morning for breakfast, before the mentoring program adopted the breakfast idea.

Simon and Kurt met infrequently until their mentoring relationship ended in the spring. Apart from a few mentoring group activities and two keyboarding meetings after school, Simon and Kurt met "five minutes every two or three weeks on average for the whole seven months."

Common theme - time commitment

Six of the seven mentors identified the theme of time commitment. Lemon, unlike the other five mentors, did not view the theme of time commitment as a concern. She stated that her mentoring relationship with Natasha "was not a lot of time, " though the time she committed to the relationship appeared to equal or surpass the majority of mentors.

Gerry expressed the theme of time commitment when he spoke about the frustrations he had regarding his conflicting commitments:

There was sometimes when I felt so ... so pulled by my other duties as a, as teacher that I really didn't have a lot of time to spend on the mentoring relationship. ... One, I felt badly simply because I, I wasn't able to put in the kind of effort and time I would like to. ... But actually there were times where it was almost a bit annoying or a bit frustrating to have, to have, ... a whole chorus of student voices, demands and things, and to have one more person who wanted to, to sit and talk about computers At the same time, of course, you didn't want to, because this person had a special relationship with you ... [you didn't] want to hurt their feeling or to offend them.

Kerri had concerns about the time required for a mentoring relationship prior to making a commitment to Christina. She felt that her involvement in other activities may not leave her enough time for her mentoring relationship. This feeling of not having enough time continued throughout their mentoring relationship, though the time she committed to the relationship appeared to equal or surpass the majority of mentors. Kerri also felt that increased commitments with additional coaching responsibilities and a new position as a counsellor may prevent her from volunteering as a mentor the following year.

Jo also expressed the theme of time commitment. She stated that she felt frustrated about the time her mentoring relationship was taking during a time of year when she was busy with other responsibilities at school:

...the three weeks that I was really busy ... made me realize how frustrating it, it can be. And ... it was frustrating because I didn't want to let Helen down because you'd [I'd] taken on this one-to-one relationship as a responsibility.

And I just wanted to take one program that I was involved in and chuck it. And get rid of it. ... but I couldn't do that. Especially to the mentoring program, to Helen, you know.

For Jo, her frustration ended when some of her other responsibilities at school ended. At that time, her uncertainty and negative feelings about her mentoring relationship also disappeared.

Jan also expressed the theme of time commitment. He felt that although Tin Tin's time commitments hampered their getting together, his own time commitments at school and at home also interfered with their mentoring relationship.

Although, Simon did not express the theme of time commitment in terms of his own mentoring relationship, he spoke abstractly about the time commitment required.

Category - mentoring relationship as a friendship

Friendship is defined here as personal regard for another person. The category of friendship was described by the mentors in terms of three common themes: mutual interests, multiplicity of roles and future oriented mentoring relationship.

Common theme - mutual interests

As described in Chapter 3, one factor used to match mentors and proteges was mutual interests. Five of the mentors expressed the theme of

mutual interests. For Fred, Kerri and Jo the presence of mutual interests was viewed positively, for Jan the presence of mutual interests was viewed neutrally and for Simon the absence of mutual interests was viewed negatively. Fred expressed the theme of mutual interests throughout his interview. Fred and Bob both enjoyed several outdoor activities including mountain biking, skiing and rock climbing. At the beginning of his mentoring relationship with Bob they discussed their mutual interests:

... at first it would be getting to know each other phase and trying you know just [to] see where our interests lay and then once we figure that out I think that our conversations revolved around our interests.

Gerry found his match with Frank was quite relevant as they had a mutual interest in computers and everything to do with computers:

And the student would usually come to the computer lab after school and we would discuss current trends in computers and technology. ... I would share some of the software I had perhaps video games, perhaps ... nifty little gadgets that would ... you know that would show you program. I would show him some of the ... material we were doing in our current computer classes even though the student was too young to be in the classes, he had quite a good working knowledge anyway.

Jo and Helen found that they had several mutual interests which focussed on physical activities. As with planning meeting times, Jo and Helen were pragmatic in ascertaining their mutual interests:

... the second meeting we had we wrote out interests we both had. So she told me things she liked and I wrote them down. I told her things I like and she wrote them down. And then we tried to find common things on both. ... we both found out that we quite enjoyed physical activities so things like walks and bike rides were the easiest way to do the social and the physical ... and make us both happy. So we came up with those kinds of activities.

Jan and Tin Tin had a mutual interest in sports. Jan was a physical education teacher with an interest in sports. Early in their mentoring relationship, Jan and Tin Tin discussed Tin Tin's desire to play on school sports teams. Later they discussed Tin Tin's purchase of a mountain bike.

In the case of Simon, the theme of mutual interests was discussed in terms of its absence and the negative impact it had on the mentoring relationship. Simon made reference to music which originally appeared to be a mutual interest:

.. but we didn't have a common ground that we could really talk about or, or converse about. Like music is one thing but, different genre's in music, and you know, that was something that we thought we'd have a commonality on but we didn't.

And, and then there's another thing, is like, I listen to different types of music than he did, and I thought oh, you know, he's probably going to be judgement[al] and say, "Oh, you know, these teachers listen to this type of music or whatever."

Common theme - multiplicity of roles

Six of the mentors expressed the theme of multiplicity of roles in their interviews. For each, the presence of multiplicity of roles was an issue which required consideration. Fred's reference to the theme of multiplicity of roles revolved around an incident on a school ski trip. His protege, Bob, was about to jump off a cliff which Fred felt may or may not be dangerous. Fred felt that as Bob's mentor he may have let him make the jump. But as a teacher, he felt that he had to intervene, for legal reasons, and tell Bob not to make the jump.

Gerry also expressed the theme of a multiplicity of roles. He stated that he would find it difficult to mentor a student he taught because it may seem to other students that he was favouring his protege. Even though he did not teach Frank, he found that students appeared puzzled by the "special treatment" his protege was getting in the computer lab after school.

Kerri expressed the theme of multiplicity of roles in reference to being Christina's mentor and teacher. For her, being both a mentor and teacher to Christina was sometimes awkward:

... in class, I sometimes found that it was awkward because she was disrupting stuff and ... I didn't want to be too hard on her. ... in some

ways I was feeling more like a friend almost like a friend to her and at the same time I had to keep the class going and couldn't make too many special allowances for her.

Although, by the end of the school year, Kerri stated that there were both positive and negative sides to having a mentoring relationship with a student that you also teach:

I don't know how the other teachers find that but I think ... if someone [protege's] going to have trouble in your class it might be easier to not be teaching them. ... I don't even know if I agree with that anymore. That's what I was thinking at the beginning but now I don't see how it, how it hurt Christina at all because ... I guess in many ways I was able to ... be more understanding. But that's something that people have to think about whether they want someone in their class or not.

Jo's references to the theme of multiplicity of roles revolved around an incident where as Helen's teacher she thought that Helen needed assistance from a resource teacher. She didn't know whether she should push the issue in their mentoring relationship as well as in the classroom. Jo felt as though she was having an "identity crisis" as to whether she should be a friend or a teacher. Her "identity crisis" was resolved when Helen began a resource program and they could continue on their "friendship path." At the same time, Jo felt some confusion over her role as a mentor and a friend to Helen. She worried that she wasn't fulfilling her role as a mentor and was just being a friend.

For Jan, the theme of multiplicity of roles emerged when he was discussing his protege's dilemma concerning his involvement in the school drama production. Jan, like Tin Tin, didn't agree with the school rule limiting one's involvement in extra-curricular activities when they were involved in a drama production. However, as a professional he felt that he could not admit that to Tin Tin without undermining the school policy.

Simon also expressed the theme of multiplicity of roles. Although he did not teach Kurt for the duration of their mentoring relationship, he had

concerns about teaching him the following year. He wondered if having a "different bond" with Kurt would make it difficult to be his teacher.

Common theme - future oriented mentoring relationship

The common theme of future oriented mentoring relationship is defined here as a mentoring relationship that will continue past the current school year. For all seven mentors, future oriented mentoring relationship was identified as an important theme related to their mentoring relationships. For five of the seven mentoring relationships the presence the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship was viewed positively, in one case its absence was viewed negatively and in one case the mentor was neutral about the absence of the theme.

Fred expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship. His protege, Bob, was in grade 10 and Fred was committed to continuing their mentoring relationship for Bob's eleventh year. He thought that Bob may "be beyond" a mentoring relationship when he entered grade 12. Fred also felt that their mentoring relationship would shift from formal to informal. That is, he did not see them formally involved in the mentoring program, though they would continue their mentoring relationship, focussing on activities.

Lemon expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship throughout her interview. Lemon's protege, Natasha, was in grade eight and Lemon was committed to continuing their mentoring relationship for the following year. Lemon, like Fred, felt that their mentoring relationship would shift from formal to informal. However, she did anticipate that she and Natasha would attend some mentoring group activities if they were planned for the present mentoring group members.

Gerry expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship. Gerry did not think that he'd "be a mentor for this student next year ... for various reasons." These reasons included the mentoring relationship itself and time commitments. However, Gerry did feel that they would continue to have "a relationship" as he felt that he would probably teach the student next year. He also stated that he would be happy to speak to the student if he dropped by the computer lab.

Kerri expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship. Kerri's protege, Christina, was in grade eight and Kerri was committed to continuing their mentoring relationship for the following year, though to a limited extent. Kerri also felt that their mentoring relationship would shift from formal to informal. She was willing to meet with Christina to "chat." However, she did not feel that she would have the time to do activities with Christina due to her new position at the school.

Jo expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship. Jo's protege, Helen, was in grade eight and Jo was committed to continuing their mentoring relationship for the following year, though she would be away for the first term. Jo also felt that their mentoring relationship would shift from formal to informal:

... my thoughts are that as an official mentoring relationship, I don't think. Well, because I don't know if we ever had an official mentoring relationship. We had a friendship. ... I see a strong reason to continue seeing each other, maybe not as often ... but to see each other one-on-one once in a while. Because I think, I've become part of Helen's life and I don't think ... by walking out of it and just becoming a teacher again, that it'll, that it'll do either of us any good. I'll feel like there's no closure. Like even though I felt like we had closure this year that yes I am going away and you know, yes we're okay with that, and yes I will, I did promise to send her a postcard.... I don't feel that there was long term closure. That we would say good-bye and that the next time she would see me, I maybe her P.E. teacher. ...I see a future in still getting together and being there for support for her. ... and making her realize that, friends don't always walk in and out of your life. That some can stay. ... and that she can turn to me, not just as a teacher down the road.

And you know, cause she's only in grade eight. ... I'm going to see her for a lot more years. She'll be here, you know, another three, four years. I really want her to know that, I guess just not myself too, but that she can turn to other teachers as well. ... and that they'll take time personally to talk to her whereas I think if I walk out right now and say, "Okay, that's the end. Next time I'm your phy. ed. teacher." ... she may think that with all teachers. Like it's okay when they're involved in a program, they'll be your friend but ... when they're not, they won't be.

Jan expressed the theme of future oriented mentoring relationship.

Jan's protege, Tin Tin, was in grade eight and Jan was committed to continuing their mentoring relationship for the following year. He also felt that their mentoring relationship would shift from formal to informal. Jan viewed himself as continuing in his role as mentor as a listener and contributor:

I think what we've established now is that he has someone on staff that he can certainly go up to and if he needs to vent, if he has a problem or something. I think he feels comfortable enough now knowing that he can come up...I'll certainly offer him an ear and suggestions to, to resolving those things. Perhaps a little more quickly than he might get through, through the usual boundaries.

In the case of Simon, his mentoring relationship with Kurt ended before the end of the year. However, Simon explained that though he had not seen Kurt recently, they had continued to see each other after their mentoring relationship officially ended. Simon felt that they had "developed something that's sort of lasting" so that even though they had officially ended their mentoring relationship, they could still talk.

Category - mentor as a listener and contributor

The theme of mentor as a listener and contributor was described by mentors in terms of four major themes: openness, mutual sharing, problem solving and positive impact. Like the proteges, the mentors descriptions of the common themes in this category were very detailed.

Common theme - openness

For six of the seven mentors, the theme of openness was evident in their interviews. The presence of openness was viewed positively by five of the mentors while the absence of it was viewed negatively by one of the mentors. For Fred, his mentoring relationship removed the barrier that exists between teacher and student and allowed it to be more open. Fred stated that it was easy to speak to his protege about any topic although he and his protege didn't get "too personal." Similarly, Lemon viewed her mentoring relationship with her protege as easy and comfortable:

... it didn't matter that I was a teacher and she was a student and I'm way older than her or whatever.

Gerry, on the other hand, spoke of the lack of openness in his mentoring relationship:

... because I had, had the impression that this student umm, you know, must have some ... difficulties at home at time, having ... several families that he goes to and so on. I, I thought it would be nice to, to get to know the student better but I found that every time we tried to discuss anything outside of the realm of computers, usually these discussions didn't go very far and [the] student just glazed over and, and so I felt a bit disappointed ... maybe with my own abilities to you know, maybe the level of trust wasn't there, to talk about things like that or ... it just, just made the relationship sometimes seem a bit, a bit superficial because it was always based on one particular aspect [computers].

Although Kerri felt that the openness with her protege varied over time, she did state that Christina was open with her from the outset of their mentoring relationship:

And I remember the first time I got together with her for lunch. And I was wondering is this going to be hard to think of something to say. And what's it going to be like? But she was very easy to talk to. She just came to my office, which isn't the, it's sort of a cubicle so it isn't a very comfortable place to be. ... we had lunch and she was really, had, had so much to say and it was really positive. Just talk for half an hour and then it was time to ... the bell rang.

Kerri also stated that she felt positive about a particular incident in which Christina opened up to her:

... when she was talking about ... what she was going to do for confirmation because it was something that she hadn't felt comfortable talking to anyone else about. And, and she did feel comfortable talking to me about it.

Jo made several references to the theme of openness in her interview:

... I know things were so smooth with Helen. And because she's quite social ... we were quite open with each other.

We just sort of talked and what came up and came up. So, it ended up being really personal and, and it was a good thing because I found out a lot about Helen's home life and, and how she felt about school and ... where she was at.

Jan spoke about the rapport that developed almost immediately with his protege, Tin Tin. He felt that this rapport and a feeling of trust were quick to develop because of the structure of the mentoring program.

Common theme - mutual sharing

Mutual sharing is defined here as the exchange of information related to their personal lives. All seven mentors identified mutual sharing as an important theme related to their mentoring relationships. For six of the seven mentors its presence was viewed positively, though to a lesser extent by Jan. For Simon, the presence of mutual sharing was predominantly negative.

For Fred, mutual sharing about the various outdoor activities he and his protege, Bob, pursued was evident throughout his interview. Similarly, Lemon made several references to the theme of mutual sharing in her interview. Lemon and Natasha shared information about a wide range of topics, though they usually focussed on their personal and family lives:

... she would talk a lot about Oklahoma because of her brother being in it and knowing people in it and being interested in that. ... And, talked about her friends. Let's see, not too much about girl friends because I knew her, I think it's her best friend, because she is in the project [mentoring program] too. ... talked about different boys mostly and how one boy would tell her he loved her one minute and the next minute be really mean to her.

Oh sometimes I, it would be about my family. I think, she saw my daughter ... play ... a basketball game.... ... She just seems interested in anything that I have to say....

Gerry expressed the theme of mutual sharing throughout his interview.

Gerry made reference to several conversations where he and/or his protege shared information related to computers and/or their vacations:

... I would sometimes sit down and show him some of the material that we [were] working on. So for example, say in the computer classes we were doing animation or something like that I would show him some examples of what some of the students [in] my classes were making. And ... go into the programming behind the animation, and let him see exactly what was involved in it, so he'd be intrigued [by] that.

... then other times we'd just sit and chat. Maybe he'd bring in magazines of, of some of the local computer magazines and was quite excited about some new development or some new program or software or game that was out there. ... at one point he had written in, he had e-mailed one of these companies and got a letter of his printed in a magazine. He was quite pleased about that and he showed me that.

...there was a period where we sent a few e-mails to each other over the Internet. ... we talked about things like modems and [the] Internet and so on about the two.

Kerri made reference to mutual sharing on a number of occasions:

We talked about me and talked about where I grew up and ... my family right now, and my children. ... and then we talked a lot about her and her dad whose no longer with her and where he's living and ... her grandmother whose ... she has a tough time getting along with and her mom. Just talked about her family life. ... talked about things she liked to do.

And she was going on a retreat. And she was talking about ... she'd gone on a retreat before and it had been lots of fun. I don't think we got into any depth but it was interesting before then I hadn't known that she had any connection to any church at all.

Jo expressed the theme of mutual sharing throughout her interview. Jo was clear about the personal nature of their conversations:

It was just, I don't know chit-chat and ... the difference between just chit-chat with someone you'd pass in the hall and the way Helen and I talked was that ... we both offered information so freely, the conversations got more in-depth so we could talk about real issues. ... without either of us prying. So I never came away from them feeling like I'd, I had given too much of my personal life. ... She never made reference to giving too much So I think she was comfortable with it as well.

... she liked hearing about our relationship and ... my future, and why I'm a teacher and things like that. She had a lot of questions about that. And she's got very traditional views about [what] the wife and the husband should do in the relationship. And she said that was very standard in Greece. The wife did all of the work ... in the house, plus worked full time. And the father worked full time ... but came home [and] was served. And so she's having trouble with Fiona and her dad. ... So I tried to relate how I feel about what Harold and I should do in the home and we both work full time.

Although Jan expressed the theme of mutual sharing, it was to a lesser extent. He did make reference to one incident of mutual sharing related to school policies regarding simultaneously involvement in school athletic teams and other school activities. Jan felt that the sharing of his views assisted his protege in understanding "that it wasn't him against the world"

Simon expressed the theme of mutual sharing throughout his interview, though with negativity. On a number of occasions Simon spoke to his protege about his values including those related to family and money. However, he was frustrated by his protege's agreeing with whatever he said. Simon wondered if "he was having any impact on him...." He was also annoyed by his protege's frequent attempts to "impress" him by exaggerating. He found this behaviour "childish."

Common theme - problem solving

All of the mentors expressed the theme of problem solving with respect to their proteges' personal and/or school lives. For five of the seven the presence of the theme of problem solving was viewed positively. Gerry viewed the absence of the theme of problem solving negatively while Simon viewed the presence of the theme of problem solving negatively.

Fred expressed the theme of problem solving throughout his interview. Fred assisted Bob with problem solving related to his personal life. Although Fred was cautious about inferring causation, he did feel that he had

helped his protege regarding lifestyle choices, particularly Bob's decision to stop using drugs and alcohol as they interfered with his outdoor pursuits. Fred also assisted his protege, Bob, with writing a resume and arranging some work experience in a bike shop. Unfortunately, at the time of Fred's interview, Bob had neither completed his resume nor pursued the work experience opportunity.

Lemon also expressed the theme of problem solving throughout her interview. Lemon and her protege often spoke about Natasha's problems with boys "because she didn't want to tell her mom about these things." In one instance, Lemon assisted Natasha with a serious situation regarding a boy:

... she'd tell me about how she'd get these phone calls and how one boy was being mean to her and she liked him still though. ... there actually was a bit of [a] problem with this boy because there was a rumour going around that ... he had sexually assaulted her. And actually a couple of other teacher[s] had heard this and I remember once being in my room and, and Mr. Long [the principal] saying that I should talk to, to Natasha about it. But it, it was just a rumour, it wasn't true. But ... I felt like I ... could be there for her anyways.

Lemon also expressed the theme of problem solving as it related to Natasha's school life, particularly Natasha's grades. In the first instance, Lemon recalls some of the strategies she discussed with her protege:

... let's see. She right from the beginning I think we talked about bad marks, she didn't seem to mind how bad marks were. So that was good. Because in the end they did improve and we worked out, well not at the very beginning but let's see before Christmas anyways. Right after first report we worked out something where she would try to see another teacher for help in a subject and ... just try to be more organized and not wait until the last minute to do her homework and things seemed to be better because actually nearer towards the end whenever I saw her ... she always had her homework with her.

... I tried to ask her about her marks sometime in there [conversation] but not start out with that. She would say, "Oh, I'm doing better." And say, "I'm, I'm going to pass this and this." Well, in the first report card she had all, she showed it to me. She had all Ds and Es and one C+, in Drama. So she was doing pretty poorly. And actually I haven't seen her report card since but she would tell me that it was better. That she was passing Math and almost passing Science, that kind of thing. So. And ... then she said that at one point she wasn't going to take summer school

because she was going on a holiday but then the last I heard that she was going to take it. So, that's good, that she would do that.

Gerry referred to the absence of the theme of problem solving in his interview:

... because I had, had the impression that this student ... must have some difficulties at home at times, having ... several families that he goes to and so on. I, I thought it would be nice to, to get to know the student better but I found that every time we tried to discuss anything outside of the realm of computers, usually these discussions didn't go very far

Kerri expressed the theme of problem solving most clearly when she referred to an important incident which occurred in her mentoring relationship with Christina. Christina confided in her mentor about her fears regarding her impending confirmation. Kerri offered her assurances and suggested that she speak to her priest:

Oh, I can think of another interesting conversation I had with her where ... she was talking about confirmation, being confirmed, ..., in the Catholic Church and she was doing it. She was feeling up in the air and sort of torn It turned out that the problem was that she, she was concerned that if she was confirmed then she could never be interested in any other faith and you know she wasn't sure about what she believed in yet. And so I talked to her about the fact that at her age you don't have to be sure about what you believe in because when you get to be eighty you still have questions. ... And that I was quite sure that, that ... the priest would... welcome questions and would want to you know talk to her about things that she wasn't sure of. ... she was saying she'd, she'd prayed about it but she really hadn't talked to anyone so I felt, I felt positive that she was, you, know, she talked to me about that. And ... she ended up going and talking to the priest that night.

Kerri also expressed the theme of problem solving when she discussed the importance of repaying money borrowed, regardless of the amount. In addition, when another student questioned Christina regarding the small size of her allowance, Kerri discussed how different households have different amounts of money and how her children don't get as much money for their allowances as their friends.

Kerri also expressed the theme of problem solving as it related to Christina's school life. She made particular reference to assisting her protege

with her behaviour in the classroom. Like, Lemon, Kerri referred to strategies she and her protege discussed:

... I remember talking to her about how she was getting along with her teachers in school because she was having real trouble in school... getting kicked out of different classes. And she just didn't seem to be really aware of why it happened and she felt like she was being picked on and yet I, I didn't say this to her but I know that as a teacher teaching her, you know, I can see that she isn't aware of what's going on but you know these things there, there was probably [was] good reason for her getting, being talked to anyway. I don't know about being kicked out but.... So we talked about one teacher in particular that she was having trouble with and we made a plan of what she might do to ... so that that didn't happen again. And she said she was always, you know, first person, to be talked to and he was, you know, yelled at her all the time no matter what she was doing. And so we talked about the things she do to try to get through a class without him even saying anything to her.... So I think that was positive. Just I felt like doing, having a little bit of a help at least she could ... have a plan and have some ideas of things she could do that might, might make a difference in class because she never said about her feelings being hurt. She never ... mentioned that but I'm sure it hurt. It must hurt her feelings when teachers are getting upset with her. Especially when it isn't something that she's really aware of what's she doing. I think that's got to be confusing. ... And it, seem[ed], she said things were getting better ... with the person and she had got through a class without ... getting in any, any big trouble. She, she could see how it was possible.

Jo expressed the theme of problem solving throughout her interview. She assisted her protege, Helen, with problem solving related to fighting with her brother and appropriate behaviour with friends of the opposite sex. However, the personal issue which Jo most often assisted Helen with was resolving her feelings about her father's impending marriage:

... her parents, her step-mom and her dad, are marrying this summer. That was quite a, quite a big topic. ... her extended family, like her real mom and real dad and their relationship in Greece and they were separated here. ... I've got quite a stable home life, so I tried to show her ... that there are stable relationships out there and people do come from stable walks of life. I also wanted her to know that she was definitely not the only one coming from a situation like that.

Now that Fiona and her dad are thinking about getting married, suddenly Helen is feeling quite ... invaded. She's ... changed her feelings completely for Fiona. She feels that ... Fiona is, is starting to boss her father around and is going to take away Helen and dad time. ... So we talked a lot about her parents. ... and I met her parents quite

often. They came in for two, two teacher-parent interviews and then a couple of times informally I talked to her dad. And ... about three or four times I talked to Fiona

Like Kerri, Jo also taught her protege. As a result of teaching Helen, Jo realized that Helen had difficulty reading and writing. In her role as a teacher, she conversed with her step-mother about getting her assistance from the Learning Services department. In her role as mentor, she continued to check with Helen on how her courses were going on a regular basis.

Jan made several references to the theme of problem solving in relation to Tin Tin's life at school. Jan viewed himself as a sounding board for Tin Tin:

... I think if I was to ask him hypothetically I think he would, he may mention that it was nice to have someone around that he could vent to a little bit. ... and someone who was not involved in any of the classes he was involved in, or the production [drama] that he was involved in. It was someone removed from his day-to-day routine. Someone he could chat with so, I guess as an end product for him ... a feeling of being more comfortable in, in the school.

Jan also assisted his protege, Tin Tin, with his tardiness to school and frustrations related to his academic achievement. Specifically, Jan and Tin Tin talked about whether he was getting enough sleep and how to get to school on time so that he wouldn't be disciplined by the administration. They also discussed Tin Tin taking responsibility for his academic achievement:

... Humanities, was one subject came up often, cause he was struggling. And it wasn't because of lack of ability, it was a lack of ... application.

But ... I think it was just an understanding of hey what am I [Tin Tin] expected [to do]. Or, or, you know, I'm responsible for my own behaviour. ... "I'm not getting it done. It's not fair." I said, "Why not? And you're the one responsible."

Another area in which Jan and Tin Tin problem solved was related to Tin Tin's involvement in the drama production, "Oklahoma." Jan made several references to discussions with Tin Tin regarding his commitment to the musical and the school policy that he could not be involved in school teams if he was involved in a drama production:

... I'd have to say probably at one of our first meetings where he just said how frustrated, how, how unsure he was over his choice to be involved in the production because he really wanted to play basketball.

He, he also found, felt very mentally and physically dragged down by the production. ... and I think he was wrestling with the, with the question of why was he involved in it cause he really didn't wish to be but he felt cornered. He was very frustrated because that excluded him from other activities in the school. ... so from that point of view, we often talked about, frustrations he may be having, ... although, eventually he was pleased with the production, glad he did it. But at the time there were a lot of frustrations he was working through.

Simon expressed the theme of problem solving, though often with negativity. Most of Simon's references to problem solving related to Kurt's personal issues. For instance, Kurt spoke to Simon about some of the problems he was having with his mother's boyfriend. However, Simon felt that Kurt was exaggerating while at the same time telling him what he wanted to hear. On another occasion, Simon discussed the value of money and a work ethic with Kurt:

...why money isn't everything ... talking about work ethics and how when I was younger even though my parents ... were well off that they made me work and I appreciated that and I wanted him to sort of learn, learn the value of a work ethic and ... I was trying to instill sort of values in him.

Simon also expressed frustration with the impact that time constraints imposed by the school day and/or Kurt's friends had on his attempts to assist Kurt with such personal problems.

On one occasion, Simon expressed the theme of problem solving related to school. He had been asked by Kurt's grandmother/guardian to obtain a reversal on Kurt's suspension for drinking alcohol:

I was at home on my own time or whatever and I get phoned by his grandmother saying that you're his mentor. ... And you should get him off this suspension and this and that. And I said, I thought to myself, that I didn't get into this role [as mentor] to get involved in politics and try to get rid of his suspension.... ... all of a sudden I'm getting caught in the middle of becoming sort of like his defence attorney.

Common theme - positive impact

All of the mentors made reference to the presence of positive impact, except Simon who made reference to the absence of positive impact.

The theme of positive impact was evident in Fred's interview. Fred stated that he felt that his mentoring relationship with Bob had "contributed positively to his [protege's] development." He saw his protege choosing to place "his energy into outdoor activities rather than his previous negative activities on his own." However, while Fred attributed his protege's change in activities to the mentoring relationship, he acknowledged that other influences such as his protege's girlfriend may also have impacted on this change.

Lemon expressed the theme of positive impact when she described a change in her protege's behaviour toward seeking assistance from her teachers and completing her homework. Lemon also expressed the theme of positive impact when she described an incident where her protege was having difficulties with a rumour about being sexually assaulted. In this instance, Lemon felt that their mentoring relationship gave her an opportunity to "be there" for her protege.

Gerry expressed the theme of positive impact when he referred to his protege creating a computer program artifact. Specifically, he stated that he felt "something productive" was happening for his protege. On the other hand, he did not feel that he had a positive impact on assisting his protege with difficulties in his personal life.

For Kerri, the theme of positive impact was evident in three places in her interview. She felt that she was being "a little bit of a help" to her protege when she assisted her in monitoring her classroom behaviour. She also felt that she had a positive impact on Christina's self esteem regarding her

family's financial situation. Specifically, Christina's peers were questioning her about how much allowance she received from her mother. In front of Christina's peers, Kerri shared information about her own children and how they didn't receive as much allowance as their friends. Lastly, she felt that she had a positive impact on Christina when she assisted Christina with her dilemma regarding confirmation in the Catholic Church.

Jo expressed the theme of positive impact in connection with assisting Helen with her family concerns. She stated that "I realized that she [Helen] did need support from an adult ... in a role that I could provide."

Jan made reference to the theme of positive impact throughout his interview. Although he felt that he could have had a greater impact on Tin Tin, he felt that he had a positive impact on his protege's tardiness problem. He also felt that he provided necessary support for his protege regarding his involvement in the school drama production:

... I think if I was to ask him [Tin Tin] hypothetically I think he would, he may mention that it was nice to have someone around that he could vent to a little bit.

Unlike the above mentors, Simon did not feel that he had a positive impact on his protege:

But I gave it [the mentoring relationship] a couple of tries and it was interesting at the beginning but I don't think we got anywhere, where I felt like I got a benefit out of it or either did Kurt. Maybe he did but he, I also thought that you know, he sort of said things just to please me. To make me feel like, you know, I think he, he's sort of knew, that ... he's [Simon's] into this so I'll sort of do sort of things to make him feel that it's worthwhile for him. And I knew that deep down it wasn't really worthwhile for him

Category - activity-based mentoring relationship

Activity-based mentoring relationship is defined here as a mentoring relationship for which activities are central to the relationship. The category

of activity-based mentoring relationship was described by mentors in terms of the themes of mentoring group activities and extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting.

Common theme - mentoring group activities

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the mentoring program involved group workshops and meetings, breakfasts and activities which were organized by the coordinators. Group workshops, meetings and breakfasts took place on school property while group activities took place in the community. All of the mentors and proteges took part in group activities like golf and laser tag which occurred off school property.

Six of the seven mentors made positive references to theme of mentoring group activity. Fred made a brief reference to the mentoring group activities as a "catalyst" for his mentoring relationship with Bob. Lemon made several references to mentoring group activities and her protege. For instance, Lemon expressed the idea that the mentoring group activities brought her closer to her protege:

I remember when we got together with the group. I think we had lots of fun. I remember we used to always laugh together.... And it was actually a really good group. I really think people had really good sense of humour. ... as we'd go around in a circle and say things or we'd play those games. It was always really fun and I think that made us closer cause we had something to share. So that was good. ... I was starting to think maybe there was a bit of a lull there because this is crummy weather and so those group activities were kind of a highlight because we didn't [meet as often]. ... And so the group meetings were really helpful cause then we would see each other....

Gerry expressed the theme of mentoring group activity explaining that his protege had an opportunity to display his "wit or humour." Kerri expressed the theme of mentoring group activity and the enjoyment she and her protege experienced. Kerri also stated that the mentoring activities were a good opportunity to connect, though not always a good opportunity to discuss:

... those breakfasts were difficult because morning wasn't a time that Christina ... got up easily. ... So she went from not showing up to getting there on time. But what I found with the breakfasts was that it wasn't, I didn't find it very good quality time. I thought ... we had some sort of chit chat.... ... I don't know how that might change but I never had any really good conversations with her but at the same time it's a time to connect. So that was positive.

For Jan, mentoring group activities allowed him to interact with his protege beyond the school setting. They were informal and allowed Jan and Tin Tin to do an "atypical kind of a teacher-student activity." Golfing gave Jan and Tin Tin a chance to assume different roles:

... here's this P.E. teacher who is just terrible, as the average human is, at hitting a golf ball with the, with a club. You know it's a silly game and it gives him [Tin Tin] an opportunity to really step to the front and ... rather than it being a me and you kind of a thing, it's a more of a us activity. I think from the mentoring relationship, that was a plus. From, from my perspective during the year, if we had done occasionally, like laser tag ... those activities were a big plus because it removes us from the ... bounds that are put on us in this ... setting [school]. ... So in our relationship I would say that it, it allowed the roles to come down a little bit.

Simon expressed the theme of mentoring group activity on a number of occasions. Simon's experience of during mentoring group activities was one of frustration and embarrassment at Kurt's exaggerations and "childish" behaviour.

Common theme - extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting

Fred, Lemon, Kerri and Jo made positive references to extending their mentoring relationships beyond the mentoring program and school setting while Jan and Simon's references were negative. Fred made several references to the theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting with discussion of activities such as mountain biking, skiing, rock climbing and water skiing.

Similarly, Lemon made several references to the theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting. On one occasion Lemon and Natasha visited Pine Point and the Dairy Queen in Norfolk:

It was a nice day and she hadn't been to the Dairy Queen ever before. ... I told her she had to have a Blizzard.... ... Going to Dairy Queen, having a Blizzard and then she'd never been to Pine Point, which I think is a beautiful place in Norfolk. ... So she thought that was good too and then we sat on a log and it was you know really pretty there.

Kerri also made several references to the theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting.

Kerri and Christina got together on the holiday to go bowling:

We did that [bowling] during Spring Break. And she went with my kids that time and that was fun. That was fun for her to get to know them and for them to meet her.

Jo also expressed the theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting, making references to several activities like walking, hiking and biking.

Jan expressed the theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting. Jan stated that he did not feel that he did a good job beyond the mentoring program and school setting and that he would take a more pro-active role if he engaged in a mentoring relationship in the future:

I don't feel I did a very good job over, over the course of the year. ... basically because of the time. ... Because we could have certainly done things. It would just have taken more unique times. I mean, similar to the breakfast meeting or later in the evenings but then again personally I wasn't prepared to do that. ... Within the school great but taking it and getting it out of the school might have been more relaxing occasionally just to get off the school ground. Even something simple.... ... I would be more active as far as creating opportunities as opposed to seeing what might unfold and what might happen.

Simon made reference to one activity beyond the mentoring program and school setting. He and his protege Kurt often met as they walked to school

for five to seven minutes. He stated that he would have like to extend their mentoring relationship to activities like fishing but Kurt's grandmother did not support activities outside of the mentoring program and school setting.

Summary of Proteges' and Mentors' Common Themes

This chapter has identified and explored the common themes of seven proteges and seven mentors in the Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program. Each of the proteges and mentors in this study experienced their mentoring relationship in unique ways. However, within the protege and the mentor groups, there were common themes of experience. For the proteges, 14 common themes were identified and grouped into four categories. Mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor, frequency of meeting, and length of meeting were the five common themes in the sustained contact between mentor and protege category. Friendship, understanding, mutual interests and future oriented mentoring relationship were the four common themes in the category of mentoring relationship as a friendship. Mutual sharing and problem solving were the two common themes in the category of mentor as a listener and contributor. Extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting, opportunity to learn and/or teach a new skill and enjoyment of activities were the three themes in the category of activity-based mentoring relationship. Each of the common themes were explored in terms of the proteges' experiences of their mentoring relationships.

For the mentors, 14 common themes were identified and then grouped into four categories. Mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor, frequency of meeting and time commitment were the five common themes in the sustained contact between mentor and protege category. Mutual

interests, multiplicity of roles and future oriented mentoring relationship were the three common themes in the category of mentoring relationship as a friendship. Openness, mutual sharing, problem solving and positive impact were the four common themes in the category of mentor as a listener and contributor. Mentoring group activities and extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting were the two common themes in the category of activity-based mentoring relationship. Each of the common themes were explored in terms of the mentors' experiences of their mentoring relationships.

In the final chapter, the major findings related to the two research questions will be discussed and linked to the literature review. Conclusions will also be formed. The limitations of the study and implications for practice and further research will be explored.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to gain insights into the experience of mentoring relationships from the perspectives of proteges and mentors, within the context of a school-based mentoring program. The discussion, conclusions, limitations and implications that appear in this chapter are drawn from the analysis of data of experiences of seven mentors and seven proteges. In the discussion, issues arising from the findings will be discussed. General and specific conclusions will follow. The limitations of the present study will be identified next. The last sections address implications for practice and further research.

Two research questions provided the focus for the present study:

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the proteges?

What is the experience of the mentoring relationship for the mentors?

The findings which address the first research questions were outlined in Chapter four. Fourteen common themes were identified for the proteges. The themes were grouped into four categories. Each of the common themes was explored in terms of the proteges' experiences .

The findings which address the second research questions were also outlined in Chapter four. Fourteen common themes were identified for the mentors. The themes were grouped into four categories. Each of the common themes was explored in terms of the mentors' experiences.

Separate discussions of the proteges' and mentors' common themes, would be relevant as the descriptive literature on the experiences of mentors and proteges, from their respective perspectives is limited. Specifically, in the preceding review of community-based mentoring programs for at-risk

students, Hamilton and Hamilton (1992) conducted telephone interviews and Huisman (1992a, 1992b) conducted personal interviews with proteges regarding their participation in mentoring programs. Huisman also administered questionnaires to the mentors. In terms of school-based mentoring programs for at-risk students, Abcug (1991) administered questionnaires to both mentors and proteges regarding their participation in the TASK mentoring program.

As shown above, separate discussions of the proteges' and the mentors' common themes would be relevant given the existing literature. However, due to the nature of the present findings, the discussion of the experiences of the proteges and mentors will be preceded by a discussion of those experiences which they shared. The analysis of the proteges' and mentors' interviews revealed that there were nine themes common to both groups. These nine themes were classified according to the same four categories. Table 3 lists the themes common to both groups, in terms of their categories.

Table 3 Summary of Themes Common to Protege and Mentor Groups

Categories	Common Themes
sustained contact between mentor and protege	mutual commitment
	one-on-one contact
	accessibility of mentor
	frequency of meeting
mentoring relationship as a friendship	mutual interests
	future oriented mentoring relationship
mentor as a listener and contributor	mutual sharing
	problem solving
activity-based mentoring relationship	extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting

The discussion of common themes related to the two research questions will be structured around those themes common to both groups. The decision to discuss the themes common to both the protege group and the mentor group was not made for pragmatic reasons only. Rather, it appears that the experience of the mentoring relationship for the proteges is inter-related with the experience of the mentoring relationship for the mentors. In attempting to make sense of those experiences, the inter-relatedness of the proteges' and mentors' experiences should not be ignored. Moreover, the extent to which common themes were identified for both proteges and mentors, may have important implications for the mentoring program under study.

Proteges' and Mentors' Common Themes

The category of sustained contact between mentor and protege was expressed by mentors and proteges in terms of four common themes: mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor and frequency of meeting. The inter-relatedness of these four themes, though evident, should be stated. Mutual commitment, an important theme for both the proteges and mentors, was also identified in the literature (Flaxman and Ascher, 1992). All of the proteges and mentors were clear about the impact of mutual commitment, or the lack of it, on their mentoring relationships. In only one case, was there a slight discrepancy in perceived mutual commitment. Mentors were particularly impressed with their proteges commitment to the mentoring relationship which meant that they were not totally responsible for maintaining the relationship. For several proteges and mentors, scheduling difficulties inherent in the lives of school staff and students were overcome through mutual commitment.

The importance of one-on-one contact as a component of intervention programs was identified in the literature (Dryfoos, 1991). While one-on-one mentoring relationships were a fundamental component of the Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program, discussion by proteges and mentors of the common theme of one-on-one contact revealed that mentoring pairs experience of one-on-one contact varied. Specifically, one-on-one contact took different forms within the seven relationships. Some mentoring pairs met within group settings or with another mentoring pair, though this did not stop proteges and mentors from experiencing one-on-one contact. Other pairs often met on their own, which facilitated one-on-one contact. While proteges' references to one-on-one contact were positive, some mentors had concerns about this aspect of the program, particularly the male mentors. Specifically, they were concerned about being alone with a student because of the personal safety advice they were given by the B.C.T.F.

Both proteges and mentors discussed the accessibility of the mentor in their interviews. Mentors were accessible to their proteges at a variety of different times and to different extents during the day. Home rooms for mentors appeared to facilitate accessibility. However, one mentor who did not have a homeroom, made himself accessible to his protege on the telephone, outside of school hours.

Related to the above themes was the common theme of frequency of meeting. Frequency of meeting was also identified in the literature as a critical component of mentoring programs (Flaxman and Ascher, 1992; Hamilton and Hamilton, 1992). At the outset of the mentoring program, and at every group workshop, mentors and proteges were requested to meet once a week. Five of the mentors and their proteges were able to meet once a week to once every second week. For two of the proteges and their mentors, meetings

took place infrequently, which was viewed negatively by both proteges and mentors. In one case, meetings were infrequent due to scheduling difficulties identified by both the protege and mentor. In the other case, infrequent meeting was, according to both protege and mentor, due to a lack of commitment on the protege's part.

The category of friendship was expressed by both mentors and proteges in terms of the common theme of mutual interests and future oriented mentoring relationship. As indicated in Chapter four, one of the factors used to match proteges and mentors was mutual interests. For the majority of mentors and proteges the experience of their relationships included mutual interests. These mutual interests were one of the foci of discussion and/or activities for the proteges and mentors. In some cases, mentoring relationships focussed on one mutual interest from beginning to end. In others, several mutual interests were explored. In only one case, was there a slight discrepancy in perceived mutual interests.

The common theme of future oriented mentoring relationship was expressed by both mentors and proteges. With the exception of two proteges who were unclear about the future of their mentoring relationships, the mentors and proteges viewed either the continuation of their mentoring relationships positively or the ending of their mentoring relationships negatively. Mentors and proteges predominantly felt that their mentoring relationships would continue informally. That is, they viewed the continuation of their mentoring relationships as shifting from the formal structure of the mentoring program to informal relationships. Both mentors and proteges felt that their mentoring relationships would continue to grow, possibly into long-lasting friendships.

The category of mentor as a listener and contributor was expressed by both mentors and proteges in terms of the common themes of mutual sharing and problem solving. Mutual sharing, very evident in the experiences of the mentors and proteges, was also evident in the literature (Flaxman and Ascher, 1992; Huisman, 1992a, 1992b; Salz and Trubowitz, 1992). With the exception of one mentor, all of the mentors and proteges felt positive about their partner's willingness to share aspects of their personal life, including other relationships and hobbies, with them. For some mentors and proteges the sharing of their personal lives with each other was a starting place in terms of conversation. Once trust was established, proteges, and in some cases mentors, were willing to share problems they were experiencing. For other proteges and mentors, it was the focus of their relationships.

Related to mutual sharing was the common theme of problem solving. Problem solving, expressed by both mentors and proteges, was identified by Huisman (1992a, 1992b). Proteges, according to Huisman, stated that one of their mentor's roles was that of a counsellor. This was true for both mentors and proteges interviewed for the present study. Mentors and proteges both recalled incidents in great detail, often the same incidents, where the mentor had assisted the protege with problem solving related to his/her personal and/or school life. In some cases, the mentor acted as a non-judgemental listener, giving the protege the opportunity to solve his/her own problems. In others, they helped the protege to solve a particular problem. In still others, they provided the protege with strategies to address a reoccurring problem.

The category of activity-based mentoring relationship, which was expressed by both mentors and proteges in terms of the common theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and

school setting, was also found in the literature. According to Huisman (1992a, 1992b), mentor questionnaires revealed that unstructured activities like playing sports, shopping and going to the beach were viewed as the best opportunities for interaction. Huisman also found that structured activities were unsuccessful due to scheduling difficulties and different ideologies. In the present study, both mentors and proteges identified activities beyond the mentoring program and school setting as highlights in their relationships. Some mentors and proteges enjoyed activities as a pair, while others enjoyed activities with another mentoring pair or within a school group setting. Whether activities were undertaken as a mentoring pair or with another mentoring pair or within a group setting was unimportant to both mentors and proteges. Mentors were usually the initiators in terms of organizing the activities. The activities were usually based on mutual interests. However, in some cases mentors introduced their proteges to new activities.

The above common themes, then, are those that the proteges and mentors shared. Given the different perspectives of the proteges and mentors, it is interesting that they held a significant number of common themes. Moreover, while proteges' and mentors' views on those common themes were different at times, they were for the most part very similar.

Proteges' Common Themes

The proteges held five common themes which were not held by the mentors: length of meeting, friendship, understanding, opportunity to learn and/or teach a new skill and enjoyment of activities. Given the different perspectives of the proteges and mentors on their mentoring relationships, it is not surprising that they did not share all of the common themes they discussed. The proteges' common themes are discussed below.

In addition to the common themes of mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor and frequency of meeting, proteges also expressed the common theme of length of meeting within the category of sustained contact between protege and mentor. The presence of lengthy meetings was viewed positively by the proteges. They enjoyed spending extended periods of time with their mentors in a one-on-one situation. The proteges also looked forward to future meetings with their mentors where they could spend an extended length of time.

Proteges expressed the common themes of friendship and understanding within the category of mentoring relationship as a friendship. These common themes were in addition to the common themes of mutual interests and future oriented mentoring relationship which they shared with the mentors. The common theme of friendship was also identified in the literature as one of the functions of mentoring relationships for proteges (Huisman, 1992a, 1992b; Cahoon, 1989). Proteges felt very positive about the friendships which had developed with their mentors. Several proteges were pleasantly surprised by the friendship which developed with their mentors. They never expected that they could have a friendship with a staff member. Being able to talk to their mentors as they would a friend was important to the proteges.

The common theme of understanding, expressed by the proteges, was also identified in the literature as a quality of good mentors (Flaxman and Ascher, 1992). Proteges stated that their mentor's tolerance and respect for their views was important to their mentoring relationships. An interesting finding was also discovered with respect to proteges expression of the theme of understanding. In some cases, it was the protege who sympathized with his/her mentor when they were encountering difficulties.

In addition to the common theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting, common themes for the proteges were the opportunity to learn and/or teach a new skill and enjoyment of activity within the category of activity-based mentoring relationship. Being open to new experiences was identified by Flaxman and Ascher (1992) as one of the qualities of a good protege. Several of the proteges in the present study were open to learning new skills as well as teaching their mentor new skills. The reciprocal nature of this common theme points to the egalitarian nature of the mentoring relationships.

Enjoyment of activities was also identified by Flaxman and Ascher (1992) as a quality of a good protege. Proteges clearly enjoyed activities with their mentors. Proteges appeared to enjoy activities based on mutual interests, those incorporating one-on-one contact and those of a lengthy nature.

Mentors' Common Themes

The mentors held five common themes which were not held by the proteges: time commitment, multiplicity of roles, openness, positive impact and mentoring group activity. Given the different perspectives of the proteges' and mentors on their mentoring relationships, it is not surprising that they did not share all of the common themes they discussed. The mentors' common themes are discussed below.

In addition to the common themes of mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor and frequency of meeting, mentors also expressed the common theme of time commitment within the category of sustained contact between protege and mentor. As with the mentors in Abcug's (1991) study of a school-based mentoring program, time commitment was a common theme for the mentors. The time commitment required to

sustain their mentoring relationships was a concern for the mentors. Mentors expressed frustration at having another commitment on top of their responsibilities at school. The "special" nature of the mentoring relationship made mentors sensitive about limiting the time spent with their proteges.

Mentors also expressed the common theme of multiplicity of roles within the category of mentoring relationship as a friendship. This theme was in addition to the common themes of mutual interests and future oriented mentoring relationship. Most mentors expressed concern regarding the various roles--mentor, teacher, and/or friend-- they simultaneously played for their proteges. They felt awkward changing "hats," particularly those mentors who also taught their proteges. Some mentors sensed that other students were "puzzled" by the special relationships they had with their proteges and this concerned them. One mentor stated that he switched from his mentor role to his teacher role, for legal reasons, when his protege tried dangerous maneuvers on outdoor trips.

In addition to the common themes of mutual sharing and problem solving, mentors also expressed the common themes of openness and positive impact within the category of mentor as a listener and contributor. Most mentors felt that their proteges were open with them from the very beginning of their relationships. Mentors viewed this openness as a positive aspect of the mentoring relationships. This openness appeared to be a precursor to the mutual sharing and problem solving which also took place in the relationships.

The common theme of positive impact which was also expressed by the mentors, was well documented in the literature. With one exception, all of the mentors felt that they had a positive impact on their proteges. In some cases, the mentors felt that they had had a positive impact on their proteges'

academic achievement and/or school behaviour. In others, they felt that they had had a positive impact on their proteges' personal lives. Mentors felt positive about the contributions they were able to make to their proteges' lives.

Mentors also expressed the common theme of mentoring group activity within the category of activity-based mentoring relationship. This theme was in addition to the common theme of extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting. Unlike the mentors in Flaxman and Ascher (1992) study who stated that structured activities were unsuccessful, the mentors in the present study were predominantly positive about the impact of the mentoring group activities on their mentoring relationships. Mentoring group activities were described by one mentor as a relationship catalyst. Another mentor stated that she thought the mentoring group activities brought her closer to her protege at a time of the year when there was a lull in their own activity planning. Still another mentor viewed the activities as opportunities for positive, atypical student-teacher activities.

Conclusions

The findings of this study led to three general conclusions. First, consistent with the constructivist paradigm, both proteges and mentors demonstrated that mentoring with its emphasis on the formation of a relationship, enabled them to construct meaning, integrating new knowledge or experiences with their prior experiences. The school-based mentoring relationships under study provided proteges with opportunities for experiences such as mutual sharing, problem solving and the extension of the mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting, which undoubtedly led to the acquisition of new knowledge. In addition, the

school-based mentoring relationships under study also provided mentors with opportunities for experiences such as mutual sharing, positive impact and the extension of their mentoring relationship beyond the program and school setting which probably also led to the acquisition of new knowledge.

Second, mentoring relationships can be positive experiences for both proteges and mentors, within the context of a school-based mentoring program. Proteges' and mentors' experience of their mentoring relationships were predominantly positive. Both staff and students clearly felt that their relationships included a variety of positive experiences including mutual commitment, mutual sharing, friendship and positive impact.

Third, school-based mentoring relationships can be mutually beneficial. For the proteges, their mentors became a significant adult in their lives, providing opportunities for a variety of positive experiences. Consistent with the theory of resiliency, mentors provided understanding. They also provided support and high or realistic expectations, in the form of assistance with problem solving. Proteges were also given opportunities to be active participants in their school and community. For the mentors, their mentoring relationships provided them with opportunities to share experiences with their proteges and perhaps, more importantly, to have a positive impact.

In addition to the above general conclusions, the findings of this study identify several important characteristics of positive mentoring relationships from the perspectives of both mentors and proteges. Mutual commitment, one-on-one contact, accessibility of mentor, frequency of meeting, mutual interests, future oriented mentoring relationship, mutual sharing, problem solving and extension of mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting were viewed as positive experiences by both mentors and proteges. In addition, proteges viewed length of meeting,

friendship, understanding, opportunity to learn and/or teach a new skill and enjoyment of activities as positive experiences. Lastly, mentors viewed openness, positive impact and mentoring group activities as positive experiences.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this study was its broad focus. Due to the dearth of studies on experience of school-based mentoring relationships from the perspectives of both proteges and mentors, the study was exploratory in nature, resulting in a broad focus. To understand the mentoring relationships, from both perspectives, it was necessary to describe participants' common themes in detail. This led to an extensive range of findings and conclusions, any one of which is worthy of further and more focussed study.

Another limitation of the study was that it focussed on only seven proteges and seven mentors within a particular school-based mentoring program. As a result, the findings are not generalizable in the traditional sense to other mentoring program participants or contexts. However, as mentioned previously, the articulation of the research questions and detailed context of the study are intended to aid the reader in ascertaining the *transferability* of the findings. That is, the reader must judge the degree to which the context of this study is similar to the context being examined and applicability of the findings.

A third limitation of this study was the absence of persistent observation. Specifically, the data for the study were collected from a single ethnographic interview at the end of the mentoring program. Although a second interview was considered half way through the program, it was decided

that the proteges and mentors would have been involved in their mentoring relationships for an insufficient length of time, three and a half months.

A fourth limitation was the participants' ability to recall and articulate their experiences. Specifically, some of the proteges appeared to have some difficulty articulating their thoughts and feelings due to their young age.

Implications for Practice

The seven proteges' and seven mentors' experience of their mentoring relationships indicates that the school-based mentoring program under study was a worthwhile venture. As revealed earlier, the Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program was based on the CSIS Mentor Strategy. The theoretical framework of the CSIS Mentor Strategy is the Bridging Model of Mentoring which aims to bridge the gap between "being at-risk in our community to being a part of our community," by engaging each protege and mentor in a "mutually beneficial, horizontal relationship"(p. 29). Although the context of the Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program (1994-95) was the school and not the community, the general goal of the program was to give proteges and mentors the opportunity to engage in mutually beneficial relationships which enhance their lives.

Arising from the experiences of the proteges and mentors are several program implications for the Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program. First, proteges and mentors were matched based on same gender and mutual interests. The experiences of the proteges and mentors indicated that these two criteria should continue to be used for matching. While no references were made to same gender criterion, the safety concerns of the mentors regarding one-on-one contact indicate that this criterion should be continued. The experiences of the proteges and mentors also indicate that the

mutual interests criterion should be continued. Specifically, mutual interests served as a focus of discussion and/or activities for the proteges and mentors.

Another important program implication is related to the four joint protege and mentor workshops. Although, interviews of proteges and mentors focussed on their relationships and not the mentoring program, the overlap between the common themes of the proteges and mentors and the workshops indicates that the workshops may have been helpful to participants. Specifically, the workshops on "Expectations, Concerns, and Goals"; "Feedback and Relationship Rules"(including the mentoring partnership contract); "Listening to Your Partner" and "Problem Solving" seem particularly relevant given the experiences of the proteges and mentors. Specific topics which should be stressed in the workshops and/or in support from the coordinators include the importance of mutual commitment, the understanding nature of mentors, mutual sharing, mentors assisting proteges with problem solving related to their personal and school lives, extending the mentoring relationship beyond the mentoring program and school setting and giving proteges opportunities to learn and/or teach a new skill. Mentors and proteges should also be encouraged, through the workshops or meetings, to establish a meeting place(s) within the school which is readily accessible.

The third program implication involves issues arising from the experiences of the proteges and mentors. While these issues should be addressed with proteges and mentors early in the mentoring program, they do require sensitivity in their presentation. The coordinators will have to decide if they should be incorporated into the orientations, workshops, meetings or discussed with individual mentoring pairs, if the issue arises. The first issue relates to one-on-one contact. Coordinators should continue to address mentors' concerns regarding the safety of one-on-one contact. Coordinators

may wish to suggest that one-on-one contact can take place under a variety of conditions. As the proteges and mentors here revealed, one-on-one contact does not necessarily require that the protege and mentor meet to the exclusion of others. Rather, one-on-one contact can take place when a mentor and protege pursue an activity with another mentoring pair. One-on-one contact can also take place when a mentoring pair pursue an activity within a group setting.

The second issue relates to time expectations and commitments of the proteges and mentors. The majority of proteges and mentors stated that they met once a week or once every two weeks. The proteges also revealed that they enjoyed lengthy meetings and/or outings with their mentors. The mentors, on the other hand, revealed that they were concerned about the time required by their mentoring relationships given their other responsibilities at the school.

The third issue relates to the mentors' experience of multiplicity of roles. The majority of mentors expressed concern regarding the various roles (mentor, teacher and/or friend) they simultaneously played for their proteges. The proteges, on the other hand, clearly valued the friendships they had with their mentors. To minimize the mentors' concerns, coordinators should discuss the pros and cons of matching mentors with proteges who they are not directly involved with in the school. In some cases, mentors may choose to experience some level of multiplicity of roles so that they can have the kind of contact teaching a protege offers.

A fourth program implication is related to the proteges' and mentors' future oriented experience of their mentoring relationships. Mentors and proteges predominantly felt that their mentoring relationships should continue, shifting from the formal structure of the mentoring program to informal self-sustaining relationships. Coordinators should consider

incorporating this finding into the structure of the mentoring program by suggesting the shift to mentors and proteges toward the year end.

Implications for Further Research

The design of this study has implications for those who would like to investigate mentoring relationships from the perspectives of mentors and proteges. In addition, the design of this has implications for those who would like to investigate mentoring relationships from the perspectives of other stakeholders such as parents, program coordinators, school staff and administrators. The methods of data collection and analysis, which are particularly worthy of recommendation, are discussed below.

Data were collected through ethnographic interviews. The two main interviewing techniques used in the interviews, the narrative account and the critical incident technique (Flanagan, 1954), combined to elicit rich descriptions of the proteges' and mentors' mentoring relationships. In this study, the first descriptive question elicited lengthy, detailed narrative accounts of the participants' mentoring relationships, particularly the mentors. The stories the participants recalled were often chronological, detailed accounts of their mentoring relationships which were further elaborated with responses to the researcher's probes. In some cases these narrative accounts would have provided sufficient data without the series of critical incident questions. In other cases, the series of critical incident questions elicited more detailed responses by the participants, particularly their thoughts and feelings. The series of critical incident questions focussed participants, particularly the proteges, on incidents, events or moments, facilitating the recall of specific details not previously mentioned.

I would also recommend the EPP-method, as discussed by Karlsson (1993), when the researcher's goal is to understand participants' meanings from interview protocols. While time intensive, the five steps in the EPP--method permit the researcher to move logically from a broad understanding of each participant's experiences to interpreting each participant's specific meaning units to analyzing participants' themes for common themes. A return to the interview protocol summaries and the protocols themselves, with the imbedded synopses, allows the researcher to add *credibility* to his/her findings.

There are many questions arising from this study. It is the opinion of the researcher that all of the findings of this study are worthy of further research. For example, the theme of problem solving, common to both the proteges and mentors, revealed that mentors' assistance with proteges' personal and school related problem solving was an important component of the mentoring relationships. However, the long term impact of the mentors' assistance was not ascertained due to length of the study coinciding with the end of the first year of the program. Another issue revealed in the common theme of problem solving was the types of assistance mentors provided to proteges. In some cases mentors assisted proteges in problem solving specific situations. In others, mentors helped proteges develop strategies to deal with reoccurring problems. It would be interesting to follow up on these aspects of the proteges' and mentors' experiences.

REFERENCES

- Abcug, L. (1991). Teachers Achieving Success with Kids (TASK): A Teacher-Student Mentorship Program for At-Risk Students. Nova University Practicum Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 974)
- Benard, B. (1991). Fostering Resiliency in Kids: Protective Factors in the Family, School and Community. Portland, Oregon: Western Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 781)
- Berk, L. E. (1992). The extracurriculum. In Jackson, P. W. ed. (1992). Handbook of Research on Curriculum. Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (1993). Improving the quality of education in British Columbia: Changes to British Columbia's education policy. Victoria: B.C. Ministry of Education.
- British Columbia Teachers' Federation. (1993). Teachers' views have some impact, Issue Alert, 6(1), 1-2.
- Brown, R. (1995). Mentoring At Risk Students: Challenges and Potential. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391 138)
- Cahoon, P. (1989). Ambassadors: Models for at-risk students. Educational Leadership, 46(5), 64.
- Cave, G. & Quint, J. (1990). Career Beginnings Impact Evaluation: Findings from a Program for Disadvantaged High School Students. New York: Manpower Demonstration Corporation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 781)
- Clawson, J. G. (1980). Mentoring in managerial careers. In C.B.Derr (Ed.), Work, family and career: New Frontiers in theory and research. New York, Prager.
- Coppock, M. L. (1995). Mentoring at-risk hispanic students in self-esteem, academic growth, and citizenship awareness. Equity & Excellence in Education, 28(1), 36-43.
- de Rosenroll, D., Saunders, G. and Carr, R. A. (1993). The Canadian stay-in-school mentor strategy: Program development resource kit. Victoria: Peer Systems Consulting Group.
- Dryfoos, J. G. (1990). Adolescents at risk: Prevalence and prevention. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Dryfoos, J. G. (1991). School-based social and health services for at-risk students. Urban Education, 26(1), 118-37.
- Everett, P. (1991). Decreasing Alternative Placement for At-Risk Students at the Secondary Level. Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 858)
- Fehr, D.E. (1993). When faculty and staff mentor students in inner-city schools. Middle School Journal, 25(1), 65-67.
- Finley, M. (1994). Cultivating Resilience: An Overview for Rural Educators and Parents. ERIC Digest. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 904)
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin, 51(4), 327-358.
- Flaxman, E. (1992). Evaluating Mentoring Programs. New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 285)
- Flaxman, E. and Ascher, C. (1992). Mentoring in Action: The Efforts of Programs in New York City. New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 291)
- Fortune, J. C., Bruce, A., Williams, J. and Jones, M. (1991). What does the evaluation of your dropout prevention program show about its success?... Maybe not enough. The High School Journal, 74, 225-31.
- Gittman, E. & Cassata, M. (1994). A Prevention Program for Middle-School High Risk Youth. A paper presented at the October 1994 conference of the Northeastern Educational Research Association In Ellenville, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 385 811)
- Glass, R. S. (1991). Opening windows for teenagers. American Educator, 15 (1), 21-6.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth Generation Evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Hahn, A. (1987). Reaching out to America's dropouts: What to do? Phi Delta Kappan, 69(4), 256-63.
- Hamilton, S. F. and Darling, N. (1996). Mentors in Adolescents' Lives. In Hurrelmann, K and Hamilton, S. F. (Eds.). (1996). Social Problems and Social Contexts in Adolescence. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Hamilton, S. F. and Hamilton, M. A. (1992). Mentoring programs: Promise and paradox. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(7), 546-50.

- Huisman, C. (1992a). The Student Mentoring Program 1989-1992. Retrospective Report. Portland: University of Portland. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 700)
- Huisman, C. (1992b). The Student Mentoring Program 1989-1992. Evaluation Report. Portland: University of Portland. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 701)
- Kamii, C. (Ed.). (1991). Early Literacy: A Constructivist Foundation for Whole Language. NEA Early Childhood Education Series. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 703).
- Karlsson, G. (1993). Psychological Qualitative Research from a Phenomenological Perspective. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Larrivee, B. and Bourque, M. L. (1991). The impact of several dropout prevention intervention strategies on at-risk students. Education, 112, 48-63.
- McMillan, J. H. and Schumacher, S. (1989). Research in Education: A Conceptual Introduction. New York: Harper Collins.
- McPartland, J. M. and Nettles, S. M. (1991). Using community adults as advocates or mentors for at-risk middle school students: A two-year evaluation of project raise. American Journal of Education. 99(4). 568-86.
- Mentoring for Adolescents. In Ontario, Ministry of Education. (1990). Student Retention and Transition: A Selection of Program Models/Maintien et transition des élèves. Unrecueil de programmes efficaces. Toronto: Ministry of Education.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Morgan, M. C. (1993). A self-esteem treatment program for tenth and eleventh-grade students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1993). [CD-ROM]. Abstract from: ProQuest File: Dissertation Abstracts Item: AAC 9326113
- Morris, S. , Pawlovich, W., and McCall, D. (1991). Evaluating the effectiveness of school drop-out prevention strategies: Some suggestions for future research: Final report. Toronto: Canadian Education Association.
- Radwanski, G. (1987). Ontario study of the relevance of education and the issue of dropouts. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.
- Random House Webster's College Dictionary. (1991). Mentor. Toronto: Random House, 847.

- Raywid, M. A. (1985). Keeping at-risk youth in school. In Wheelock, A. and Sweeney, M. A. (1989). *Alternative education: A vehicle for school reform*. Changing Schools, 17(2), 1,4-6.
- Raywid, M. A. (1987). Finding education's lost children: The status, cost and prevention of dropout-prone youth. In Wheelock, A. and Sweeney, M. A. (1989). *Alternative education: A vehicle for school reform*. Changing Schools, 17(2), 1, 4-6.
- Salz, A. and Trubowitz, J. (1992). You can see the sky from here: The Queens College big buddy program. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(7), 551-556.
- School District No. 36 (Surrey). (1992). Connect: The Surrey Mentorship Program. Surrey: School District No. 36 (Surrey).
- Scott, M. E. (1992). Designing effective mentoring programs: Historical perspectives and current issues. Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 30, 167-177.
- Slicker, E. K. and Palmer D. J. (1993). Mentoring at-risk high school students: Evaluation of School-Based Program. The School Counselor, 40, 327-34.
- Smink, J. (1990). Mentoring Programs for At-Risk Youth: A Dropout Prevention Research Report. South Carolina: National Dropout Prevention Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 931)
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Tuck, K. (1991). Junior High School Intensive Care and School Involvement Program (JHSICSIP). Evaluation. School Year 1990-91. District of Columbia: District of Columbia Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 569)
- Turkel, S.B. & Abramson, T. (1986). Peer tutoring and mentoring as a drop-out prevention strategy. Clearing House, 60(2), 68-71.
- Vico, Giambattista. (1710). De antiquissima Italorum sapientia. In Watzlawick, P. (Ed.). (1984). The Invented Reality. New York, W.W. Norton.
- Von Glaserfeld, E. (1984). An introduction to radical constructivism. In Watzlawick, P. (Ed.). (1984). The Invented Reality. New York, W.W. Norton.
- Wake County Public School System. (1989). School/Community Helping Hands Project. Executive Summary. Raleigh: North Carolina(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 760)
- Weber, L. R., Miracle, A. and T. Skehan. (1994). Interviewing early adolescents: Some methodological considerations. Human Organization, 53(1), 42-47.

- Wheatley, G. H. (1991). Constructivist perspectives on science and mathematics learning. Science Education, 75(1), 9-21.
- Wheelock, A. and Sweeney, M. A. (1989). Alternative education: A vehicle for school reform. In the Center on Evaluation, Development and Research. (1991). The Alternative School Choice. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa.
- White-Hood, M. (1993). Taking up the mentoring challenge. Educational Leadership, 51(3), 76-78.
- Woolsey, L. K. (1986). The critical incident technique: An innovataive qualitative method of research. Canadian Journal of Counselling, 20(4), 242-254.

APPENDIX A

Emily Carr Mentoring Program Proposal

The following sections are designed to address any questions you may have about Emily Carr's mentoring program.

1a. Mentoring program goals

In the most general terms, the goal of the mentoring program is to provide mentors and their at-risk students with the opportunity to have a mutually beneficial relationship which enhances their lives. For the students at-risk, the program goals include reducing their at-risk behaviours and modeling how to form a positive adult-teenager relationship. For the mentors, the program goal is make the relationship significantly relevant and rewarding to sustain their involvement.

1b. School needs

Although there are not a large number of at-risk students at Emily Carr, there are students who are at-risk of dropping out of school, taking drugs, getting pregnant, being passively aggressive (acting in) and/or becoming violent. Some of these students also do not have a significant adult in their life

1c. School philosophy statement

Although Emily Carr does not have a mission statement, the school board's slogan of "Focus on the Learner" concurs with this program which focuses on individual at-risk students and their unique needs. The following quote from the Emily Carr Teachers' Handbook exemplifies the philosophy of Emily Carr :

"The central theme of adolescence is that of identity, coming to know who one is, what one believes in and values, what one wants to accomplish and get out of life."

2a. Mentoring partner(protege) group

-any student who teachers, counsellors, administrators, classroom assistants and/or parents identify as having any at-risk and can be matched with a mentor

-students may identify themselves

-students at-risk behaviours may range from mild to severe

2b. Mentoring partners(protege) group at-risk behaviours

-there are students who are at-risk of dropping out of school, taking drugs, getting pregnant, being passively aggressive (acting in) and/or becoming violent

2c. Program benefits to at-risk students

-by providing one person within the school setting whom the student has on-going positive contact, it is hoped that the student will

1. view adult relationships as valuable

2. feel he/she has an advocate
3. have an adult to share concerns, successes, activities with
4. have a model of how to form positive relationships
5. develop trust
6. develop an understanding of respect

3a. Mentoring volunteer group

- committed staff who can be matched with a partner
- 1994-95-interested teachers, classroom assistants, and support staff
- 1995-96-grade 11s, community members, NYSA youth workers

3b. Mentoring volunteers offerings

- positive role model, advocate, resource person, friend, advice, opportunity for dialogue, organizational skills, attend outside activities with student, expertise in a particular area--sports, music, art, drama, outdoors, expose student to positive activities, academic support

4. No. of partnerships planned

- 94-95--three to ten for first year
- start small, build on success
- 95-96--incorporate grade elevens as mentors next year and increase the number of partnerships

5. Preparation of mentoring partners/volunteers

- preliminary discussions/questionnaires
- workshop series (five)
- student council input(volunteers only)

6. Length of mentoring relationships

- November to June

7. Follow-up support and supervision

- meetings
- contact with coordinators
- celebrations
- interviews with mentoring partners and volunteers

8. Evaluation of program

- interviews
- initial and follow-up questionnaires

APPENDIX B

Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program
Mentoring Volunteer Information Sheet

Name:_____ Date:_____

1. What are your expectations for the mentoring relationship (match)?

2. What would you like to get out of the match?

3. What would you like to see a student get out of a match with you?

4. What concerns do you have for yourself in a match?

5. What concerns do you think a student might have?

6. What personal strengths do you feel that you have to offer a student?

7. What can the student offer you?

8. If you defined your match as successful, what would that look like?

9. What is your definition of friendship?

10. Have you had any volunteer experience before? What are some of the highlights/difficulties?

11. Have you ever been involved in a mentoring relationship before? What are some of the highlights/difficulties?

12. What special skills, hobbies or interests do you have?

13. Are you involved with any groups within the school or the community which may appeal to students?

14. What activities would you be interested in doing with a student?

15. During a typical week , when would you be available to meet with a student? Be as specific as possible in terms of day of the week and time of day.

16. Is there any student at Emily Carr who you think would make a good match for yourself or another staff person involved in the program?

17. Additional Comments/Questions:

APPENDIX C

Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program
Mentoring Partner Information Sheet

Name: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____ Postal Code: _____

Phone Number: _____ Sex: _____

Age: _____ Birthdate: _____

School: _____

1. What is your definition of a friendship?

2. What do you think a mentor is?

3. What do you know about mentoring?

4. Have you ever been in a situation where you were a mentor to another person? If yes, what was the situation and what was it like for you? What qualities do you feel you had to offer to the other person?

5. When you think of an ideal mentor, what would that person be like?

6. Do you have a job? If yes, where do you work? How many hours per week do you work?

7. What career interests do you have?

8. How do you feel about school?

9. What subjects in school do you like? not like?

10. Do you participate in any extra-curricular activities at school?

11. Do you participate in any organized activities outside of school?

12. What kinds of things do you like to do in your spare time(sports, hobbies, interests)?

13. What kinds of things would you like to do, but don't?

14. What kinds of things do you imagine you and your mentor might do together?

15. What do you think you could currently give to a mentoring relationship, as a mentoring partner?

16. When could you meet with your mentoring volunteer? How much time per week would you like to spend with your mentor?

17. Do you have any concerns about the program?

18. Additional Comments/Questions:

APPENDIX D

Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program Partner/Parent Information Sheet

This information sheet is designed to address some of the questions you may have about Emily Carr's mentoring program.

A. Mentoring program goals

In the most general terms, the goal of the mentoring program is to provide mentoring volunteers and partners with the opportunity to have a mutually beneficial relationship which is relevant and rewarding.

B. School philosophy statement

Although Emily Carr does not have a mission statement, the school board's slogan of "Focus on the Learner" supports this program which focuses on individual students and their unique needs. The following quote from the teachers' handbook exemplifies the philosophy of Emily Carr :

"The central theme of adolescence is that of identity, coming to know who one is, what one believes in and values, what one wants to accomplish and get out of life."

C. Mentoring partner group (students)

1994-95 approximately ten students who feel they could benefit from a mentoring relationship with a staff person
1995-96 (?)

D. Program benefits to mentoring partners

Acting as mentoring volunteers, a staff member could provide the following to his/her mentoring partner:

1. positive role model
2. advocate
3. resource person
4. friend
5. advice
6. opportunity for dialogue
7. organizational skills
8. support for outside activities
9. expertise in a particular area-- sports, music, art, drama, outdoors
10. exposure to new activities,
11. academic support

E. Mentoring volunteer group (staff)

1994-95-interested teachers, classroom assistants, and support staff
1995-96-grade 11s, community members, RYSA youth workers (?)

F. Program benefits to mentoring volunteers

Many staff have engaged in informal mentoring relationships in the past and found them to be positive experiences. They also realize that there may be students in the school who could benefit from mentoring relationships who are not involved in informal mentoring relationships.

G. Preparation of mentoring partners/volunteers

- preliminary discussions/information
- interviews/questionnaires
- workshop series focussing on mentoring relationships

(Please turn over.)

H. Time and place of workshops

-school and/or Douglas Community Centre (approx. 12:30-3:30 p.m.)

I. Commitment

-a minimum of one half hour per week for as long as the relationship lasts

Note: Mr. Watch and Ms June, the Mentoring Program coordinators, are available to answer any questions which you may have about the program. They may be reached at the school

APPENDIX E

Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program
Parental Release Form for Mentoring Partners

I have read the Emily Carr Mentoring Program's Partner Information Sheet with my child. I am aware of the program's expectations concerning the involvement of the mentor, child and parent.

Please print:

I, _____, agree to allow my child
(first name, last name)

_____ to be involved in this program and am willing to
(first name, last name)

actively support the mentoring relationship.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postal Code: _____

Phone Numbers: _____(home) _____(work)

Signed: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX F**Mentoring Activity - Workshop No. 1
November 22, 1994****a. Mentor and mentoring definitions**

1. Have you ever had a mentor?
2. What is your definition of a mentor?
3. What is your definition of mentoring?

b. Qualities, expectations and assumptions

1. What qualities will you will bring to the relationship?
2. What do you hope to get out of your mentoring relationship?
3. What do you hope or think your partner will get out of the relationship?
4. What kinds of concerns do you have about getting involved in a mentoring relationship?
5. What kinds of concerns do you think your partner (at-risk student might have about getting involved in a mentoring relationship?
6. How might you lessen your concerns and insure your hopes? What can we do during the workshops to help? What can we do after the workshop series is over?

APPENDIX G

**Mentoring Partner Activity -
Workshop No. 1**

November 25, 1994

A. Mentor and mentoring

List as many word as you can which you associate (think of/ pop into your head) with the words mentor and mentoring

[illegible]

B. Mentoring - Qualities, Expectations and Assumptions

1. What qualities will you will bring to the relationship?

2. What do you hope to get out of your mentoring relationship?

3. What do you hope or think your volunteer (adult) will get out of the relationship?

4. What kinds of concerns do you have about getting involved in a mentoring relationship?

5. What kinds of concerns do you think your volunteer might have about getting involved in a mentoring relationship?

6. What kinds of support can we give, including the workshops to lessen your concerns and insure that your hopes are realized?

APPENDIX H

Bridging Activity #1

Please meet before the next workshop to work on your answers to the following questions.

1. What expectations do you each have for your match? How do you see achieving your expectations?

2. What concerns, if any do each of you have for your match? How do you see dealing with them?

3. What are some activities that each of you would like to do when you are together? (This may be similar to expectations/strategies question.)

APPENDIX I

Emily Carr Junior Secondary School Mentoring Program
Mentoring Partnership Contract

We understand that we have been selected as a mentoring partnership and we both are willing to make a commitment to:

1. attend and participate in all relationship development workshops;
2. participate in all scheduled meetings with the program coordinators;
3. meet one-on-one to undertake mutually agreeable program and relationship activities on a weekly basis;
4. complete log record at the end of each weekly meeting;
5. report to the program coordinator any problems or issues that arise that may be adversely affecting our relationship and to which we are having difficulty responding;
6. work with one another and, if necessary, the program coordinator on issues that are affecting our mentoring relationship;
7. participate in any meetings or sessions that are intended to bring closure to our mentoring relationship;
8. attend mentoring program follow-up meetings, events and celebrations;
9. give feedback to the program coordinator which will be used to build a more effective program.

Mentoring Partner Signature:_____

Mentoring Volunteer Signature:_____

Date:_____

APPENDIX J

Giving and Receiving Feedback

Name: _____

Answer questions 1-3 and then share them with your partner.

1. What was it about the feedback **giver** that may have contributed to the outcome of the feedback?

2. What was it about the **situation** that may have contributed to the outcome of the feedback?

3. What was it about you as the feedback **receiver** that may have contributed to the outcome of the feedback?

Answer questions 4 -6 and then share them with your partner.

4. What was it about the feedback **giver** that may have contributed to the outcome of the feedback?

5. What was it about the **situation** that may have contributed to the outcome of the feedback?

6. What was it about you as the feedback **receiver** that may have contributed to the outcome of the feedback?

APPENDIX K

Emily Carr Mentoring Program Log

Date:_____	Time:_____
	(start/end)
Place:_____	
Date of parent contact	Activity:_____
if necessary:_____	
____phone call ____note	

Highlights/Feedback

Mentoring Partner	Mentoring Volunteer
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

APPENDIX L

Emily Carr Junior Secondary Mentoring Program Personal Reflection Activity

1. How has your mentoring relationship been beneficial to you, particularly in the last two months?
2. What, if anything, would you like to change about your mentoring relationship?

APPENDIX M

Emily Carr Junior Secondary School
Listening Activity - Feedback

1. How did you feel when you were talking?

2. How did you feel when you were listening?

3. What made the speaking activity difficult?

4. What do you feel are the important aspects of good listening/

APPENDIX N

**Emily Carr Junior Secondary
Problem Solving Activity****A. Good and Bad Decisions****1. Bad Decisions - Things that had an effect on my decision**

Partner -

Mentor -

2. Good Decisions - Things that had an effect on my decision

Partner -

Mentor -

3. Our Match

APPENDIX O

SCHOOL BOARD CONSENT FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Department of Counselling Psychology
 Faculty of Education
 2125 Main Mall
 Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4
 Tel: (604) 822-5259
 Fax: (604) 822-2328

March 22, 1995

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I am a Curriculum and Instruction graduate student at the University of British Columbia as well as a teacher in the [REDACTED]. I am interested in studying the school-based mentoring program at [REDACTED]. The title of my proposed thesis is "School-Based Mentoring: The Experience of Mentors and Proteges."

My thesis will describe the introductory year of the [REDACTED] Mentoring Program (1994-95) and the experience of that program for both the mentors (staff persons) and proteges (students). My thesis questions are:

1. What is the personal experience of the mentoring program for the mentors?
2. What is the personal experience of the mentoring program for the proteges?

The proposed study has three significant potential benefits. First, it will document what the school-based program at [REDACTED] looks like, providing a concrete model. Second, it will allow in-depth study of the participants' mentoring relationships which will provide insights into the personal experience of the program for both the mentors and proteges. Third, it will hopefully provide the coordinators with information which will lead to the improvement of the program.

For this study, an ethnographic design will be used. Each subject will be asked to create a narrative story beginning before the mentoring program began in November and ending at the time of the interview. In addition, each person will be asked to identify positive incidents in their mentoring relationship and then negative incidents. Each interview will last approximately one hour. Following the analysis of the data, mentors and proteges will have the opportunity to give feedback through focus groups. Focus groups will meet with the researcher for one hour.

An overview of the study will be presented at the end of the mentoring workshop on April 18. Staff and students will be given consent forms to sign if they decide to volunteer for the study. Students will also be required to have one of their parent(s) or guardian(s) sign a consent form. Following the receipt of staff, student and parent/guardian consent forms, individual interviews will be arranged at the convenience of participants in a vacant room in the school. Following the analysis of the data, mentors and proteges will meet in focus groups. Interviews and focus group sessions will be audio taped and transcribed. The researcher will be the only one to listen to the audio tapes. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor will have direct access to the transcripts. In addition, names will not be identified on any transcripts, and audio tapes will be erased at the completion of the study.

Please find enclosed copies of staff, student and parent consent forms. My faculty advisor has submitted my Request for Ethical Review form to the U.B.C. Behavioural Sciences Screening Committee. If you have any questions you may contact me at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Richard Young, at 822-6370(w). I look forward to hearing from you regarding the above research.

Sincerely,

Jillian Morgan

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

APPENDIX P

INITIAL LETTER OF CONTACT - STAFF

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Department of Counselling Psychology
 Faculty of Education
 2125 Main Mall
 Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4
 Tel: (604) 822-5259
 Fax: (604) 822-2328

April 15, 1995

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student at the University of British Columbia as well as a teacher in the [REDACTED]. I am interested in studying the school-based mentoring program at [REDACTED]. The title of my proposed thesis is "School-Based Mentoring: The Experience of Mentors and Proteges."

My thesis will describe the introductory year of the [REDACTED] Mentoring Program (1994-95) and the experience of that program for both the mentors (staff persons) and proteges (students). My thesis questions are:

1. What is the personal experience of the mentoring program for the mentors?
2. What is the personal experience of the mentoring program for the proteges?

The proposed study has three significant potential benefits. First, it will document what the school-based program at [REDACTED] looks like, providing a concrete model. Second, it will allow in-depth study of the participants' mentoring relationships which will provide insights into the personal experience of the program for both the mentors and proteges. Third, it will hopefully provide the coordinators with information which will lead to the improvement of the program.

This study will require your involvement in two ways. You will be interviewed for approximately one hour. The interview will be arranged at your convenience in a vacant room in the school. Your interview will be audio taped and a transcript will be made. Following the analysis of the data, mentors will form a focus group to give feedback to the researcher for approximately one hour. The focus group session will be audio taped and a transcript will be made.

Confidentiality will be maintained through the following procedures. The researcher will be the only one to listen to the audio tapes. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor will have direct access to the transcripts. In addition, names will not be identified on any transcripts, and audio tapes will be erased at the completion of the study.

At the end of the mentoring workshop on April 18, 1995, I will answer any questions concerning this study. You can also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Richard Young, whose phone number is 822-6380. At the workshop I will ask you to consent to participate in this study by completing a consent form. Refusal to participate will not affect your involvement in the mentoring program. If at any time you choose to withdraw from the study you may do so without being prejudiced. If you have any questions you may contact me at [REDACTED]. I appreciate your consideration of this request and I hope that you will look forward to participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Jillian Morgan

APPENDIX Q

INITIAL LETTER OF CONTACT - STUDENTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Department of Counselling Psychology
 Faculty of Education
 2125 Main Mall
 Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4
 Tel: (604) 822-5259
 Fax: (604) 822-2328

April 15, 1995

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student at the University of British Columbia as well as a teacher in the [REDACTED]. I am interested in studying the school-based mentoring program at [REDACTED]. The title of my proposed thesis is "School-Based Mentoring: The Experience of Mentors and Proteges."

My thesis will describe the introductory year of the [REDACTED] Secondary Mentoring Program (1994-95) and the experience of that program for both the mentors (staff persons) and proteges (students). My thesis questions are:

1. What is the personal experience of the mentoring program for the mentors?
2. What is the personal experience of the mentoring program for the proteges?

The proposed study has three significant potential benefits. First, it will document what the school-based program at [REDACTED] looks like, providing a concrete model. Second, it will allow in-depth study of the participants' mentoring relationships which will provide insights into the personal experience of the program for both the mentors and proteges. Third, it will hopefully provide the coordinators with information which will lead to the improvement of the program.

This study will require your involvement in two ways. You will be interviewed for approximately one hour. The interview will be arranged at your convenience in a vacant room in the school. Your interview will be audio taped and a transcript will be made. Following the analysis of the data, proteges will form a focus group to give feedback to the researcher for approximately one hour. The focus group session will be audio taped and a transcript will be made.

Confidentiality will be maintained through the following procedures. The researcher will be the only one to listen to the audio tapes. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor will have direct access to the transcript. In addition, names will not be identified on any transcripts, and audio tapes will be erased at the completion of the study.

At the end of the mentoring workshop on April 18, 1995, I will answer any questions concerning this study. You can also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Richard Young, whose phone number is 822-6380. At the workshop I will ask you to consent to participate in this study by completing a consent form. You will also be required to have one of your parent(s) or guardian(s) sign a consent form. Refusal to participate will not affect your involvement in the mentoring program or your grades. If at any time you choose to withdraw from the study you may do so without being prejudiced. If you have any questions you may contact me at [REDACTED]. I appreciate your consideration of this request and I hope that you will look forward to participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Jillian Morgan

APPENDIX R

STAFF CONSENT FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Department of Counselling Psychology
 Faculty of Education
 2125 Main Mall
 Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4
 Tel: (604) 822-5259
 Fax: (604) 822-2328

I, _____, consent/do not consent (please circle) to be a participant in the study "School-Based Mentoring: The Experience of Mentors and Proteges." The study is part of a graduate degree thesis in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of British Columbia. The study is being conducted by Jillian Morgan, under the supervision of her faculty advisor, Dr. Richard Young of the Counselling Psychology Department. I am aware that I may contact Jillian Morgan (_____) or Dr. Richard Young (822-6380) if I have any questions.

I am aware that my involvement in this study will include an interview of approximately one hour, although providing less or more time to this project is at my discretion and availability. The interview will be arranged at my convenience in a vacant room in the school. The interview will be audio taped and a transcript will be made. The focus of the interview will be the mentoring relationship in which I am engaged. Following the analysis of the data, mentors will form a focus group to give feedback to the researcher for approximately one hour. The focus group session will be audio taped and a transcript will be made.

I recognize that the proposed study has three significant goals. First, it will document what the school-based program at _____ looks like, providing a concrete model. Second, it will allow in-depth study of the participants' mentoring relationships which will provide insights into the personal experience of the program for both the mentors and proteges. Third, it will hopefully provide the coordinators with information which will lead to the improvement of the program.

I understand that confidentiality will be maintained through the following procedures. The researcher will be the only one to listen to the audio tapes. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor will have direct access to the transcripts. In addition, names will not be identified on any transcripts, and audio tapes will be erased at the completion of the study.

I understand that my participation in this project is voluntary and may be terminated by me at any time without being prejudiced. Refusal to participate will not affect my involvement in the mentoring program . Should I have any questions, I may ask them at any time.

I acknowledge that I will not be paid for my participation.

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form.

Date: _____

Signed: _____

APPENDIX S

STUDENT CONSENT FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Department of Counselling Psychology
 Faculty of Education
 2125 Main Mall
 Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4
 Tel: (604) 822-5259
 Fax: (604) 822-2328

I, _____, consent/do not consent (please circle) to be a participant in the study "School-Based Mentoring: The Experience of Mentors and Proteges." The study is part of a graduate degree thesis in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of British Columbia. The study is being conducted by Jillian Morgan, under the supervision of her faculty advisor, Dr. Richard Young of the Counselling Psychology Department. I am aware that I may contact Jillian Morgan (_____) or Dr. Richard Young (822-6380) if I have any questions.

I am aware that my involvement in this study will include an interview of approximately one hour, although providing less or more time to this project is at my discretion and availability. The interview will be arranged at my convenience in a vacant room in the school. The interview will be audio taped and a transcript will be made. The focus of the interview will be the mentoring relationship in which I am engaged. Following the analysis of the data, proteges will form a focus group to give feedback to the researcher for approximately one hour. The focus group session will be audio taped and a transcript will be made.

I recognize that the proposed study has three significant goals. First, it will document what the school-based program at _____ looks like, providing a concrete model. Second, it will allow in-depth study of the participants' mentoring relationships which will provide insights into the personal experience of the program for both the mentors and proteges. Third, it will hopefully provide the coordinators with information which will lead to the improvement of the program.

I understand that confidentiality will be maintained through the following procedures. The researcher will be the only one to listen to the audio tapes. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor will have direct access to the transcripts. In addition, names will not be identified on any transcripts, and audio tapes will be erased at the completion of the study.

I understand that my participation in this project is voluntary and may be terminated by me at any time without being prejudiced. Refusal to participate will not affect my involvement in the mentoring program or my grades. Should I have any questions, I may ask them at any time.

I acknowledge that I will not be paid for my participation.

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form.

Date: _____

Signed: _____

APPENDIX T

PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Department of Counselling Psychology
 Faculty of Education
 2125 Main Mall
 Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4
 Tel: (604) 822-5259
 Fax: (604) 822-2328

I, _____, consent/do not consent (please circle) to have my son/daughter/ward, _____, participate in the study "School-Based Mentoring: The Experience of Mentors and Proteges." The study is part of a graduate degree thesis in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of British Columbia. The study is being conducted by Jillian Morgan, under the supervision of her faculty advisor, Dr. Richard Young of the Counselling Psychology Department. I am aware that I may contact Jillian Morgan (_____) or Dr. Richard Young (822-6380) if I have any questions.

I am aware that my son/daughter/ward's involvement in this study will include an interview of approximately one hour, although providing less or more time to this project is at my son/daughter/ward's discretion and availability. The interview will be arranged at my son/daughter/ward's convenience in a vacant room in the school. The interview will be audio taped and a transcript will be made. The focus of the interview will be the mentoring relationship in which my son/daughter/ward's is presently engaged. Following the analysis of the data, proteges (students) will form a focus group to give feedback to the researcher for approximately one hour. The focus group session will be audio taped and a transcript will be made.

I recognize that the proposed study has three significant goals. First, it will document what the school-based program at _____ looks like, providing a concrete model. Second, it will allow in-depth study of the participants' mentoring relationships which will provide insights into the personal experience of the program for both the mentors and proteges. Third, it will hopefully provide the coordinators with information which will lead to the improvement of the program.

I understand that confidentiality will be maintained through the following procedures. The researcher will be the only one to listen to the audio tapes. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor will have direct access to the transcripts. In addition, names will not be identified on any transcripts, and audio tapes will be erased at the completion of the study.

I understand that my son/daughter/ward's participation in this project is voluntary and may be terminated by me or my son/daughter/ward at any time without being prejudiced. Refusal to participate will not affect my son/daughter/ward's involvement in the mentoring program or his/her grades. Should I or my son/daughter/ward have any questions, we may ask them at any time.

I acknowledge that my son/daughter/ward will not be paid for his/her participation.

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form.

Date: _____

Signed: _____

APPENDIX U

Interview Protocol - Mentors and Proteges

General Introduction:

I will be placing the tape recorder between us so that I can clearly hear what we both say. I may take some notes to assist me in the interview.

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed. I would like to review some of the aspects of this interview. Everything you say in this interview will be kept confidential (your identity won't be revealed). You may withdraw from this interview and/or the study at any time without being prejudiced (no consequences). In this study you will be referred to by a pseudonym (a name of your choice other than your own). You will get an opportunity to look at the data analysis next fall. All audio-tapes will be destroyed at the end of the study in December 1995.

The research findings from this study will be used to understand the nature of mentoring relationships from the perspectives of mentoring volunteers and partners. The research findings will also be used to provide a model of a school-based mentoring program and improve [REDACTED] program.

You have been involved in a mentoring relationship for approximately seven months. I am interested in your thoughts and feelings about your mentoring relationship. I have some general questions for you, but please feel free to add whatever you think would be important for me to know. If you have brought any materials to the interview you may refer to them at any time.

Do you have any questions before we begin.

Questions:

1. Please choose a pseudonym (another name). Please state your sex and role within the school--student (age, grade), teacher, classroom assistant.

2. Tell me a story about your seven months in your mentoring relationship. Begin when you were approached about becoming involved in the mentoring program and ending with today. Include things that happened and your thoughts and feelings.

Begin your story with the first time you heard about the mentoring program last November. Tell me month by month what happened in your relationship. Could you also tell me about your thoughts and feelings related to your mentoring relationship.

Could you describe the mentoring interaction which you mentioned as _____?

Could you describe what went on during _____?
event

Could you give me an example of _____?

If I was sitting near you and your mentor/protege, what kinds of things would I hear you and your mentor/protege talking about?

Tell me about the last time() you met with your mentor/protege?

3.
 - a. What were some of the things you've done together in the last seven months?
 - b. About how often do you see each other?
 - c. What are the main things you talk about?
 - d. Think of a particular time in your mentoring relationship which was really important (stood out). Describe the moment or incident.

What happened? What did you talk about? What did you feel? think?

If I was sitting near you and your mentor/protege, what kinds of things would I hear you and your mentor/protege talking about?

In what ways was it important?

Why was it important?

What made it important?

How did it affect your relationship as a whole?

Could you describe the mentoring interaction which you mentioned as _____?

Could you describe what went on during _____?
event

Could you give me an example of _____?

- e. Think of another time in your mentoring relationship which was really important (stood out). Describe the moment or incident.

What happened? What did you talk about? What did you feel? think?

If I was sitting near you and your mentor/protege, what kinds of things would I hear you and your mentor/protege talking about?

In what ways was it important?

Why was it important?

What made it important?

How did it affect your relationship as a whole? - positive or negative

Could you describe the mentoring interaction which you mentioned as _____?

Could you describe what went on during _____?
event

Could you give me an example of _____?

f. You've mentioned _____ incidents. Can you think of any negative moments or incidents which happened in your relationship which you feel are important?

or You've mentioned _____ incidents which were important. How would you categorize each incident in terms of its impact on your mentoring relationship - negative or positive?

What happened? What did you talk about? What did you feel? think?

If I was sitting near you and your mentor/protege, what kinds of things would I hear you and your mentor/protege talking about?

In what ways was it important?

Why was it important?

What made it important?

How did it affect your relationship as a whole? - positive or negative

Could you describe the mentoring interaction which you mentioned as _____?

Could you describe what went on during _____?

event

Could you give me an example of _____?

4. Do you have any thoughts about the future of your mentoring relationship?

5. Do you have any thoughts about your involvement in the mentoring program next year or in the future?

6. Would you recommend the program to other students/staff? Why?

7. Do you have any additional comments?

Closure:

Thank you very much for being interviewed about the mentoring program. As I mentioned previously, when I have analyzed all of the data from the interviews, I would like to meet with all of the mentors/all of the partners to discuss what I have found. At that time I will want you give me any feedback you may have on my findings. Hopefully, I will meet with your group in September. If you have any questions between now and our next meeting, please don't hesitate to ask. Thank you again.