The Impact of Dual Roles in Mentoring Relationships: A Mixed Research Study

Jennifer Boswell
University of Houston Victoria, boswellj@uhv.edu

Marcella D. Stark
Texas Christian University, m.stark@tcu.edu

Angie D. Wilson
University of North Texas, angie.wilson@unt.edu

Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie
Sam Houston State University, tonyonwuegbuzie@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps

Part of the Counselor Education Commons

The Impact of Dual Roles in Mentoring Relationships: A Mixed Research Study

Abstract

In the field of counselor education, mentors often are involved in varying roles with mentees, such as being mentor, dissertation chair, and or chair to the mentee. Due to the various roles, both the mentor and mentee need to recognize how each of these roles impacts the development of the mentee and the overall mentoring relationship. The purpose of our study was to examine the relationship between perceived dual roles of the mentor and the impact on the mentoring relationship. We found that counseling students and faculty who had experienced dual roles in their mentoring relationships had high career-related functions than did their counterparts who had not experienced dual mentoring relationships.

The Impact of Dual Roles in Mentoring Relationships: A Mixed Research Study

According to Hodges (2009), "a mentor assists someone through a transition phase in the learning experience, providing advice and support as well as sharing their values and professionalism (p. 32)." Specifically, related to the counseling field, a mentor is defined as "someone with experience and expertise in the counseling field who is willing to share knowledge and offer advice to foster professional development" (American Counseling Association, 2012, p. 68). Mentoring relationships between students and faculty, at the graduate level, can lead to numerous benefits, both professionally and personally, and is a mutually beneficial relationship for both the mentee and mentor. Professionally, mentorship can assist with increasing employment opportunities, the development of professional skills, and overall professional development (Bova, 2000; Lechuga, 2011). Personally, mentorship has been associated with improved motivation, confidence, and self-esteem (Neary, 2000). In conjunction with the benefits previously mentioned for mentees, mentors often feel a sense of fulfillment that comes from sharing their experiences with others (Black & Zullo, 2008).

Counselor Education Literature

Current Trends in Mentoring

In the past 5 to 10 years, researchers have begun to delve into the mentoring needs of specific populations within counselor education because there has been more of a focus on diversity, social justice, and multiculturalism both within the profession and society as a whole. A common undercurrent relates to the lack of connection among students and faculty, universities, and the larger counseling profession (Haizlip, 2012; Haskins et al., 2013). Roach and Young (2007) recognized that many counselor education programs focus on the maturation of students through counselor education programs but pay little attention to the well-being—

personally and professionally—of students as they develop into counseling professionals. This lack of attention can lead to early burnout and impairment of these young professionals. One way to create an atmosphere of wellness and self-care in students is to foster healthy mentoring relationships student-to-student and student-to-faculty. To this end, Boswell, Wilson, Stark, and Onwuegbuzie (2015) encouraged counselor education program faculty to create a mentor-friendly environment by encouraging faculty mentorship of students through formal or informal mentoring programs and supporting faculty mentorship of students through mentoring training.

Mentoring Needs of Students and Faculty

Student and faculty interaction is vital for matriculation through higher education programs. Faculty help develop critical thinking and scholarly work through mentorship of graduate students and pretenured faculty. During the past 20 years, there has been an increase in the number of researchers focusing on addressing strategies and information related to successful mentoring relationships between graduate students and their respective mentors. Some universities have begun instituting structured mentoring programs for both faculty and students (Beltman & Schaeben, 2012; Borders et al., 2011), with others using a variety of methods used within higher education to foster mentoring relationships between students and faculty. In counselor education, where dangers of counselor impairment necessitate the promotion and monitoring of wellness in counseling students (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 1995), the mentoring relationship also may be used to model self-care (Johnson, 2002).

Needs of Pretenured Faculty

Newly appointed assistant professors in counselor education experience significant stress and worry about their new roles and responsibilities (Borders et al., 2011; Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008; Eberman & Kahanov, 2011; Rayle, Bordes, Zapata, Arredondo, Rutter, & Howard, 2006).

Magnuson, Norem, and Lonneman-Doroff (2009) completed a 6-year longitudinal study examining the needs and experiences of new tenure-track faculty members in counselor education. Four themes emerged from their research: (a) the positive and negative aspects of their work environment, (b) the assistant professor's sources of satisfaction and pleasure in their work, (c) the integration of both professional and personal development, and (d) the individual journey of each participant as they moved toward tenure and promotion. Magnuson et al. recommended both current and new counselor education faculty members consider the opportunity, or lack thereof, to develop mentoring relationships. Magnuson and her colleagues noted that when the participants experienced dissatisfaction with their position or university, it was usually linked to a lack of support by their colleagues. Hill (2004) suggested that this lack of collegial support leads to occupational stress, lower productivity, and decreased involvement with students and the program/department. At the departmental or program level, Hill suggested that counselor education programs help to increase the overall satisfaction, productivity level, and wellness of new faculty through the creation of formal or informal mentoring programs, or assist in developing a university-wide peer mentoring program for all junior faculty.

Boswell et al. (2015) discovered several commonalities related to mentoring needs within each of three developmental levels (master, doctoral, and pretenured faculty). The master's level participants mentioned specific mentoring qualities such as the mentor being approachable, approaches to mentorship, and mentoring strategies such as providing specific feedback, as representing their most important mentoring needs. The doctoral participants noted the gender of the mentor as being important to the mentoring relationship. Also, two other needs were made apparent: (a) having multiple mentors and (c) having the mentor provide specific answers and advice to the mentees' questions and concerns. The pretenured counselor education faculty's

needs included having a mentor who served dual roles for the mentee and who exhibited certain characteristics such as being approachable, having a personal connection with the mentee, and providing direct and honest feedback.

Mentor Functions

Tepper, Shaffer, and Tepper (1996) created the Mentor Function Scale in order to measure psychosocial and career-related mentorship functions. Assessment of the overall functions of mentoring might assist with the comprehensive needs of mentees being met. The Mentor Function Scale (Tepper et al., 1996) has been used in adapted forms in the field of counselor education by various researchers (e.g., Black, 1998; Farrell, 2007).

A major focus of mentoring is centered on psychosocial and career development (Farrell, 2007; Johnson, 2007; Kram, 1983). Mentoring relationships evolve over time; therefore, the psychosocial aspect of the mentoring relationship develops after trust has been established. Faculty mentors address the psychosocial aspect of mentorship by providing feedback and support about work-life balance; and understanding and navigating one's role as a student, clinician, or faculty member. Furthermore, mentee and mentorship teams that occur organically versus those teams that are assigned often have more increased psychosocial development (Boswell et al., 2015; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997; Tenebaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001). Mentees who have formed a personal connection with their mentors are more likely to discuss non-career-related aspects of their lives and thoughts regarding self-doubt and competence, which leads to a greater focus on the psychosocial development of the mentee (Farrell, 2007). Although psychosocial advancement is an integral aspect of the mentee's experience, the career or professional development element remains the springboard for the existence of the relationship. The career-related functions of faculty mentorship, especially when

working with doctoral-level mentees, center on time management, teaching and research

obligations, and identifying significant goals that the mentee wants to achieve in his or her

professional career. Faculty and students in counselor education programs receive career-related

mentorship for clinical issues, teaching, service, research, and networking (Boswell et al., 2015).

However, the emphasis on the psychosocial factors of mentorship for counselor education

students and faculty makes sense given that the relationship is the foundation of the counseling

profession (Farrell, 2007).

Multiple Roles

Mentors often do more than facilitate learning and growth in their mentees. Mentors may

serve additional roles of academic advisor, class instructor, clinical supervisor, administrative

supervisor (in the case of teaching and research assistants), dissertation committee chair, co-

author, and/or conference co-presenter. Ethical guidelines (see American Counseling Association

[ACA], 2014, F.3.A; Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [ACES], 2003,

section 2.09) discourage clinical supervisors to serve in more than one role. Indeed, there is the

danger that the mentor may become more friend than mentor (Warren, 2005) and lose his or her

ability to provide unbiased evaluation (Johnson, 2007; Welfel, 2002) and serve as a gatekeeper

for the profession (Welfel, 2002). Nevertheless, avoiding dual roles is not practical in academe

(Borders & Brown, 2005; Warren, 2005; Welfel, 2002). In many cases, a mentoring role will

evolve from one of these other roles as the relationship begins to take on career and psychosocial

functions (Johnson, 2007). Bowman, Hatley, and Bowman (1995) provided the compromise that

mentors should thoughtfully consider the ethics within each role rather than attempt to avoid dual

roles all together.

Researchers exploring both supervision and mentoring have revealed that dual roles can be beneficial. In their study of the dual role of clinical supervisor and administrative supervisor, Tromski-Klingshirn and Davis (2007) discovered that 83% of supervisees did not view the dual role as a problem and 72.5% reported specific benefits, such as more time with the supervisor and greater efficiency. Pan, Sun, and Chow (2011) found that supervisor mentors have more knowledge of their mentee's needs and are better able to provide challenging project assignments and access to social networks. Building upon Wilde and Schau's (1991) earlier musing that "broadness may be an integral part of mentoring" (p. 177), Johnson (2007) posited that the overlap of roles yields better outcomes for trainees.

Purpose and Rationale of the Study

In counselor education, mentors often engage in multiple roles with mentees (e.g., mentor, dissertation chair, clinical supervisor, professor) and, therefore, both the mentor and mentee need to recognize how each of these roles impacts the development of the mentee and the overall mentoring relationship. Although a number of researchers have examined the usefulness and benefits of mentoring in higher education and, specifically, in counselor education (Arthur, & Russell-Mayhew, 2010; Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008; Buyukgoze-Kavas, Taylor, Neimeyer, & Guneri, 2010; Casto, Caldwell, & Salazar, 2005; Farrell, 2007; Taylor & Neimeyer, 2009; Walker, 2006), few researchers have studied the mentoring relationship and the impact of the mentor's engagement in dual, or multiple roles, through the use of the Mentoring Functions Scale. Thus, the purpose of our study was to examine the relationship between perceived dual roles of the mentor and the impact on the mentoring relationship. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the relationship between perceptions of whether they experienced a dual

   relationship with a mentor and scores on an adapted version of the Mentoring

   Functions Scale among individuals in counselor education programs?

2. What is the relationship between developmental status (i.e., master's-level student,

   doctoral student, or pre-tenured faculty) and perceptions of whether they experienced

   a dual relationship with a mentor?

We hoped that findings from this study would inform mentoring practices in counselor education

programs. Previous researchers did not examine the impact of mentor dual roles on the

mentoring relationship. The need exists to understand the outcomes of dual roles on the

relationship and the mentee's perceptions of these roles on his/her development.

Method

Participants

Participants, who were part of a larger study examining mentoring relationships in

counseling programs, were selected via the following sources: (a) members of various counselor

education listservs and (b) counseling students and alumni from the universities of each

researcher. To be selected for the study, the participant had to be either a graduate (i.e., masters-

or doctoral-level) student in a counseling or counselor education program or a pre-tenured

faculty member in a counselor education program. Further, the participant had to report being in

a mentoring relationship wherein he/she was the mentee. Some participants reported having an

assigned mentor, whereas other mentoring relationships were initiated by the mentee.

The sample consisted of 30 participants, of which 26 were female. The academic levels

of these participants were masters ($n = 11$), doctoral ($n = 10$), or pretenured faculty ($n = 9$).

Further, their mean age was 35.07, with the distribution as follows: 6.7% were 18-24 years old,

36.7% were 25-31 years old, 33.3% were 32-38 years old, 10% were 39-45 years old, 3.3% were

46-52 years old, and 10% were 53+ years old. With respect to ethnicity, 83% of the participants

were White and 17% were African American. The majority of participants reported that they

attended or worked at a CACREP-accredited counseling program ($n = 23$), with the remaining

participants ($n = 7$) representing a non-CACREP accredited program.

Instruments and Procedure

      Qualitative research phase. For the qualitative research phase, each participant

underwent a semi-structured interview in order to determine (a) what differences exist in the

mentoring needs perceived by the three sets of participants (i.e., participants who were enrolled

in a master's program in counseling, participants who were enrolled in a doctoral program in

counseling, and participants who identify themselves as junior faculty) and (b) how these

participants experience their mentoring relationships. Each semi-structured interview involved

the interviewer asking eight overarching questions and follow-up questions pertaining to the

participant's mentoring needs and experiences. Each interview was audio recorded and then

transcribed. Member checking of each interview was conducted to enhance accuracy (i.e.,

internal credibility) and adequacy (i.e., external credibility).

      Each transcript first was coded by the two researchers who had not interviewed the

participant. The original researcher who completed the interview then coded the transcription

independently, noting points of agreement and disagreement with other researchers. The coding

agreement among the researchers ranged from 76% to 100%, with 93.7% being the overall

average percentage of agreement between the researchers. The researchers discussed their

respective rationales for each of the codes until consensus had been reached.

Quantitative research phase. For the quantitative research phase, the participants (*n* = 30) completed an adapted version of the Mentoring Functions Scale (Noe, 1988) which comprised 16 items. The original Mentoring Functions Scale was a 21-item Likert-format instrument that helped researchers to assess the degree to which the mentor was providing vocational and psychosocial functions (Noe, 1998). However, Tepper, Shafer, and Tepper (1996) adapted Noe's (1988) original Mentor Functions Scale by selecting 16 of the original 21 items. The 16 items selected by Tepper et al. (1996) were the same 16 items utilized in the current study. Those 16 items included eight items to measure psychosocial mentoring functions and eight items to measure career-related mentoring functions. Participants in this study were asked to select the most appropriate response regarding their mentorship experiences using a 5-point rating scale; 5 represented *to a very large extent*, 4 represented *to a large extent*, 3 represented *to some extent*, 2 represented *to a slight extent*, and 1 represented *not at all*. Reliability and validity of the 16 items from the Mentoring Functions Scale reported a Cronbach's alpha of .88 for the psychosocial scale scores and .90 for the career-related scale scores of the Mentoring Functions Scale (Tepper et al., 1996). Other researchers have found internal consistency to be between .84 and .91 for the psychosocial scale and between .79 and .86 for the career-related scale (Chao, 1997; Green & Bauer, 1995). Allen (1999) also found coefficient alphas between .94 and .93 for these two scales.

Research Design

Because our study involved the use of qualitative and quantitative research approaches, it represented what is termed a *mixed methods research study* or *mixed research study* (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Specifically, our mixed methods study involved combining phenomenology (i.e., qualitative phase) and postpositivism (i.e., quantitative phase). This

combination yielded what Mayoh and Onwuegbuzie (2014, 2015) referred to as *mixed methods phenomenological research* (MMPR)—specifically, a *concurrent MMPR*, which consisted of a dominant descriptive phenomenological phase and a less-dominant postpositivist phase (i.e., PHEN+quan). In descriptive phenomenology—as was the case in the current study—researchers focus on describing each participant's lived experiences (Todres & Holloway, 2004). In the present investigation, phenomenological reduction (Giorgi, 2009) was enhanced by including three researchers in the study who had undergone transitions themselves from master's program to doctoral program to serving as a junior faculty member. Each of these researchers, in turn, was able to play devil's advocate whenever needed and were able to keep the other researchers on the team *honest* by posing difficult questions about various elements of the mixed methods research process (e.g., procedures, interpretations) and by promoting synergy. In contrast, a postpositivist stance was adopted, for example, to assess the degree to which the mentor of each participant was providing vocational and psychosocial functions, as well as to quantitize (i.e., convert qualitative data into numerical codes that can be analyzed quantitatively or statistically; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003; Sandelowski, Voils, & Knafl, 2009; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

Analysis

In order to create a textural-structural explanation of the participants' lived experiences (Polkinghorne, 1989), a *sequential mixed analysis* (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003) was employed, which involved analyzing the data in a series of stages. First, utilizing constant comparison analysis (Glaser, 1965) and classical content analysis (Berelson, 1952), via the use of the software program, QDA Miner 4.0 (Provalis Research, 2011), the researchers coded chunks of words into meaningful units that described the contents of the segmented data, and they

identified underlying themes *a posteriori* (Constas, 1992), which represented the participants'

perceptions. Also, the researchers conducted debriefing interviews (Onwuegbuzie, Leech, &

Collins, 2008) for verification of the analysis.

After the coding process, the researchers employed data transformation in which the

qualitative data (i.e., emergent codes) were quantitized (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Onwuegbuzie

& Teddlie, 2003; Sandelowski et al., 2009; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Specifically, each

code was quantitized such that if a participant made a statement during her/his interview that was

eventually unitized under one of the emergent codes, then a score of "1" was given to the theme

for this response; a score of "0" was given otherwise. This dichotomization yielded what

Onwuegbuzie (2003, p. 396) referred to as an *inter-respondent matrix* of themes (i.e., *participant

x theme matrix*), which consisted only of 0s and 1s.

The next stage of the sequential mixed analysis (i.e., confirmatory analyses) involved

using the inter-respondent matrix to assess the relationship between any quantitized codes

(relating to a dual relationship with a mentor) and (a) their levels of mentee-mentor psychosocial

function via an independent samples *t* test; and (b) developmental status (i.e., master's-level

student, doctoral student, or pre-tenured faculty) via an analysis of variance (ANOVA). This

quantitzing of codes, followed by a correlating of the quantitized codes with quantitative data,

represented what Onwuegbuzie and Combs (2010) referred to as a *crossover mixed analysis*,

whereby the analysis types associated with one tradition (i.e., quantitative analysis: independent

samples *t* test, ANOVA) were used to analyze data associated with a different tradition (i.e.,

qualitative data: emergent codes).

Results

The constant comparison analysis led to the identification of 28 codes, which then were organized into seven themes. The seven themes were: (a) *Relationship between mentor and mentee* (7 codes), (b) *Communication style or patterns* (2 codes), (c) *Preferred gender of mentor* (2 codes), (d) *Introduction of relationship* (3 codes), (e) *Mentee needs* (6 codes), (f) *Mentee Benefits* (3 codes), and (g) *Experiences as a mentee* (5 codes). Table 1 shows each of the codes and themes.

Table 1

Constant Comparison Themes and Codes

Theme	Code
Relationship between mentor and mentee	
	Dual roles
	Approachable
	Individual approach to mentorship
	Encouragement
	Desire to be approached by mentor/not have to ask
	Characteristic of mentor
	Personal connection/relationship
Communication style or pattern	
	Provide information (unsolicited)
	Feedback
Gender	
	Gender/Gender of mentor
	No specific needs by gender
Introduction of relationship	
	Mentor relationship initiated by mentee
	Relationship initiated by mentor
	Assignment of mentor not as beneficial
Mentee needs	
	Multiple mentors
	Mentee seeking specific answer/advice
	Unmet expectations/needs
	Understanding politics
	Future/becoming need
	Peer mentoring
Mentee benefits	
	Preparation for what to expect/real world application
	Current trends in the field

Provides opportunities/resources

Experience as a mentee

Modeling
Experience as a mentor
Life balance-positive and negative examples
Negative experience
Desire/positive view of being challenged

These codes and themes then were subjected to a classical content analysis to determine their frequencies. These emergent themes emerged across all three sample groups (i.e., master's students, doctoral students, and junior faculty). Also, with the exception of three code combinations out of the 84 combinations (i.e., 28 codes x 3 sample groups), the emergent codes emerged across all three sample groups. The classical content analysis revealed that by far the most dominant theme was *Relationship between mentor and mentee*. Interestingly, this theme contained the code of interest for the present investigation, namely, *Dual roles*. Indeed, this code was the second most prevalent code within this theme, after the code *Characteristic of mentor*.

Quantitizing of the emergent codes revealed that 46.7% of the sample members contributed to the *Dual roles* code, in contrast to 53.3% of participants who did not contribute to this code. That is, there was a fairly even distribution between participants who had experienced a dual relationship with a mentor—such as the mentor also being the instructor of one or more classes taken by the mentee or the mentee's clinical supervisor, and those who had not experienced a dual relationship. These two groups were compared with respect to mentoring functions scale total scores, psychosocial scale scores, and career-related scale scores.

Using Onwuegbuzie and Daniel's (2002) criteria for a standardized skewness coefficient and a standardized kurtosis coefficient, the mentoring functions scale total scores (standardized skewness coefficient = -1.13; standardized kurtosis coefficient = 0.62), psychosocial scale scores (standardized skewness coefficient = -1.25; standardized kurtosis coefficient = -0.88), and

career-related scale scores (standardized skewness coefficient = -0.03; standardized kurtosis

coefficient = -1.04), all suggested normality. Thus, a parametric analysis—specifically, a series

of independent samples *t* tests—was used to assess overall mentoring functions, psychosocial

functions, and career-related functions with respect to whether or not the participant had

experienced a dual relationship with a mentor.

After applying the Bonferroni adjustment (cf. Chandler, 1995; Ho, 2006; Manly, 2004;

Vogt, 2005) to control for the inflation of Type I error resulting from the conduct of three

independent samples *t* tests (i.e., adjusted α = .05/3 = .0167), the first independent samples *t* test

revealed that participants who had experienced a dual relationship with a mentor (*M* = 63.92, *SD*

= 6.78) had statistically significantly (*t* [21.06] = 3.64, *p* = .002) higher mentoring functions total

scores than did participants who had not experienced a dual relationship with a mentor (*M* =

51.69, *SD* = 10.04). The effect size associated with this difference, as measured by Cohen's

(1988) *d*, was extremely large at 1.43. Additionally, although there was no statistically

significant difference (*t* [24.52] = 0.77, *p* = .45) in psychosocial scores between participants who

had experienced a dual relationship with a mentor (*M* = 31.79, *SD* = 4.56) and participants who

had not experienced a dual relationship with a mentor (*M* = 30.38, *SD* = 4.86), participants who

had experienced dual relationships (*M* = 31.46, *SD* = 6.63) had statistically significantly (*t*

[23.91] = 4.02, *p* = .001) higher career-related scores than did their counterparts (*M* = 21.31, *SD*

= 6.24). The effect size as associated with this difference was extremely large (*d* = 1.58). Thus, it

was the career-related functions component of mentoring functions that discriminated

participants who had experienced a dual relationship with their mentors from their counterparts.

In order to address the second research question, a 2 (i.e., dual relationship experience vs.

non-dual relationship experience) x 3 (i.e., master's-level student vs. doctoral student vs. pre-

tenured faculty) chi-square analysis was conducted. This analysis revealed a statistically

significant relationship, $X^2(2) = 7.13$, $p = .028$. Specifically, only 18.2% of master's students

who had experienced a dual relationship with a mentor, compared with 50.0% of doctoral

students and 77.8% of pretenured faculty members. In other words, the experience of dual

relationships increased as the sample members advanced in their career development. The effect

size associated with this difference, as measured by Cramer's V, was 0.49. Using Cohen's (1988)

criteria, this result suggested a large effect size.

Discussion

In this study, the researchers examined the role between the developmental roles of

students and faculty in counselor education (master's, doctoral, and junior faculty) and their

respective scores on the Adapted Mentoring Functions Scale and, more specifically, the

relationship between dual roles in mentoring and scores on the Adapted Mentoring Functions

Scale among individuals in counselor education programs. In a previous study, Boswell et al.

(2015) found specific needs related to the developmental level of a mentee as they matriculated

through a counselor education program. Of specific note in that study, the authors found that a

mentor who had several roles in the mentee's professional career impacted the mentee the most

at the doctoral level.

In the current study, researchers found that counseling students and faculty who had

experienced dual relationships had high career-related functions than did their counterparts who

had not experienced dual mentoring relationships. As such, the findings are consistent with past

mentoring researchers who have noted that the mentoring relationship was key to a mentee's

growth and professional fulfillment and satisfaction (Allen & Eby, 2004; Barker, 2006; Haggard

& Turban, 2012; Strayhorn & Saddler, 2009). Often times, counselor education mentors move

between various roles when working with students and other faculty mentees. Faculty mentors

can play a variety of additional professional roles with mentees that are beneficial to the

mentee's growth and professional development (Gottlieb, Robinson, & Younggren, 2007). These

might include serving on the mentee's dissertation committee, hiring the mentee as a graduate or

research assistant, or encouraging the mentee to teach or to co-teach an academic course within

the counseling program. Mentors who engage in dual, or multiple, roles for a mentee also aid in

the academic success, matriculation, and professional growth of women and minority students

(Davis, 2010).

<p align="center">**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**</p>

The focus of our study was on the perceived impact of the dual, or multiple, roles of

mentors on the mentoring relationship. Several limitations of our findings surfaced. These

limitations affect the generalizability of our findings. First, the participants in our study were

selected from a previous mentoring study. By using this selection process, our participants were

not selected from a random sample. Future researchers may want to use a randomized sampling

procedure. Second, the researchers in this study used the Mentoring Functions Scale to determine

the degree to which the mentor was providing support and growth surrounding career and

psychosocial functions of the mentee. The original Mentoring Functions Scale developed by Noe

(1988) was for use with educational leadership student mentees. The Mentoring Functions Scale

has been adapted for use with counselor education students (Farrell, 2007) but little has been

done to validate the adapted questions. Future researchers may consider evaluating the revised

Mentoring Functions Scale to ensure that it maintains the consistency and score-validity of the

scale for use with different mentee populations. In addition, researchers may explore the

development of a counselor education-specific mentoring scale in order to address the mentoring needs of students in this profession.

The variable of dual relationship with a mentor is a quantitized code, which resulted from transforming qualitative data from a previous study (see Boswell et al., 2015). This sample of 30 participants is low for extensive statistical analysis. However, qualitative research is designed to explore the unique experiences of participants rather than to produce generalizable results. Additionally, the majority of participants were White (83%) and from the Southern region of the United States (50%). Future research should be conducted with a larger and more diverse sample. Finally, a sampling bias exists because participants in the initial study might have different perceptions than those counseling students and faculty who elected not to participate or who were not members of the listservs or institutions where solicitation took place. As such, caution should be used when making inferences about results.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Practice

In sum, related to Research Question 1, researchers found that a mentors who served multiple professional roles impacted doctoral student mentees more than they impacted masters student and pretenured faculty mentees. Additionally, related to Research Question 2, participants in all three groups (masters, doctoral and pretenured faculty) who received mentorship from a mentor serving in dual roles reported high career-related functions than did their peers who had not received mentorship from someone acting in dual roles. Overall, our research supports previous literature suggesting that multiple roles in mentoring relationships are beneficial (Boswell et al., 2015; Bowman et al., 1995; Johnson, 2007; Pan et al., 2011). Taking into consideration the benefits of organically created mentoring relationships (Boswell et al., 2015; Cox, 2005; Fagenson-Eland et al., 1997; Tenebaum et al., 2001), counselor education

programs might facilitate such relationships by strategically assigning advisees, teaching

assistants, and research assistants. Use of formal mentoring needs instruments (see Boswell et

al., 2015) and/or informal surveys of students' career and research interests could inform

assignments most likely to develop into advantageous mentoring dyads.

Although ethics remain an issue whenever there exists a power differential in

relationships—whether supervisory or mentoring—we agree with Bowman et al.'s (1995)

assertion that multiple relationships should not be avoided altogether. Rather, mentors should

contemplate each role, its benefits and conflicts, the authority that they hold, and potential for

misapplication or exploitation. Consultation with other faculty might assist in thinking through

these issues. Mentors who serve dual roles should confer with colleagues in accordance with

ethical codes (see ACA, 2014, C.3.e).

References

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2004). Factors related to mentor reports of mentoring functions
provided: Gender and relational characteristics. *Sex Roles, 50*, 129-139.
doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000011078.48570.25

American Counseling Association. (2012, March), "ACA graduate student committee launches
mentorship initiative", *Counseling Today,* 54, 68-69.

American Counseling Association [ACA]. (2014). ACA code of ethics. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Arthur, N., & Russell-Mayhew, S. (2010). Preparing counsellors for interprofessional
collaboration through supervision and lateral mentoring. *Canadian Journal of
Counselling and Psychotherapy, 44*(3), 258–271

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (2011). *Best practices in clinical
supervision: ACES task force report*. Retrieved from
http://www.acesonline.net/resources/aces-best-practices-supervision

Boswell, J. N., Wilson, A. D., Stark, M. D., & Onwuegbuzie A. J. (2015). The role of mentoring
relationships in counseling programs. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching
in Education, 4*, 168-183. doi:10.1108/IJMCE-03-2015-0007

Barker, E. R. (2006). Mentoring – A complex relationship. *Journal of the American Academy of
Nurse Practitioners, 18*, 56-61. doi:10.1111/j.1745-7599.2006.00102.x

Beltman, S., & Schaeben, M. (2012). Institution-wide peer mentoring: Benefits for mentors. *The
International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education, 3*(2), 33-44.
doi:10.5204/intjfyhe.v3i2.124

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communicative research.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Black, L. L. (1998). *The development and validation of the mentor functions scale for counselor education*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts International, 59-08, 2864.

Black, L. L., & Zullo, E. (2008). Mentoring. In F. T. L. Leong, E. M. Altmaier, & B. D. Johnson (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of counseling: Changes and challenges for counseling in the 21st century* (Vol. 1; pp. 296- 299). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision.* New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Borders, L. D., Young, J. S., Wester, K. L., Murray, C. E., Villalba, J. A., Lewis, T. F., & Mobley, A. K. (2011). Mentoring promotion/tenure-seeking faculty: Principles of good practice within a counselor education program. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 50*, 171-188. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb00118.x

Bowman, V. E., Hatley, L. D., & Bowman, R. L. (1995). Faculty-student relationships: The dual role controversy. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 232-242. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1995.tb00245.x

Bova, B. (2000). Mentoring revisited: The Black woman's experience. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 8*(1), 5–16. doi:10.1080/713685511

Briggs, C. A., & Pehrsson, D. E. (2008). Research mentorship in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 48*, 101-113. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2008.tb00066.x

Buyukgoze-Kavas, A., Taylor, J. M., Neimeyer, G. & Yerin, G. (2010). The mentoring relationship: a comparison of counseling students in the United States of America and Turkey. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 4*, p. 387-398.

Casto, C., Caldwell, C., & Salazar, C.F. (2005). Creating mentoring relationships between

      female faculty and students in counselor education: guidelines for potential mentees and

      mentors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 3*, p. 331-336.

Chandler, C. R. (1995). Practical considerations in the use of simultaneous inference for multiple

      tests. *Animal Behaviour, 49*, 524-527. doi:10.1006/anbe.1995.0069

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

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.)*.* Hillsdale, NJ:

      Lawrence Erlbaum.

Constas, M. A. (1992). Qualitative data analysis as a public event: The documentation of

      category development procedures. *American Educational Research Journal, 29,* 253-266.

      doi:10.3102/00028312029002253

Cox, E. (2005). For better, for worse: The matching process in formal mentoring schemes.

      Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 13, 403-414.

      doi:10.1080/13611260500177484

Davis, D. J. (2010). The academic influence of mentoring upon African American undergraduate

      aspirants to the professoriate. *The Urban Review*, *42*, 143-158. doi:10.1007/s11256-009-

      0122-5

Eberman, L. E., & Kahanov, L. (2011). Mentorship of new faculty members. *International

      Journal of Athletic Therapy & Training, 16*(6), 34-37. doi:10.1123/ijatt.16.6.34

Fagenson-Eland, E. A., Marks, M. A., & Amendola, K. L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring

      relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *51*(1), 29-42. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1997.1592

Farrell, R. (2007). *Personal experiences of mentoring among doctoral students in counselor education*. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2007).

Frame, M. W., & Stevens-Smith, P. (1995). Out of harm's way: Enhancing monitoring and dismissal processes in counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 35*, 118-129. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1995.tb00216.x

Giorgi A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems, 12*, 436-445. doi:10.1525/sp.1965.12.4.03a00070

Gottlieb, M. C., Robinson, K., & Younggren, J. N. (2007). Multiple relations in supervision: Guidance for administrators, supervisors, and students. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 38*, 241-247. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.38.3.241

Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisers: Relationships with doctoral students potential, productivity and commitment. *Personnel Psychology, 48*. 537-561.

Haggard, D. L., & Turban, D. B. (2012). The mentoring relationship as a context for psychological contract development. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*, 1904-1931. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00924.x

Haizlip, B. N. (2012). Addressing the underrepresentation of African-Americans in counseling and psychology programs. *College Student Journal, 46*, 214–222.

Haskins, N., Whitfield-Williams, M., Shillingford, M. A., Singh, A., Moxley, R., & Ofauni, C. (2013). The experiences of black master's counseling students: A phenomenological

inquiry. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 52*, 162-178). doi: 0.1002/j.1556-

6978.2013.00035.x

Hill, N. R. (2004). The challenges experienced by pretenured faculty members in counselor

education: A wellness perspective. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 135-146.

doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01866.x

Ho, R. (2006). *Handbook of univariate and multivariate data analysis and interpretation with

SPSS*. London, England: Chapman & Hall.

Hodges, B. (2009). Factors that can influence mentorship relationships. *Pediatric Nursing, 21*(6),

32-35. doi:10.7748/paed.21.6.32.s24

Johnson, W. B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of

mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 88-96.

doi:10.1037//0735-7028.33.1.88

Johnson, W. B. (2007). Transformational supervision: When supervisors mentor. *Professional

Psychology: Research and Practice, 38*, 259-267. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.38.3.259

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm

whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

doi:10.3102/0013189X033007014

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentorship relationship. *Academy of Management Journal,

26*, 608-625. doi:10.2307/255910

Lechuga, V. M. (2011). Faculty-graduate student mentoring relationships: Mentors' perceived

roles and responsibilities. *Higher Education, 62*, 757-771. doi:10.1007/s10734-011-9416-

0

Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Lonneman-Doroff, T. (2009). The 2000 cohort of new assistant

professors of counselor education: Reflecting at the culmination of six years. *Counselor*

Education and Supervision, 49, 54-71. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00086.x

Manly, B. F. J. (2004). *Multivariate statistical methods: A primer* (3rd ed.). London, England:

Chapman & Hall.

Mayoh, J., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2014). Surveying the landscape of mixed methods

phenomenological research. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, *8*,

2-14. doi:10.5172/mra.2014.8.1.2

Mayoh, J., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2015). Towards a conceptualization of mixed methods

phenomenological research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *9*, 91-107.

doi:10.1177/1558689813505358

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd

ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Neary, M. (2000). *Teaching, Assessing and evaluation for clinical competence: A practical guide*

for practitioners and teachers. Cheltenham, England: Nelson Thornes.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring

relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 457-479. doi:10.1111/j.1744-

6570.1988.tb00638.x

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2003). Effect sizes in qualitative research: A prolegomenon. *Quality &*

Quantity: International Journal of Methodology, 37, 393-409.

doi:10.1023/A:1027379223537

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Combs, J. P. (2010). Emergent data analysis techniques in mixed

methods research: A synthesis. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Sage Handbook of*

mixed methods in social and behavioral research (2nd ed., pp. 397-430). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daniel, L. G. (2002). Uses and misuses of the correlation coefficient. *Research in the Schools, 9*(1)*,* 73-90.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L., & Collins, K. M. T. (2008). Interviewing the interpretive researcher: A method for addressing the crises of representation, legitimation, and praxis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *7*(4), 1-17.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A framework for analyzing data in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 351-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pan, W., Sun, L., & Chow, I. H.S. (2011). The impact of supervisory mentoring on personal learning and career outcomes: The dual moderating effect of self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 78*, 264-273. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.001

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspective in psychology: Exploring the breadth of human experience* (pp. 41-62). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Provalis Research. (2011). *QDA Miner 4.0.* User's guide. Montreal, QC, Canada: Author.

Rayle, A. D., Bordes, V., Zapata, A., Arredondo, P., Rutter, M. C., & Howard, C. (2006). Mentoring experiences of women in graduate education: Factors that matter. *Current Issues in Education, 9*(6), 1-15.

Roach, L. F., & Young, M. E. (2007). Do counselor education programs promote wellness in their students? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 47*, 29-45. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2007.tb00036.x

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C. I., & Knafl, G. (2009). On quantitizing. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 3*, 208-222. doi:10.1177/1558689809334210

Strayhorn, T. L., & Saddler, T. N. (2009). Gender differences in the influence of faculty-student mentoring relationships on satisfaction with college among African Americans. *Journal of African American Studies, 13*, 476-493. doi: 10.1007/s12111-008-9082-1

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Applied Social Research Methods Series (Vol. 46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, J. M. & Neimeyer, G. J. (2009). Graduate school mentoring in clinical, counseling, and experimental academic training programs: an exploratory study. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 2*, p. 257-266.

Tenebaum, H. R., Crosby, F. J., & Gliner, M. D. (2001). Mentoring relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 326-341. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1804

Tepper, K., Shaffer, B. C., & Tepper, B. J. (1996). Latent structure of mentoring function scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56*, 848-857. doi:10.1177/0013164496056005013

Todres, L., & Holloway, I. (2004). Descriptive phenomenology: Life-world as evidence. In F. Rapport (Ed.) *New qualitative methodologies in health and social care research* (pp. 79-98)*. London, England: Routledge.

Tromski-Klingshirn, D. M., & Davis, T. E. (2007). Supervisees perceptions of their clinical supervision: A study of the dual role of clinical and administrative supervisor. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 46,* 294-304. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2007.tb00033.x

Vogt, W. P. (2005). *Dictionary of statistics and methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Warren, E. S. (2005). Future colleague or convenient friend: The ethics of mentorship. *Counseling and Values, 49,* 141-146. doi:10.1002/j.2161-007X.2005.tb00260.x

Welfel, E.R. (2002). *Ethics in counseling and psychotherapy: Standards, research, and emerging issues.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Wilde, J. B., & Schau, C. G. (1991). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentees' perceptions. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 59*, 165-179. doi:10.1080/00220973.1991.10806559