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ABSTRACT

Mentoring has typically been studied in business environments, with fewer studies focusing on academic contexts and even fewer in the field of sport management. This study sought to examine the mentoring relationships among sport management doctoral dissertation advisors (mentors) and their former doctoral students (protégés). Semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with 13 participants. Participants collectively described examples of all of Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions, with counselling, coaching, and exposure and visibility among the most frequently reported. Mentors and protégés described their current relationships as positive as well as both personal and professional in nature. Participants desired a wide range of characteristics in the other member (mentor or protégé) and cited numerous personal and professional benefits, including friendship and advanced career progression, as a result of their mentoring relationships. A discussion of these findings within the context of the relevant previous academic literature and suggestions for future research are also provided.
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LIST OF OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Lineage
The family tree-like structure containing a mentor and all of his or her protégés.

Mentor
Mentors are more experienced individuals who guide, advise, support, counsel and/or provide other mentoring functions to less experienced individuals (protégés) with the intent of furthering the protégés’ career and personal development (adapted from Cronan-Hillix, Gensheimer, Cronan-Hillix, & Davidson, 1986). In this study, a mentor was operationalized as a sport management doctoral dissertation advisor.

Mentoring
“A process for the reciprocal, informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and psycho-social support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional development; mentoring entails informal communication, usually face to face and over a sustained period of time, between a person who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or experience (the mentor), to a person who is perceived to have less (the protégé)” (Bozeman & Feeney, 2008, p. 469).

Protégé
Protégés are often viewed as less experienced individuals who stand to benefit from receiving guidance, counselling, advice, and/or other support from mentors for the purpose of career and personal development. In this study, a protégé was operationalized as a former sport management doctoral student who has successfully completed his or her doctoral degree.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

The impact others have on the development of individual careers cannot be understated. When managers are asked to discuss what contributed to the successes and frustrations that have impacted their lives, influential individuals are repeatedly mentioned (Kram, 1980). Many of these prominent individuals take the form of sponsors, mentors, patrons, godfathers or close personal friends (Kram). While several of the aforementioned individuals may provide similar functions, the listing above demonstrates the wide range of terminology and often confused conceptualizations of these interpersonal relationships. Given the many different dyadic associations that exist, classification of these interactions can be difficult.

Definitional issues and subtle nuances have plagued the study of mentoring and have prevented clear demarcation of similar concepts (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007, 2008; Jacobi, 1991; Merriam, 1983). Bozeman and Feeney (2007) have suggested that the extensive depth and breadth of the topic of mentoring is to blame for the lack of unified theory development and that “mentoring research adds up to less than the sum of its parts” (p. 719). The lack of agreement, however, does not result from a lack of academic effort. Allen and Johnston (1997, as cited in Bozeman & Feeney, 2007, 2008) reported that over 500 articles were published on mentoring in education and business settings in the period between 1986 and 1996. Likewise, Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, and DuBois (2008) found 15,131 articles and reports on mentoring in the 20 years between 1985 and 2006, further demonstrating the extent to which the broad topic of mentoring has proliferated.
However, studies exploring the nature of mentoring relationships in academia are limited (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Furthermore, as explained in the ensuing Study Rationale, most of the research on academic mentoring relationships has been completed in the area of psychology. Relatively little research has been conducted on mentoring in the field of sport management, and there is an absence of research focusing on mentoring relationships between sport management doctoral dissertation advisors and their doctoral students (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

1.2 Research Questions

The overall purpose for this study was to examine mentoring relationships between sport management doctoral dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students. More specifically, the study was influenced by a number of research questions, including:

1. What mentoring functions do sport management dissertation advisors provide for their doctoral students?
2. What is the nature of the current relationship between sport management dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students?
3. What are the characteristics desired in each member (dissertation advisor and doctoral student) of the relationship?
4. What are the outcomes of mentoring relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students?

In order to effectively answer these research questions, each question was broken down into various sub-problems. The research questions, along with their related sub-
questions, are located at the end of each corresponding literature review section. Since the study was primarily inductive in nature, specific hypotheses or outcomes were not generated (Creswell, 2003).

The remainder of this chapter serves as an introduction to the study and includes the rationale for this thesis and the various contexts of mentoring. The following chapter reviews some of the extensive literature that has been written on the topic of mentoring, focusing specifically on functions and phases of mentoring, characteristics desired in mentors and protégés, and mentoring outcomes. The Methodology chapter describes items such as sample selection, data collection and analysis, and delimitations and limitations. The Results chapter summarizes the findings that emerged from the interview data while the Discussion chapter presents these findings in the context of the previous academic literature. Finally, items such as participant recruitment letters, letters of information, and interview guides for both the mentors and the protégés are included as appendices.

1.3 Study Rationale

Despite the growth of mentoring described in the opening section, scholars (e.g., Dickinson & Johnson, 2000; Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gliner, 2001) have noted that the majority of mentoring knowledge has been gained through studies completed in organizational settings. In contrast, fewer studies have explored the nature of mentoring relationships in academia (Clark et al., 2000; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Of those studies conducted in academia, most are focused on the mentoring and advisory relationships that exist between psychology doctoral students and their advisors (e.g., Clark et al.;
Dickinson & Johnson; Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Lark & Croteau, 1998; Schlosser & Gelso). Although scholars recognize the importance of mentoring in the field of sport management, the topic has not received much in the way of scholarly attention. For example, Pastore (2003) called mentoring an essential area for sport management educators, yet Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) stated that there had been “little emphasis on the mentoring process in educational institutions with particular reference to sport” (p. 25).

Over the past decade, several sport management scholars (i.e., Mahony, Mondello, Hums, & Judd, 2004, 2006; Pitts, 2001; Weese, 2002) have become concerned about the potential shortage of qualified sport management faculty members and the related preparation of sport management doctoral candidates who may fill many of these position openings. Inadequate preparation of doctoral candidates may negatively affect the growth of the field of sport management (Pitts). As expressed by Pastore (2003) and Dixon and Mott (2008a), the mentoring that occurs among doctoral candidates and their dissertation advisors is “critical to the success of new sport management faculty, as well as the continued growth of the field as a whole” (Dixon & Mott, 2008a, ¶ 1). Therefore, I attempted to narrow the aforementioned gap in the mentoring literature by examining the nature of select mentoring relationships within the sport management academy.

Additionally, many studies have looked at mentoring from a narrow perspective. Despite the fact that Kram (1980, 1983, 1988) studied both members (mentors and protégés) of the mentoring relationship in her influential works, many authors (e.g., Clark et al., 2000; Dreher & Cox, 1996; Lark & Croteau, 1998; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; Tenenbaum et al., 2001) have analyzed only one member’s
perspective in an attempt to understand the mentoring relationship (McCarron, 2006). There is also a dearth of studies examining both members’ perceptions of the mentoring relationship (McCarron). It is possible that one member’s perception of the mentoring relationship differs dramatically from the other member’s perception of that very same relationship. Consequently, I employed semi-structured interviews to examine selected mentoring relationships from both the mentors’ and the protégés’ perspectives.

1.4 Mentoring versus Advising

This study focused on select mentoring relationships between sport management doctoral dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students (who have subsequently completed their doctoral degrees and are now faculty members themselves). As some authors have pointed out, mentoring and advising may be considered two distinct concepts. Schlosser and Gelso (2001) distinguished between advisors and mentors because they felt the two terms were not synonymous and “one can be an advisor without being a mentor, and certainly one can be a mentor to someone without being that person’s advisor” (p. 158). Based on this assumption, interviewing dissertation advisors and their doctoral students in an attempt to examine aspects of mentoring in graduate school may be inappropriate.

However, other authors’ views of mentoring and advising vary. Johnson (2007b) conceptualized graduate faculty relationships with students as occurring along a continuum based on various levels of involvement, emotional connection, reciprocity of the relationship, and intentional delivery of mentoring functions. Bigelow and Johnson (2001) noted that “purely instrumental mentoring may be synonymous with advising” (p.
2). Alternatively, other researchers have suggested that advisors provide many mentoring functions. For example, Tenenbaum et al. (2001) assumed that “most graduate students think of their advisors as playing some of the roles – albeit perhaps not perfectly – that fall within the province of traditional mentoring” (p. 329). These authors consequently used a wide sample of advisor-advisee relationships to gather empirical data on mentoring relationships in graduate school. Similarly, Green and Bauer (1995) used graduate student advisees to examine the mentoring functions that were provided during supervisory relationships with their graduate advisors. These authors also established that advisors were expected to perform mentoring functions and noted that “the advisor-student relationship provides a rich opportunity to study how supervisory mentoring takes place and its consequences” (Green & Bauer, p. 539).

Given the link demonstrated above between mentoring and advising, I chose to study mentoring by examining the relationships between former sport management doctoral students and their dissertation advisors. Therefore, I assumed that these dissertation advisors provided mentoring functions for their students and that their relationships can be considered mentoring relationships. However, if this assumption proved to be false, the results would have indicated this (as the protégés may have mentioned receiving few mentoring functions and negative or neutral outcomes of the advising relationship).
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 A Brief History of Mentoring

The concept of mentoring is routinely traced to ancient Greece and more specifically, Homer’s epic poem *The Odyssey* (Roberts & Chernopiskaya, 1999). Mentor, a wise, older friend of Odysseus, was entrusted to care for Telemachus, Odysseus’ son, when Odysseus left to fight the Trojan War. During Odysseus’ absence, Telemachus received guidance and advice from Mentor as well as from the goddess Athena, who at times disguised herself both as Mentor (Koocher, 2002), and Mentes, another close friend of Odysseus’ (Homer, 8th C BC/2001). While disguised as Mentor, Athena encouraged Telemachus to stand up to the suitors who, in Odysseus’ absence, had taken over Telemachus’ home and were vying for his mother’s hand in marriage (Hamilton, 1942). Athena also empowered Telemachus to embark on a journey to discover the fate of his father (Homer). Although many of the current conceptions of mentoring relationships may not involve being entrusted with the care of another individual, numerous aspects of Homer’s ancient conception, including the transmission of guidance and advice, are certainly common to modern mentoring relationships.

Following the ancient mythical notion of mentoring, the first modern use of the term “mentor” was seen in François Fénelon’s 1699 book *Les Aventures de Telemaque* (Roberts & Chernopiskaya, 1999). More recently, research on mentoring relationships has burgeoned. Since the late 1970s, researchers have examined mentoring in a variety of settings (Allen & Eby, 2007). Some researchers began by alluding to or briefly mentioning the concept of mentoring (e.g., Collins & Scott, 1978; Kanter, 1977;
Zaleznik, 1977). Other authors (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, and Lima, 2004; Eby, Rhodes & Allen, 2007; Jacobi, 1991) have credited Levinson (1978) and Roche (1979) with the first empirical studies examining mentoring relationships. Specifically, Levinson undertook the first life cycle approach to studying adult development and found that “the mentoring relationship is one of the most complex, and developmentally important, a [person] can have in early adulthood” (p. 97). As Roche pointed out, prior to his study of top level executives, and despite the popularity of mentors in other areas such as philosophy and the military, little attention was paid to mentors or their significance in business settings. He found that nearly two-thirds of executives reported having had a mentor relationship and that these individuals also reported higher incomes and most notably, greater levels of career satisfaction than their non-mentored counterparts.

Given the initial positive benefits of mentoring cited above, it is not surprising that research into mentoring relationships has proliferated. With some of her conceptualizations based loosely around Levinson’s (1978) findings, Kram (1980, 1983, 1988) examined organizational relationships between younger and more experienced managers. These fundamental works have influenced many mentorship studies and Kram is considered to be one of the leading and most influential experts in the field (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Savickas, 2007).

With respect to the study of mentoring relationships in education, Jacobi (1991) noted that Astin (1977), along with Pascarella and his colleagues (Pascarella, 1980; Pascarella, Terenzini, & Hibel, 1978), were among some of the first authors to publish the importance of faculty-student relationships on educational outcomes. Astin found that students at small colleges, who by virtue of the college structure would potentially have
more opportunities for interaction, were much more satisfied with faculty-student interactions than their counterparts at larger institutions. Students were also more satisfied with student-faculty interactions if the interactions occurred frequently. Similarly, Pascarella and Terenzini (1977) found that students who persisted in college had higher measures of interactions with faculty as compared to those who voluntarily left college. While these authors did not specifically acknowledge the presence of mentoring relationships, their analyses in the area of student-faculty interactions did provide some of the foundation for more contemporary studies of mentoring in academia.

2.2 Definition of Mentoring

While many scholars agree on the origins of mentoring, there is a tremendous lack of agreement surrounding the most basic foundation of mentoring – its definition. This is not surprising, however, given the storied history of mentoring, as well as the typically isolated approaches to studying mentoring previously described. Scholars have lamented the paucity of a generally accepted mentoring definition for many years. Wrightsman (1981) stated that “there is a false sense of consensus, because at a superficial level everyone ‘knows’ what mentoring is. But closer examination indicates a wide variation in operational definitions, leading to conclusions that are limited to the use of particular procedures” (p. 3). Furthermore, Merriam (1983) stated that:

the phenomenon of mentoring is not clearly conceptualized, leading to confusion as to just what is being measured or offered as an ingredient in success. Mentoring appears to mean one thing to developmental psychologists, another thing to business people, and a third thing to those in academic settings. (p. 169)
Nearly a decade later, Jacobi (1991) noted that “variation in operational definitions continues to plague mentoring research and has almost certainly devalued the concept for application in “hard” research” (p. 508). And yet, more than 15 years after Jacobi’s call for a unified definition of mentoring, Bozeman and Feeney (2007) still criticized the same issue. As these authors pointed out, many have failed to provide a definition of mentoring altogether. Bozeman and Feeney also proposed that the most basic definitional issues can be traced back to Kram’s (1980, 1983) mentoring definition or lack thereof.

As previously noted, Kram is considered to be a leading expert in the field of mentoring (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Savickas, 2007) and many studies have used either her exact conceptualizations or a slight reworking of those proposed in her 1983 Academy of Management Journal article. Once again, it is worth mentioning that while this influential article detailed the phases that mentoring relationships pass through, an exact definition of a mentoring relationship was never listed (Bozeman and Feeney, 2007). In her 1988 book, Kram provided the following definition:

> derived from Greek mythology, the name implies a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individuals learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes this important task. (p. 2)

While this definition is satisfactory for an initial exploratory study, it fails to provide the flexibility needed for an emerging field of study and becomes inadequate when moving to different contexts within the topic of mentoring (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007).

The situation is much the same with respect to definitions of mentoring in academic contexts. Jacobi (1991) reviewed much of the literature related to academic

---

1 See Bozeman and Feeney (2007, 2008) and Jacobi (1991) for listings of the many mentoring definitions published by researchers.
mentoring and determined that most definitions included a number of common elements. These are: (a) mentoring relationships are helpful and focused on assisting with protégés’ achievements; (b) mentoring relationships include elements of career assistance and development, psychosocial and emotional support, and role modelling; (c) mentoring relationships are reciprocal in nature where both members of the relationship experience benefits; (d) mentoring relationships are personal and involve direct interaction between mentors and protégés; and (e) mentoring relationships typically occur between inexperienced protégés and mentors who have more experience, influence, and achievement.

More recently, Bozeman and Feeney (2008) have provided the following definition of mentoring:

>a process for the reciprocal, informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and psycho-social support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional development; mentoring entails informal communication, usually face to face and over a sustained period of time, between a person who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or experience (the mentor), to a person who is perceived to have less (the protégé). (p. 469)

Although this definition is only a moderate departure from many of the definitions advanced previously (Bozeman & Feeney, 2008), there are a number of subtle nuances that afford the aforementioned definition greater flexibility and applicability. As a result, I selected Bozeman and Feeney’s definition of mentoring as the foundational definition for this study. Consequently, a further discussion of this definition is warranted.

The first difference between Bozeman and Feeney’s (2008) definition and those provided by other scholars pertains to hierarchical status. Previous definitions have alluded to discrepancies between the mentor’s and the protégé’s position within an
organization. Bozeman and Feeney contended that a hierarchical difference between the mentor and the protégé is not required, but instead, the difference only needs to be in the level of knowledge and experience. This is not to say that the mentor must be more knowledgeable or experienced than the protégé; rather, the mentor should have more relevant knowledge and experience.

The second distinction of Bozeman and Feeney’s (2008) definition concerns the informal nature of knowledge transmission and social exchange in mentoring relationships. The authors challenge the notion of formally arranged mentoring relationships and instead assert that these relationships must be informal. Their claim does not discount the many formal mentoring programs that currently exist in organizations, but the authors stress that mentoring relationships, even those arranged formally, do not “develop on command” (p. 469).

An additional nuance of Bozeman and Feeney’s (2008) definition, but one not mentioned by the authors themselves, involves the relative age of the mentor and protégé. Many definitions, including Kram’s (1988), assume that the mentor must be older than the protégé. Bozeman and Feeney’s definition avoids referencing either member’s age. As Mott, Porschitz, Sherman, and Manz (2007) pointed out, the conceptualization of “career” has changed as individuals no longer receive guarantees of long-term employment. In fact, many individuals will work for more than one organization throughout their careers. Therefore, it is entirely possible for a mentor to be younger than the protégé, especially if the protégé has recently transitioned into the organization as an older adult.
2.3 Contexts of Mentoring

Mentoring has typically been studied within three domains: the workplace\(^2\), academia, and community or youth mentoring (Allen & Eby, 2007). As noted by Savickas (2007), “the 20 years of accumulated research in these three domains has been disparate and fragmented, having been the product of several disciplines, each with a unique orientation” (p. xvii). It is suggested that Kram’s early work on mentoring is the only factor holding this fragmented literature together (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007). Moreover, authors of mentoring studies often failed to consider the research being conducted in other areas (Allen & Eby) and tended to conduct “one off” studies, with little attention being paid to causal explanation (Bozeman & Feeney). Eby et al. (2008) further suggested that mentoring research conducted exclusively within “disciplinary silos” has resulted in fragmented and divided findings with “little cross-disciplinary communication among mentoring scholars” (p.255). It is this “silo mentality” that is largely to blame for the considerable disagreement surrounding mentoring definitions (Bozeman & Feeney; Jacobi, 1991). Bozeman and Feeney extend the fragmentation problem even further and censure that inconsistencies result from a lack of attention to core concepts and theory.

In an attempt to consolidate and clarify the findings surrounding mentoring, a number of authors have conducted reviews and meta-analyses of the existing mentoring literature. For example, Merriam (1983) reviewed mentoring literature in adult development, business and academic contexts, while Jacobi (1991) completed a review of

\(^2\) Although universities and other academic settings are organizations and are the primary workplace for many individuals, for the sake of clarity in this document, the use of the term ‘organization’ refers to business, workplace, industrial and other non-academic environments. Academia and academic organizations will be denoted as such.
undergraduate mentoring in academia. In addition, DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, and Cooper (2002) undertook a meta-analytic review of the outcomes of youth mentoring programs, Allen et al. (2004) completed a meta-analysis of the effects of mentoring on protégés in organizational settings, and Eby et al. (2008) recently completed a multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. Overall, these researchers have concluded that the outcomes of mentoring relationships are positive. While beneficial, the effect size of general youth mentoring appeared to be small (DuBois et al., 2002; Eby et al.), with the most favourable outcomes occurring in mentoring programs targeting disadvantaged youth (DuBois et al.). In comparison, organizational and academic mentoring produced larger effect sizes. Mentored individuals in organizational settings reported higher levels of compensation and more promotions, were more likely to be satisfied with their careers, were more committed to their careers, believed they would advance in their careers, and also had greater intentions to stay with their current employers as opposed to their non-mentored counterparts (Allen et al.).

2.3.1 Mentoring in Organizations

While mentoring in organizations is not the focus of this project, concepts discovered through studies in organizational settings should not be dismissed simply because of the context of the research study. For example, Kram (1980) completed her influential studies using matched pairs of junior and senior managers within a corporate setting and many researchers, regardless of their orientation, have adopted her concepts and frameworks. As previously discussed, the silo mentality that has plagued the
mentoring literature has produced fragmented and exclusive results. Therefore, when appropriate, incorporating mentoring concepts obtained through organizational studies may serve to tie mentoring literature together and improve the applicability of research findings. Consequently, while a complete review of literature regarding mentoring in organizational settings is far beyond the scope of this thesis, information derived from organizational studies will be identified and referenced as needed throughout this literature review.

2.3.2 Mentoring in Academia

There are a variety of mentoring contexts that have been examined within the specific domain of academia. For example, mentoring has been studied at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and researchers have also focused on mentoring that occurs within particular educational departments. With respect to undergraduate education, Jacobi (1991) completed a literature review of mentoring and undergraduate success while Dorsey and Baker (2004) undertook an integrative review of mentoring literature specific to undergraduate nursing students. Johnson and his colleagues (e.g., Bigelow & Johnson, 2001; Clark et al., 2000; Dickinson & Johnson, 2000; Fallow & Johnson, 2000; Huwe & Johnson, 2003; Johnson, 2002, 2008; Johnson & Huwe, 2002; Johnson, Koch, Fallow, & Huwe, 2000; Johnson & Nelson, 1999) have written extensively on aspects of mentoring in graduate education, and often more specifically in the field of psychology. Finally, some authors have conducted research on mentoring in graduate education using a cross section of disciplines such as the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences (Tenenbaum et al., 2001), whereas others have focused on
specific segments of the graduate student population such as students of colour (Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005) or those of lesbian, gay, and bisexual orientation (Lark & Croteau, 1998).

Although the citations listed above illustrate some variety in the academic mentoring literature, the majority of this published work is focused on mentoring relationships in psychology graduate programs. With respect to the academic field of sport management, little research has been completed on the topic of mentoring, apart from Baker’s (2006) doctoral dissertation on faculty mentoring. In this study, Baker surveyed current sport management faculty members in order to examine mentoring relationships between junior and senior faculty members. However, mentoring relationships among faculty members may be considerably different from those involving faculty members and their doctoral students. Despite completing an extensive literature search, I was unable to locate any research examining the mentoring relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their doctoral students. This absence of literature further highlights the need for mentoring research to be completed in this specific area.

At this point, it may be beneficial to report that while there does seem to be some consistency with respect to the broad structure of many doctoral programs, some variance may occur within the psychology discipline, particularly those in counselling psychology. As noted by several scholars (Cronan-Hillix, Gensheimer, Cronan-Hillix, & Davidson, 1986; Clark et al., 2000; Johnson, Koch, et al., 2000), students in counselling psychology reported fewer and shorter duration mentoring relationships when compared to students in traditional research focused programs. Johnson and Nelson (1999) have suggested that
this difference may be the result of the clinical orientation of these programs. Students in
counselling psychology may be required to spend a considerable amount of time with
external supervisors in clinical placements, thereby inhibiting students from developing
mentoring relationships with professors in their department. Therefore, care must be
taken when comparing or generalizing results found in (clinical) psychology with broad
graduate education results or environments.

Another important point to consider when studying mentoring relationships in
academia is that the purpose of academic mentoring often differs from mentoring in
organizations. In organizational settings, mentors often socialize protégés to meet the
demands of a specific job or position. For instance, the Vice-President of a specific
company may take a junior manager “under his or her wing” and prepare this person to
eventually assume the vice-presidency of a particular division in that company. In
contrast, academic mentors typically socialize protégés into the profession, not into a
specific role. Because a professor’s job is often divided between research, teaching,
service and other obligations, it is nearly impossible for a mentor to familiarize a protégé
with all aspects of academia. Instead, mentors attempt to introduce protégés to the
general structure and requirements of academia (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Tenenbaum et
al., 2001; Van Dyne, 1996).

2.4 Mentoring Functions

Using the data obtained during her study of developmental relationships in
corporate settings, Kram (1980) identified two primary mentoring functions: career
functions and psychosocial functions. In her 1988 book, Kram stated that these functions
are “essential characteristics that differentiate developmental relationships from other work relationships” (p. 22). Collectively, these functions further an individual’s growth and advancement. Career functions are those which enhance a protégé’s career development while psychosocial functions build a sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness both inside and outside of the organization (Kram, 1980, 1988). Career functions are comprised of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Psychosocial functions consist of role modelling, acceptance and confirmation, counselling, and friendship. Taken together, these functions allow a protégé to navigate difficulties associated with various career and life stages (Kram, 1980, 1988).

While an overwhelming majority of researchers have adopted Kram’s (1980, 1988) mentoring functions, some authors studying mentoring in organizations have suggested alternatives to these initial categorizations. For example, Scandura and her colleagues (Scandura, 1992, as cited in Allen et al., 2004; Scandura & Ragins, 1993; Scandura & Viator, 1994) posited that as opposed to being a component of the larger psychosocial grouping, role modelling formed a third, separate and distinct, mentoring function. However, Allen et al. (2004) conducted a meta-analysis of career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés and found that the majority of the previous studies conducted in organizational settings used Kram’s mentoring functions. They stated that “the extant theoretical and empirical research is clear that career and psychosocial functions serve as the primary distinct and reliable overarching operationalizations of mentoring” (p. 128) and that “follow up work has empirically supported” (p. 128) Kram’s two broad characterizations.
With respect to the academic mentoring literature, the majority of the academic scholars embrace Kram’s (1980, 1988) career and psychosocial functions of mentoring. For example, Clark et al. (2000), Johnson and his colleagues (Bigelow & Johnson, 2001; Dickinson & Johnson, 2000; Johnson, 2008; Johnson, Koch, et al., 2000; Johnson & Nelson, 1999) and Lark and Croteau (1998) have all employed Kram’s mentoring functions in their research. In contrast, Tenenbaum, Crosby, and Gliner (2001) proposed three different mentoring functions: instrumental functions, psychosocial help, and networking. Instrumental functions were deemed to be academic or job-related functions and psychosocial help was defined as social-emotional support, making the first two factors very similar to Kram’s proposed categorizations. Networking items, however, referred to “how often advisors helped students make connections within the field” (Tenenbaum et al., 2001, p. 332) and these items were treated as a separate and distinct function of mentoring in academia. Building upon Tenenbaum et al.’s study, Ortiz-Walters and Gilson (2005) also conceptualized academic mentoring as having three distinct functions and included instrumental, psychosocial and networking items in their questionnaire. Given that the majority of previous research in academic settings has accepted Kram’s categorization of career and psychosocial functions, the functions found in this study of academic mentoring were also grouped in accordance with Kram’s framework.

2.4.1 Career Functions

When provided by a mentor, career functions primarily serve to assist a protégé’s career development and advancement. Specific career functions are made possible
because of a mentor’s experience, position within the organization, and his or her organizational influence. While career functions are experienced primarily by the protégés, these functions may benefit both the protégés and the mentors. By learning their role within the organization, gaining exposure to influential individuals, and securing promotions, protégés are able to advance their careers. When mentors provide these functions for protégés, mentors may benefit from increased support among subordinates as well as greater respect from peers and superiors for fostering talent within the organization (Kram, 1980, 1988).

*Sponsorship*, which involves consciously promoting an individual for possible promotions, is critical for career advancement. It is also the most frequently observed career function in organizational settings (Kram, 1988). Without the support and accolades put forth by the mentor, it is possible that a protégé may be overlooked for promotions. In her discussion of power within organizations, Kanter (1977) stressed the importance of sponsorship and also introduced the concept of reflected power. She claimed that “sponsors,” who were defined as “mentors and advocates upward in the organization” (p. 181), were necessary for career mobility. Simply having a sponsor is advantageous for many protégés. When a protégé is associated with a particular sponsor, others within the organization may view the protégé as more powerful. This reflected power stems from the fact that the protégé has received the support of an influential individual and likely has access to the influential individual’s resources. The importance of these sponsors and the unofficial power they bestow was further emphasized by Kanter’s finding that sponsors were unofficially known as “rabbis” and “godfathers” within the organization she studied.
Sponsorship, however, is a risky function for the mentor as the protégé’s eventual success or failure may influence the mentor’s own reputation. If the mentor recommends a specific protégé and that protégé succeeds in the newly appointed position, others around the mentor, including superiors and subordinates, may increase their perceptions of the mentor’s judgment. In this case, it is possible that the concept of reflected power may even be reciprocated back onto the mentor. Conversely, if the protégé does not succeed in the new position, the mentor’s reputation may suffer (Kram, 1980, 1988).

*Exposure and visibility* occurs when a mentor intentionally gives a protégé tasks which will involve interaction with influential others in the organization. Through this interaction, the protégé has the opportunity to impress powerful individuals while simultaneously building relationships that may lead to further advancement. The benefits and drawbacks to providing this function are similar to the sponsorship risks described above - the protégé’s performance will reflect either positively or negatively on the mentor’s reputation (Kram, 1980, 1988).

*Coaching* increases a protégé’s understanding of how to progress through the organization. Given their experienced positions, mentors provide strategies for their protégés to achieve work objectives, gain recognition and fulfill career aspirations. Coaching often involves sharing ideas on how to improve specific assignments and disclosing inside knowledge on organizational politics and processes. In these cases, protégés risk being influenced by one perspective, which may or may not be accurate (Kram, 1980, 1988). Similarly, when mentors share their perspectives with protégés, they help to ensure that the mentors’ opinions and views are perpetuated throughout the
organization, and this may be beneficial or detrimental to the success of the organization (Kram, 1988).

Mentors protect protégés when they intentionally safeguard them from negative attention. Because of their positions in the organization, mentors can often withstand the unfavourable publicity with little harm to their reputations. When projects are not on schedule or if protégés have not yet learned how to negotiate within the organization, mentors may deal with the situations themselves, thereby shielding protégés from damaging exposure. This protection function may be particularly problematic in cross-gender mentoring relationships. Occasionally, female protégés are protected more than their male counterparts and this can lead to missed opportunities as females may not be able to demonstrate their competence in difficult situations (Kram, 1980, 1988).

The mentoring function of challenging assignments involves mentors presenting protégés with tasks that will increase their technical competencies and further their self-confidence. When protégés successfully complete these assignments, they feel a sense of accomplishment. However, without adequate feedback from their mentors, protégés may feel frustrated and unprepared. Not only do challenging assignments prepare protégés for greater responsibility but they may also free mentors from specific duties, leaving time for other tasks (Kram, 1980, 1988).

2.4.2 Psychosocial Functions

Psychosocial functions affect mentors and protégés on a more personal level as these functions often extend beyond organizational advancement. Intended to increase an individual’s sense of competence, the outcomes of these functions depend on the quality
of the interpersonal relationships between mentors and their protégés. Psychosocial functions may provide support for protégés who are adjusting to new work roles while mentors may gain a sense of accomplishment and enhanced self-worth from assisting less-experienced individuals (Kram, 1988).

*Role modelling* is the most frequently observed psychosocial function and involves setting examples through behaviours, attitudes, and values. Because of their positive behaviours, mentors provide opportunities for protégés to observe how to conduct themselves in various organizational settings. Protégés then identify with these behaviours and may emulate them during their own organizational experiences (Kram, 1980, 1988). Role modelling may also be an unconscious process. Mentors may be unaware of how their actions affect protégés and similarly, protégés may not recognize the extent to which they are modelling their mentors’ behaviours (Kram, 1988).

*Acceptance and confirmation* is an important mentoring function for both mentors and protégés. By reaffirming a protégé’s competence, a mentor provides the protégé with support and builds his or her confidence. Protégés also benefit when mentors accept protégés for who they are, and this may subsequently encourage protégés to take risks and to share their feelings with their mentor, rather than simply agreeing in the interest of pleasing others. Similarly, when protégés respect and support their mentors, mentors receive the acceptance and confirmation that may be lacking as a result of stagnant career advancement. In addition, if a mentor is struggling to feel useful in the later stages of his or her career, a protégé’s acceptance of and reliance on the mentor may offset feelings of low self-esteem or self-worth (Kram, 1980, 1988).
By providing *counselling*, mentors allow protégés to discuss issues that may prevent them from accomplishing their organizational responsibilities or that may detract from their sense of competence. Early in their careers, protégés often experience concerns that centre on the following issues: developing competence while still feeling satisfied in their careers; relating to new peers while retaining their personal values; and balancing increasing work responsibilities with other aspects of their lives. As protégés progress through the different stages of their careers, the nature of their concerns may change. This does not negate the importance of counselling at the various stages but instead solidifies the need for mutually respectful and supportive mentor relationships. By sharing their own personal experiences with protégés, mentors are able to revisit important decision points in their respective careers and reflect on how those situations have influenced their career development (Kram, 1980, 1988).

The final psychosocial function involves mutual and enjoyable social exchanges. These informal interactions may revolve around work or non-work related activities and generally serve to make the organizational environment more enjoyable. Through *friendship*, protégés are able to feel more like peers in relation to their mentors as opposed to subordinates in a dyadic relationship. Mentors also benefit from their protégés’ friendship as it may allow them to stay connected to younger generations. In cross-gender relationships, friendship and informal interactions outside of the workplace may be limited in order to prevent inaccurate assumptions regarding the relationship (Kram, 1980, 1988).
2.4.3 Mentoring Functions Provided

The provision of mentoring functions will vary with each mentoring relationship. In addition, mentoring functions are not mutually exclusive but instead frequently overlap. Demarcation between functions is often difficult as career and psychosocial functions may be combined during mentor-protégé interactions. Several factors influence which functions are provided in a mentoring relationship, including the developmental stages of each individual, the nature of the mentoring relationship and the organizational context (Kram, 1988).

Mentoring relationships are often formed because the developmental stages of each individual are complementary. Protégés may seek out mentors who are able to provide the critical functions the protégés currently require. Conversely, mentors’ concerns about themselves, their families and their own careers influence the functions they are able to provide to protégés. For example, mentors who are comfortable with their current status may be more willing to provide protégés with sponsorship as well as exposure and visibility when compared to mentors who are frustrated with their own lack of career advancement opportunities. Based on these situations, mentors and protégés are often attracted to one another. When this match occurs, both individuals are able to offer functions that address and fulfill the other member’s needs. As the relationship progresses, the developmental needs of each individual are likely to change, and as explained in a subsequent section, the relationship progresses through a number of phases.

The specific functions provided in a mentoring relationship are also impacted by the members’ interpersonal skills. For example, protégés who are able to ask for specific
guidance may develop a relationship with their mentors faster than those who lack effective communication skills. Similarly, mentors who possess active listening skills may be more suited to provide counselling to protégés. Attitudes and beliefs may also influence mentoring relationships. Protégés who hold negative views towards authority may have difficulty accepting specific mentoring functions while mentors who can effectively manage conflict and feelings of competition may be more adept at providing a wide range of mentoring functions (Kram, 1988).

Finally, the organizational context also influences the functions provided in a mentoring relationship. If a mentor and a protégé are located at vastly different hierarchical levels in the organization, the provision of mentoring functions may be affected. Specifically, because of a mentor’s powerful position in the organization, he or she may be able to sponsor a protégé for positions with increasing responsibility yet, conversely, be unable to provide the daily coaching and friendship that is often found when members are closer in organizational status (Kram, 1988).

2.4.4 Mentoring Functions Applied to Academic Settings

As described above, many mentor relationships are reciprocal and mutually beneficial. This also holds true for mentoring relationships in academic settings. Career functions in academic settings may be similar to the general career functions described above. For example, like organizational settings, sponsorship was also found to be an important function that mentors provided for their protégés in academic settings (Clark et al., 2000). Mentors may sponsor protégés by promoting their advancement through graduate school. This often includes nominating protégés for awards, endorsing research
projects and sponsoring protégés’ work for publication. Sponsorship may also allow protégés to bypass bureaucratic obstacles, possibly speeding up the timelines for research proposals. In addition, sponsorship can play a critical role when protégés begin searching for postdoctoral and employment opportunities. Having the support of a faculty member, along with the reflected power (Kanter, 1977) that accompanies this endorsement, signals that the protégé has access to his or her mentor’s resources and has someone who is willing to promote the protégé’s career (Johnson & Huwe, 2003).

Exposure and visibility occurs in graduate school when mentors invite protégés to collaborate on projects, especially those projects that will be presented to other influential academic members (Johnson & Huwe, 2003). In doing so, a protégé gains visibility in his or her mentor’s network of colleagues (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986). By sharing information regarding department politics, providing strategies for managing interpersonal conflict and suggesting short term goals that will assist in achieving longer term goals, mentors coach protégés on how to successfully navigate graduate school (Johnson & Huwe). When mentors provide challenging assignments for their protégés, they are able to increase their technical skills and competence levels, resulting in increased confidence. Finally, protégés are often protected from threats to their reputation or program status by their academic mentors. Mentors may help protégés avoid embarrassment by steering them away from potentially damaging tasks or provide support for protégés should they encounter difficulties while defending their dissertations (Johnson & Huwe).

Similarly, literature suggests that psychosocial functions in academic settings usually resemble the psychosocial functions described earlier. Through role modelling,
protégés are afforded opportunities to identify with individuals who are already established in their chosen fields and observe qualities protégés may wish to emulate. Graduate students are able to observe their mentors display the skills, abilities and behaviours required to successfully navigate through the profession (Johnson & Huwe, 2003). According to Clark et al. (2000), acceptance and confirmation is the most frequently reported psychosocial function of mentoring provided by mentors in academic settings. By demonstrating that they believe in their protégés’ abilities, mentors may increase their protégés’ confidence. In turn, this may allow the protégés to attempt tasks that they previously believed could not be accomplished (Johnson & Huwe).

Counselling involves allowing protégés to discuss personal and professional issues. By discussing career goals and how to balance work and family demands, mentors provide protégés with outlets to seek advice and reassurance during their progression through their doctoral program. With respect to friendship, Johnson and Huwe (2003) suggest that it is not necessary for mentors and protégés to share a friendship bond per se, but rather the dyadic relationship must contain mutual support, trust and respect. When this occurs, mentors and protégés value each other similar to how colleagues may, and are able to maintain professional boundaries while still being sensitive to the personal needs of each member.
RESEARCH QUESTION #1

What mentoring functions do sport management dissertation advisors provide for their doctoral students?

Sub-questions

a) According to dissertation advisors, what specific mentoring functions did they provide for their former doctoral students?

b) According to former doctoral students, what specific mentoring functions did their dissertation advisors provide?

c) Are dissertation advisors’ and former doctoral students’ perceptions of the mentoring functions provided consistent?

2.5 Phases of Mentor Relationships

Mentor relationships are dynamic and constantly evolving. These relationships pass through a number of phases and may even shift from being mutually enhancing to destructive for one or more members (Kram, 1988). As Kram (1980) stated:

the essential characteristics of a development relationship are clarified by taking note of the career and psychosocial functions that the relationship provides [for each member]. However, a description that only includes these functions is static and incomplete. A developmental relationship is characterized by an evolutionary process; the functions provided, the affective experiences of each [member], and the quality of the interaction change. This dynamic perspective enhances understanding of a developmental relationship by delineating how its essential characteristics change over time. (p. 119)

Oftentimes, phases in a mentor relationship are closely linked to stages in an individual’s development. In his attempt to identify a systematic conception of the life cycle, and more specifically adulthood, Levinson (1978) identified a number of different
eras that every individual passes through. These include early and middle adulthood. The
authors found that the primary concern in early adulthood is initiation and the focus shifts
to reappraisal during middle adulthood. Therefore, the overall progression of the
mentoring relationship will be influenced by the specific developmental stages of both
the mentor and the protégé (Levinson). For example, protégés who have just entered the
workforce are considered junior members and will have concerns surrounding career
development, family life, and the appropriate balance of these aspects. These junior
members may seek out senior members who are able to help them with their concerns.
Conversely, individuals who are at the midpoint of their careers may be involved in
reflection and reassessment regarding any future, and perhaps limited, advancement
opportunities. By assisting junior members with their career development, midcareer
members may be able to review and relive past decisions, thereby providing new sources
of confirmation and identity (Kram, 1988).

Given the rather consistent stages of early and middle adulthood (Levinson,
1978), many authors have attempted to classify specific phases of mentor relationships.
However, there is some disagreement between authors regarding the exact number of
mentoring relationship phases, as well as the names assigned to each of these. In general,
Levinson found that most mentoring relationships begin with excitement and mutual
attraction and after a period of years, end with feelings of ambivalence or worse, feelings
of anger and resentment. Missirian (1982) described a number of phases including
initiation, development, and termination while Phillips-Jones (1982) noted mutual
admiration, development, disillusionment, parting, and transformation. But as Kram
(1988) pointed out, there may be a number of limitations to using these findings. Both
Missirian and Phillips-Jones obtained data retrospectively, focused on only one member of the mentoring relationships, and interviewed only female subjects. In yet another account of mentoring phases, O’Neil & Wrightsman (2001) identified the following phases in an academic mentoring relationship: making the critical entry decision; building of mutual trust; taking risks; teaching skills; learning professional standards; and dissolving or changing the relationship.

While these authors’ descriptions of the phases of a mentoring relationship do vary, they represent a fairly similar general progression. Mentors and protégés meet and enter into a mentoring relationship, the relationship progresses through a number of periods of development and increasing mutual trust, and then eventually the relationship changes or dissolves, and may or may not include some element of negativity. Although O’Neil and Wrightsman’s (2001) phases are specifically related to academic mentoring, this conception has not been widely cited by other researchers. To the best of my knowledge, O’Neil and Wrightsman’s phases can be found only in a limited number of books, conference proceedings, and an unpublished manuscript. In comparison, Kram’s 1983 *Academy of Management Journal* article detailing the phases of the mentoring relationship is the most cited in the mentoring literature (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007). Given the scholarly popularity of this article, Kram’s phases were adopted in this study.

Kram (1983) conceptualized four phases of mentoring relationships and described them as “predictable, yet not entirely distinct” (p. 614). The first phase of a mentoring relationship is called *initiation* and typically lasts six months to one year. During this time mentors and protégés have frequent interactions and may even develop what Kram calls “fantasies.” Protégés may begin to feel strong admiration and respect for their
mentors and look forward to their mentors’ support and guidance. Meanwhile, mentors see their protégés as individuals who are “coachable,” enjoyable to work with, and can be used to transmit the mentors’ values and views of the world (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Kram). While in the initiation phase, academic mentors may help graduate protégés form roles and professional boundaries within new environments, develop a sense of personal and professional direction, and increase potentially fragile feelings of competence (Johnson & Huwe).

The second phase of a mentoring relationship is the cultivation phase. This phase lasts approximately two to five years and is typically characterized by a peak in the provision of both career and mentoring functions (Kram, 1983). In academic mentoring relationships, the cultivation phase will often last until protégés leave graduate school. Relationships occupying this phase provide an increasing sense of security and competence with little turmoil or conflict (Johnson & Huwe, 2003). During this phase mentors assist protégés in formulating early professional identities. In order to form a professional identity, protégés must have acute self-awareness, remain cognizant of professional limitations and be willing to take risks. By helping protégés complete challenging tasks and undertake risks in the form of new roles, mentors serve to increase their protégés’ self-confidence while simultaneously increasing their own credibility (Johnson & Huwe).

Next, mentoring relationships traditionally enter the separation phase. This phase varies from six months to two years and is characterized by the protégés’ increased autonomy and is accompanied by feelings of turmoil, anxiety, and loss as the mentoring relationship becomes less central in each member’s life. Kram (1983) posits that the
separation between members of the mentoring dyad occurs structurally and psychologically. In an ideal scenario, a timely structural separation will elicit an emotional separation, allowing the protégé to test his or her ability to function independent of his or her mentor. However, poorly timed separations can produce negative outcomes. If the structural separation is premature, it may arouse feelings of intense anxiety as the protégé will feel forced, yet unable, to operate without close mentor support. Conversely, if a structural separation occurs after an emotional separation, one member of the relationship may begin to resent the other member as his or her actions become inconsistent with the member’s needs (Kram).

As previously mentioned, the progression from phase to phase is not marked by clearly defined boundaries but instead occurs through a blending of phases. According to Johnson and Huwe (2003), this blended and confused transition is considerably more prominent as mentoring relationships move from cultivation to separation. This shift often occurs during the protégé’s last year of the program and is the period of the mentoring relationship that is most likely to elicit stress and conflict. In many cases, protégés soon graduate and their interactions with their mentors decrease dramatically. As the end of the cultivation phase approaches, protégés have hopefully gained an increased sense of autonomy and have decreased their reliance on their mentor, making the transition to the separation phase easier. While this progression may be difficult for either member to accept, both members must remember it is an integral and healthy part of the mentoring relationship, and is critical if the relationship is to succeed in the following phase (Johnson & Huwe).
Finally, the mentoring relationship undergoes a period of *redefinition*. This lasts for an indefinite length of time and may result in the formation of a different relationship structure. Often protégés and mentors form new yet less intense relationships that are characterized by the mutual support formed earlier in the relationship and progress into “peerlike,” long-term friendships (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Kram, 1983). In academic settings, members may meet up at conferences and update each other on the significant events that have occurred since their last contact. In some instances, mentors and protégés remain very close and frequently interact in a newly formed collegial manner, producing collaborative scholarly articles or joint research projects. In fewer cases, mentors and protégés cease communication altogether after the protégés have graduated. Regardless of the relationship that is eventually formed during the redefinition phase, mentors and protégés usually remain indebted to each other for the many benefits each member has accrued (Johnson & Huwe).

In order to examine each phase of mentoring relationships, research should be conducted using matched mentor-protégé pairs in varying phases of the relationship (i.e., Kram, 1980) or a longitudinal study that examines the progression of mentoring relationships. Since the mentoring relationships under investigation in this study were examined retrospectively, it was not possible to ascertain an accurate description of each of the mentoring relationship phases.

In addition, it has been suggested that because of the structure of graduate programs, mentoring relationships may transition from phase to phase in a fairly predictable pattern (Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005). For example, students may work with a mentor for the three to five year period while they are completing their doctoral degrees.
and then graduate and begin their careers in another location. This physical distance typically provides a natural separation in the relationship, and the relationship progresses into the redefinition phase. As described in the Methodology chapter, all protégés had completed their doctoral dissertations and were employed as faculty members at various North American academic institutions in the area of sport management. As a result, only the current nature of these mentoring relationships was examined. Thus, it was assumed from the outset that all of the mentoring relationships were in the redefinition phase.

**RESEARCH QUESTION #2**

What is the nature of the current relationship between sport management dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students?

**Sub-questions**

a) How do dissertation advisors characterize the nature of their current relationships with their former doctoral students?

b) How do former doctoral students characterize the nature of their current relationships with their dissertation advisors?

c) Are dissertation advisors’ and former doctoral students’ characterizations of the nature of their current relationships consistent?

**2.6 Characteristics Desired in Academic Mentoring Relationships**

The specific characteristics desired in mentoring relationships will vary between relationships and will be a function of numerous factors including the mentor’s characteristics, the protégés characteristics, their respective development stages, as well as the organizational setting and environment. In addition, the success of mentoring
relationships will depend in part on the match between the mentors’ and the protégés’ specific characteristics (Bozeman & Feeney, 2008). Therefore, it is not possible to create one definite list of qualities or characteristics that all protégés or mentors should possess to foster successful mentoring relationships. However, a number of studies have found some commonly desired characteristics and these are described below.

2.6.1 Characteristics Desired in Academic Protégés

As demonstrated throughout this manuscript, protégés receive a wide variety of benefits from mentoring relationships. Yet in academia, studies show that only 50-65% of graduate students are mentored (Clark et al., 2000; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Fallow & Johnson, 2000). Therefore, it appears that a large number of graduate students are missing out on mentoring relationships and their associated benefits. Research summarizing what mentors look for in academic protégés is more scarce as compared to qualities sought in academic mentors (Huwe & Johnson, 2003). In their article designed to assist graduate students in forming mentoring relationships, Huwe and Johnson (2003) present profiles of excellent protégés and distinguish between desired personality characteristics and behaviour patterns. According to the authors, excellent protégés demonstrate: emotional stability, making them receptive to feedback and tolerant of their own weaknesses without intense feelings of shame; an internal locus of control, believing that their actions are largely under their own control and may be more likely to persevere when faced with obstacles; the ability to be coached, by demonstrating that they are willing to learn from their mentors; high levels of emotional intelligence, indicating a
greater ability to manage interpersonal interaction; and an achievement focus, allowing them to contribute to their mentors’ research agendas (Huwe & Johnson).

With respect to behavioural patterns, excellent protégés tend to: exhibit strong communication skills, allowing them to accurately and concisely share their thoughts with others; produce excellent results, and the high quality of this work is eventually reflected back onto the mentors; and demonstrate career planning by setting goals and eventually offering more visibility to the mentor through their successful career outcomes (Huwe & Johnson, 2003). Conversely, those protégés who are overly dependent, arrogant, distant and detached, emotionally unstable, who procrastinate, fail to attain acceptable achievement levels, and display poor interpersonal boundaries are less likely to be mentored (Huwe & Johnson).

2.6.2 Characteristics Desired in Academic Mentors

In order to examine the characteristics that protégés desired in prospective mentors, Olian, Carroll, Giannantonio, and Feren (1988) manipulated the characteristics of prospective mentor profiles and found that protégés were significantly more attracted to mentors with high levels of interpersonal competence. These authors hypothesized that this competence influences a mentor’s ability to perform psychosocial functions, ultimately affecting the overall quality of the mentoring relationships and being more influential in a protégé’s career advancement. In academic settings, Clark et al. (2000) asked students to describe the three most important personality characteristics of their current mentor. The authors received more than 1675 descriptors which they sorted into categories and subsequently provided the top 15 characteristics. These included being
supportive (frequency count of 111), intelligent (104), knowledgeable (73), and ethical (56). Similarly, Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) found that the most important characteristic of a “good” mentor was being “interested and/or supportive” of the student. Personality characteristics (such as a sense of humour, honesty, dedication, and empathy) and being “knowledgeable/competent” were cited as the second and third most important characteristics, respectively. Buhler (1998) also noted that mentors must be available, be committed to the relationship, and possess the necessary communication skills to convey their skills and knowledge.

Interestingly, for five of the six top characteristics used to describe “bad” mentors, the results were the opposite of the corresponding “good” characteristic (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986). For example, “interested/supportive” had the highest importance score for good mentors whereas “uninterested/unsupportive” was mentioned most frequently for bad mentors. Other negative mentor characteristics included lacking knowledge, exploiting protégés and being unavailable or inaccessible. Personality characteristics of “bad” mentors included rigidity, criticality, egocentricity and dishonesty (Cronan-Hillix et al.). Given these less than desirable characteristics, Johnson and Huwe (2003) recommend that protégés identify the characteristics that are most important to them and keep these in mind while searching for prospective mentors. However, they also caution that a perfect mentor does not exist and it is unlikely that one mentor will provide every function for all of his or her protégés.
RESEARCH QUESTION #3

What are the characteristics desired in each member (dissertation advisor and doctoral student) of the relationship?

Sub-questions

a) What characteristics do dissertation advisors desire in doctoral students?

b) What characteristics do doctoral students desire in dissertation advisors?

2.7 Outcomes of Mentoring

Although much of the literature focuses on the positive outcomes of mentoring relationships for the protégés (e.g., Allen et al., 2004; Kram, 1988), there are also numerous benefits for the mentors (e.g., Kram, 1988) and the organizations in which the mentoring relationships occur (e.g., Wilson & Elman, 1990). Unfortunately, negative outcomes of mentoring relationships have been reported as well (Johnson & Huwe, 2002, 2003). Since little is known about the mentoring relationships between sport management doctoral students and their dissertation advisors, the focus of this study was on the positive outcomes. However, because negative outcomes may have been present in the mentoring relationships under study, reviewing the associated literature was also necessary.

2.7.1 Outcomes of Mentoring for Mentors

While much of the academic literature focuses on the benefits experienced by protégés (e.g., Dreher & Ash, 1990; Dreher & Cox, 1996; Lark & Croteau, 1998; Tenenbaum et al., 2001), mentors certainly benefit from these relationships as well. For
example, mentors may benefit from increased support and respect from subordinates, peers and superiors as a result of fostering talent within the organization (Kram, 1980, 1988). Additionally, if a protégé who has been mentored becomes successful, others may increase their perceptions of the mentor’s judgment (Kanter, 1977). Although there are some situations in which it may not be advantageous to the organization as a whole, mentors are often able to influence others and ensure their own views and opinions are perpetuated, at least in the interim (Kram, 1988). They are also able to develop individuals they would consider to be competent workers or colleagues (Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997). Mentors may also benefit from increased productivity when graduate students are involved in the mentor’s research program and from heightened visibility through the efforts and successes of graduate students.

By mentoring others, mentors are able to increase their social networks and develop close relationships or friendships with their protégés. In addition, mentors may develop a loyal following among their protégés and may benefit from potential situations where protégés would be able to “payback” their mentors (Allen et al., 1997). Lastly, in addition to other potential benefits not mentioned above, mentors may experience a sense of personal satisfaction from watching others develop and succeed, along with a sense of generativity (Allen et al.). Generativity centres on relationships with younger generations and involves developing the next generation and ensuring that they will be ready to succeed those before them (Levinson, 1978). With respect to academia, one particular mentor noted that a benefit of mentoring was “sharing past experience with people realizing that at one time I needed such guidance as well” (Allen et al., p. 77) while another mentor wanted “to pass along the benefits that I have. You don’t want to just take
and let that be short-lived and self-contained because then it is wasted” (Allen et al., p. 77). These quotations demonstrate how mentors, and not only protégés, benefit from mentoring relationships.

Many of the negative outcomes for mentors result from the risks mentors take when entering into mentoring relationships and providing functions such as sponsorship, exposure and visibility, and challenging assignments. If the outcome of these functions are negative, this may reflect poorly on the mentor’s reputation and he or she may be seen as incompetent, unable to develop talent and could lose power, status and respect within an organization (Kanter, 1977; Kram, 1980, 1988). Other negative aspects of mentoring include protégés becoming too dependent on mentors and the mentoring relationships becoming too time consuming (Busch, 1985).

As Johnson and his colleagues (Johnson, 2008; Johnson & Huwe, 2002; Johnson & Nelson, 1999) described, mentoring relationships are complex, multifaceted dyads that may include ethical dilemmas or require mentors to provide potentially incompatible functions. For example, mentors often support and sponsor protégés while simultaneously attempting to objectively evaluate their progress towards socialization into the profession or occupation. These ethical problems may be especially difficult in doctoral programs where mentors must evaluate protégés’ professional and moral competency to proceed in the profession after developing strong emotional and reciprocal relationships (e.g., clinical psychology). As a result, mentors may feel conflicted by their responsibility to uphold professional and ethical standards and their desire to avoid betraying their protégés (Johnson, 2008).
In addition, Johnson and Huwe (2002) proposed a typology of mentoring dysfunction in graduate school and suggested 12 primary problems (such as poor mentor-protégé matching, boundary violations by either member, or exploitation) that when presented either independently or in combination, may explain the majority of dysfunctional mentoring relationships. Although dysfunction was beyond the scope of this study, mentoring dysfunction may be worth exploring in the future once the positive aspects of mentoring relationships in sport management have been examined.

2.7.2 Outcomes of Mentoring for Protégés

Many authors have noted the critical importance of having mentoring relationships. Levinson (1978) stated that a mentoring relationship was one of the most important relationships an individual could have and the importance of having a mentor was further stressed in publications such as the Harvard Business Review article titled “Everyone who makes it has a mentor” (Collins & Scott, 1978). In addition, benefits of mentoring experienced by protégés have repeatedly been cited in the academic literature. For example, Roche (1979) found that individuals who were mentored reported earning more money and having greater levels of career satisfaction when compared to their non-mentored counterparts. Similarly, other authors have confirmed these findings, as mentored individuals reported receiving more promotions, having higher incomes, were more satisfied with their pay and other benefits (Allen et al., 2004; Dreher & Ash, 1990), and believed they would advance within their organization (Allen et al.).

Based on their review of the academic mentoring literature, Johnson and Huwe (2003) concluded that graduate students also experience many positive benefits of
mentoring. The authors distinguished between benefits accrued before graduation (called predoctoral) and benefits received after graduation (postdoctoral) and also noted that these outcomes were both intrinsic and extrinsic. According to Johnson and Huwe, protégés may experience the following predoctoral benefits: professional skill development whereby protégés are able to watch their mentors perform in their professions and consequently “learn the ropes”; increased professional competence and identity development resulting from their mentors’ feedback and guidance; encouragement and reaffirmation regarding the protégés’ skills and dreams; additional networking opportunities facilitated by the mentor; increased predoctoral productivity such as conference presentations and journal publications; the successful completion of dissertation requirements in a timely manner; the ability to secure prestigious internships; and greater overall satisfaction with the doctoral program. Similarly, Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) found that students with mentors had more publications, more first authored publications, more conference papers authored, and were involved in a greater number of research projects than their non-mentored peers. In contrast to Johnson and Huwe, Cronan-Hillix et al. did not find a relationship between having a mentor and overall satisfaction with the doctoral program. However, the authors did find that satisfaction with the mentor was positively related to satisfaction with the program.

Furthermore, postdoctoral benefits may include: greater income and earlier employment resulting from the mentor’s sponsorship for prestigious or informal job openings; more rapid career promotion and mobility; increased career satisfaction; career “eminence” or the recognition that is associated with having the support and sponsorship of a mentor; increased creativity and innovation with respect to scholarly projects
(Johnson & Huwe, 2003); and knowledge and experience regarding mentoring others (gained through the protégé’s own mentoring relationships), especially since mentored individuals are more likely to mentor others (Johnson and Huwe; Roche, 1979).

Despite the many positive outcomes listed above, protégés sometimes experience negative outcomes or negative aspects of mentoring relationships. Clark et al. (2000) and Fallow and Johnson (2000) found very similar results with respect to the protégés’ frequency of reporting negative behaviours. The negative aspects of mentoring included: mentors not being as available as protégés would have liked; difficulty ending the mentoring relationship; inability to meet mentors’ expectations; being required to do things that made the protégés feel uncomfortable; having their mentor take credit for their work; the mentor engaging in unethical behaviour; believing their mentors’ behaviour was seductive; and believing their mentors sexualized the relationship (Clark et al.; Fallow & Johnson). While negative outcomes of any kind are undesirable, Clark et al. found that the majority of respondents indicated no negative experiences. Furthermore, incidents of serious negative outcomes such as sexualization of the relationships or engaging in seductive behaviours were relatively low at between 2% and 4% of respondents (Clark et al.; Fallow & Johnson).
RESEARCH QUESTION #4

What are the outcomes of mentoring relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students?

Sub-questions

a) According to dissertation advisors, what are the outcomes of mentoring relationships for both the advisors and the doctoral students?

b) According to former doctoral students, what are the outcomes of mentoring relationships for both the doctoral students and the dissertation advisors?

c) Are dissertation advisors’ and former doctoral students’ perceptions of the outcomes of mentoring relationships consistent?
3.0 METHODOLOGY

This study was a qualitative inquiry designed to explore the mentoring relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students. The methodology chapter outlines the following sections: justification of the methodology, the researcher as an instrument, ethical considerations, sample selection, data collection, data analysis, and finally, delimitations and limitations.

3.1 Justification of Methodology

Qualitative methods, as opposed to quantitative approaches, are used when the researcher would like to emphasize words rather than numbers (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). In this project, I chose to examine the nature of select mentoring relationships in the sport management academy. According to Creswell (2003), qualitative methods are “exploratory and useful when the researcher does not know the important variables to examine. This type of approach may be needed because…the topic has never been addressed with a certain sample or group of people” (p. 22). While research on the topic of mentoring itself has proliferated, fewer studies have been conducted in academia. Although one quantitative study has been conducted on mentoring relationships among sport management faculty (Baker, 2006), I am not aware of any studies completed on the specific mentoring relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their doctoral students. Given the nature of my research question and Creswell’s quotation provided above, it was appropriate to use a qualitative approach in order to study these mentoring relationships.
With respect to epistemology, researchers with a post-positivist perspective have adopted a constructionist view of meaningful reality (Crotty, 1998). Unlike their positivist counterparts, post-positivists believe that research outcomes cannot be completely objective or absolutely certain (Crotty). Post-positivists challenge the positivist belief of an “absolute truth of knowledge” (Creswell, 2003, p.7), and also purport that it is not possible to be “positive” about knowledge, especially when studying human behaviour (Creswell). Given these principles, I used a post-positivist approach to study the phenomenon under investigation - mentoring relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students.

Although Creswell (2003) describes post-positivism as being synonymous with the scientific method and focusing on “developing numeric measures of observations” (p. 7), those are not necessarily the views I adopted for this study. Instead, I approached the study from the perspective that there are theories that govern the world and that these need to be examined (Creswell), but not solely through quantitative measures. Accordingly, I used semi-structured interviews to qualitatively examine the nature of select mentoring relationships in the sport management academy. As Crotty (1998) pointed out, it is possible for qualitative researchers to hold positivist orientations and approaches. Therefore, a qualitative study using a post-positivistic perspective to examine mentoring in the under-researched context of academia was quite appropriate.

Furthermore, Crotty (1998) distinguished between positivistic and post-positivistic presentations of research. Consistent with a post-positivistic approach, the results are presented as my interpretation of the data. The findings do not represent established facts but instead are my conclusions, which are based on my analysis of the
participants’ responses in conjunction with previous mentoring theories. Others may consider my conclusions, judge their soundness and plausibility, and determine the overall applicability of the findings to their lives (Crotty).

3.2 The Researcher as an Instrument

A key tenet of qualitative research is the notion that investigators cannot separate themselves entirely from the data. Consequently, the results of qualitative research will inevitably be shaped by the investigators’ own experiences and worldviews (Creswell, 2003). As a result, I must provide the perspective from which I approach this study. As explained in Appendix A, I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with such a wonderful thesis advisor, and mentor, Dr. Jess Dixon. He has certainly provided many of the mentoring functions discussed throughout this document and this experience has undoubtedly affected my views, and expectations, of academic mentoring relationships. As such, I must acknowledge these influences. In order to frame the position from which I approached this study, my thoughts, my worldviews, and my initial hesitancy towards conducting qualitative research are also described (see Appendix A).

3.3 Ethical Considerations

Prior to completing any aspect of the data collection, this study was submitted to the University of the Windsor’s Research Ethics Board (REB) for ethics approval. As per the University of Windsor’s REB protocol, I was required to obtain ethical clearance from all of the potential participants’ REBs or Institutional Review Boards (IRBs). In some cases, the participants’ institutions accepted the University of Windsor’s ethics
clearance letter and additional ethical clearance was not required. In other situations, I submitted my University of Windsor ethics application to the participants’ institutions for review and subsequently received ethical clearance.

Participant anonymity was not possible in this study as I completed the telephone interviews and consequently knew the participants’ identities. Similarly, while I did not intentionally disclose participant identities in the release of the findings, confidentiality could not be absolutely guaranteed. The sport management academy is a rather small, close-knit group of professionals, and since the rationale for selecting participants (i.e., members of the lineages with the greatest scholarly productivity and the largest aggregate numbers of former doctoral advisees) is disclosed in this document, members of the sport management academy may be able to determine the study participants, particularly the dissertation advisors.

3.4 Sample Selection

The initial sample for this study consisted of five doctoral dissertation advisors and ten former doctoral students (two students from each dissertation advisor’s lineage), for a total of 15 participants. Questions pertaining to adequate sample size often do not have a simple, straightforward answer (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). As previously illustrated in the literature review, there are no known qualitative studies examining mentoring in the sport management academy. Consequently, it is not possible to use previous studies in this area as references for sample sizes. Furthermore, many of the academic mentoring studies have employed surveys (i.e., Green & Bauer, 1995; Heinrich, 1995; Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005; Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991; Tenenbaum et al.,
Unfortunately, these studies are of limited use with respect to sample size verification as quantitative surveys differ considerably from “information rich,” qualitative studies (Lark & Croteau, 1998).

There are, however, a limited number of qualitative studies that may be used for the purpose of sample size comparison. Heinrich (1995) and Lark and Croteau (1998) examined mentoring relationships in academia using interviews. The sample size for these studies ranged from 14 (Lark & Croteau) to 22 participants (Heinrich). In addition, the current study used a design similar to McCarron’s (2006) master’s thesis. This thesis, completed in the area of psychology, examined the experiences of mentors and protégés in an academic setting by interviewing twelve faculty mentors and seven graduate protégés, for a total of 19 participants. Considering these study sizes, along with the time constraints of completing a master’s thesis, the initial sample size of 15 participants was deemed to be acceptable.

The sample was selected in one of two ways, depending on the specific population (dissertation advisors vs. former doctoral students). The sample of dissertation advisors was determined through a purposive sampling procedure. Purposive sampling is appropriate for unique cases that will be particularly informative, as well as when identifying specific cases for in-depth exploration (Neuman, 1997). Using a data set obtained from Dixon and Mott (2008b), advisors were selected on the basis of high scholarly research productivity and large aggregate numbers of former doctoral advisees. Because of these specific selection criteria, additional advisors were not selected to replace advisors who chose not to participate. Former doctoral students were randomly selected from a compilation of dissertation advisors’ former advisees. When needed, and
until the list was exhausted, additional students were randomly selected from the compilation of former advisees in order to replace those who did not respond to my requests for an interview or those who elected not to participate.

For the purposes of this study, inclusion in the sample was restricted to those individuals for whom valid North American university contact information could be obtained through public records. Therefore, individuals who had completed their doctoral degrees but who were not currently employed as faculty at a North American academic institution were excluded from the study. In addition, both mentors and protégés who had retired from academia, regardless of whether valid contact information could be obtained, were also excluded.

While the initial sample selected for this study consisted of a total of 15 participants, regrettably one doctoral dissertation advisor who was initially selected for this study did not respond to my participation requests, and as noted earlier, replacement advisors were not selected. Similarly, several former protégés also declined or were unable to participate for various reasons. In total, I contacted 15 former doctoral students and I was able to interview ten of these individuals. One protégé was removed from the participant pool after completing the interview, having learned that he/she failed to meet the previously specified inclusion criteria. This left a total of nine protégé interviews. Unfortunately, one mentor had a small listing of former advisees who met the inclusion criteria and only one of these individuals elected to participate in this study, leaving one lineage of protégés incomplete. Therefore, the final sample for this study contained four doctoral dissertation advisors and nine former doctoral students, for a total of 13 (n=13) participants. A profile of the participants’ sex can be found in Table 1. Coincidentally,
the dissertation advisor and the former doctoral student who did not participate in this study formed part of the same lineage. As a result, I was able to obtain complete interview data for four of the five lineages (i.e., A, C, D, and E) that were specifically selected for inclusion in the study.

Table 1: Sex of Participants Listed by Lineage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Lineage</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protégé 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protégé 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dashes indicate participant was not interviewed

3.5 Data Collection

As previously noted, semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with dissertation advisors and a random sample of their corresponding former doctoral students. Interviews are distinguished from social conversations because at least one of the parties comes to an interview with a specific goal in mind (Stewart & Cash, 2006). In this study, I attempted to gain an understanding of the participants’ mentoring relationships. Although the ability to notice non-verbal cues is limited through the use of telephone interviews, there are some instances when telephone interviews are beneficial. Perhaps the greatest advantage associated with using telephone interviews is the ability to sample a geographically diverse group of individuals rather economically (Berg, 2007). For this study, participants were located throughout North America, making in-person interviews incredibly costly and impractical for a master’s thesis. Therefore, telephone interviews were a viable method of gathering this interview data.
According to Berg (2007), there are a number of important considerations that must be accounted for when conducting telephone interviews. Firstly, the interviewer must establish legitimacy. In this study, legitimacy was accomplished by sending potential participants an email containing a recruitment letter that was created on university letterhead. The letter outlined the participant’s involvement in the study and specified that I would be contacting him or her to further explain the study, answer any questions, and discuss his or her role in the data collection (see Appendices B and C). Next, the interviewer must convince potential participants of the importance of the study and their participation in it. This was also accomplished through the recruitment letter. This letter clearly articulated the importance of this study and stressed how the participants’ involvement was critical to its success. The importance of the study was also conveyed when I telephoned prospective participants to solicit their participation in the study.

Another important factor that must be taken into consideration when selecting a research method is the interviewer’s characteristics and qualifications. Fontana and Frey (2005) stated that interviewer characteristics such as age, sex and interviewing experience have little effect on interview responses. Although I did not have extensive experience interviewing others before beginning this study, I had participated as a research assistant for a government funded study where I was able to conduct one in-person and one telephone interview. While I was certainly still considered a neophyte with respect to conducting interviews, having the opportunity to complete a previous telephone interview helped to reduce my level of anxiety while conducting the first few participant interviews for this study. In addition, prior to commencing this research I did not have any direct
experience interviewing individuals in higher positions within academia. However, I did have experience interacting with individuals in positions of power. Through previous job experiences I was privileged with opportunities to interact with physicians and chiefs of medical departments. Consequently, I was able to apply the interpersonal communication skills refined during my previous professional interactions to the interviews that were conducted for this study with sport management faculty members.

However, research has also shown that student interviewers produce a greater response effect when compared to non-student interviewers (Fontana & Frey, 2005). A response effect is said to occur when the researcher influences a participant’s response. This could happen if the interviewer (inadvertently) altered the delivery of the question to suggest a desired answer or re-worded the question, thereby changing the implicit or explicit meaning of the query (Fontana & Frey). Since I am a student, this response effect must be acknowledged. Fontana and Frey also noted that higher status interviewers produce a larger response effect in comparison to lower status interviewers. In this study, I was a lower status interviewer and based on the findings mentioned previously, my lower status position may have helped to minimize any potential response effect.

3.5.1 Interview Guide Development

One of the more challenging aspects of this study was developing the guides to be used during the interviews. Being new to qualitative research, I was unsure of how to proceed with this task but realized the outcomes of my data collection would be dependent upon the quality of the questions that I asked participants. I consulted with a number of texts but was unable to find a clear description of how to proceed. I also
looked at dissertations to generate some ideas of how previous students had constructed their interview guides, but since there are few studies with the same focus as mine, the insight was limited. Knowing that my interview guides would be further clarified during my pilot interviews, I created a number of open-ended interview questions that I thought would capture the information required to answer each of the research questions and the related sub-questions. I then added the compulsory ethics consent information as well as a paragraph describing the focus of the study so participants could respond to my questions accordingly.

3.5.2 Pilot Interviews

In an attempt to combat the student interviewer response effect and to practice administering semi-structured interviews, I performed three pilot interviews via telephone. These pilot interviews also served as tests for the clarity of the interview questions and provided some feedback regarding the face validity of the questions (Neuman, 1997). In order to mimic the composition of the selected sample and the ensuing interviews (i.e., one dissertation advisor and two former doctoral students), two faculty members from the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor were approached to participate as former doctoral students in the pilot interviews. Unfortunately, the Department of Kinesiology does not offer a doctoral program at this time and I was unable to select a highly productive doctoral dissertation advisor from this group. However, in addition to having advised numerous master’s students through the thesis process, a faculty member in the Department of Kinesiology had previously served on a doctoral dissertation committee. Because of this experience, this professor was asked
to participate in a pilot interview to test the doctoral dissertation advisors’ interview
guide. Immediately following the completion of the pilot interviews, I debriefed with
each pilot interviewee, asking questions regarding the overall interview experience and
gaining feedback on the questions themselves, as well as my interview technique (see
Appendix D). Based on the feedback from the pilot interview debriefing sessions, I made
some minor changes to the interview guides in order to ease the flow of the interview
conversations (Seidman, 2006). For example, one pilot interviewee suggested that I begin
the interviews with a few simple “ice breaker” questions such as the years in which the
students began and completed their doctoral degrees. However, none of these changes
resulted in modifications to the fundamental nature of the questions within the guide.

3.5.3 Contacting Prospective Participants

All participants were sent a recruitment letter via their respective university email
addresses, informing them that they had been selected to participate in this study (see
Appendices B and C). The letter outlined the purpose and the nature of the participants’
involvement in the study. The letter also explained that I would be contacting prospective
participants within a few days to answer any questions and discuss their potential
involvement in the study. In an attempt to ensure that participants had an opportunity to
read my email before I contacted them to discuss their participation, I used the University
of Windsor student webmail “notify when delivered” and “notify when read” options.
Once I had received notification that the participants had read my recruitment letter, I
tried to contact them by telephone. Unfortunately, not all of the subjects’ email servers
supported the “notify when read” function. In these instances, the delivery notification
email indicated that I would not receive any further correspondence and I telephoned the participants within a few days of sending the initial email.

After answering any questions prospective participants may have had, a mutually agreed upon interview time was arranged. Participants were then sent information letters detailing their involvement, the potential benefits and risks associated with their participation, and their rights with respect to withdrawal, anonymity, and confidentiality (see Appendices E and F). Participants were also sent the corresponding interview guide so that they had the opportunity to prepare their answers to the questions in advance of the interview (see Appendices G and H).

In the event I was not able to make initial contact via telephone within one week of sending the recruitment letters, a follow-up letter was emailed to each of the outstanding individuals (see Appendix I). This notice reminded all prospective participants of their critical importance to the success of this study and requested their cooperation by participating. The follow up letter also requested that prospective participants who were unable or unwilling to participate in the study reply (either by telephone or email) and indicate so, in order for their names to be removed from my prospective participant list.

3.5.4 Participant Interviews

Participants were contacted as scheduled to initiate the telephone interviews. Before beginning each interview, participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point, and were reminded that anonymity was not possible in this study. Participants were also reminded that while every attempt would be made to ensure
confidentiality (such as removing identifiers from quotations selected for publication), because of the small, close-knit nature of the sport management academy, confidentiality could not be guaranteed. If participants wished to proceed with the study, verbal consent to participate in the interview as well as consent to audio tape the interview was obtained. As Warren (2002) and Berg (2007) have noted, receiving verbal consent to participate in research is a practical alternative to completing signed paper consent forms when tape recording interviews.

At this point, participants were also reminded of the focus of the study. While it is possible that individuals participating in this study may have had more than one mentoring relationship, this study sought to examine only the mentoring relationships between dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students. Protégés were reminded of this fact before beginning the interview and were asked to answer the questions with respect to their doctoral dissertation advisor only. For verification, protégés were also asked to state the name of their dissertation advisor. It was, however, problematic to provide the dissertation advisors with the names of the specific protégés who participated in this study, as this would violate confidentiality agreements. This resulted in an asymmetrical relationship where protégés answered the interview questions with respect to their specific dissertation advisor while dissertation advisors answered the interview questions with respect to their relationships with former doctoral students who currently held faculty appointments in sport management.

All interviews followed the corresponding interview guides (see Appendices G and H). I tried to take a non-directive approach and allowed the participants to control the length of the answers and the interview climate (Stewart & Cash, 2006). Modifications
were not made to the questions throughout the interview process. However, additional probing questions were sometimes used to clarify the participants’ responses to a particular question (Berg, 2007; Gratton & Jones, 2004).

Upon completion of the interviews, I thanked the participants for their time and provided them with the opportunity to review their interview transcripts once they had been transcribed. In such instances, participants received an email indicating that they were free to make any changes they wished, and were provided with a date by which they should return the transcript. If the transcripts were not returned by the deadline date, I assumed that the participants were satisfied with the transcripts.

3.6 Data analysis

Each of the interviews was digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. The audio recordings of the transcripts were stored on my personal computer and on an external hard drive until the transcriptions were completed, at which time they were removed from the computer and stored exclusively on an external hard drive that, as per the REB’s guidelines, will be kept in a secure location for five years. After the data analysis was completed, the transcription files were also placed on the external hard drive that, again, will be kept in a secure location.

There is some debate within the academic community regarding keeping the interview process and the subsequent analysis of data separate. Seidman (2006) recommended avoiding analyzing the interview data before completing all of the interviews in order to prevent imposing emergent themes on subsequent interviews. In contrast, other authors (e.g., Lincoln & Guba, 1985) recommended completing both
stages simultaneously so one process may inform the other. In this study, the transcriptions were completed as the interviews were conducted. Since I completed all of the transcriptions myself, I became very familiar with the participants’ responses. While I did not intentionally begin any data analysis while I was conducting the remaining interviews, it was difficult to completely ignore the responses given up to that point. Therefore, it is possible that answers given by previous participants may have influenced some of the probing questions used during subsequent interviews.

This research study was primarily inductive in nature. Because of the lack of research examining mentoring in academia, and specifically in the field of sport management, specific hypothesis were not created for any of the research questions. Instead, using the coding and analysis process described below, I allowed the data to inform the results of this study (Creswell, 2003). The research questions examining the nature of the current relationships, the characteristics desired and the outcomes of these relationships were analyzed using an inductive approach. In order to analyze the functions provided within these mentoring relationships, a deductive approach was initially employed and the participants’ responses were mapped according to Kram’s (1988) framework of mentoring functions. An inductive approach was then used to adapt Kram’s functions for use in academia.

3.6.1 The Coding Process

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), coding is “the analytical processes through which data are fractured, conceptualized, and integrated to form theory” (p. 3). In this study, coding involved applying units of meaning to the participants’ responses
contained in the interview transcripts. These units of meaning were then combined, organized and grouped with other relevant units of meaning to form larger patterns and themes (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Coding was completed both by hand and with the assistance of qualitative data analysis software QSR NVivo 8. The process of coding, however, was anything but straightforward or simple and included repeated reading of the transcripts and the coded material, along with categorization and re-categorization of the coded data. Being a novice researcher, especially with respect to qualitative research, I was initially intimated by the sheer volume of data that was produced during this study. In order to conceptualize and understand the data analysis that I was undertaking, I often envisioned the coding as a series of steps that required placing relevant data and noteworthy statements into labelled “bins” or “buckets” (Gratton & Jones, 2004). In NVivo, these buckets are known as nodes, which store all of the data that researchers have coded at that bucket. These buckets can then be combined, reduced, reformatted or eliminated altogether as my understanding of the data and its themes changed. At times this exercise was frustrating. I initially questioned my ability to accurately code the data and also found that the idea of discrete theme buckets was limiting as some themes spanned multiple buckets. As I continued with the analysis I became more confident in my coding of the data and my ability to synthesize individual responses to form emergent themes.

My initial step in coding the data was to read through each transcript. Although I had completed all of the transcriptions myself, the process was spread over a period of a few months and I was not able to recall all aspects of the interviews. While reading the transcripts, I began to develop introductory nodes and topics that emerged from the data.
Using NVivo, tree nodes and free nodes were created to represent the emerging categories. A tree node was created for each lineage, with sub-nodes for mentors and protégés. Each of these nodes was further subdivided according to research question, with nodes for the preliminary themes that emerged from the transcripts. My next step involved coding relevant text to these nodes (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Taken together, these steps form a process known as open coding (Gratton & Jones, 2004). Strauss and Corbin (1998) define open coding as “the analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in data” (p. 101).

With the “coding stripes” function turned on, I then went back and re-read the transcripts to ensure that all of the text that I deemed to be relevant was coded. Among other functions, the coding stripes option allows the user to read the source data and see the coding location(s) of the information contained in each source. For instance, I was able to read a specific sentence or paragraph within a particular transcript and determine to which nodes that information had been coded. This also allowed me to verify that my coding was fairly consistent. In a small number of cases I noticed that I had inappropriately coded some of the participants’ descriptions of working with their mentor to nodes related to the nature of their current relationships. This was resolved by simply un-coding this material from the incorrect nodes and re-coding the material at the appropriate nodes. I then copied each of the individual lineage tree nodes (e.g., lineage A mentor, lineage A protégés) and the coded data from these tree nodes to form one mentor tree node that contained all of the mentors’ responses and one protégé tree node that contained all of the protégés’ responses.
Next, I moved to a manual coding and analysis process. I printed each of the nodes and the contents that I had assigned to each node using NVivo. I then read the coded data, summarizing each individual reply in the margins of the printouts. I compiled a summary sheet for each node, grouping similar responses together and attributing them to the respective participants. In several instances I realized that my initial coding had slight inconsistencies or could be better represented by additional or different coding and this was completed. At this stage some nodes were also merged or deleted. This phase represented axial coding, and according to Strauss and Corbin (1998), is defined as “the process of reassembling data that were fractured during open coding” (p.124). During this stage I tried to reduce the large amount of data to a more manageable number of emergent themes and noteworthy statements. I also attempted to move from specific analysis to more general outcomes. For example, I analyzed all of the individual responses that were previously coded to a particular node. I then summarized each response and looked for patterns between responses given by protégés of a specific lineage, between the protégés’ responses and those given by their mentor, across the entire group of mentors or protégés, and among the responses given by all participants.

Throughout the coding process I made a number of coding memos. I used these memos to record my thoughts on the coding process, potential trends or explanations that I observed in the data, or points that should be included in the Discussion chapter. Although the preceding description makes it seem as though coding and analysis was a linear procedure involving a concrete number of steps, the exact process that I followed cannot be described in such rigid terms. Often, aspects of open coding and axial coding overlapped and rather than concentrating on the type of coding and analysis that I was
using, I focused on working with the data to the best of my abilities in order to understand mentoring relationships.

3.6.2 Coding Verification

As Fontana and Frey (2005) stated “qualitative researchers are realizing that interviews are not neutral tools of data gathering but rather active interactions between two (or more) people leading to negotiated, contextually based results” (p. 698). Fontana and Frey also noted that interviewers are appreciating that their data are “reflexive, problematic and sometimes contradictory” with “tremendous, if unspoken, influence of the researcher as author” (p. 714). Therefore, it was unrealistic to expect completely objective analyses of the transcribed interviews. However, to ensure that I used a clear and valid set of codes and that the codes were applied properly, portions of the coded data were checked against my advisor’s interpretation of the data (Gratton & Jones, 2004). Although coding is a personal task and there were bound to be discrepancies, I chose to check my coding with another individual who was familiar with the topic of mentoring to eliminate incongruities that may have occurred as a result of being unfamiliar with the general topic. When relevant, the coding memos described above were used to assist in resolving any discrepancies (Gratton & Jones). Any other discrepancies were discussed with my advisor and a mutually agreeable solution was derived.
3.7 Delimitations and Limitations

Like all studies, there were a number of delimitations that were set by the researcher and some limitations that arose from the study assumptions and methodology. These are described below.

3.7.1 Delimitations

The dissertation advisors in this study were purposively selected based on their high levels of scholarly productivity and large aggregate numbers of former doctoral advisees (Dixon & Mott, 2008a). As a matter of consequence, many members of the sport management academy were excluded from consideration for this study. The sample was further delimited to include only those individuals who were currently employed at a North American institution of higher learning. Therefore, mentors and protégés who were retired or working at educational institutions outside of North America were also excluded. In addition, protégés with more than one dissertation advisor (i.e., co-advisors) were excluded from the study as it would have been difficult to ascertain which specific mentoring functions were provided by each advisor and the corresponding outcomes of these functions.

Furthermore, by delimiting the sample of potential participants to include only select advisors and their former advisees, I risked failing to obtain a complete sample of 15 participants if one or more mentors and/or protégés elected not to participate in this study. Ideally, participants in this study would have been interviewed in person, but because of their diverse geographical locations and the cost prohibitiveness of travelling
across North America, I chose to conduct telephone interviews instead. As described below, there are a number of limitations associated with this method of data collection.

As previously illustrated, little research has been conducted on mentoring in the area of sport management. Hence, there were many aspects of mentoring that could have been investigated. I chose to examine the mentoring functions that dissertation advisors provided for their doctoral students, the nature of the current relationships between dissertation advisors and former doctoral students, the characteristics that each member desired in the other member, and the outcomes of these mentoring relationships. All of these topics focused primarily on the positive aspects of the mentoring relationships between dissertation advisors and their doctoral students. Therefore, it is possible that there were negative aspects contained in the mentoring relationships studied, but that these negative aspects were not apparent because the interview questions did not explicitly address negative aspects of mentoring relationships.

3.7.2 Limitations

One of the greatest limitations of this study involved the assumption that doctoral dissertation advisors provide mentoring functions. The rationale for this assumption was explained in the introduction to this study and as previously noted, if this assumption was inaccurate, the protégés’ responses would reflect this (by indicating low levels of mentoring functions and negative or neutral outcomes). In addition, this assumption was clearly articulated during the interview as protégés were asked to think only of their dissertation advisors when answering questions. This may also have prevented protégés from sharing information related to other mentoring relationships that they may have had.
Another limitation with this study pertains to the fact that the study was completed retrospectively. It is entirely possible that mentors and/or protégés could have altered their memories and perceptions of the mentoring functions or outcomes and even the mentoring relationships themselves (Kram, 1983). Similarly, physical or emotional distance from the other member may have resulted in individuals perceiving the relationship as being more positive (or negative) than they would have reported while the relationship was occurring.

The data for this study were collected through semi-structured telephone interviews. While telephone interviews allowed me to interview a geographically diverse sample of participants, there are some limitations associated with this method. The primary concern revolves around the fact that I was not able to observe non-verbal cues and consequently may not have captured some of the subtle nuances associated with the participants’ responses. In some cases, interviewers have been unable to establish rapport with their participants, thereby limiting the quality of the data obtained (Bryman & Teevan, 2005).

There are also a number of limitations associated with qualitative research. These include qualitative research being subjective, difficult to replicate, lacking transparency, and having problems with generalization (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). I acknowledge each of these potential criticisms but also contest that no study is completely devoid of methodological problems and I attempted to control for these issues whenever possible. For example, to avoid being overly subjective, I attempted to refrain from making generalizations about the interviewees’ replies and, in addition to stating the perspectives from which I approached this study, I attempted to avoid inferring details from my own
mentoring relationships during my analysis of the data. In addition, I recognize that it may not be possible to generalize findings obtained while studying highly productive mentoring relationships to all mentoring relationships within the sport management academy.
4.0 RESULTS

As described in the Methodology chapter, four mentors and nine protégés participated in this study. The amount of time that had elapsed (as of the interview date) since the protégés completed their doctoral degrees varied from 2 to 18 years, with an average of 7.22 years ($SD = 4.99$). Although this was a qualitative study that highlighted the participants’ responses and quotations as opposed to numerical data, it is important to provide these average and standard deviation values because of the evolutionary nature of mentoring relationships. As presented in the Discussion chapter, the individual relationships that exist between mentors and their protégés change as the protégés progress throughout their own careers. Therefore, it is important to provide descriptive statistics regarding the amount of time that had elapsed since the protégés had completed their doctoral degrees. Because of the small protégé sample size, comparing responses between protégés who had recently graduated (e.g., two to four years ago) and protégés who had graduated many years ago (e.g., approximately ten or more years ago) was not feasible. For example, both protégés from one of the lineages graduated recently (two and four years ago) while protégés from another lineage graduated 11 and nine years ago, respectively. Consequently, I was unable to determine whether variance among the protégés’ responses could be attributed to differences in the amount of time since graduation or attributed to differences associated with each mentor’s individual actions. However, it is worth noting that some variance in the time since graduation did exist.

As the following results clearly indicate, dissertation advisors provided many mentoring functions for their former doctoral students. Furthermore, in some cases, the former doctoral students explicitly stated that they still consider their advisors to be
mentors today. Therefore, my initial assumption that sport management dissertation
advisors provide mentoring functions for their doctoral students was supported. As a
result, the terms advisor and mentor are used interchangeably throughout the remaining
chapters of this thesis. For the sake of clarity, when describing dissertation advisors’
former students, the word former is often omitted. It is understood, however, that they
were former (and not current) protégés as all participants had completed their doctoral
degrees.

When possible, specific reference to the respondents’ categorization (mentor or
protégé) and/or lineage (A, B, C, D, or E) is provided in the results. In cases where
identifying the specific participants could potentially compromise their identities, general
references are given.

When asked to describe what it was like to work with their advisors, protégés
overwhelmingly indicated that it was a positive experience. Seven of the nine protégés
explicitly mentioned or confirmed that it was a positive experience, describing it as
“great,” “a very pleasant experience,” or as “excellent” and “I couldn’t have imagined it
being any better.” Five protégés said their experience was fun or enjoyable. Of these, two
protégés specified how much they enjoyed conversing and interacting with their mentors,
while another protégé described how much she appreciated her advisor’s work-life
balance and her ability to take a break, “grab a beer” and then get back work.

Protégés A1 and A2 were very consistent in their descriptions of what it was like
to work with their advisor. They described him as a fair, efficient, and targeted advisor
with a very straightforward approach to completing the doctoral degree, and especially
the dissertation component. These protégés also said that they respected their advisor’s
ability to follow through on his commitments, as well as the clarity with which he expressed his expectations, and cited professionalism as the foundation of their relationships. Other protégés were not nearly as explicit in their descriptions but did mention that their advisors were somewhat hands-off, yet available if needed; that their advisors were helpful during their degree and even after graduation; that they were very efficient and provided feedback in a very timely manner; and said that their mentor was wonderful to work with but also held very high expectations.

Although the majority of the protégés’ descriptions were favourable, a few of the responses were presented with a less positive connotation. One protégé said that although he found his advisor’s tendency to supervise from a macro perspective frustrating at times, he acknowledged that he benefitted much more by doing things for himself. Another protégé indicated that his experience was sometimes demanding, difficult and tedious. However, it should be noted that both protégés who expressed these frustrations or difficulties did explicitly indicate that their overall experience was “great” and “very pleasant,” respectively.

There was some variance in the descriptions given by protégés regarding the different locations and types of interactions that they had with their mentors during their doctoral degrees. In most instances, protégés’ interactions with their advisors involved formally scheduled, one-on-one meetings that took place in the advisor’s office or exchanges in the classroom during courses and seminars. However, protégés also interacted with their advisors outside of the academic environment. Examples of this included playing tennis, golf or softball, taking their dogs to the dog park, having lunch or coffee together, and going out for dinner or having dinner at their mentors’ house.
Overall, the protégés’ descriptions of their experiences with their advisors during their doctoral degrees were very positive. The results of the research questions and sub-questions, supplemented with appropriate participant quotes, are presented below.

4.1 Mentoring Functions

The first research question in this study sought to determine what mentoring functions sport management doctoral dissertation advisors provided for their doctoral students. This was completed by asking dissertations advisors what specific mentoring functions they provided for their former doctoral students, by asking former doctoral students what specific mentoring functions they received from their advisors, and by comparing these responses.

Since Kram’s (1980, 1988) framework of mentoring functions was adopted for this study, I attempted to place the participants’ responses within Kram’s career (sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments) and psychosocial (role modelling, acceptance and confirmation, counselling, and friendship) functions. At times, the participants’ responses were very difficult to classify as many of the functions are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Oftentimes, study participants easily described a process that they either provided (mentors) or received (protégés), but had more difficulty breaking the overall outcomes into specific mentoring functions. For example, when asked to describe how his advisor provided guidance, counselling or advice, Protégé B1 replied “yeah that’s a hard question because all of the above in numerous ways.” Protégé D1 added that her advisor “knew what skills I needed to be successful and she made sure I had those skills” thereby alluding to the overall
process and outcomes that she received but not the individual steps that her mentor undertook. As explained in the Discussion chapter, some modifications to Kram’s mentoring functions may be required in order to effectively capture many of the nuances found in academia and the resultant mentoring functions that are associated with these differences.

The provision of mentoring functions depends on a number of factors including the mentors’ characteristics and their ability to provide specific functions, the protégés’ characteristics and their developmental needs, and any situational factors in the mentoring relationships (Kram, 1988). Although mentors described the various mentoring functions that they provided for their protégés, and collectively these descriptions encompassed all of Kram’s (1988) functions, the frequency of each function varied. For example, mentors described considerably more examples of coaching than of protection. Mentors also cited the psychosocial function of counseling much more frequently than role modeling. Similarly, the protégés’ responses collectively included all of Kram’s mentoring functions but differed in frequency. Protégés provided fewer examples of sponsorship and protection as compared to coaching and exposure and visibility, along with more examples of role modeling in comparison to acceptance and confirmation. As explained in the Discussion chapter, there are a number of possible reasons for these variances in the frequency with which particular functions were identified by participants.

In addition to the direct mentoring functions provided by mentors, protégés also reported receiving mentoring-like functions from other sources. A number of protégés said that they benefitted from guidance provided by other faculty members who were at
their institutions while they were completing their doctoral degrees. In some cases, protégés described how their programs or institutions were set up to foster student development and encouraged senior students to take an active role in providing assistance to their junior colleagues. For example, senior students would regularly explain the importance of conference presentations and would help junior students develop material to submit to relevant conferences. This assistance may have consequently reduced the mentoring functions and support mentors provided for their protégés. One protégé felt it was important to note that this reduction in mentoring functions could be attributed to the structure of his doctoral program and not a deficient relationship between him and his advisor. He also added that while he did not require extensive mentoring, he could easily have asked for assistance if it was needed.

A number of mentors indicated that they provide mentoring functions with the intent of giving their students an experience that is improved from the mentors’ own doctoral experience and/or with the purpose of bettering the mentoring and doctoral experience for future generations. Mentors repeatedly summarized that one of their main goals was to discover each student’s post-degree intentions, determine the steps that would be required to achieve those goals, and assist the student with the execution of the steps in order to accomplish these outcomes. For example, Mentor D stated that:

I think each student has been different and each student had a different plan or professional plan of where they wanted to head. So the idea was to figure out how to help that student and help him or her be successful in their quest to be a faculty member.

Mentor E added:

I always try to figure out what it is they want to do, you know, so … usually I know if they really want to go to a research institution or if they want to go more
Mentors also expressed the need to assist students with the successful and timely completion of the dissertation process, the need to help students become confident and productive academics while possibly weaning them off of their mentor’s support, and the responsibility of helping students find their “first academic home.” But as mentioned above, simply describing these tasks does not adequately express the processes that mentors employ with their students and does not allow others to learn from these mentoring relationships. Consequently, I have attempted to break these tasks into their component steps according to Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions framework.

In addition, a number of advisors suggested that effective mentors were able to recognize and understand each of their protégés’ individual needs and tailor their mentoring approach(es) accordingly. One mentor described this process as “situational advising,” which he suggested may be analogous to Hersey and Blanchard’s (1969) situational leadership theory. He indicated that mentors needed “to have the skills to handle them hands-on, you have to have the skills to handle them hands-off and it’s your own judgment as to what that particular student needs at that particular time to be successful.”

4.1.1 Mentors’ Perceptions of the Career Functions

With respect to career functions, mentors described sponsoring their protégés by serving as references for them during their job search and by writing letters in support of their protégés’ abilities. Despite the fact that only a few examples of direct nomination (which is required for sponsorship classification) were provided, it is possible that
sponsorship occurs more frequently, yet perhaps more indirectly. An explanation of how this indirect sponsorship may be present in many aspects of the mentors’ actions can be found in the Discussion chapter.

Mentors also provided their protégés with exposure and visibility. Mentors provided opportunities to increase their students’ profile and reputation throughout the academic community by allowing their protégés to guest lecture or teach some of their respective mentor’s courses and by providing opportunities for their students to co-author or write book chapters with which the mentors were involved. In addition, three of the four mentors unequivocally described the important networking functions they provided for their protégés. Mentor A said “when we go to conferences I’ll introduce my doctoral students to my colleagues in the field to help them develop their own network, particularly as it comes time to, you know, looking for positions.” Likewise, Mentor E added “I introduce students to people at NASSM [the North American Society for Sport Management conference] that I think they would benefit from knowing.” One mentor also described how she used to circulate a listing of “all of the former students and the institutions that they were at so that students would know how to network” and would have access to contact information for all of her former protégés.

Moving beyond Kram’s (1988) conceptualization of exposing individuals to influential others, I also considered the mentors’ actions of socializing their protégés into the profession of academia to be an act of exposure and visibility. Mentor A described how he involves his students in projects obtained through his university’s research institute, thereby allowing students to become familiar with the research process, various topics within their sport management discipline, and organizations conducting business in
these areas. Mentor D also described a series of independent studies that she assigned to her doctoral students in order to expose them to many aspects of sport management and academia. Depending on the profile of her current students, these were administered individually or in a group setting, and would involve “a series of articles to read about what’s going on in the field, and how you publish [or] how you present.” The second phase of the independent study required students to complete a “review of research” and “for some students it was a refresher [while] for some students who didn’t do a master’s thesis it was a way to get them introduced to research methods.” These tasks certainly provided exposure and visibility to various aspects of sport management and academia and also allowed Mentor D to provide a great deal of coaching to her students.

Mentors coached their protégés on many aspects during their graduate education including course selection, choosing suitable dissertation topics and recommending appropriate journals and outlets for publication. For example, Mentor A said that his help included “from an academic standpoint, you know, the kind of bread and butter – what courses to take and how to design their program[s]” and that he “recommend[ed] certain journals that might be most appropriate for their research.” Mentor A also added:

I try to teach them everything I know, the other faculty try to teach them everything they know, and then the students bring of course their own knowledge base, so theoretically the student is better than we are at the time they leave. Perhaps not more experienced [but] at least their knowledge is that collective wisdom that comes from our faculty and what they have, what they bring to the table.

One mentor also watched her students perform their own teaching responsibilities and provided feedback on their performances. Other mentors helped their students finish in a timely manner by setting deadlines and coaching them on the steps they need to complete in order to obtain their degrees. Mentor D explained that she has had a number of great
students who simply required set deadlines. As a result, she would say “okay, we’re going to defend on X date and then I want you to work backwards from that date to get yourself prepared.” By doing this, she was able to work with her students to build their confidence and understand what was needed to finish their degrees.

In addition, all mentors described how they coached their protégés through the research process and demonstrated the steps required to complete research projects and publications. For example, Mentor D used the independent studies previously mentioned to facilitate this process while Mentor A involved his doctoral students in projects obtained through his university’s research institution.

Another critical experience that the mentors coached their protégés through was the job search process. While these tasks frequently overlapped between the career function of coaching and the psychosocial function of counselling described below, mentors provided support and guidance to protégés when it came time to creating their curriculum vitas (CV), drafting research agendas, preparing cover letters, organizing job applications and generally getting the students’ materials ready for the job market. One mentor even described how she provided her students with sample interview questions and sometimes conducted mock interviews to assist with the interview process. Overall, mentors reported the greatest number of coaching examples in comparison to the other career mentoring functions.

In contrast to the multiple instances of coaching and exposure and visibility, only one mentor described a mentoring action that I was able to classify as protection. When her students graduated and began teaching at their new institutions, Mentor E shared with
them any relevant teaching materials from classes that she had previously taught. As she explained:

I think that that actually is one of the biggest helps that you can provide someone because you know some of these places that they go they’re teaching four classes or whatever. If you at least provide them an outline of some of the things that you’ve done for two of them it takes a real load off [them].

By sharing these materials, Mentor E was potentially able to alleviate some of her students’ workload, leaving them with more time to put towards other responsibilities associated with their new jobs or other areas in their lives. This action could possibly have helped to protect the students from the overload and stress of adjusting to life as an academic.

Finally, mentors also described instances of providing challenging assignments for their students. A number of mentors said that they established challenging publishing and presentation expectations. For instance one mentor required that his students deliver two presentations per annual NASSM conference while another mentor expected that her students would have completed between two and five publications and/or presentations by the time they graduated. Mentor D shared that sometimes her students would ask “who’s side are you on?” and she would reply “I’m on your side but you know I have to push you a little bit too.” Other mentors provided challenging assignments in the form of dissertation topic selection exercises. They asked their students to think about possible dissertation topics and then over the course of a few months or even a few semesters, and sometimes with the assistance of formal writing activities, these topics were narrowed down to an eventual selection.

With respect to providing overarching challenging assignments, a number of mentors held specific, and often demanding, requirements and expectations. Mentor C
described how he expected his students to continuously read and write and added that “I will not allow them any leniency in terms of working hard and doing their work.” In fact, as explained in the Discussion chapter, the entire process of obtaining a doctoral degree could be seen as a challenging assignment.

4.1.2 Mentors’ Perceptions of the Psychosocial Functions

In contrast to the protégés’ responses listed below, mentors did not provide many direct examples of their own role modelling behaviours. One mentor said that through his own role modelling he tries to teach his students the value of working “hard day in and day out,” achieving desired outcomes, and being proud but not boastful of these achievements. Conversely, another mentor said she did not purposefully role model for her students.

Mentors reported a number of instances when they provided acceptance and confirmation for their students. One mentor explicitly described how although he did not disclose his intentions to his students, he would go for lunch with those students who he perceived to “need a little more encouragement and a little more support.” By expressing his support and fellowship, he could help to build his students’ confidence and sense of positive self-regard. Another mentor also believed her responsibilities included building her students’ confidence, and she sometimes suggested students read uplifting self-improvement books in order to facilitate this confidence building process. Mentor D explained that humour was an important part of her relationships and that it was critical to be supportive but candid with students. Mentor E agreed that honesty was a key component and said that she tried to be:
as supportive as possible but also very honest in my assessments. So, for example, if someone writes a paper and brings it in and you know I don’t think it’s all that great, then I’m not going to say that it’s really great. I’m going to somehow, someway try to provide constructive criticism in a way that doesn’t completely deflate them.

According to Kram (1988), mentors and protégés are able to “derive a sense of self from the positive regard conveyed by the other” (p. 35) through acceptance and confirmation. Applying this description specifically to academia, I have included examples of how mentors accept and encourage their protégés’ unique research interests and desired outcomes. For example, Mentor E dispelled the notion that the degree to which a mentor benefitted was directly related to their protégés’ outcomes. By recognizing that they benefit regardless of their protégés’ intentions, mentors can determine where their students would like to be from a career standpoint (i.e., teaching or research institutions) and help them achieve those goals rather than suggesting they pursue a career that would serve the mentor’s interests. In a similar fashion, a number of mentors specified that they allowed their students to select their own dissertation topics rather than assigning students a portion of the mentor’s ongoing research agenda. By accepting the students’ chosen topic (providing that the chosen topic falls within the mentor’s research scope), mentors could confirm that the students’ research area and specific dissertation topic are worthwhile.

Mentors reported providing a significant amount of counselling for their protégés. Mentor A likened his assistance to “fatherly advice,” saying “the academic advice is certainly there,” but that he also provided “the fatherly advice on their careers and their path and what they can expect.” Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of the mentors’ counselling responses pertained to helping protégés with their job search and the
selection of their first “academic home.” Mentors continuously assisted students in determining the type of university they wished to pursue, identifying their strengths and weaknesses and evaluating how these matched with the requirements of the prospective institutions. When asked how he provides guidance, counselling, or advice for his students Mentor A stated “overall it’s helping them choose their first academic home. In other words, from all of the places where they’ve been offered positions to try and help them determine what’s the best fit for them.”

He added:

so whether it’s a research I institution or whether it’s, you know, more of a balance between teaching and research or primarily a teaching institution I try to help the student identify what would be a good fit for them given their motivations and skills and career direction.

During these discussions mentors used their knowledge of the field of sport management along with any specific insight they may have into a particular institution to help their protégés evaluate the job postings or openings and determine the best opportunities.

Mentors also counselled their protégés on the importance of maintaining a balance between school or work obligations and their personal lives/commitments. Although variance between male and female mentoring styles was not intentionally examined in this study, there was a small but unexpected sex related finding involving the provision of counselling. Interestingly, both male mentors indicated that they tried not to cross into their students personal lives and had only provided personal assistance in a few situations. In contrast, both female mentors seemed to be more involved with at least a few of their protégés’ personal lives. For instance, one mentor described how some of her students have encountered a number of personal problems:
I mean I’ve seen students go through divorce, go through all sorts of personal things. And so part of it was always just to be there to, you know, listen, and to help him or her with that situation. And, you know, if they asked for advice, try to give it. If they didn’t, just listen. I think there were a couple of students that I had, I mean, I know that they were going through a divorce when they were in school and they were probably ready to quit but they didn’t.

These students expressed their gratitude towards their mentor and told her that “they [did not] know, to be honest, if they would have made it with another advisor.” This highlights the critically important role advisors play and how an advisor’s counselling can help students successfully complete their degrees.

Finally, mentors described instances of how they provided Kram’s (1988) friendship function. As detailed in subsequent sections of the Results chapter, mentors certainly consider some of their former protégés to be friends. However, since I asked mentors about their relationships with their former (and not their current) protégés, I was not able to determine whether the friendship component developed before or after the students had graduated. Likewise, I was not able to determine whether mentors provided friendship during the protégés’ doctoral education or whether this aspect developed afterwards. An elaboration of this function as it relates to academic mentoring can be found in the Discussion chapter.

In addition to her description of friendship, Kram’s (1988) final psychosocial function included a mutuality component. Although a conclusion cannot be made regarding the presence of friendship, there is clear evidence that these academic mentoring relationships contained mutuality. For example, Mentor D said she “tried to set up a relationship where it was comfortable, where you called me [by my first name] you didn’t call me Dr. [last name]. I didn’t like the doctor,” thereby bringing their relationship to a mutual, first name basis. Another mentor added “I have never allowed any of my
students to call me Dr. or Sir, it’s always [my first name].” Mentor E stated “I think that you have to develop a general respect for one another. So they have to somehow come to respect me and vice versa, I have to come to respect them.” Mentor C agreed with this notion, believing that faith and trust are central relationship characteristics. He said his students must believe:

that I am there only for them, it’s not for my personal glory and satisfaction. They have to have that faith and I have to have that trust in them that they are doing, they are trying their best to do the best.

He added:

the most important one is the trust and … I will be able to create that trust in the first place by allowing them to do what they wanted to do, the [dissertation] topic. Then my interest is not served. If I have interests that they should do [a particular topic], then it is for my benefit [that] they will be working. Now because of this that trust is created.

Taken together, these actions help to create trust, honesty, and a sense of mutuality amongst mentors and protégés in academic mentoring relationships.

4.1.3 Protégés’ Perceptions of the Career Functions

Three protégés reported that their mentors provided direct sponsorship actions on their behalf. These activities included writing reference letters in support of their protégés, and often taking that support one step further, making phone calls to faculty members with job openings in order to endorse their protégés’ suitability for the positions. Protégé A2 explained “certainly he is a guy who can make phone calls and say look, this is someone with some ability and the people on the other end of the phone would tend to listen to that.” Protégés C1 and C2 described how their mentor offered them invitations to speak as invited guests or guest lecturers. In some instances, Mentor C
arranged these invitations so that they corresponded with job openings at specific institutions where the protégés were interested in applying. According to Protégé C1, “there was always a kind of unwritten rule that [my mentor] would take care of his own.” In addition, Protégé E2 described how his mentor recommended him for an undergraduate teaching assignment. This was particularly helpful for him as he was hoping to work within a teaching institution upon completion of his degree and this allowed him to gain valuable teaching experience that he could then leverage during the job search process. Through these sponsorship actions, mentors were able to use their influence and reputation in the field of sport management to provide their protégés’ with career-related opportunities.

Protégés gave a number of examples of how their advisors provided them with exposure and visibility. Many protégés indicated that their mentors helped them understand the research and publication process by including them in research projects and involving them in writing journal articles and book chapters. Similarly, several protégés indicated that they were furnished with opportunities to guest lecture or co-instruct classes with their mentors. Protégés also reported that their mentors exposed them to the various aspects of academia, with Protégé B1 saying “when I was a doctoral student [my mentor] did a great job of letting me get exposed to different things, [including] … consulting projects, … scholarly research, as well as … program approval.” One protégé also indicated that his mentor served as the NASSM President and Past-President while he was a doctoral student which allowed him to become involved in some of the conference planning. He said he was very appreciative of the exposure he received, recalling that his mentor “did a nice job of exposing me to a lot of
those different kinds of experiences” and adding that it “definitely made me aware of what all went into the various hats we wear as a faculty member in the sport management discipline.” Protégé D2 described the exposure and visibility her advisor provided her for by saying:

the very first semester on campus she had an independent study that she had set up with me that just got me familiar with things I needed to know about research and about [the] campus and all sorts of things. At the time, I didn’t realize how beneficial all of that information would be, but she knew exactly what she was doing and got me started right away.

Through this independent study and the many other actions their mentors took, protégés were exposed to, amongst others, the various aspects of the research process, the field of sport management, and academia in general.

In addition to being exposed to the various aspects of academia, protégés described how their mentors leveraged their own reputations and connections within NASSM to increase their protégés’ visibility by providing the protégés with networking opportunities and introducing them to influential individuals. Protégé E1 stated:

well you know one thing that really sort of sticks out in my mind is my very first NASSM. She really made it a point to go around and introduce me to people that she was connected to at NASSM within the field and that was huge, huge, because I got to meet those people and now when I go to NASSM I still know those people. I can go to them and say “hello, how have you been?” and I can strike up conversations and so I feel like I have a little bit of a network or a support system at NASSM and not because I’ve done these things great and fantastic in my short career but because she took me around and made it a point to say “hey, this is my student …” and helped me make those connections.

In fact, protégés provided many examples that demonstrated the value that they placed on their networking experiences, and these illustrations can be found in Appendix J. The protégés’ networking connections and resultant outcomes gained through their mentors’
introductions were beneficial in many ways. One protégé described how she met one of her closest personal and professional friends through her mentor, saying:

we do more work together than anyone else that either of us does work with and we also are extremely close friends … we share common interests, are at similar stages in our career and in our life outside of our career with our families, so that has been a huge, huge personal and professional benefit that has come from the connections to [my mentor].

This same protégé also explained how networking and maintaining contact with people from within her advisor’s lineage has led to the hiring of a fellow former advisee at her institution.

Protégés overwhelmingly described instances of how their mentors coached them throughout their doctoral experience. All nine protégés explicitly detailed at least one instance of how their advisor provided coaching on some aspect (and usually multiple aspects) of the doctoral program, the field of sport management, and/or academia. For example, Protégé B1 said his advisor provided valuable advice and guidance related to his studies as well as his dissertation and related research, consequently making it very difficult for him to distinguish and describe all of the specific examples. A number of protégés described how their mentors familiarized them with academia in general and other protégés noted that their mentors assisted them with their transition back to school, as they had taken some time away from their education before beginning their doctoral degrees. Protégés A1 and C2 both said that their mentors acted as a “sounding board,” answering questions related to the overall doctoral process and the research process, respectively. Protégés A2 and D1 echoed these sentiments, with Protégé D1 describing how her mentor, who was so well entrenched in the university, “knew the places and people to send me to” for help with her cognate area concentration and specific research
method. Numerous protégés described how their mentors assisted them with the research and the writing processes by stressing the importance of theoretical foundations, mapping the steps involved in data collection, outlining the data analysis procedures, providing writing guidance, and offering editorial feedback. Protégés also described the critical role their advisors played in their dissertation topic selection. In addition to the job search related counselling described below, protégés also received job search related coaching. Mentors provided assistance with preparing curriculum vitae and application letters, gave practice interview questions, and discussed relevant job negotiation tactics and questions.

In comparison to coaching, protégés provided fewer examples of protection. Protégés reported that their mentors sometimes shielded them from potential conflicts and helped them avoid future pitfalls. Protégé A1 believed it is very important that an advisor “protect you from the wants, needs and aspirations from other committee members in order to utilize your research for their personal benefit” and said that his advisor “made sure that that [the protégés’ research being used for other purposes] didn’t happen.” Protégé E2 said he felt that his mentor “always had my best interests in mind” and Protégé A2 described an instance where his advisor adamantly requested that he cancel an upcoming job interview. While slightly confused at the time, Protégé A2 later realized that his mentor “had a bigger perspective than I did and frankly, he knew what he was talking about” as the job would not have been an ideal fit for him. By expressing his concern, his mentor protected him from any potential frustration and difficulties associated with an incompatible faculty position.

Similar to the protection function, protégés described fewer instances where their mentors provided challenging assignments. Protégé E1 recalled a situation where her
mentor challenged her to move beyond her initial research ideas and to instead create a more theoretically based research question. This, in turn, helped to spur her shift towards theoretically grounded thinking, which she described as an important outcome of her doctoral training. Protégé C1 said that in general his mentor demanded excellence and that although his mentor provided the support to accompany his high expectations, it was at times, very challenging. As described in the mentor’s Results section above, the entire doctoral process may also be seen as a challenging assignment. Further explanation of this is provided in the Discussion chapter.

4.1.4 Protégés’ Perceptions of the Psychosocial Functions

In comparison to the mentors’ responses, protégés cited many more and varied examples of how their mentors served as role models. Some protégés provided examples of their mentors’ professionalism, with Protégé C1 saying his mentor was “very good as far as teaching on what it means to be a professional in education, what is expected of you … [and how to deal] with political issues within academi[a].” Protégé A2 described his mentor as a:

a leader by example and I think that it was really about almost this uber-professionalism. He wasn’t the kind of guy who was sitting back with me and throwing down beers on a Saturday night. It was about doing the task at hand and I think that I kind of carried that forward with how I interact with my colleagues and my students. That you should like people, you should be friendly with people, but you need to do the job and don’t do things that will jeopardize how people see you. So he was very professional with his doctoral students.

Some protégés indicated that they were able to take aspects of their mentors’ teaching styles and incorporate them into their own approaches while others said their mentors exemplified “a really great researcher and a really great teacher.” A number of
protégés indicated that as a result of the positive mentoring experience they received from their advisors, they were now in a better position to interact with their own students in an advising capacity. Protégé C2 stated that “I’ve tried to do that [i.e., aspects of his advisor’s mentoring style] with my students who I mentor now as well, so I guess seeing how he interacted helped me later on.” Protégé B1 said that he sometimes finds himself unintentionally mimicking his mentor’s actions and mannerisms while Protégé C1 summarized his role modelling experience as:

I benefitted from learning how to deal with students one-on-one, how to take, you know, if I’ve got an honours student or a graduate students who’s doing a thesis I think that I am much more fully prepared than a lot of the other professors that I see to deal with those cases because of what I’ve seen from [my mentor].

Protégé D2 described her mentor as a great role model for how to be successful and as someone who kept a work life balance. She stated “she was such a good role model herself and just seeing how she conducted herself and all of the things that she was able to accomplish with her own teaching and research and working with the doc students,” adding:

she made me realize that, you know, it’s okay to have fun. Work hard, play hard. [She] knows when it’s time to take a break and go grab a beer and, then we’ll get back to work. I think she was about teaching …. life-work balance because she does such a good job with that herself. She works very hard but she does do some fun things too.

Protégé E2 said his mentor “was a role model, she was someone I looked up to and I hope to be like her in many ways” and that:

I think that, you know, I still strive to be like her. I want to continue to improve my teaching and I certainly want to work on publications …. I don’t know that I’ll ever, you know, reach the same level [as her] on both but it’s certainly something to aspire to. She’s still doing it, you know, she didn’t reach a level and stop so I think that’s how I see it now.
Protégés reported a number of examples of how their mentor accepted their various decisions and confirmed their skills and ability to succeed within the field of sport management. More specifically, Protégé C2 recalled his mentors’ acceptance of his dissertation topic, saying:

I remember we sat down at the beginning of the second year and I told him I was thinking of switching over to that area and he said that he was actually going to recommend that because I had done more stuff in the area of [that topic] and seemed to enjoy that more and so that encouragement really helped because it’s good to have your chair on board with what you’re doing.

Protégé E2 described how his mentor was always open to his ideas, how “he never felt looked down upon” and “never felt that he couldn’t come to her” especially with matters related to his dissertation research. He also clearly remembered her stating that going through the dissertation process was not a hazing exercise and that she was there to help guide him with his personal, professional, and theoretical development. In terms of eventual career selection, Protégé D2 described how her mentor accepted her for who she was, tried to help her discover her interests and determine what she wanted to after graduation, but did not push her to become a faculty member. Protégé D1 also described how when she was presented with an excellent employment opportunity, her advisor accepted and even encouraged her decision to go ABD (All But Dissertation), a term referring to students who have completed their coursework requirements and comprehensive examinations but not their doctoral dissertations.

With respect to confirmation of their abilities, numerous protégés cited their mentors’ ability to build their confidence and reassure them that they could be successful in academia and the field of sport management. Protégé C1 described how he was able to gain confidence through his mentor’s expectations for excellence and ensuing support.
Similarly, Protégé D2 described her mentor as “my own personal cheerleader” who was there to push and encourage her throughout, and beyond, her doctoral education.

Counselling was the most widely and frequently reported psychosocial mentoring function, as all nine protégés provided examples of how their mentors counselled them on various aspects of the job search process. Protégés overwhelmingly described how their mentors would use their experience in the field of sport management along with their knowledge of other institutions and departments to help guide their protégés with their career selection. For example, Protégé D1 stated that her advisor was:

> very helpful in sifting through the ads and kind of pointing out well this might be a good fit for you and I know so-and-so who’s there or who had been there and you know you should talk to this person so I think just from the initial stages of that she was very helpful.

Another protégé confirmed that her mentor provided job selection assistance by suggesting key criteria that she should be aware of throughout her position search. She also confided that she still uses these criteria in conjunction with her mentor’s opinion when considering prospective jobs opportunities today. Similarly, Protégé A2 recalled how his advisor provided pivotal career guidance by indicating schools that he should avoid applying to as they would not be an ideal fit for him.

In addition to the extensive job search counselling they received, protégés also reported that their mentors counselled them on how to handle specific situations such as dealing with politics in academia and provided continual advice and guidance, confirming “I can’t think of one [instance] where she wasn’t providing guidance or counselling in some way” (Protégé D2).

Finally, as previously mentioned I am unable to determine whether the mentors and protégés established friendship relationships before or after the protégés completed
their degree requirements. Nevertheless, protégés described how their mentors provided them with aspects of mutuality. A number of protégés indicated that their mentors treated them like peers or equals, never emphasizing the power and status differences that existed between each member. Protégés were often told to call their mentors by their first names, which also served to lessen power and status differences. In addition, some protégés explicitly expressed how much they respected and trusted their mentors and how these feelings remained long after their formal education experience was complete.

4.1.5 Comparison of Perceptions of Mentoring Functions

The intent of this section was not to arduously compare the specific responses provided by mentors and protégés, but to instead present a summarized description of the mentoring functions provided in these relationships. Overall, the mentors’ and the protégés’ perceptions of the mentoring functions provided were fairly consistent. Both groups collectively described all of the functions contained in Kram’s (1988) framework and also reported rather consistent frequencies regarding the various functions provided. For example, both mentors and protégés recounted the greatest number of counselling, coaching, and exposure and visibility functions while simultaneously describing fewer instances of sponsorship and protection.

Mentors and protégés provided similar descriptions for the exposure and visibility function, with both groups indicating the importance of socialization into the profession through exposure to various areas of research, teaching, and service, among others. Mentors and protégés also described the critical importance of networking and the positive outcomes that resulted from these introductions and associations. Likewise,
mentors and protégés were consistent in their explanations of coaching and challenging assignments. Important areas of coaching included: course selection; the doctoral education process; dissertation topic selection; the research process; the writing process; theoretical development; and the job search process. Many of the challenging assignments involved publishing and presenting expectations.

With respect to the sponsorship and protection functions, the protégés’ and mentors’ examples differed. Interestingly, mentors only described sponsoring their protégés by writing reference letters while protégés included how their mentors would make supportive phone calls on their behalf. One protégé’s response also contained a description of how his mentor protected him from any conflicting wants or needs of his committee members while one mentor explained how she shared their teaching materials with her former protégés who were now instructing their own classes, possibly protecting them from some of the difficulties associated with the transition from doctoral student to faculty member.

Both mentors and protégés overwhelmingly indicated the importance of counselling, and more specifically assisting protégés in selecting their first academic homes. A comparison of other psychosocial function responses revealed that protégés provided many more examples of role modelling while the groups provided consistent descriptions of mutuality. Specifically, protégés expressed how their mentors led by example, displayed positive instances of how to interact with students, and demonstrated the importance of work-life balance. Both groups also said their relationships were built on a first name basis and that they respected the other member. Finally, mentors and
protégés described how the protégés’ confidence was built and how their decisions and interests were affirmed through the acceptance and confirmation function.

Interestingly, one mentor and both protégés from a specific lineage provided a description of a contract that the mentor supplied for his/her protégés. While I do not believe that it was a formally binding contract, it did help to lay out the nature of the relationships and what students could expect as they progressed through the program. The mentor would outline the specific expectations he/she had for his/her protégés and the expectations he/she had for him/herself. The mentor would also ask the protégés to fill in the expectations that they had for their mentor. Based on the descriptions provided by the participants, the contract represents an excellent example of how this mentor provided a wide range of functions for his/her protégés while highlighting the interrelated nature of these mentoring functions. For example, the participants indicated that the contract contained all of the components that would be required in order to successfully complete the doctoral degree as well as clarified publishing expectations for conference presentations and journal submissions. Activities designed to help socialize protégés into the profession were also included in the contractual agreement. Finally, the contract contained other extracurricular or social activities and requests desired by either party, such as playing a round of golf with students, visiting students at their places of employment or meeting for monthly lunch appointments.

Incorporating the mentoring functions described above, the contract specified that the mentor may be obligated to provide a number of mentoring actions for his/her students. These included (but were not limited to) the following functions: coaching through the doctoral education process, exposure and visibility to the field of sport
management and the responsibilities associated with an academic career, challenging assignments in the form of publishing expectations, accepting and confirming the students’ research interests, counselling the student on academic and career related matters, and providing a mutual relationship that is built on collegiality and interaction inside and outside of academia.

4.1.6 Most Valuable Mentoring Functions Provided

After describing the mentoring functions that they provided (mentors) or received (protégés), participants were asked to identify the specific function that was most valuable to the protégés’ success. Although some mentors suggested more than one action, there was little overlap between their responses. Two mentors believed that strengthening the protégés’ research competency and providing a theoretical, research oriented foundation was most important, while other mentors suggested that being supportive, emphasizing a work-life balance, assisting with the selection of the protégés' first academic home, and adapting their mentoring style to meet the protégés’ needs were most important to the protégés’ successes.

With a few exceptions, protégés also lacked consistency in their specific descriptions of the most valuable mentoring functions. Two protégés said that it was not possible to identify a single most valuable function. Of these, one protégé believed that the functions her mentor provided for her were all related and it was the combination of these functions that lead to an excellent outcome, while another protégé felt that it was simply the “advising in graduate school” that was most valuable. In addition, Protégés C1 and C2 both described the importance of how their mentor taught them the research and
the writing process while furthering their ability to think critically. The other most valuable mentoring actions that the protégés believed their mentors provided for them included: demanding excellence, networking, building their confidence, setting clear expectations, providing the opportunity to teach undergraduate classes, and general relationship building. Relating these actions to the mentoring functions described above, exposure and visibility was the most frequently mentioned function followed by coaching, and then challenging assignments and acceptance and confirmation. However, as noted in the Discussion chapter, participants may not have been aware of or may not have understood each of Kram’s mentoring functions and therefore the applicability of this frequency listing is limited.

4.2 Nature of the Current Relationship

The second research question sought to examine the nature of the current relationship between sport management doctoral dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students. Sub-questions exploring the mentors’ and the protégés’ characterizations of their current relationships, along with a comparison of these characterizations aided in this examination. These findings, with relevant quotations from participants, are presented below.

4.2.1 Mentors’ Characterizations of their Current Relationships

Since the dissertation advisors were not told specifically which of their former students were being interviewed for this study, the advisors spoke about the nature of their current relationships with former students on a general level. Three of the four
advisors indicated that the nature of these relationships varies and that they may have several different types of relationships depending upon the individual student. As a result of this variance, it is not possible to describe the current status of all of the potential relationships.

While there may be a small number of exceptions, the majority of these relationships are positive. As Mentor A expressed, although it is a rare occurrence, any relationships that encounter an impasse or become negative are usually dissolved. Consequently, mentors described their relationships as “very good,” “positive,” and consisting of “mutual respect and admiration.”

The frequency with which mentors and former protégés interact varies and again, is dependent upon the specific individuals. Mentors reported interacting with their former students anywhere from once per year to once per week. For a number of mentors, their only interactions with some former protégés occur while both members are attending conferences. Those same mentors often speak monthly with some former protégés and once every few months with others. Mentor A estimated that he speaks with 50% of his former protégés on a monthly basis, 25% on a quarterly basis, and the remaining 25% bi-annually. One mentor has been known to send holiday cards to all former doctoral students, therefore providing at least once instance of interaction per year. Regardless of the frequency of interaction with her former protégés, Mentor E said she hoped they felt comfortable asking her for help:

some of them I am in less contact with, but even the ones that have less contact with me, I hope, I think, would feel comfortable calling me up and asking me for help or advice or whatever it may be, you know, even if it’s five years from now.
In addition to the frequency of the interactions, the nature of the interactions between mentors and former protégés also varies. As previously mentioned, mentors and former protégés see each other at conferences where they “catch up” over dinner or drinks, and some mentors even room with their former protégés. Mentors and protégés also collaborate on research projects. Some mentors elect to work only with those protégés who may require some extra publication assistance while other mentors continue their collaborations long after the protégés have graduated. In addition, mentors communicate with their former protégés via telephone and email. The specific frequency and mode of communication often depends upon the individual advisor. For example, Mentor C communicates primarily via email while Mentor D says the changing nature of her responsibilities unfortunately limits the time she can spend simply “chatting” with former students.

All mentors also indicated that they still provide various mentoring functions to some of their former students and serve as a resource when needed. For example, Mentor D said her involvement included “still getting calls and playing the supportive role. In some cases it’s still presenting and publishing with some former students.” Mentor C described how his former students still call him for advice and how he is proud that they come to him for assistance. Mentor C also provides publishing assistance for some students and Mentor E echoed these responses, claiming to provide publishing as well as career path assistance to her former students.

Three mentors indicated that they are friends with many of their former doctoral students. One mentor said “I think with some students it’s a friendship relationship now” and also indicated that “some students I room with when I go to conferences who I now
Another mentor called his/her doctoral students his “life friends” and said:

it’s a huge set of my friends because I would imagine like a lot of other professionals in this field, I spend more time working with the professionals in my field that I do with, say, with my neighbours in my hometown. And so my strongest friends are my professional colleagues, which include many of my former doctoral students.

However, while these relationships are still positive, in my estimation not all mentors and former protégés can be considered friends. One mentor said he/she is “quite close only in terms of affection and respect for each other.” He/she explains:

I respect them for their achievements since passing, since graduating, and I tell them it’s a matter of mutual respect and mutual admiration. They admire what I’m still doing, they like what I do … and I admire their achievements.

While this mentor implied that this mutual respect and admiration was a form of friendship, I believe that this conceptualization of friendship differs somewhat from the other mentors’ descriptions of the friendships that they have with their former doctoral students.

As these results demonstrate, relationships between mentors and former protégés are both personal and professional in nature. All mentors indicated that they have at least some involvement in their protégés’ current professional and personal lives, and this again varies depending on the individual students. For instance, sometimes the emails that are exchanged relate to current research collaborations while other messages simply inquire about the status of an individual’s family. Mentor E indicated that her involvement “runs the gamut from teaching to service to research to personal lives.”

Mentor A explained:

sometimes it’s “how are your kids?”, that kind of stuff more than, you know, “what are you researching right now?” … And sometimes it also depends on the
person. Some people are looking for more academic advice and some people are more interested in just maintaining friendships.

Mentor C provided additional support for the varying nature of these relationships, stating:

I interact with all of them but [with] some of them it’s not on the basis of their research. They are so smart, they are so good, they don’t need my advice so they don’t ask me. But some of them still need me and I would say in a month I would have calls from about three or four people about some questions, research questions, some statistical procedures, those kinds of questions will come up.

According to one of the mentors interviewed, there is an interplay between the amount of professional development and collegial friendship that he provides to his former protégés once they have graduated. In order to represent this concept graphically, he provided the model depicted in Figure 1. As students graduate and begin their own careers, he assists primarily with professional development tasks such as editing manuscripts for journal publications, suggesting appropriate outlets for publication, and providing support and advice for attending conferences. As former protégés progress through their careers, they become more confident and self-sufficient. They acquire additional publications and presentations and may also seek tenure. Consequently, protégés no longer require extensive professional advice and his assistance shifts from being mostly professional to being a collegial or friendship relationship.

Figure 1. One mentor’s depiction of the proportional relationship of professional development and collegial friendship provided to former protégés
Overall, almost all protégés indicated that their relationship with their advisor was positive and none of the protégés indicated that they had a negative relationship. When asked to describe their relationship, four protégés said that they consider their dissertation advisor to be a friend while three protégés explicitly stated that they consider their dissertation advisor to still be a mentor today. Interestingly, all three protégés who consider their advisor to be a mentor also consider their dissertation advisor to be a friend. For example, Protégé B1 said he thought that “the relationship has evolved to one of a collegial or friendship relationship” but also said “I still look at [my advisor] as a mentor today.” He agreed that while he still may ask for advice or guidance, it’s not the advisor- student relationship but instead has evolved to a more equal level. Protégé D2 called her advisor “one of my better friends” and added “I can always count on [my advisor] to give me good advice and at any point I can just pick up the phone and give her a call or send her an email and I know she’ll get right back to me with good advice.”

One protégé said she believed her friendship with her advisor has evolved but she still considered it to be a solid friendship. She also expressed that although (at the time of the interview) she had completed her doctoral degree two years earlier, her advisor is still a mentor to her today. She provides assistance in many ways including sharing feedback on potential job openings and giving publishing advice. Protégé D2 indicated that her advisor now provides her with guidance regarding her career path and specifically with respect to potential administrative opportunities and responsibilities. As these protégés indicate, the advice and guidance provided to them by their mentors span a wide variety of topics. In addition, Protégés A1 and B1 described their dissertation advisors as
colleagues, with A1 elaborating “he’s still a colleague that I would consider [talking to] about anything that I thought was relevant to my professional career.”

The frequency with which protégés interacted with their dissertation advisors varied. The majority of the protégés indicated that they interact with their advisors regularly, and more specifically “every couple of months,” “several times per year,” “once per calendar quarter,” and “one to two times per semester.” Two protégés said they interact very infrequently, perhaps once or twice per year, as a result of their mentors’ time constraints. However, a number of protégés stressed that the infrequent interaction was not a result of a poor relationship but simply because they did not want to burden their advisors. In contrast, one protégé said she speaks with her mentor very frequently, usually once per week or once every two weeks depending on each members’ schedule.

When asked about the nature of their current interactions with their advisors, protégés provided a wide range of answers. Regardless of the specific responses, many of the protégés indicated that their relationships were positive and an absence of various activities, such as publishing together or “catching up” at conferences, did not result from problems in the relationships but instead was the result of extenuating circumstances. Eight of nine protégés indicated that they saw their advisors at conferences, where they met up with their advisors and perhaps other former protégés and went for lunch, dinner, drinks, coffee, or otherwise just spent time together. The one protégé who hadn’t seen his advisor at a conference explained that his schedule had not allowed him to attend the annual NASSM conference but if he did attend, his advisor would be the first person he would seek out.
There were some discrepancies among the protégés’ preferred methods of contacting their advisors, but regardless of the methods, all protégés reported having contact with their advisors. Six protégés indicated that they do speak with their advisors on the telephone while three protégés said they do not. Of those who do talk to their advisors on the phone, some said the purpose of their phone calls was mainly professional while others phoned their advisors just to “chat.” With respect to email communication, six protégés indicated they regularly email their advisors while three protégés do not. One protégé felt email was too impersonal but another protégé said that because of his advisor’s hectic travel schedule, email was the easiest way to reach him. Other protégés used email to “touch base” periodically, to interact in between seeing each other at conference meetings, or to communicate details of their current research collaborations.

In addition to seeing each other at conferences and interacting via telephone and email, three protégés indicated that they visit their mentor. Two protégés visit their respective mentors when they are in their region or en route to visit with relatives, while another protégé said her mentor has previously visited her and that she is currently planning a trip to see her mentor. With the exception of these three cases, the other protégés’ personal interactions with their mentors are generally limited to conference meetings.

Some differences emerged among the protégés’ involvement in publishing with their advisors. Five protégés said that they collaborate with their advisors on book chapters, research articles, symposiums, or conference presentations. However, for some protégés, their involvement with their advisor is restricted to conference presentations.
because of their advisor’s limited availability, other job responsibilities, or obligations to publish with their current doctoral students. Conversely, two protégés said that they do not publish with their advisor whatsoever. This is primarily because the protégés’ research interests have shifted in different directions than their advisors’ or because their advisors have many competing demands on their time, and not because of a strain in their relationship. One protégé said that while he doesn’t publish or frequently interact with his advisor, it is not indicative of a deficient relationship. Instead, he believes his mentor is effective at evaluating and understanding his former protégés’ individual needs and adapts his own actions accordingly. When describing his mentor, he stated that “in some ways, after you finish he allows you and your needs to guide where the relationship will go in the future. I could call him, I could publish with him, and he would be supportive of that.” Because this protégé fulfills his publishing requirements through other means, his mentor does not necessarily need to constantly involve himself in his protégé’s academic life; yet as the previous quotation demonstrates, his mentor would be there for him if needed.

Finally, all protégés indicated that their relationship with their advisor is both personal and professional in nature. There was some variance in the ratio of personal to professional matters, but regardless of the focus, all protégés indicated both components were present. When asked if his relationship was on a personal and a professional level, Protégé B1 replied “absolutely, yes. I mean on a personal level I’m sending her pictures of my children and these sorts of things as well, but yes, definitely both personally and professionally.” For some protégés, while they do discuss their family lives first, the reasons for communicating with their advisor were mainly professional. Protégé C2 said
“oh we’ll start out asking about the other’s family and making sure everything is okay, but the nature or the point of the phone call is usually business related.” For others, the personal aspects are far more important and any professional topics are discussed afterwards.

4.2.3 Comparison of Mentors’ and Protégés’ Characterizations

Like the previous comparison section, the purpose of this component was not to painstakingly examine every response given by the mentors and protégés but instead to compare the responses in a more holistic and generalized manner. The mentors’ and the protégés’ descriptions of their current relationships were consistent and there were no glaring disparities between the two sets of responses. As previously reported, all participants indicated that the current relationships between dissertation advisors and former doctoral students are positive. Many mentors and protégés indicated that these relationships had evolved into friendships and collectively, both parties expressed that the mentors still provide mentoring functions. Overall, participants’ descriptions of the nature of their interactions were consistent, with emails, phone calls, conference meetings, and research collaborations being mentioned. With respect to the frequency of interaction, the protégés’ specific responses fell within the broader ranges expressed by the mentors. For example, one mentor said she interacted with some of her protégés once per month or once every few months and interacted with other protégés weekly or biweekly. The mentor’s corresponding protégés said they interacted with their advisor either weekly or biweekly and once or twice per semester, respectively. Finally, both mentors and
protégés indicated that their relationships were personal and professional in nature, with some variance reported depending on the specific relationship in question.

Although the previous paragraph highlights many of the consistencies between the respondents’ answers, not every response was an exact match to the other member’s answers. For example, some protégés detailed their research collaborations with their advisors (or lack thereof) and explained some of the reasons for their situation. In contrast, some mentors did not explicitly address the research collaborations they are currently engaged in while others responded only generally, making it impossible to complete a specific comparison between results. However, it is worth restating that there was an asymmetrical relationship in the interviews, where the protégés responded with respect to their specific mentor, but the protégés’ identities were not disclosed to the mentors. Therefore, the mentors provided general responses regarding the nature of their current relationships with former doctoral students who held faculty positions. The mentors also indicated that their relationships with former protégés varied depending on the specific student. Given these discrepancies, it is entirely possible, and even feasible, that there would not be an exact match between the answers provided by mentors and their respective protégés. Consequently, I am comfortable concluding that the mentors’ and the protégés’ characterizations of their current relationships, at least in the context of this study, are similar.

4.3 Characteristics Desired

The third research question sought to determine the characteristics desired in each member of the mentoring relationship. More specifically, the characteristics that mentors
desired in their protégés and the characteristics that protégés desired in their mentors are presented below.

4.3.1 Characteristics Desired in Protégés

When asked about the characteristics they desire in doctoral students, some mentors provided a very brief list of a few key characteristics while others had either longer lists or were less specific when articulating their desired characteristics. Often times mentors said that they considered their most effective previous doctoral students when generating lists of important protégé characteristics and these effective individuals helped to shape the mentors’ responses. Some of the more frequently mentioned characteristics included: having the ability to write; being critical/conceptual thinkers; being curious or inquisitive; being hardworking, especially with respect to reading and writing; being (internally) motivated; and having the ability to take constructive criticism. Table 2 provides a frequency report for these characteristics. It must be noted that these responses were obtained from a very small sample of mentors and that conducting information rich, qualitative interviews is not the ideal methodology for collecting list-like answers from a vast number of participants.

Table 2: Frequency of the Most Important Characteristics Desired in Protégés

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to Write</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical/Conceptual Thinker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious/Inquisitive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated/Internally Motivated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance/Dedication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Take Constructive Criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Take Themselves Too Seriously</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enduring Interest in Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the characteristics listed above, mentors provided a number of other characteristics that their most effective previous doctoral students possessed. These included being self-starters, having a balance between school and outside activities, having a strong interest in sport and being friendly to their peers and professors. One mentor also described some of his highly effective former doctoral students as being quiet and not overly talkative individuals. These individuals were strong in their convictions but did not feel the need to routinely demonstrate their knowledge in an overbearing manner during classroom discussions.

When asked to describe any characteristics that they looked for before agreeing to advise prospective doctoral students, mentors were fairly consistent in their replies. Three mentors mentioned some aspect of compatibility, ranging from having similar research interests to having compatible personalities. These mentors indicated that they evaluated their personal chemistry and connection with prospective advisees and this was usually facilitated either through personal interviews before applicants were accepted to their respective programs or during preliminary coursework before student-advisor matches were finalized. Mentor C said he tries to assess prospective doctoral students’ research orientations and their eagerness or reasons for pursuing a doctoral degree while Mentor A tries to determine prospective students’ dedication to the process. In addition, Mentors D and E both ask for writing samples from prospective students. Mentor E tries to assess prospective students’ ability to think conceptually, but acknowledges that this can often be difficult to assess, especially if she has not previously seen the prospective students’ performance in classroom settings.
Collectively, protégés suggested a wide range of responses when asked what they believed were the most important characteristics an advisor should possess. When one was asked what he believed were the most important characteristics an effective doctoral dissertation advisor should possess, he replied that he was unable to “pinpoint specific characteristics” and that he did not think that all advisors could fit into one particular profile or box. Instead, he believed that every person is different and as mentors (or protégés), each person would bring different characteristics to the unique relationship. He did, however, suggest that “a good mentor is one that really sees the value in mentoring and is willing to devote the time and energy necessary to fostering that relationship.” In contrast, the remaining protégés provided characteristics such as being a team player as well as possessing the ability to read students’ needs and adjust their approaches accordingly. Other characteristics included being honest and having the ability to be critical but not harsh, being rigorous, setting a tone of accountability, and being able to guide students without actually completing the tasks for them. Being knowledgeable, experienced, organized, empathetic/sympathetic, caring, possessing the ability to communicate and having a balance between being directive and facilitative were also mentioned.

Although protégés were able to provide specific characteristics that they desired in a mentor, a number of protégés did not seek out a mentor with these characteristics before beginning their own doctoral degrees. For example, Protégés C1 and D2 said that they were “clueless” with respect to seeking characteristics in a dissertation advisor. Protégé C1 said that while he knew his eventual dissertation advisor was in an area that
matched his interests and was highly respected, his knowledge was otherwise limited. 

Protégé D2 said her main concern was being accepted into the doctoral program, and added “I actually hadn’t even thought about the importance of an advisor. That wasn’t part of my decision making because I didn’t realize at the time how important that aspect was.” Protégé E1 echoed those sentiments, saying “I think I was very lucky. I went into it blind in many, many ways.” For one protégé, while he selected his doctoral program primarily based on “programmatic characteristics as opposed to specific faculty characteristics,” the reputation of the faculty at the institution he chose did factor into his decision. Other protégés said they were influenced by circumstances such as the location of their job or their family and not an advisor and his or her characteristics.

Of those protégés who sought out mentors with specific characteristics, many looked for mentors with common interests, especially research interests, or for mentors who were fair, nice, personable, and approachable. One protégé described how she was told to:

> find somebody who is nice, who is a good person, and who has similar research interests. It doesn’t matter if it’s the best person in the field or if it’s the top school in the field, find somebody that you connect with … and will let you research what you want to research because it also relates to what they’re researching and not just make you do whatever they’re doing.

Protégés A1 and A2 said they looked for an advisor who was honest, on task, and serious about the process but also stood by their decisions and was willing to accommodate students’ needs. For Protégés C1 and C2, they looked for an advisor who was highly respected with a strong reputation. One protégé looked specifically for a female mentor while a number of protégés described a personal connection they felt when meeting their prospective advisors. Protégé D1 stated “it just made sense. Her background, her
experiences were very similar to mine, her research interests, there was a connection there” and also stressed the importance of meeting beforehand in order to gauge how the relationship might progress.

4.4 Outcomes of Mentoring

The fourth and final research question examined the outcomes of mentoring relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students. Each member of the relationship was asked about the mentoring outcomes that they received, as well as any outcomes that they believe the other member of the relationship may have received. A comparison between the members’ perceptions of the outcomes was then conducted. These results, supplemented with appropriate quotations, are presented below.

4.4.1 Mentors’ Perceptions of Mentoring Outcomes

Mentors reported a wide variety of career and personal benefits as a result of their mentoring relationships with their protégés. Mentors did not suggest any negative outcomes of mentoring; however, an absence of negative outcome reporting cannot be mistaken for an absence of mentoring dysfunction as this study focused on the positive elements and I did not explicitly inquire about any negative outcomes that mentors may have experienced.

All mentors reported publishing with some of their doctoral students, thereby increasing their own publication records. Mentor D said “you publish and present with these students and in some cases you might do a couple of projects beyond the
dissertation” and then described how a group of her former doctoral students produced a number of annual conference presentations. Similarly, Mentor A stated:

from a research standpoint I’ve served as a co-author on a variety of research studies that my doctoral students have prepared. Both while they’re in their [final] year and in their first few years in the profession they’ll invite me to be a co-author and we’ll work on the articles together, so over the years that’s helped me build my publication record.

In addition to publications, mentors described how they were able to expand their own breadth of knowledge and learn alongside their doctoral students, both with respect to literature and methodology. Mentor C explained:

one of the advantages of being a professor, particularly with doctoral students, is that you learn, you learn with them and they take you to places where you have not been and in the process you learn many new things.

Mentor D echoed these sentiments, stating:

I’m the kind of advisor that was more open instead of keeping someone under my own umbrella of research. Now there’s pros and cons with that, but I think I really got exposed to a great deal of literature that I would never have seen - interesting, interesting studies, new ideas, having to learn new methodologies, Delphi studies, qualitative research. I mean I’m a quantitative researcher so I really did learn different methodologies.

Doctoral students can also assist with aspects of a research project, and as Mentor E explained:

they are people you can bounce ideas off of … [they provide] fresh or new ideas that I maybe [had not] thought of because I’m so engrossed in the literature …. They help me collect data, they help me write up reports, they help me analyze data, you know I try to get my [doctoral] students … involved in all aspects of the research endeavour.

In addition to research related advantages, mentors expressed other career associated benefits. Mentor A said he has been invited by his former doctoral students to be involved in consulting projects that they were pursuing. Mentor D stated “I’ve learned a lot of things from former students” and “I think I grew as a person and I think it helped
me to be a better teacher, too.” For instance, she would watch her doctoral students teach their classes and not only provide feedback to them but sometimes incorporate some of her protégés’ teaching strategies into her own courses. As a result of his experiences with his doctoral students, Mentor C believes his own capacity to embrace others has increased and this has subsequently allowed him to better interact with people who may possess different competencies, expertise, issues, and/or problems.

Mentors’ reputations also benefit when their protégés succeed. According to Mentor C, “the moment some individual learns that some of the people they have met were my students, immediately my stock goes up.” Although he was not directly involved in all of his protégés’ successes, these achievements reflect positively on his status within the field and he is viewed as capable of developing talent and fostering successful individuals. As previously mentioned, Mentor E believes she benefits from all of her protégés regardless of their eventual career paths. She noted:

if you have a very good doctoral student, it helps your career in terms of the very specific things, you know like publications or teaching tips or whatever tremendously. The return on investment is huge and I think that some people probably think then if you have a doctoral student that maybe goes to a teaching institution or whatever, it may not positively impact the advisor’s career. But I see it very differently because I feel like just working with doctoral students enhances my career so wherever they go I’ve found them to be important to my career progression

Mentors’ positive outcomes were not strictly career focused, as they also reported receiving numerous personal benefits. As previously mentioned, all mentors considered their protégés to be friends, albeit at varying levels, and consequently believed this friendship to be one of the main benefits of their mentoring relationships. Mentor D said “I’ve now become friends with some of my doctoral students. We’ve moved away from the mentor-protégé relationship and we are friends.” Mentor E said:
having doctoral students has enriched my personal life, you know, I’m friends with many of them, I remain friends with many of them and I know I can count on them for certain things. It’s just it’s been a huge bonus to my personal life.

She further elaborated about her relationships with doctoral students by stating:

I don’t think that my career would be nearly the same if I didn’t meet those interesting, funny, creative people. I mean they make my job so much more fun. I enjoy working with doctoral students immensely, not that I don’t love working with undergraduate and master’s students too, but it’s just another piece that, you know, makes it a little different, makes it a little challenging, more challenging. So I think in an overall respect, it [i.e., relationships with doctoral students] just increases my level of satisfaction with my career choice.

Mentor D believes that through these relationships she has grown as a person, and these relationships extend beyond the limits of the doctoral degree.

The other significant personal benefit expressed by all mentors is the satisfaction and personal enrichment they receive from these relationships. Since mentors work with doctoral students for a number of years, mentors are able to watch them grow and develop. As Mentor A said, “you really get to watch them grow and for me it’s personally rewarding to just kind of marvel at how much they’ve improved and the skills and the confidence they’ve gained.” Mentor D responded:

oh it’s the calls after they graduate. When they are on the tenure track and they call you and they ask you for input for their external reviewers. Or when they call you and they’re advising doctoral students and say “how did you put up with me?”

She continued:

you know, maybe there’s some issues going on in their workplace and they just want to get some advice or there is a problem with a student, you know “what would you do?” they would ask. So I think it’s the calls that you get after someone graduates that are more meaningful because that means you made an impact on the person. And you get this internal satisfaction. You can’t describe it, it’s the satisfaction you get knowing that you helped someone.
Mentor C stated “it is just the satisfaction that I have contributed to the growth of one individual and that individual is doing really well.” He also indicated that he feels a sense of pride when looking at the NASSM membership and the complement of young scholars in the field and knowing that he was involved in their training and development. He added “having contributed to the growth of individual scholars, outstanding scholars, is a great feeling, very [satisfying].”

4.4.2 Protégés’ Perceptions of Mentoring Outcomes

Protégés overwhelmingly indicated that they received many benefits from their mentoring relationships with their advisors. For some protégés their advisors were absolutely critical to their experiences. Protégé A1 stated that he would not have gone to that institution if it was not for his mentor, while Protégé D1 similarly stated that she was not sure her degree would have happened at all if it was not for her advisor. Protégé D2 described the central role her advisor played by stating that “it was the cornerstone. Absolutely, the key to my experience was my advisor.”

One of the major benefits reported by more than half of the protégés interviewed was job search assistance. Five protégés said that their mentors used their knowledge of the field of sport management to help them when selecting positions. For example, mentors would share contextual information regarding job openings and offer their insight into how these positions would or would not be an appropriate fit for the protégés. Protégé E2 described how his mentor was able to write meaningful reference letters because of their close relationship and stated:

because of the way she built our relationship and the way that she really creates a relationship with her advisees, when it came time to writing a letter of
recommendation or anything in support of what I wanted to do it was more meaningful.

Protégés E2 and D1 both noted their mentors’ assistance in filtering through job advertisements. Protégé D1 described her mentor’s assistance as:

very helpful in sifting through the ads and kind of pointing out well this might be a good fit for you and I know so-and-so who’s there or who had been there and you know you should talk to this person, so I think just from the initial stages of that she was very helpful.

A number of protégés also stated that their advisors provided significant advice regarding where to accept job offers and as mentioned previously, for some protégés this job selection assistance still continues beyond the completion of their doctoral degrees.

In addition to the specific job search assistance mentioned above, protégés often benefitted from their mentors’ reputations and the reputations of their institutions. All protégés from lineages A, C, and E, along with Protégé D1, indicated that they could leverage their mentors’ reputations in a variety of settings such as job searching and networking at conferences. Protégé A2 stated:

I had some tremendous opportunities when I finished my [doctoral degree] that resulted from him, from the [institutional] brand, and you know also from the fact that I had been encouraged to do presentations and publish while I was a student.

Protégé E1 indicated that she believed her association with her advisor helped her career, even if it was simply being known as one of her advisor’s former students. Since Mentor E is known for producing successful and productive students, and by virtue of being one of Mentor E’s students, Protégé E1 may also have earned this reputation. Protégé E2 confirmed this notion and also stated that he believed he was able to leverage his advisor’s positive reputation after completing his degree. Furthermore, protégés indicated that they received direct career benefits from their advisors’ reputations. When asked if
they were able to leverage their advisor’s reputation or the reputation of their institution when applying for jobs. Protégé C2 replied “oh I certainly think it helped. I mean I wouldn’t go in and say ‘I’m [my advisor]’s student’ or ‘I’m from [this institution]’ but you see that on the CV there.” Protégé C1 explained that he obtained his first job offer partly because of his association with his advisor and the connections his advisor had with others in field. Mentor C was invited to give a presentation at another institution and he brought Protégé C1 along with him. As a result of this presentation, Protégé C1 received an interview for a job opening and was eventually awarded the position. In other instances mentors received phone calls from former students or other professors in the field who had current job openings. The mentors were asked if they had any suitable candidates, once again demonstrating how protégés were able to benefit from their associations with their mentors.

Some protégés also reported being very well prepared for their first faculty positions upon completing their degrees because of the preparation they received during their doctoral education. As Protégé B1 expressed:

I was ready from day one to be teaching my own classes and doing my own scholarship and getting involved in various service functions and mentoring students and so on …. And that helped get my faculty career off to a fast start or a good start as a result of that process.

Protégé B1 further explained that as a result of his mentor’s “hands-off” approach to advising, he was forced to become very self-sufficient in order to complete his degree. He stated that a benefit of his self-sufficiency was that:

I was ready to do things by myself and hit the ground running as soon as I started my faculty position, whereas I know [with] some of my peers[who weren’t forced to be so self sufficient] …, there was more of a transition necessary.
In addition, Protégé E2 explained that as a result of the teaching opportunities his mentor provided for him during his doctoral studies, he was able to discuss his experiences in the classroom during job interviews and present concrete examples of his experience in certain situations rather than simply suggest what he would do if faced with those events.

Many protégés reported a number of publishing-related benefits. For instance, protégés indicated that their advisors helped them to publish articles based on their dissertations or other research projects they may have been involved in, suggested relevant outlets for publications, and helped them to become familiar with the research process in general. One protégé recalled how his advisor assisted him during his search for a publishing company by suggesting a company with which his advisor had previous success. Another protégé described how she and her mentor, along with a number of her mentor’s former advisees, gave a number of conference presentations and published one article together. For Protégé D2, in addition to her earlier projects with her mentor, she also collaborates with other former advisees and says “I really enjoy working with others who had [her] as an advisor. We’re kind of cut out of the same cloth there, we understand each other.”

In addition to the many career related benefits of their mentoring relationships, protégés also received a wide range of personal benefits. Friendship is one of these main benefits. Five protégés said that they became friends with their advisor and Protégé A1 described how his advisor embraced him and his family during his doctoral education. Protégé D2 exclaimed “it’s nice to have such a great friend … somebody I can turn to, somebody I respect and I trust, and I know will always be there for me” while Protégé E2 said that her mentor “has probably become one of my closest friends now.” Protégé D1
noted that she has since become very good friends with some of her mentor’s other former advisees and would not have been introduced to these colleagues if it wasn’t for her advisor.

Another personal benefit many protégés reported receiving from their mentoring relationship involved observing their mentor in a role model capacity. In addition to describing how their mentors provided role modelling behaviours, which is detailed in an earlier Results section, protégés recounted the benefits that they gained from this mentoring function. Protégé A1 said he benefitted from the professional example his mentor set while Protégé E1 was able to incorporate aspects of her mentor’s teaching style into the way she teaches her own classes. Protégé E2 said he appreciated watching his advisor interact in and outside of school, thereby being a role model for how he could conduct himself inside and outside of academia. Protégés of Mentor C also viewed him as a role model, with Protégé C1 saying he felt he was able to mentor his own students after observing Mentor C interact with his students. Protégé C2 noted that he observed some aspects of his mentor’s style that he liked and other aspects that he would prefer not to adopt. He stated:

well, I think you certainly see things that you would do and that you would not do. And I hope my advisees see that too, from me … I mean everybody does a whole lot of good things and sometimes they make mistakes, and … it’s hard to see that if you don’t have a close relationship with your advisor. And I’m glad I was able to learn from [my advisor], you know, things that “oh yeah, I want to follow what he did in this area” or “oh, I may do something different in another area” but it certainly helped me, I think, as an advisor to other students now.

Other personal benefits included developing a sense of self-confidence, growing as a person throughout the doctoral education process, and receiving support and personal assistance from mentors during difficult times.
4.4.3 Comparison of Mentors’ and Protégés’ Outcomes

In general, the mentors’ descriptions of the outcomes their protégés would have received and the protégés’ descriptions of their mentors’ outcomes were fairly consistent. The largest discrepancy between the two perceptions involves the protégés’ hesitancy to suggest positive outcomes that their mentors would have received, despite the fact that the mentors could easily describe the various ways they benefitted. Six of the nine protégés were unable to initially provide potential benefits for their mentors or were very cautious in their descriptions. For example, Protégés B1, C2, and E1 were not sure of any benefits their mentors may have received, while Protégé E2 replied “I think that’s probably the toughest question to answer,” and Protégé C1 said “you’d have to ask him, you know, because I honestly don’t know what he learned from me personally.” Protégé A2 explained:

I think he was fine without me. I don’t know. I don’t know what benefit there was to him. He’s had a lot of doctoral students and probably a lot of them stronger than I was. I think it was just sort of a pretty smooth process for him and at this point in his career, if I had never existed he’d be doing the same thing right now with a smile on his face.

Similarly, Protégé E1 believed her mentor’s career would be unaffected and said:

she has a large network of people she could be working with, so if I wasn’t around I don’t think it would hurt her career in anyway, whereas for me, if she weren’t around, it would definitely be much tougher on my career.

In order to actually suggest benefits their mentors would have received, most protégés had to think of the benefits that they received when mentoring their own students. After doing this, protégés were able to list most of the benefits that their mentors had initially recounted, although they were still hesitant in their descriptions. These included being friends with their former advisees and receiving additional
publications, as well as expanding their research areas and the methodologies they used. Protégés also noted how their advisors would likely have received satisfaction when seeing their students grow and mature, graduate, be recognized for their work, progress through their careers, take on leadership positions, and advance the field of sport management as a whole.

Interestingly, there were a number of benefits that protégés suggested their mentors may have received but were not actually mentioned by the mentors. These included continuing to leverage relationships with corporations or sports teams that students had fostered through their dissertation work and having the opportunity to work with non-traditional students who brought different sets of research interests or previous work experiences. However, it is important to remember that mentors were not asked to comment on the benefits received from a specific advisor-advisee relationship. Therefore, an absence of these reported benefits does not necessarily indicated that the advisors did not benefit in these manners, but simply that these were not mentioned when describing the general benefits they received.

When comparing the benefits mentors believed their protégés would have received with what protégés actually claimed to have received, the outcomes are similar to the results presented above. One advisor suggested he would be merely speculating on the outcomes his protégés received while another mentor said that the outcomes that were most beneficial to each student would have been dependent on the individual relationship between the mentor and the protégé. Like above, mentors were able to suggest a number of the benefits protégés actually reported receiving, including publishing assistance, help with career selection, interaction inside and outside of academia, and benefits accruing
from the protégés’ association with their mentors. There were also some benefits reported by mentors that were not specifically provided by protégés. For instance, one mentor described how she played a critical role in one student’s selection of academia as a career choice. Another mentor expressed how he hoped his students learned to be strong but modest and demonstrated how an advisor can be warm and friend-like yet also be strict. Again, it must be noted that the mentors spoke generally about protégé benefits and these inconsistencies do not necessarily represent deficiencies but could simply imply that the specific protégés the mentors were referring to were not included in this study.
5.0 DISCUSSION

This section contains a discussion of the aforementioned findings in relation to the relevant academic literature. Since only the most important aspects that emerged from the data are presented, the focus and resultant discussion is not equally divided among each research question but instead focuses primarily on the functions provided within these academic mentoring relationships.

In many instances there were a greater number of themes that emerged from the protégés’ responses as compared to those provided by the mentors. One possible reason for this is the fact that there were nine protégés yet only four mentors involved in this study. Since the number of protégés was more than double the number of mentors that participated in the study, it is not surprising that I received more answers and themes from the protégés. Another possible explanation could be that protégés vividly remembered what functions their mentors provided for them, whereas mentors may not have realized how impactful a certain action was, may have forgotten about that action, or were not even aware that they performed that action. Alternatively, the discrepancy in responses may be linked to the asymmetrical relationship. Although protégés knew the mentor that they were answering the interview questions about (their dissertation advisor), the mentors were not aware of specifically which protégés were involved in the study. Therefore, the mentors were forced to answer in a general context and were likely to leave out specific details of the relationships that were provided by the protégés.
5.1 Mentoring Functions

As previously mentioned, I adopted Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions framework in order to analyze the mentoring activities that occur in sport management academic mentoring relationships. Kram’s functions are the most widely cited mentoring functions, with much of the extant literature providing support for her two broad characterizations of career and psychosocial functions (Allen et al., 2004). In addition, a number of authors have adopted Kram’s functions in their own academic mentoring investigations (e.g., Bigelow & Johnson, 2001; Clark et al., 2000; Dickinson & Johnson, 2000; Johnson, 2008; Johnson, Koch, et al., 2000; Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Lark & Croteau, 1998). Now that I have completed this study, I realize that despite being the most frequently used framework in the study of academic mentoring relationships, this framework is not necessarily ideal for analyzing the mentoring functions in the field of sport management.

In general, the process of analyzing the individual mentoring functions displayed within mentoring relationships is difficult. Breaking down the mentoring process into specific functions may detract from the overall depiction of these outcomes and may not accurately represent what is occurring in these relationships. It may be that the presence of these mentoring functions produces a synergistic interaction effect that results in an outcome which is greater than the sum of the individual parts. However, it would be very difficult to ascertain and describe exactly what occurs in these mentoring relationships without breaking the actions into their component parts. This description is also important to provide so that other mentors and protégés may learn from the participants’
relationships. Therefore, delineating these actions is a necessary and required component in analyzing mentoring relationships and the resultant mentoring functions.

In addition to the less-than-ideal structure of Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions framework and the challenges associated with analyzing the individual mentoring functions, many of the actions described by mentors and protégés overlapped, which made classification even more difficult. Some of these categorizations are not mutually exclusive, and this can cause difficulty when coding and distinguishing component parts. For example, mentors routinely involved their protégés in their current research projects. If the mentor’s primary aim was to simply make students aware of the process, it would most likely fall under the exposure and visibility function. However, if the mentor’s intentions were to include that student in the research project so the student may submit a portion of the work for publication, the mentor may be providing indirect sponsorship. If the mentor’s intentions are both of the above, some combination of the above, or are not specified, coding of this action becomes difficult and open to interpretation.

Similarly, protégés reported that their mentors provided them with networking opportunities and introduced them to influential others, especially at conferences. If the mentor speaks highly of the student, endorses his or her work, or mentions the protégé’s talent and capabilities, the mentor is displaying aspects of sponsorship and networking. According to Kram’s (1988) conceptualization, networking is considered to be a component of the exposure and visibility function. If the mentor only introduces the student by name, then this is mostly likely a simple exposure and visibility action. Unfortunately, the descriptions provided by mentors and protégés were not usually this specific and coding some of the participants’ responses was problematic.
My main recommendations for individuals wishing to extend this area of inquiry pertain to classifying the mentoring functions. In the Introductory chapter, I wrote that mentoring concepts should not be rejected solely on the basis of the context in which the research was conducted. I then stated that using concepts discovered in organizational contexts may increase the cohesiveness of the mentoring literature and extend the applicability of research findings. However, after conducting this study I do not agree with what I initially stated. Researchers should not use Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions simply because they have been the most widely cited in organizational research. Although Kram’s distinctions have been adopted in many academic mentoring studies, researchers must not feel pressured to continue this trend. Instead, researchers should consider incorporating other authors’ conceptualizations of the mentoring functions.

Another option is that a perfect framework for capturing the nuances of academia does not currently exist and consequently needs to be created. In this case, developing an adapted version of Kram’s (1988) mentoring framework or alternatively, developing a new, independent mentoring functions model for use in academia, may be required. Based on the data obtained through this study, I have adapted a number of Kram’s mentoring functions with the hope of more effectively capturing the mentoring functions that sport management dissertation advisors provide for their doctoral students. Specifically, the functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, challenging assignments, and friendship manifested themselves differently in this study than described by Kram (1988) in her study of organizational mentoring relationships. These differences are discussed in the following sections and supported by relevant quotations.
or themes that emerged from the data. A brief discussion of each of the mentoring functions that were fairly consistent with Kram’s conceptualizations (i.e., coaching, protection, role modelling, counselling, and acceptance and confirmation) is also presented. All of these functions are then summarized in the adapted mentoring functions framework proposed below. Interestingly, the majority of the functions that were found to be consistent with Kram’s conceptualization are psychosocial functions, while those that were adapted are primarily career functions. One possible explanation for this finding is that the structure and nature of academia differs from organizational settings and these nuances result in changes or adaptations to the career focused functions. However, mentors and protégés still form intense personal relationships largely independent of the academic or organizational context, and therefore the relational and interpersonal psychosocial functions exist in similar fashions.

5.1.1 Proposed Adaptations to Career Functions

According to Kram’s (1988) description of sponsorship, active and direct nomination of the protégé and/or his or her work is required by the mentor. Based on the results of this study, the mentors’ only explicit sponsorship actions involved writing reference letters and making phone calls in support of their protégés during the students’ job searches. In addition to the overt support that they received, almost all protégés reported benefitting from the status acquired through their association with their mentors. By virtue of being associated with these prominent individuals, protégés were able to leverage their mentors’ reputations and experienced reflected power (Kanter, 1977). As mentioned earlier, this reflected power indicates that protégés have the support of
influential others and may have access to their mentors’ resources, which may further their position in the field. The instances of reflected power described in this study are consistent with Johnson and Huwe’s (2003) and Kram’s (1988) discussions of reflected power in academic and organizational mentoring relationships, respectively.

Interestingly, findings from this study also suggested that the mentors received positive associations from their protégés. As the protégés graduated, began their own academic careers and subsequently experienced success, the mentors’ reputations increased. One mentor stated that “the moment some individual learns that some of the people they have met were my students, immediately my stock goes up.” Although the protégés’ successes often did not result directly from the mentors’ actions, the mentors still benefitted because of their previous associations with those protégés. Others in the field may have seen the mentors as capable of developing talent and their reputations most likely increased.

As the preceding paragraph describes, sponsorship can be instrumental to the protégés’ success. Although protégés frequently mentioned the sponsorship action of writing reference letters or making supportive telephone calls, these were the only actions described. This lack of diverse sponsorship action could imply that, with the exception of serving as a reference during the protégés’ job searches, mentors provide few instances of sponsorship. However, it is equally possible that many of the mentors’ actions involve instances of indirect sponsorship. For example, when a mentor invites one of his or her protégés to work on a research project that will eventually be submitted for publication by both authors, he or she is sponsoring the protégé and his or her actions and/or competencies by having the mentor’s name listed in conjunction with the protégé’s name.
If the protégé delivers an unsuccessful presentation or writes an incoherent abstract, the mentor’s reputation and status could be negatively impacted. Conversely, if the protégé succeeds in these publication attempts, the mentor’s status within the field could be improved. The possible presence or inclusion of indirect sponsorship in many of the mentor’s other, and more well-defined functions may help to explain why the prevalence of direct sponsorship was found to be so low in this study.

Moving beyond Kram’s (1988) narrow conceptualization of exposure and visibility, which involves exposing students to influential others and conversely exposing influential others to the students and their work, I included tasks that involved exposing and socializing the student to the following areas: the broad field of sport management; the different disciplinary aspects/areas of sport management; the researchers who study within the realm of sport management and their resulting publications; the various responsibilities of faculty members within sport management; and academia as a whole. This socialization into the profession is cited as a critical part of the doctoral students’ experiences. Tenenbaum et al. (2001) assumed that “advisors are generally of importance to graduate students, both for the official roles they play and for the way in which they socialize graduate students into professional life” (p. 329). Furthermore, Johnson (2007a) suggested that astute mentors engaged protégés in the various professional activities and environments that they would require in order to succeed in academia, and this would result in more satisfied and capable future academics. According to a number of researchers (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Tenenbaum et al., 2001; Van Dyne, 1996), the socialization of protégés into the profession as opposed to a particular role is one of the chief differences among mentoring in academia as compared to organizational settings.
Given that Kram’s (1988) mentoring function descriptions were derived from organizational studies, it is not surprising that the socialization aspect of exposure is not included in her descriptions. However, as listed above, protégés in this study described a myriad of opportunities and endeavours that their mentors provided for them, and this conceptualization consequently warrants inclusion in the exposure and visibility function.

In addition to socializing protégés into academia, mentors and protégés both described many instances of networking and the critical importance this aspect plays in helping protégés become familiar with, and known in, the field of sport management. Despite the perceived importance in academia, Kram (1988) did not explicitly use the term networking in her description of the exposure and visibility function in organizational contexts. In contrast, Tenenbaum et al. (2001) described characterizations that were very similar to Kram’s broad categories (instrumental and psychosocial, compared with career and psychosocial) but also included a third separate and distinct mentoring function categorization – networking – in their survey. Using this same three category approach to mentoring functions, Ortiz-Walters and Gilson (2005) examined the instrumental, psychosocial and networking functions received by protégés of colour. While I certainly agree that networking is a critical mentoring function (and further support for this opinion, in the form of participant quotes, can be found in Appendix J), I am not convinced that the networking function should constitute its own separate and distinct mentoring categorization. Instead, I believe it should be more appropriately placed under Kram’s broad career function categorization. In this case, networking would become its own function and no longer be included as a sub-component of exposure and visibility. In my estimation, grouping exposure and visibility together with networking
reduces the overall importance and focus of each of these components, at least in the context of academia.

Similar to a number of Kram’s (1988) other career functions, her description of challenging assignments may require some modification so that it can accurately represent the concept of challenging assignments in the academic context. Kram describes challenging assignments as a function that “characterizes effective boss-subordinate relationships” and “relates to the immediate work of the department” (p. 31). In academic contexts, the preceding description is not overly relevant. While providing protégés with challenging tasks would allow them to build specific and technical competencies, it could be argued that the entire doctoral education process is one large, overarching challenging assignment. Mentors routinely teach skills, encourage learning, and provide feedback, all of which are components of the challenging assignment function (Kram). Without these experiences and skills, protégés will be unable to seize opportunities afforded through sponsorship, exposure and visibility, networking, and other mentoring functions (Kram). Similarly, if academic protégés are not given experiences such as researching, presenting, manuscript writing, or teaching throughout their doctoral education, it is likely that they will be ill-prepared for any future faculty positions.

5.1.2 Career Functions Consistent with Kram (1988)

Much like Kram’s (1988) description of organizational mentors coaching their protégés and preparing them for success in an organization, academic mentors did just the same for their protégés in preparing them for a career in academia. Mentors taught their
students the skills and knowledge that they would need to continue successfully in academic contexts before and after graduation. For example, mentors coached their students on course selection and dissertation topic options, helped to explain the research and writing processes, and assisted with aspects of the job search process, such as preparing the required documents. All nine protégés provided examples of how their mentors coached them through various aspects of the doctoral education experience. This finding is consistent with Clark et al. (2000) who reported that academic protégés received direct training and instruction most frequently.

In contrast to some of the other more frequently mentioned functions, there were only a few instances of protection reported by the mentors and protégés, combined. Although they provide a limited basis for comparison, these descriptions were consistent with Kram’s (1988) explanation of the protection function. Additional research should be conducted in an attempt to identify additional instances of protection and to determine whether these also fit within Kram’s description.

5.1.3 Proposed Adaptations to Psychosocial Functions

Kram’s (1988) final psychosocial function is friendship. She characterized this function as consisting of enjoyable social exchanges and/or personal experiences that enhance work activities, but also briefly described an element of increasing mutuality. Johnson and Huwe (2003) advanced this description in the context of academia and renamed this function “friendship and mutuality.” These authors stressed that academic mentoring relationships do not need to contain aspects of friendship but instead must include professionalism and collegiality while maintaining appropriate boundaries. If this
is the case, mentors and protégés should be able to interact and value each other in a collegial manner while showing regard for the other member and his or her personal needs, but remain within the limits of a professional relationship.

Furthermore, Johnson and his colleagues (Johnson, 2008; Johnson & Huwe, 2002; Johnson & Nelson, 1999) discussed the complex and sometimes conflicting nature of academic mentors’ roles. They described how mentors may simultaneously engage in incompatible functions such as sponsoring their protégés while attempting to objectively assess their capabilities. These situations can be problematic as mentors may feel trapped between their professional obligation to remain objective and their desire to avoid betraying their protégés. Although Kram (1988) labelled her final psychosocial function as friendship and described it as having elements of relationship similar to “good friends,” she did mention that there may be limits that need to be imposed. She suggested that mentors and protégés may wish to restrict their involvement outside of work environments and acknowledged that these friendship interactions may lead to conflict when one member must evaluate or manage the other.

As a result of these descriptions, and given the findings of this study, I am skeptical of whether Kram’s depiction of the friendship component can occur while students are still completing their degrees or whether this aspect develops after the students have completed the direct supervisory and advisement phase of the relationship. Although many of the mentors and protégés in this study classified their current relationships as friendships, I am unsure of when the friendship aspect fully evolved.

However, as illustrated in the Results chapter, protégés and mentors provided many examples of mutuality within their relationships. For example, protégés addressed
their mentors by their first names and described how their mentors treated them like peers. Furthermore, Johnson (2007a) described increasing mutuality and reciprocity as one of the critical components mentors can provide for their doctoral students. In light of the literature presented above and the clear evidence that mutuality exists among academic mentoring relationships in sport management, I suggest that Kram’s (1988) delineation of the friendship function be replaced with a description that is more consistent with Johnson and Huwe’s (2003) adaptation of friendship and mutuality, but also incorporates Johnson’s discussion of mutuality and collegiality. In his book designed to guide faculty members with their mentoring relationships, Johnson states that in addition to mutuality, “excellent mentoring requires ... nurturing of th[e] increasingly collegial bond with students” (p. 69). Combining the elements described above, I have proposed a model which I believe captures the mutuality, collegiality, and friendship that may exist within academic mentoring relationships (see Figure 2).

This modified Venn diagram (Figure 2) shows how the mentoring relationships between mentors and protégés may consist of the following: mutuality only; collegiality only; a combination of mutuality and collegiality; or friendship, which encompasses mutuality, collegiality, or both. Figure 2 is a fluid model with the outline of each element representing the lowest level of the respective components. The level of each component increases towards the centre of the model. For example, a relationship that contained only a very low level of mutuality would be located close to the exterior of the mutuality circle. As increasing levels of mutuality were developed in this relationship, the position of this relationship would move closer to the centre of the figure. If this relationship progressed to include collegiality, the position would shift to either of the overlapping
mutuality and collegiality regions. As the members of this relationship developed friendship (in addition to mutuality and collegiality), their relationship would enter the middle oval. The position would then move towards the centre as the level of friendship increased. Relationships that do not contain aspects of mutuality, collegiality or friendship would be located in the negative space surrounding the model.
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*Figure 2.* Venn diagram depicting the mutuality, collegiality, and friendship that may exist within academic mentoring relationships.

While I question whether true friendship can exist in an academic mentoring relationship (because of the mentors’ obligations to provide incompatible functions), others may believe this element exists and characterize their relationships as friendships. In these cases, the proposed model accommodates this characterization. More importantly, including friendship in this model allows it to represent academic mentoring relationships as they evolve. As protégés complete their degrees, move into their roles as
faculty members, and become more competent and confident in their abilities, their current mentoring relationships adapt to reflect this growth and change. Likewise, their position within the model would adjust accordingly.

According to Johnson (2007a), excellent academic mentoring relationships include progressive changes and evolve towards increased levels of collegiality and friendly interaction. As protégés complete their doctoral degrees and become faculty members themselves, the nature of their mentoring relationships evolves. The active advisement that protégés received while completing their degree may lessen or cease altogether. At the same time, mentors and protégés may develop additional feelings of mutuality, collegiality, and/or friendship. Because these changes in mentoring relationships are not clearly demarcated, the fluidity of the proposed model allows the changing nature of the mentoring relationships to be captured. As mentors and protégés experience increasing levels of mutuality, collegiality, and/or friendship, their position within the model would move from the exterior of the respective circles towards the centre of the proposed figure.

5.1.4 Psychosocial Functions Consistent with Kram (1988)

In her study of organizational mentoring relationships, Kram (1988) found that role modelling was the most frequently reported psychosocial function. While the mentors in this study mentioned only a few examples of how they provided role modelling, protégés described many instances of how their mentors demonstrated these behaviours. Similarly, protégés in other academic settings reported that role modelling was the second most frequently reported psychosocial function and the third most
frequently reported mentoring function overall (Clark et al., 2000). Despite a potential discrepancy between the mentors’ reports in this study and the frequencies reported in other studies, the role modelling described in this study was consistent with the examples provided by Kram and Johnson and Huwe (2003). Additional research should be conducted to potentially explain the differences among mentor and protégé reporting found in this study, as it is possible that mentors are providing a considerable amount of unintentional role modelling for their protégés. While Kram describes intentional and unintentional components to role modelling, increasing the mentors’ awareness of how their protégés perceive the role modelling behaviours may be beneficial. If the importance and prevalence of role modelling in academia is confirmed through subsequent studies, and the mentors are made aware of the extent to which they influence and impact their protégés, mentors may become more conscious of their actions.

Through the other member’s acceptance and confirmation, individuals are able to develop a positive sense of self. As protégés establish their skills and competency in their field, the acceptance and confirmation they receive from their mentors provides them with support and encouragement. In an academic context, and specifically in this study, mentors encouraged their protégés to pursue dissertation topics that were of interest to the protégés. Mentors also respected their protégés’ various career desires and intentions (i.e., working in teaching institutions, research institutions, or other non-academic areas of sport management). By accepting the protégés’ interests and areas of study, mentors may have been able to confirm that their protégés’ unique research interests, resulting dissertation topics, and eventual contributions to the field of sport management were worthwhile.
Kram described the counselling function as the mentoring activities that permit and encourage protégés to discuss any personal or professional concerns that they may have. Kram also suggested that the mentors’ counselling pertained to three primary areas. These included: developing competence and satisfaction with the chosen career and the ensuing responsibilities; ensuring personal values and identity were maintained during professional relationships; and incorporating career responsibilities into the various aspects of an individual’s life. The majority of the counselling that mentors provided for their protégés spanned the first and second counselling areas previously identified and involved helping protégés select their first faculty position and academic home. Protégés repeatedly identified how their mentors used their knowledge of the field and shared any insight they may have had when discussing the suitability of prospective job openings. Mentors took into account each of their protégés’ individual characteristics and desires and assisted in determining the best “fit.” Mentors provided protégés with additional counselling related to balancing professional and personal obligations and activities, which corresponds directly to Kram’s third primary counselling area.

5.1.5 Kram’s (1988) Mentoring Functions Framework Adapted for Academic Contexts

Table 3 provides a listing of Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions, which based on the results of this study, are adapted for use in academic contexts. A very brief description of each function is provided, along with an example of how the function was displayed in the mentoring relationships under investigation. Readers are cautioned that
each example is only one description of that particular mentoring function and may be presented in a number of ways, depending on the specific mentoring relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Functions</td>
<td>Mentors sponsor protégés through promotion and nomination. Direct – involves active and intentional nomination of the protégé. For example, mentors write reference letters and make phone calls on behalf of protégés during the job search process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Indirect – can be found in many of the mentor’s other mentoring functions provided for protégés. For example, in addition to exposing the protégé to the research process, mentors indirectly sponsor protégés when they include protégés in research projects that culminate in submitting publications containing both authors’ names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure and Visibility</td>
<td>Mentors expose protégés to influential others and socialize protégés into academia. This socialization often includes exposing protégés to their chosen academic field and the different disciplinary aspects/areas within that field; the researchers who study within the realm of that field and their resulting publications; the various responsibilities of faculty members within that field; and academia as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Mentors help protégés become familiar with, and known in, their academic field and provide protégés with access to their resources. For example, mentors introduce protégés to their colleagues at conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Mentors teach their protégés the skills and knowledge needed to successfully continue in academic contexts before and after graduation. For example, mentors coach their protégés on course and dissertation topic selection, the research and writing processes, and the job search process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>Mentors safeguard their protégés from negative attention and threats to their reputation or program status. For example, mentors protect their protégés from the wants and needs of self-serving committee members, and ensure that the protégés’ needs and requirements are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenging Assignments

Mentors provide challenging assignments to increase the protégés’ technical skills and competence, as well as encourage learning. In many cases, the entire doctoral education process can be seen as a large, overarching challenging assignment.

Psychosocial Functions

Role Modelling

Mentors intentionally (and unintentionally) demonstrate behaviours and attitudes required for successful navigation of academia. For example, mentors may demonstrate how to balance career and personal responsibilities or how to conduct themselves in a professional manner.

Acceptance and Confirmation

Mentors affirm and encourage the protégés’ abilities and desires. For example, mentors convey confidence in the protégés and validate the protégés’ research interests as worthwhile.

Counselling

Mentors provide support and guidance to their protégés while allowing protégés to discuss personal and professional concerns. For example, mentors help protégés choose their first faculty position and provide advice on balancing personal and professional obligations.

Mutuality, Collegiality, and Friendship

Mentors and protégés display reciprocal admiration for each other and interact in a collegial manner while respecting the other’s personal needs and remaining within the limits of a professional relationship. As the relationship evolves, aspects of friendship may develop. For example, mentors treat protégés like peers or equals, request that protégés address them by their first name, and do not emphasize the power and status differences between them.

5.1.6 Prevalence and Frequency of Mentoring Functions

Because I did not want to influence the participants’ responses anymore than was necessary in order to examine their mentoring relationships, I did not specifically inquire about each individual mentoring function. For example, I did not directly ask if there were any instances of protection or role modelling displayed throughout the mentoring relationships. Instead, I simply asked protégés to describe the guidance, counselling, or
advice that their mentors provided for them, how their mentors provided opportunities or helped to develop their careers, how their advisors helped their personal development, and if there were any other actions that their advisors took in order to mentor them. Similarly, the mentors were asked how they provided the aforementioned items for their doctoral students. While participants collectively described examples of all of Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions, it is not possible to conclude that specific mentoring functions were absent from particular relationships simply because those functions were not reported by participants. In some instances, protégés may not have been aware that their mentor provided a function for them, and thus they were unable to include it in their description of the mentoring functions they received. For example, if a mentor has successfully protected his or her protégé from harm, unless the mentor explicitly communicates this to the protégé, the protégé may not even be aware of the mentor’s actions.

However, it is also entirely possible that mentors and protégés (perhaps unknowingly) chose to only provide examples of actions that they most closely associate with mentoring. Because intuitively, functions such as protection or acceptance and confirmation may not be as representative of mentoring as coaching or exposure and visibility, it is possible that these functions were not mentioned as frequently during the interviews. Clark et al. (2000) expressed support for this notion by reporting that the highest rated functions (i.e., direct training and role modelling) in terms of prevalence in the academic mentoring relationships between psychology doctoral students and their faculty mentors were very compatible with the traditional responsibilities assumed by
graduate school professors. Conversely, functions that may be less congruent with traditional professor responsibilities (i.e., protection or friendship) were rated lower.

For example, in this study both mentors and protégés reported more instances of coaching than protection and recounted more counselling than role modelling. Because mentors or protégés were not specifically asked about the individual frequencies with which they provided or received mentoring functions, caution must be used before concluding that the functions described more often are actually more prevalent in these mentoring relationships. Further studies that provide all of the mentoring functions and explicitly inquire about the frequency with which they were provided must be conducted before being able to determine whether some functions are provided significantly more often than other functions or whether the participants’ ability to recall certain functions from memory without prior prompting contributed to the decreased reporting of certain functions.

The frequency of some mentoring functions in academic relationships may vary from the frequency of those same mentoring functions found within organizational mentoring studies. For example, Kram (1988) reported that with respect to career functions, sponsorship was observed most frequently. However, as described in the Results chapter and explained in an earlier section of this Discussion chapter, the frequency of sponsorship provision (as defined by Kram) was limited in this study. In comparison, Clark et al. (2000) found that psychology doctoral students ranked sponsorship as the fourth most frequently provided mentoring function. Kram also reported that role modelling was the most frequently reported psychosocial function in organizational studies while Clark et al. listed this function as the third most frequently
reported in academic mentoring relationships. In this study, mentors provided very few examples of how they role modelled for their students. Conversely, protégés described many examples of how their mentors displayed role model behaviours and many protégés confirmed that they considered their mentors to be their role models. These inconsistencies serve to reinforce a number of conclusions, including the need for a complete and efficient framework for classifying functions displayed in academic mentoring relationships, so that once they are properly classified, comparisons can be made between organizational results (which is where the bulk of the previous scholarly attention has been focused), and those findings emerging from academic contexts. These contradictions also highlight the danger in assuming that mentoring relationships present themselves similarly across disciplines and serve as a reminder that concepts that were gleaned from one mentoring context may not be applicable in other contextually-based mentoring relationships.

5.1.7 Most Valuable Functions

Similar to the frequency discussion presented above, additional investigation must be conducted before concluding that the mentoring functions described as most valuable in this study are in fact the most valuable mentoring functions in the sport management academy. Again, because the mentors and protégés who participated in this study were not provided with a complete listing of all of the mentoring functions but instead provided a rating of importance based solely on the functions they had described, accurate conclusions cannot be made. Specifically, protégés may have accidentally failed to describe a particular mentoring function during the interview that was actually very
instrumental in their development and because they had not mentioned it in their earlier enumeration of functions, it was not included in their importance ranking. Conversely, participants may have mentioned a specific function when describing what was provided in their mentoring relationship but failed to consider that function when proclaiming the most important function. For example, job search counselling was the only function (career or psychosocial) that all protégés mentioned as a function that their mentors provided for them. Protégés were very descriptive in their accounts of how their mentors provided this assistance and described the details of exactly what this advice and guidance entailed. In addition, five protégés explicitly mentioned job search counselling as a benefit of their mentoring relationships. However, none of the protégés mentioned this assistance as the most important mentoring function, which may further demonstrate the potential lack of accuracy in these responses.

5.2 Nature of Current Relationships

Consistent with Kram’s (1983) discussion of mentoring relationship phases, and Johnson and Huwe’s (2003) portrayal of academic mentoring relationships in the redefinition phase, participants described their relationships as positive and collegial. Both parties provided examples which suggested that, in contrast to the interactions they had during their protégés’ time as doctoral students, they currently maintain a different relationship structure. For example, Mentor D said “I think what has happened is I’ve now become friends with some of my doctoral students. We’ve moved away from the mentor-protégé relationship and we are friends” and added “I can now, you know, not worry about always being the mentor. It’s like ‘okay, we’re really friends now.’”
However, some protégés indicated that despite graduating and holding faculty positions at other institutions, they are still mentored by their advisors. Similarly, mentors indicated that they continue to provide mentoring functions for many of their protégés after graduation. For example, one protégé, who graduated over ten years ago, described her mentor as one of her “better friends” whom she rooms with at conferences, but also indicated that her advisor still mentors her today. She explained that her mentor has already entered an area of academia that she is currently considering entering, and that they had recently had a number of conversations regarding this subject. Based on these somewhat conflicting descriptions, a discussion of whether the mentor-protégé aspect is ever completely removed from their relationships is warranted. Although Mentor D was not specifically asked about the possibility of moving away from the mentor-protégé relationship, she fittingly provided the following response:

I mean you definitely go through the cycle of where you continue to be the mentor even for years after, until the person I think gets to a point in his or her professional career where they’re now out on their own advising their own doctoral students.

Based on this quote, it appears as though Mentor D believes that the mentor-protégé aspect of the relationship does decrease over time. However, many protégés still classify the advice they receive from their advisors as mentoring, while a number of mentors said they still provide mentoring functions to their former protégés who have obtained their doctoral degrees. Given the complexity of this issue, and the many and varied mentor-former protégé relationships that exist, further investigation is required before any conclusions can be made.

When examining and analyzing the structure and progression of mentor-protégé relationships over time, researchers may wish to consider building upon the model
described by one mentor in this study (Figure 1). Although I am not in a position to make specific and absolute recommendations or modifications solely using the data obtained through this study, I do believe the mentor’s graphic depiction could potentially be used to represent many of the mentor-former protégé relationships. One of my preliminary recommendations includes modifying the mentor’s term “collegial friendship.” Given the discussion of mutuality, collegiality, and friendship found earlier in this chapter, the compounded idea of collegial friendship may be inconsistent with the proposed Venn diagram model. As a result, the collegial friendship component has been renamed mutuality, collegiality, and friendship (see Figure 3). In addition, I have incorporated a floating, instead of a fixed, diagonal line which moves based on the unique proportional relationship of professional development and psychosocial aspects provided to each protégé. In some cases, the diagonal line may not touch the opposite corners of the rectangle as the mentor may not initially provide mutuality, collegiality, and/or friendship or over time, may cease providing professional development (see Figure 3).

Consideration must also be given to whether this model could be restructured to represent the entire mentoring relationship or if it is only applicable to the redefinition phase.

Figure 3. Adaptation of the proportional relationship of professional development and mutuality, collegiality, and friendship provided to former protégés.
5.3 Characteristics Desired in Academic Protégés and Mentors

Mentors and protégés were asked to provide the most important characteristics that they desired in prospective protégés and mentors, respectively. One protégé believed it was not possible to list specific characteristics but suggested that mentors should be willing to devote the time and energy required to cultivate the mentoring relationships. These comments directly mirror Buhler’s (1998) suggestions that mentors should be committed to their mentoring relationships and should be willing to devote their time to fostering the accompanying interactions. Perhaps because of the individualized nature of mentoring relationships, it is not possible to describe a perfect set of characteristics desired by the other member. Just as each member is different, so too are the characteristics he or she would desire in a prospective mentoring partner.

Both mentors and protégés provided a wide range of characteristics that they desired in the other member, with only a few of the characteristics being mentioned more than once. It is possible that surveying (as compared to interviewing) many doctoral students and dissertation advisors may provide greater insight into the characteristics desired in academic mentoring relationships. However, simply asking a larger sample of individuals may only produce a larger number of varied responses that still lack similarity. In fact, this is exactly what Clark et al. (2000) found in their study of academic mentoring relationships in the field of psychology. The authors asked doctoral student protégés to list the three most important personality characteristics of their most significant faculty mentor. Five hundred and twenty one students listed a total of 1,675 characteristics that the authors reduced to 118 distinct characteristics. The top three characteristics had a frequency count of only 111, 104, and 73 responses, respectively.
Despite receiving 787 completed questionnaires, these authors only found repetition in approximately 1 in 7 responses. Although future research could be conducted in the area of sport management with the intent of compiling a specific list of desired characteristics, it is possible that due to the unique and individual nature of each relationship and its members, this could be a very arduous, if not impossible, task.

5.4 Mentoring Outcomes

With the exception of securing prestigious internships, which is not directly related to most sport management doctoral programs, protégés in this study reported receiving all of the positive predoctoral benefits outlined by Johnson and Huwe (2003). Because this study did not examine satisfaction or provide a comparative non-mentored group, it was not possible to determine whether protégés received many of the postdoctoral benefits cited by Johnson and Huwe or Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986). Protégés were, however, able to increase their knowledge and experience regarding mentoring others, which was gained through the protégés’ own mentoring relationship experiences. This is especially encouraging as mentored individuals are more likely to mentor others (Johnson and Huwe; Roche, 1979). Perhaps by increasing the number of protégés who experience successful mentoring relationships, and by having those individuals take the knowledge and insight they gained and enter into their own mentoring relationships (as mentors), the overall prevalence and quality of mentoring relationships within the sport management academy could be increased.

The positive benefits received by mentors and protégés were the focus of the mentoring outcomes in this study. Negative outcomes were not reported; however, an
absence of reporting does not necessarily indicate an absence of occurrence. It is possible that mentors or protégés experienced negative outcomes as a result of their mentoring relationships but for a variety of reasons, chose not to disclose this information during their interviews. Once a better understanding of the positive outcomes experienced by mentors and protégés has been derived, examining any negative outcomes of mentoring, mentoring dysfunction, and/or ethical issues mentors and protégés face may be worthwhile.
6.0 CONCLUSION

The following section provides a summary of this study, highlights some of the study’s strengths, addresses additional limitations, discusses potential implications resulting from this study, and suggests directions for future research.

6.1 Summary

This study sought to examine the mentoring relationships among sport management doctoral dissertation advisors (mentors) and their former doctoral students (protégés), focusing specifically on the mentoring functions advisors provided for their doctoral students; the nature of their current relationships; the characteristics each member (mentor and protégé) desires in the other member; and the outcomes of these mentoring relationships. Semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with 13 participants. The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. The data was analyzed manually and with qualitative analysis software, and this process included both open and axial coding.

Participants collectively reported providing (mentors) or receiving (protégés) all of Kram’s (1988) career and psychosocial mentoring functions. For example, mentors sponsored their protégés by writing reference letters, exposed protégés to the field of sport management and the various aspects related to careers in academia, provided networking opportunities, coached protégés through the doctoral education experience as well as the research and writing processes, protected their students from potentially problematic committee members, and provided challenging publication expectations. With respect to psychosocial functions, protégés described their mentors as role models...
who led by example and successfully balanced work and personal responsibilities. Protégés also reported that their mentors confirmed their unique interests and helped to build their confidence, provided counselling for job opportunities and future plans, and displayed mutuality and collegiality.

When describing their current relationships, mentors and protégés recounted positive interactions that are both personal and professional in nature and occur with varying levels of frequency. Although the relationships vary and are dependent upon the specific individuals involved, a number of participants characterized their relationships as friendships and many indicated that they still provide or receive mentoring functions. Mentors cited a wide variety of characteristics that they desired in their protégés and most tried to ensure that they were compatible with prospective doctoral students before agreeing to advise them. Protégés also provided an array of characteristics that they desired in their mentors, but some confessed that they did not actually seek out these characteristics when searching for a dissertation advisor.

Finally, both mentors and protégés reported receiving many positive outcomes as a result of their mentoring relationships. Mentors cited professional benefits such as additional publications and an expanded breadth of knowledge resulting from their protégés’ varied dissertation topics. Mentors’ personal benefits included friendship, satisfaction, and personal enrichment. Despite the mentors’ ability to describe the benefits they received, many protégés struggled to describe how their mentors would have benefitted from these relationships. When asked about their own benefits, protégés indicated that they benefitted from their mentors’ reputations and received job search support, preparation for their careers, publishing assistance, and friendship.
Despite adopting Kram’s (1988) mentoring function framework primarily because of its significant popularity within the mentoring literature, it has become apparent that this framework may not effectively capture many of the context-specific nuances associated with academic mentoring relationships. With some adaptations, many of Kram’s functions were re-worked to incorporate these unique elements. For example, mentors may provide many instances of indirect sponsorship but fewer examples of direct sponsorship as defined by Kram; Kram’s definition of exposure and visibility was expanded to include socializing the protégés into academia; given the importance mentors and protégés placed on networking, this function should no longer be grouped within exposure and visibility but should be its own separate career function; challenging assignments could include the doctoral education process as a whole; and finally, the description of the friendship function should accommodate aspects of mutuality and collegiality (as depicted in Figure 3). In order to determine the prevalence, frequency, and importance of the mentoring functions, additional studies that provide participants with listings of each of the mentoring functions and explicitly address each research aspect (i.e., prevalence, frequency, and importance) independently are needed.

With respect to the nature of their current relationships, participants appeared to be in the redefinition phase of their mentoring relationships, which contained greater aspects of mutuality, collegiality, and/or friendship than may have been present in earlier phases. A model provided by one of the mentors, perhaps with a few modifications, may serve as an excellent pictorial representation of this relationship. However, even after describing their current relationships, it is not clear at what point the friendship function was fostered and whether or not it was present during the active mentoring phases.
Given the unique nature of the individuals in mentoring relationships, along with
the wide range and variety of characteristics desired in the other members of the
mentoring relationship, it may be difficult to create a specific list of desired
characteristics with any amount of accuracy. Other academic mentoring studies have
reported similar outcomes. Future research on the topic of characteristics desired in
members of academic mentoring relationships involving large numbers of participants
may be able to provide some insight into the desired characteristics. Finally, the positive
mentoring outcomes received by participants in this study were consistent with Johnson
and Huwe’s (2003) descriptions of predoctoral benefits. Because comparative non-
mentored groups were not assessed, it is not possible to determine if many of the specific
long term or career related benefits and satisfactions associated with mentoring were
realized.

6.2 Strengths of the Study

In contrast to the highly studied business and organizational contexts, fewer
studies have examined the mentoring relationships that occur within academic settings
(Clark et al., 2000; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). In addition, while sport management
scholars recognize the importance of the topic of mentoring, academic mentoring
relationships within this field have received little scholarship. Therefore, this study serves
as an important initial investigation of the mentoring relationships between sport
management dissertation advisors and their doctoral students. In comparison to the many
quantitative studies that have examined aspects of mentoring relationships, the qualitative
approach of this study permitted an exploration of the participants’ views and feelings on
the subject matter. Through open-ended questions, mentors and protégés shared their mentoring experiences and provided information rich text that I was able to analyze and use to support my findings.

Furthermore, many of the previous mentoring studies examined only one group of mentoring partners (i.e., mentors or protégés) and then attempted to apply the findings to the various mentoring relationships. In contrast, I interviewed both members of the same mentoring relationship and compared their responses to gain a more balanced perspective. For example, rather than simply asking the mentors about the mentoring functions they provided and concluding that those functions were in fact present in the relationships, I also interviewed the protégés in order to gain their insight and corroborate the information provided by each member. Collectively, conducting a study examining mentoring in academia from a qualitative perspective, while simultaneously interviewing both members of the relationship about their various perceptions, adds unique elements not found in many previous mentoring studies.

6.3 Additional Limitations

In addition to the limitations presented in the Methodology chapter, there are a few other limitations that arose during the completion of the study that must be noted. The questions in the interview guides, and especially those pertaining to the functions of mentoring, were intentionally designed to be rather vague. As mentioned in the Discussion chapter, because I wanted to minimize my influence on the participants’ responses, I did not specifically inquire about each of Kram’s (1988) individual mentoring functions. Instead, I simply asked protégés to describe: the guidance,
counselling, or advice their mentors provided for them; how their mentors provided opportunities or helped to develop their careers; how their advisors helped their personal development; and if there were any other actions that their advisor took in order to mentor them. Similarly, the mentors were asked how they provided the aforementioned items for their doctoral students. Therefore, it is possible that the specific aspects of mentoring suggested in the interview guides influenced the participants’ responses. In order to determine additional details regarding the functions of mentoring found in academia, a study that explicitly inquires about each mentoring function, its relative importance, and its provision frequency should be undertaken.

Further, there were asymmetrical relationships contained within this study (i.e., the protégés responded with respect to their specific advisors while the mentors responded with respect to their general group of former protégés who held faculty positions in sport management throughout North America). Therefore, the protégés knew the identities of their mentors but the mentors were not told the specific identities of the protégés who participated in this study. Consequently, this asymmetrical relationship may have prevented mentors from describing the exact mentoring functions they provided, the nature of their current relationships, and/or the outcomes they received from the specific mentoring relationships under investigation.

Finally, because all protégés said that they are still in contact with their mentors and because confidentiality could not be absolutely guaranteed, protégés may have been hesitant to describe potential problems they may have encountered in their mentoring relationships. This may have skewed the finding that these relationships are generally
positive and a future study should attempt to explicitly inquire about the negative aspects and outcomes of academic mentoring relationships in the field of sport management.

6.4 Potential Implications

By completing a study in the under-researched area of mentoring in sport management, I hope to have drawn attention to the topic of mentoring between dissertation advisors and their doctoral students. It is also possible that the findings from this study will act as the basis for subsequent, more detailed analyses of mentoring within this field.

Upon reading the findings of this study, protégés can gain an understanding of the wide range of functions that are found in academic mentoring relationships. If necessary, current protégés may be able to discuss these various mentoring functions with their advisors to determine how to incorporate additional functions into their own relationships. Similarly, prospective doctoral students seeking a dissertation advisor might be able to apply the insight gained on mentoring relationships to their own search. For example, like some of the participants in this study, prospective protégés may not realize the critical importance that doctoral advisors play in an individual’s doctoral education, and after reading this study, may be in a better position to find a well-suited mentor.

Sport management faculty may also benefit from the results of this study. Individuals who currently advise (or who will soon begin advising) doctoral students may become aware of what other advisors in the field are doing for their doctoral students and could perhaps incorporate these aspects into their own mentoring relationships. These
actions, however, may not be strictly limited to the advising of doctoral students and could possibly be adapted for other educational levels and degrees. For example, individuals could potentially create their own contract with their doctoral students and incorporate elements that are important to them (e.g., evaluating students’ teaching skills or going out for lunch). Mentors could also choose one of Kram’s (1988) individual mentoring functions, and based on their own unique abilities and circumstances, focus on integrating additional behaviours into their mentoring relationships. More specifically, a mentor who balances the rigours of academia with the demands of a young family could model these behaviours for his or her doctoral students and perhaps discuss some of the challenges associated with these responsibilities.

6.5 Directions for Future Research

Although this study provided a starting point for the examination of the relationships between sport management dissertation advisors and their doctoral students, much more research in this area is needed. For example, studies specifically focusing on the mentoring functions that advisors provide for their doctoral students would offer additional results that may be compared to the findings from this study. Interviewing a larger number of mentors and protégés would provide further insight into the mentoring functions seen in academia, and more specifically, the field of sport management. In this case, interview questions should specifically inquire about each of Kram’s (1988) mentoring functions rather than asking broad, generalized questions related to overall career and personal development. This might help to determine the nature, frequency, and prevalence of some of the mentoring functions that were less emergent in this study.
Similarly, particular attention could be given to functions that based on this study, differed from Kram’s initial conceptualizations. This information could then be used to modify the adapted mentoring functions proposed in this study.

Other potential directions for future research consist of replicating this study with a randomly generated sample of mentors and protégés. Doing so may allow the findings to be generalized beyond academic mentoring relationships involving highly productive sport management faculty members who have previously advised a large number of doctoral students. If possible, researchers should also remove the asymmetrical component of the relationship by disclosing both members’ identities and inquire about various aspects of their mentoring relationship. This would hopefully allow mentors to respond more specifically to the unique mentoring relationships under investigation.

While this study, along with others, helped to identify the mentoring functions that are present in mentoring relationships, the comparative importance of each function is not known. Through the use of regression based techniques such as policy capturing or conjoint analysis (Aiman-Smith, Scullen, & Barr, 2002; Karren & Woodard Barringer, 2002; Wolfe & Putler, 2002), a perceived relative weighting or evaluation of the various mentoring functions could be determined. In doing so, researchers could create fictional profiles of mentors who exhibit varying levels (e.g., high, medium, and low) of the established mentoring functions (e.g., career and psychosocial). Participants would then be asked to rank order the profiles according to their preferred mentoring characteristics. This analysis could enable a comparison of mentoring functions in hopes of determining the relative importance of each function.
Using a quantitative survey approach, researchers could examine the characteristics mentors and protégés desire in the other member of the relationship. This survey would presumably include a greater number of traits and characteristics than those provided during an interview, and could also garner a larger number of participant responses. Additionally, an examination of the relationships between dissertation advisors and their current doctoral students might allow for an analysis of the various phases of the mentoring relationships (as opposed to only studying relationships in the redefinition phase, as was the case in this study).

In addition, aspects and outcomes of mentoring relationships such as satisfaction (Clark et al., 2001) and/or success (e.g., Tenenbaum et al., 2001) could also be examined. While participants have provided anecdotal evidence of positive outcomes, quantitative measures of protégés’ satisfaction with their mentoring relationships or their doctoral experiences could be examined. Although I acknowledge that there are some inherent flaws and not all aspects of success could be captured using survey methodology, the effect of mentoring on protégé and/or mentor success could also be studied. Moreover, a longitudinal investigation that measures academic achievements such as publication frequencies, promotion rates, or research funding could be gathered and compared across groups reporting various levels of mentoring functions.

Subsequent studies could also be conducted to investigate the influence of the participants’ sex on their mentoring relationships and the resultant outcomes. While differences among male and female protégé experiences or variance between male and female mentoring styles were not a focus of this study, there was an apparent difference in the amount of personal counselling provided by male and female mentors. This finding
is generally consistent with Tenenbaum et al. (2001), who found that female advisors provided more psychosocial help than their male counterparts. While readers are cautioned about drawing conclusions based on the small sample size used in this study and that fact that sex differences were not a primary focus, this rudimentary finding provides support for examining sex related differences in the future. Through the use of same-sex and mixed-sex mentor-protégé pairs, numerous aspects of the mentoring relationship could be studied. Following the lead of other authors who have conducted studies on mentoring relationships in minority populations (e.g., Lark & Croteau, 1998; Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2001), sport management researchers could investigate the mentoring relationships among racial minorities or lesbian, gay, and bisexual mentors and protégés as well.

Finally, once a sufficient understanding of the positive aspects of mentoring in academia has been gleaned, researchers could begin to investigate the negative outcomes and instances of mentoring dysfunction that have been found in other mentoring relationships. This would enable scholars to present a more complete and holistic description of mentoring experiences.

6.6 Conclusion

As so eloquently expressed by McCarron (2006) when summarizing her own experience studying mentoring in academia:

just as a mentor and protégé(e) [sic] grow personally and professionally as they journey down the mentoring path together, so too have I grown as I continue along my own personal journey as a protégée [sic] and as a researcher, having been enriched by this experience and looking forward to what lies ahead. As a result of conducting this research, I feel that I have developed a greater appreciation for all that my mentor has done for me, and I make a greater
conscious effort to express my gratitude at every opportune moment. I truly believe that my relationship with my mentor is better because of this experience.

I wholeheartedly agree with McCarron’s description. As explained in my Researcher Autobiography (Appendix A), I previously classified myself as a quantitative researcher and was intimidated by qualitative methodologies. Throughout the course of this study, I have grown and evolved as a researcher. I have come to appreciate qualitative research, realized how labour intensive the interview process can be, and embraced many of the nuances that I used to fear.

I have also grown immensely throughout my mentoring experience. I am indebted to my thesis advisor (and mentor) for all of the mentoring functions he has provided for me. Like McCarron (2006), I sincerely believe that our relationship is better as result of completing this thesis. Developing an intimate knowledge of the mentoring functions and the characteristics that mentors must possess in order to effectively deliver these functions has reinforced my gratitude and appreciation.

In addition, I have benefitted from the participants of this study who so willingly shared their mentoring experiences with me. It is my hope that I can eventually apply the insight and knowledge I gained through this study to my eventual search for a dissertation advisor. And of course, I hope that my doctoral education experience includes the positive outcomes reported earlier, and that after graduation I may also develop lasting relationships comprised of collegiality, mutuality, and friendship.

However, I would like to believe that I am not the only person who has benefitted (or will benefit in the future) from this experience. I hope that others are also able to profit from the information found within this study and perhaps as a result of reflecting on their own mentoring experiences, have given some thought to a topic they would not
have considered otherwise. With any luck, some of the participants can apply this information to their own current and/or future mentoring experiences, regardless of their position in the relationship – as a mentor, as a protégé, or maybe even one day being fortunate to have experienced both.

As noted in the Introduction chapter, Pastore (2003) and Dixon and Mott (2008a) believe that the mentoring that occurs among doctoral candidates and their dissertation advisors is “critical to the success of new sport management faculty, as well as the continued growth of the field as a whole” (Dixon & Mott, 2008a, ¶ 1). I also agree with this notion. Although I have spent a rather short amount of time engaged in the field of sport management, and I am certainly not qualified to predict the future directions of an entire academic field, I believe that enhanced mentoring experiences (at all levels) could potentially benefit the field of sport management in a countless number of ways. As displayed within the literature review and the findings of this study, mentoring can have a profound positive impact on mentors and protégés, as well as the organizations in which they interact. Consequently, I believe this topic warrants further discussion and scholarship in many areas and levels of sport management academia.
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Appendix A: Researcher Autobiography
Given the influence that researchers have on their own qualitative studies, it is only fitting that I elaborate on some aspects of my life that I believe may have influenced the completion of this study. Most notably, these include my previous experience with mentors, my reasons for pursuing this study, and my initial hesitancy towards conducting qualitative research.

According to a popular African proverb, it takes a village to raise a child. While I agree with the basis of this proverb and acknowledge that many individuals have had an influence in my development, aside from my family members, there have been relatively few people who have had a profound and enduring impact on my life. Growing up I played many sports and was fortunate to have a number of great coaches. While I assume that they all influenced me in one way or another, there is only one coach that had a memorable and lasting impact. Mrs. Williams, my soccer coach during my younger teen years, was a caring yet strong woman who demanded accountability. Although our interactions were mostly limited to soccer, she impacted the way I approached the game and I often looked up to her.

With respect to educational settings, although I enjoyed many of my teachers’ classes in elementary school and high school, I do not remember having a specific individual who significantly influenced my development. Likewise, I do not recall having a specific professor who influenced my education or future career directions during my undergraduate degree. Thankfully, I am very fortunate to have had an absolutely wonderful mentor who I looked up to (and still do) during my master’s degree. My advisor, Dr. Jess Dixon, helped me in countless ways – far more than can be listed here – and I am sure there are many other mentoring functions he provided for me that I am not
yet aware of and will come to appreciate at a later time. This positive experience has undoubtedly influenced my view of mentoring relationships in graduate education and therefore needs to be acknowledged.

I must admit that my motivation to complete this study was primarily selfish. Although not all graduate students’ experiences unfold in this manner, I was very fortunate that my advisor gave me free reign in determining the area of study for my thesis. Rather than being assigned a component of a study that Jess was working on, I was given the opportunity to choose a thesis topic that I was interested in studying. However, I had little previous exposure to the area of sport management and its encompassing topics, and selecting one idea to study for the next year or so was a very daunting and stressful task. Despite Jess’ assistance in discussing and working through my interests, helping me map my rudimentary “likes and dislikes chart” into corresponding research disciplines, and recommending key scholarly articles in different areas, I struggled to narrow down ideas for a potential thesis topic. One afternoon, as I wrestled with prospective topics and ideas, Jess began discussing a study he was currently working on. He then went on to describe a future opportunity that involved interviewing highly productive members of the sport management academy. Although at the time I certainly didn’t realize all that the study would entail, my interest was piqued. In fact, I don’t remember being so excited about an idea before that point. I left the university that afternoon incredibly excited and relieved that I had finally found a thesis topic!

One of the main reasons I was so interested in examining the topic of mentoring, and more specifically in sport management, stemmed from my interest in pursuing a
doctoral degree in that area. I thought conducting this study would be a great way to speak with many influential and productive members of the sport management academy. Not only would I become familiar with these individuals, I would also have the opportunity to introduce myself. In addition, I would have the chance to learn about other individuals’ mentoring experiences firsthand. I would be able to speak with doctoral dissertation advisors and hopefully learn about their mentoring styles, while also speaking with former students who had gone through the doctoral education process and who could potentially share their experiences. Having completed the study, I am very happy to report that my initial expectations were met and exceeded. The participants were very willing to share their stories with me and I was able to gain insight into mentoring experiences in graduate school that I can hopefully put towards my eventual doctoral experience.

Finally, I feel obliged to share how my thoughts and views of the world have evolved. Throughout my high school education and during the first few years of my undergraduate degree I was heavily focused on science related topics. Although I’m ashamed to admit it now, I used to think that science was “better” and that educational programs that didn’t involve the study of physical sciences were not as rigorous. I am not sure how or why I came to hold these beliefs, but looking back (and using some of the knowledge I gained from my graduate courses) I can see that these views certainly influenced the way I thought about the world. As a result of my previous thinking, I was reluctant to embrace qualitative research. I knew the thesis topic that I had selected involved interviews and that I was going to be collecting qualitative data. What I did not anticipate was the difficulty that I was going to have believing in what I was doing. One
of the greatest obstacles I faced was feeling comfortable using the style with which qualitative research is presented. For many years I unquestionably wrote in the third person and the thought of sharing personal information with the readers of this document scared me. Over the course of this thesis process, I have accepted and welcomed these aspects of qualitative research. I now believe that it is critical to write this document in the first person, and I recognize that this researcher autobiography is an important component of my thesis. While I will be the first to admit that I am far from the level of thinking of experienced qualitative researchers, I am proud to say that I no longer see myself as strictly a quantitative researcher.
Appendix B: Mentor Recruitment Letter
Hello Dr. [insert name here],

My name is Jacqueline Beres and I am a graduate student pursuing my Master of Human Kinetics degree at the University of Windsor. As part of my thesis for this program, I will be examining the nature of select mentoring relationships within the sport management academy.

The mentoring relationships selected for this study have been chosen on the basis of scholarly productivity and protégé network size. Dr. [insert name here], you have been identified as an advisor who has an excellent record of scholarly productivity and have advised a large number of former doctoral students. With your permission, I would like to interview you regarding the nature of your relationships with your former doctoral students. The interview questions will be provided beforehand and the interview will be conducted via telephone. I expect it to last approximately 60 minutes.

Given the process by which I have selected potential participants, your participation is critical to the success of my study and I would greatly appreciate having the opportunity to further discuss my research with you. I will be contacting you via telephone in the next few days to answer any questions you may have regarding my study and potentially schedule an interview appointment.

This study has received ethical clearance from the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board, and if required, has received approval from the Institutional Review Board at [insert school affiliation].

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me via email or at (519) XXX-XXXX. Alternatively, you may contact my thesis advisor, Dr. Jess Dixon, at (519) 253-3000 ext. 2461.

Thank you and I look forward to speaking with you.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Beres
B.Sc., MHK Candidate
(519) XXX-XXXX
xxxxxxx@uwindsor.ca
Appendix C: Protégé Recruitment Letter
Hello Dr. [insert name here],

My name is Jacqueline Beres and I am a graduate student pursuing my Master of Human Kinetics degree at the University of Windsor. As part of my thesis for this program, I will be examining the nature of select mentoring relationships within the sport management academy.

The mentoring relationships selected for this study have been chosen on the basis of scholarly productivity and protégé network size. Dr. [insert name here], you have been identified as a former doctoral student of Dr. [insert mentor’s name here]’s and have been selected as a potential participant in my study. With your permission, I would like to interview you regarding the nature of your relationship with your former doctoral advisor. The interview questions will be provided beforehand and the interview will be conducted via telephone. I expect it to last approximately 60 minutes.

Given the process by which I have selected potential participants, your participation is critical to the success of my study and I would greatly appreciate having the opportunity to further discuss my research with you. I will be contacting you via telephone in the next few days to answer any questions you may have regarding my study and potentially schedule an interview appointment.

This study has received ethical clearance from the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board, and if required, has received approval from the Institutional Review Board at [insert school affiliation].

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me via email or at (519) XXX-XXXX. Alternatively, you may contact my thesis advisor, Dr. Jess Dixon, at (519) 253-3000 ext. 2461.

Thank you and I look forward to speaking with you.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Beres  
B.Sc., MHK Candidate  
(519) XXX-XXXX  
xxxxx@uwindsor.ca
Appendix D: Pilot Interview Debriefing Questions
Pilot Interview Debriefing Questions

General Information
1. I have a list of specific questions that I will be asking in just a minute, but do you have any feedback (either in general or specifically) that you would like to share with me?

Interview Guide
2. Were there any questions in the interview guide that were confusing or need more clarification?
3. Were there any questions that seemed inappropriate or irrelevant to the topic of mentoring?
4. Were there any questions that seemed repetitive?
5. Did the interview questions follow a logical progression?

Structure of the Interview
6. Was it helpful to receive the interview guide ahead of time?
7. Do you have any comments about the telephone interview process?
8. Do you have any feedback regarding my interview skills, especially anything that I should know in order to improve future interviews?

Thank you again for your assistance with this task.
Appendix E: Mentor Letter of Information
LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: Examining mentoring relationships within the sport management academy: Perspectives of mentors and protégés.
Population Group: Dissertation advisors

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jacqueline Beres, Master of Human Kinetics Candidate, under the direction of Dr. Jess Dixon, from the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor. The results of this study will contribute towards Ms. Beres’ masters thesis.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact Dr. Jess Dixon at (519) 253-3000 ext. 2461 or by email at jdixon@uwindsor.ca.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study seeks to examine the nature of select mentoring relationships within the sport management academy. For the purposes of this study, mentoring relationships have been defined as the relationships between former sport management doctoral students, who are now sport management faculty themselves, and their doctoral dissertation advisors. More specifically, this study will investigate the mentoring functions provided by dissertation advisors, the nature of the current relationships between dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students, the characteristics desired in mentors and protégés and the outcomes of these mentoring relationships.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, I would ask that you participate in a telephone interview that I will initiate at mutually agreeable time. The interview will inquire about your relationships with your former doctoral students. Shortly after completing the interview, the interview will be transcribed and you will be given the option of reviewing this transcription.

The interview should take approximately 60 minutes and follow up contact is not required.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The risks associated with participating in this study are minimal. You may experience some slight discomfort given the nature of the relationships you have with your former doctoral students. Please know that you may refuse to answer any questions during the interview.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

The direct benefits to you will be limited. The interview questions will give you the opportunity to reflect on your relationship with your doctoral students, which may make you more aware of the positive outcomes of these relationships. You may also become more aware of the positive outcomes of mentoring relationships and subsequently provide these functions to other individuals you may be currently mentoring.

It is hoped, however, that the sport management academy as a whole will benefit from your participation in this study. Mentoring has previously been called an “essential area” for sport management educators yet few studies have examined the nature of these relationships. I am hoping that by studying your relationships with your doctoral students, along with other mentoring relationships like yours, I will be able to find similar themes and patterns in the mentoring relationships and therefore pass this information on to others in the field of sport management.
PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You will not receive any payment for your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Since the interviews are being conducted by the student investigator and she will know the identity of the participants, anonymity is not possible.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. However, since the sport management academy is a rather small, close knit group of professionals, and because the rationale for selecting participants will be disclosed in the research findings, other members of the sport management academy may be able to determine a few of the study participants. Therefore, your confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

The interview recordings will not be released to anyone else. You will have the option of reviewing and editing the completed interview transcription.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. You may also remove your data from the study at any point.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

Results of this study will be available from the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board website and can be found by selecting ‘study results’ from the left hand menu. The results will be available after August 25, 2009.

Web address: www.uwindsor.ca/reb
Date when results are available: September 15, 2009

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data may be used in subsequent studies.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

_____________________________________   ______________
Signature of Investigator      Date
Appendix F: Protégé Letter of Information
LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: Examining mentoring relationships within the sport management academy: Perspectives of mentors and protégés.

Population Group: Former doctoral students

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jacqueline Beres, Master of Human Kinetics Candidate, under the direction of Dr. Jess Dixon, from the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor. The results of this study will contribute towards Ms. Beres’ masters thesis.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact Dr. Jess Dixon at (519) 253-3000 ext. 2461 or by email at jdixon@uwindsor.ca.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study seeks to examine the nature of select mentoring relationships within the sport management academy. For the purposes of this study, mentoring relationships have been defined as the relationships between former sport management doctoral students, who are now sport management faculty themselves, and their doctoral dissertation advisors. More specifically, this study will investigate the mentoring functions provided by dissertation advisors, the nature of the current relationships between dissertation advisors and their former doctoral students, the characteristics desired in mentors and protégés and the outcomes of these mentoring relationships.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, I would ask that you participate in a telephone interview that I will initiate at mutually agreeable time. The interview will inquire about your relationship with your doctoral dissertation advisor. Shortly after completing the interview, the interview will be transcribed and you will be given the option of reviewing this transcription.

The interview should take approximately 60 minutes and follow up contact is not required.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The risks associated with participating in this study are minimal. You may experience some slight discomfort given the nature of the relationship you have with your doctoral dissertation advisor. Please know that you may refuse to answer any questions during the interview.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

The direct benefits to you will be limited. The interview questions will give you the opportunity to reflect on your relationship with your doctoral dissertation advisor, which may make you more aware of the positive outcomes of this relationship. You may also become more aware of the positive outcomes of mentoring relationships and subsequently bring this information to other mentoring relationships you may currently be involved in.

Is it is hoped, however, that the sport management academy as a whole will benefit from your participation in this study. Mentoring has previously been called an “essential area” for sport management educators yet few studies have examined the nature of these relationships. I am hoping that by studying your relationship with your doctoral advisor, along with other relationships like yours, I will be able to find similar themes and patterns in the mentoring relationships and therefore pass this information on to others in the field of sport management.
PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You will not receive any payment for your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Since the interviews are being conducted by the student investigator and she will know the identity of the participants, anonymity is not possible.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. However, since the sport management academy is a rather small, close knit group of professionals, and because the rationale for selecting participants will be disclosed in the research findings, other members of the sport management academy may be able to determine a few of the study participants. Therefore, your confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

The interview recordings will not be released to anyone else. You will have the option of reviewing and editing the completed interview transcription.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. You may also remove your data from the study at any point.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

Results of this study will be available from the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board website and can be found by selecting ‘study results’ from the left hand menu. The results will be available after September 15, 2009.

Web address: www.uwindsor.ca/reb
Date when results are available: September 15, 2009

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data may be used in subsequent studies.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

____________________________________  ___________ _________
Signature of Investigator      Date
Appendix G: Mentor Interview Guide
Interview Guide for Doctoral Dissertation Advisors

Advisor:  Telephone:  
Date of Interview:  Time of Interview:  

Briefing Questions:  
What will follow is approximately a 60 minute interview. Please note that you have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions.

Consent to Participate in Research  
Your participation in this study is voluntary. Please remember that while every effort will be taken to ensure confidentiality, because of the small, close-knit nature of the sport management academy, confidentiality cannot be absolutely guaranteed. After reading the Letter of Information you previously received, do you consent to participate in this research study?

Yes ☐  No ☐

Date & time consent was received: ________________________

Consent for Audio Taping  
I would like to record this interview in order to facilitate transcription after the interview is complete. This is a voluntary procedure and you are free to withdraw at any time by requesting that the taping be stopped. As indicated in the Letter of Information, after the interviews have been transcribed, the audio recordings will be stored on an external hard drive in a secure location for five years. Confidentiality will be respected but is not guaranteed and the digital recordings will be for professional use only. Do you consent to having this interview digitally recorded?

Yes ☐  No ☐

Date & time consent was received: ________________________

Focus of Study  
While it is possible that you may have (or had) more than one mentoring relationship, this study seeks to examine only the mentoring relationships between doctoral students and their dissertation advisors. Therefore, I would like you to answer the following questions with respect to your relationships with your former doctoral students who now hold faculty appointments in sport management.

Interview Questions:  

Introductory Questions
1.  For how long have you been advising doctoral students?  
2.  During that time period, roughly how many doctoral students have you advised?
Mentoring Functions Provided
3. Can you please tell me how you provided guidance, counselling, or advice for your doctoral students?
   a. Are there any memorable instances that you would like to describe?
4. Can you please describe how you provided opportunities or helped to develop your doctoral students’ careers?
5. Can you please describe how you helped your doctoral students’ personal development?
6. Are there any other actions that you take in order to mentor your doctoral students?

Outcomes of Mentoring Functions
7. What are some of the benefits that you have received from working with your doctoral students?
8. How, if at all, do you believe your career has advanced as a result of your relationship with your doctoral students?
   a. Can you please provide any specific examples of this?
9. How, if at all, do you believe you have benefitted personally from your relationships with your doctoral students?
   b. Can you please provide any specific examples of this?
10. How do you believe your doctoral students have benefitted from your relationships?
     c. Can you please elaborate on any general/career/personal benefit you believe your doctoral students may have received?

Characteristics Desired of Doctoral Students
11. What do you believe are the most important characteristics an effective doctoral student should possess?
12. What are the specific characteristics, if any, that you look for in prospective doctoral students prior to agreeing to advise them?
13. Thinking back to some of your most effective doctoral students, can you please describe some of the characteristics that these individuals possessed?
14. Are there any characteristics that you would consider “essential” to successful relationships with your doctoral students?

Nature of Current Relationship
15. How would you describe your relationship with former doctoral students who currently hold academic positions?
16. How frequently do you interact with these individuals?
17. What is the nature of these interactions? (e.g., at conferences, collaborating on research projects).

Concluding Questions
18. Is there anything else that you would like to elaborate on, either related to a previous answer or simply something that you feel is pertinent to this study?
Concluding Remarks

I would like to thank you for your participation in this study. Your responses are critical to the success of my thesis and I sincerely appreciate your time. Should you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me or my thesis supervisor, Dr. Jess Dixon, by email or telephone as listed on the Letter of Information.

As a final question, would you like to review a copy of this interview transcript?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If yes:
I will be transcribing the interviews over the next few weeks and will forward you a copy for your review and approval. Following your review of the transcript, please send any edits, comments, or feedback through email or regular mail using the contact information you will receive with the transcript.

Thank you.
Appendix H: Protégé Interview Guide
Interview Guide for Former Doctoral Students

Former Doctoral Student: ____________________________
Date of Interview: ____________________________ Time of Interview: ____________________________

Briefing Questions:
What will follow is approximately a 60 minute interview. Please note that you have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions.

Consent to Participate in Research
Your participation in this study is voluntary. Please remember that while every effort will be taken to ensure confidentiality, because of the small, close-knit nature of the sport management academy, confidentiality cannot be absolutely guaranteed. After reading the Letter of Information you previously received, do you consent to participate in this research study?

Yes □ No □
Date & time consent was received: ____________________________

Consent for Audio Taping
I would like to record this interview in order to facilitate transcription after the interview is complete. This is a voluntary procedure and you are free to withdraw at any time by requesting that the taping be stopped. As indicated in the Letter of Information, after the interviews have been transcribed, the audio recordings will be stored on an external hard drive in a secure location for five years. Confidentiality will be respected but is not guaranteed and the digital recordings will be for professional use only. Do you consent to having this interview digitally recorded?

Yes □ No □
Date & time consent was received: ____________________________

Focus of Study
While it is possible that you may have (or had) more than one mentoring relationship, this study seeks to examine only the relationships between former doctoral students and their dissertation advisors. Therefore, I would like you to answer the following questions with respect to your relationship with your doctoral dissertation advisor.
For the record, please state who your doctoral dissertation advisor was: ____________________________

Interview Questions:

Introductory Questions
1. In what year did you start your doctoral degree?
2. When did you finish?
3. At what university was this degree completed?
Mentoring Functions Provided
4. Can you please tell me how your advisor provided guidance, counselling, or advice?
   a. Are there any memorable instances that you would like to describe?
5. Can you please describe how your advisor provided opportunities or helped to develop your career?
6. Can you please describe how your advisor helped your personal development?
7. Are there any other actions that your advisor took in order to mentor you?

Outcomes of Mentoring Functions
8. What was it like working with your advisor?
9. How, if at all, do you believe your doctoral education benefitted from your relationship with your advisor?
   d. Can you please provide any specific examples of this?
10. How, if at all, do you believe your career advanced as a result of your relationship with your advisor?
    e. Can you please provide any specific examples of this?
11. How, if at all, do you believe you have benefitted personally from your relationship with your advisor?
    f. Can you please provide any specific examples of this?
12. How do you believe your advisor benefitted from your relationship?
    g. Can you please elaborate on any general/career/personal benefits your advisor may have received?

Characteristics Desired of Doctoral Dissertation Advisors
13. What do you believe are the most important characteristics an effective doctoral dissertation advisor should possess?
14. What were the specific characteristics, if any, that you looked for in an advisor prior to beginning your doctoral degree?
15. Since completing your doctoral degree, has your opinion changed regarding the most important characteristics an advisor should possess?
   a. If yes, how?

Nature of Current Relationship
16. Please describe your relationship with your advisor at this point in time.
17. How frequently do you interact with your advisor?
18. What is the nature of these interactions? (e.g., at conferences, collaborating on research projects).

Concluding Questions
19. Is there anything else that you would like to elaborate on, either related to a previous answer or simply something that you feel is pertinent to this study?
Concluding Remarks

I would like to thank you for your participation in this study. Your responses are critical to the success of my thesis and I sincerely appreciate your time. Should you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me or my thesis supervisor, Dr. Jess Dixon, by email or telephone as listed on the Letter of Information.

As a final question, would you like to review a copy of this interview transcript?

Yes ☐  No ☐

If yes:
I will be transcribing the interviews over the next few weeks and will forward you a copy for your review and approval. Following your review of the transcript, please send any edits, comments, or feedback through email or regular mail using the contact information you will receive with the transcript.

Thank you.
Appendix I: Follow-Up Letter
Dear Dr. [insert name here],

I trust that you received the introductory email I sent last week explaining the purpose of my master’s thesis and requesting your participation. Unfortunately, I have not been able to make contact with you via telephone.

My records indicate that you can be reached at [insert telephone number here]. If this information is incorrect, please accept my apologies for this sending this letter.

Should you be willing to discuss your participation in my study, please feel free to contact me via email to arrange a follow-up telephone call. Alternatively, I will attempt to contact you again within the next few days.

In the event you wish to be removed from my potential participant list or are unable to participate in my study, please reply to this email indicating so. This will ensure that I will not contact you any further and will also allow me to continue with my data collection.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to speaking with you,

{Signature}

Jacqueline Beres
B.Sc., MHK Candidate
(519) xxx-xxxx
xxxxx@uwindsor.ca
Appendix J: Examples of Protégés’ Networking Opportunities and Outcomes
As described in the Results section, protégés were provided with many networking opportunities during their doctoral education. They detailed how their mentors routinely introduced them to influential others and recounted the benefits that they received from these introductions and associations. Protégé D1 agreed that these opportunities were beneficial and added:

being part of the [institution’s] network is something that is invaluable - so helping me connect with folks, introduc[ing] me to people when they are on campus, facilitating relationships with former students [who] I would not have met ... [otherwise]. That was very helpful along the way. The idea of becoming involved with NASSM, going to NASSM as a student and, you know, making connections and realizing that this was an important group to be a part of and the experiences of being at the conference and what I learned from it that was all very helpful to me.

Protégé D2 expressed further support for the critical importance of networking by saying:

one of the best things she did was introducing me to everybody at the conferences. She, of course, had me going to conferences, presenting at conferences from the get-go. I just remember, [my mentor], she’s such a social butterfly. She knows everybody. And she just introduced me, and just the association that I was one of her students gave me instant credibility and the networking from that has just been phenomenal. Since graduating, I’ve enjoyed meeting many of her former and current doc students at conferences. It’s just a huge network of folks to, you know, potentially do research with or just to consult with, talk to. But I think that was probably one of the best things, the networking opportunities at conferences.

When asked if his advisor had ever networked on his behalf or introduced him to other people in the field, Protégé A2 further highlighted the importance of networking and responded:

yeah, I think that what he was most interested in doing is making sure that the [institution’s] graduates, and there’s a lot of ‘em, are familiar with the [institution’s] students, including those who are approaching graduation. And there’s sort of a[n institutional] fraternity and he’s a part of it...his influence is a big part of that....So when I was going to conferences I would find myself in a hotel suite with [my mentor] and a number of his former students who were now five years, ten years into, you know, their careers as professors. And that absolutely opens some doors for me that I had some choice about where I would
take a job. And I’ve tried to continue that because I believe it’s one of the strengths of that institution. So now when I go to a conference, I go to dinner and go out on the town with [students] who are in their second and third years at [the institution] and now some of those [students] are in their first year as professors somewhere and they will and I will continue to get to know those students at [the institution].

Taken together, these examples clearly demonstrate the critical importance of networking in academic mentoring relationships. As a result, I propose that networking should be a separate and distinct career function within Kram’s (1988) original mentoring functions framework.
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