

Mentoring in Clinical Psychology Programs: Broadening and Deepening

Lorraine Mangione and Kathi A. Borden
Antioch University New England

Lavita Nadkarni
University of Denver

Katherine Evarts
Antioch University New England

Kelsey Hyde
University of Denver

Mentoring has received much attention in the research and training literature for several years and has been increasingly described as important in the teaching and training enterprise. Questions about the definition of mentoring, where it does and does not take place, its association with different psychology training models, and the growing diversity of graduate students who may have different mentoring needs than previous cohorts, have all been addressed in the literature and inform this study. This exploratory research adds to the understanding of mentoring by gathering data from current more culturally diverse mentees from scientist–practitioner and practitioner–scholar training programs in psychology. A survey was sent to graduate programs, and responses from 290 participants were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Mentors were highly valued by mentees, even though they defined and described mentors in a variety of ways. There was little to no difference depending on one’s training model, and several respondents discussed the needs of culturally diverse students. Mentees often mentioned 2 broad categories as critical to mentoring: pragmatic support, such as help managing graduate school and finding jobs, and emotional support. Overall, aspects of the relationship competency seemed to be the foundation for all mentoring activities for many of the participants.

Keywords: mentoring, training, relationship, cultural diversity

Attention to the research and practice of mentoring in general, and in psychology education and training in particular, has grown tremendously in the past several years (Brewer, 2012; Campbell & Ander-

son, 2010; Johnson, 2014). Previous research in the larger world of work and education, and psychology in particular, has shown that mentoring is associated with positive outcomes, generally speaking.

This article was published Online First July 17, 2017.

LORRAINE MANGIONE is a graduate of Duke University for her bachelor’s and University of Kansas for her doctorate, is a professor of psychology and Director of Practica at Antioch University New England in Keene, New Hampshire. She teaches doctoral students in the Department of Clinical Psychology. Teaching, clinical, and research interests include training issues, group therapy, supervision, creativity, psychodynamic and relational theory, loss and grief, women beyond midlife, mentoring, and meaning-making in Bruce Springsteen’s work. She has published, with Donna DiCello, *Daughters, Dads, and the Path through Grief: Tales from Italian America*, a book encompassing loss, mourning, father/daughter relationships, Italian American culture, stereotypes, religion, and spirituality. She was the recipient of the Massachusetts Psychological Association Special Recognition Award for Exceptional Dedication to Teaching and Training in Psychology in 2015.

KATHI A. BORDEN is Professor of Clinical Psychology Department at Antioch University New England. She received her undergraduate degree from Binghamton University of the State University of New York, and her doctorate in Clinical Psychology from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She is a Past President of the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology and has received the American Psychological Association Advocacy Award for her work as a Federal Education Advocacy Coordinator. She is an Associate Editor of *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* and on the Editorial Board of *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*. She is a licensed psychologist whose clinical and research interests include child and family issues and interventions, school consultation, legislative advocacy, integrative treatment approaches, gender identity and sexual orientation, and clinical psychology education and training.

LAVITA NADKARNI is the Associate Dean at the University of Denver’s Graduate School of Professional Psychology, where she teaches and supervises graduate students. She received her master’s degree in Forensic

Psychology from City University–John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and her doctorate in Clinical Psychology from Adelphi University’s Derner Institute of Advanced Psychological Studies. She is the current President of the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology. She is a Past Editor of the *Psychotherapy Bulletin*. She is a licensed psychologist whose clinical and research interests include clinical psychology education and training, diversity, and forensic issues related to immigration, and other civil and criminal related matters. She is the co-author of the book, *Principles of Forensic Report Writing*, and has co-edited and co-authored many publications related to diversity issues.

KATHERINE EVARTS is finishing her doctoral internship at University of New Hampshire with the hopes of receiving her PsyD in August, 2017, from Antioch University New England. Katherine will be Assistant Director of the Psychological Services Center at Antioch University New England next year, while also teaching at the university and seeking licensure. Clinical and research interests include attachment, trauma, LGBTQ+ health, social justice, and program evaluation.

KELSEY HYDE is a third year doctoral student at the University of Denver’s Graduate School of Professional Psychology, where she studies clinical psychology with a specialty focus in the area of child and family psychology. She received her master’s degree in Clinical Psychology from the University of Denver’s Graduate School of Professional Psychology and her bachelor’s degree in Psychology and English at Grinnell College. She has clinical experience in community mental health and residential treatment settings, as well as a background in elementary education.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THIS ARTICLE should be addressed to Lorraine Mangione, Department of Clinical Psychology, Antioch University New England, 40 Avon Street, Keene, NH 03431. E-mail: lmangione@antioch.edu

Johnson (2014) gave an overview of the benefits of mentoring in psychology training, including in academic productivity, networking and initial employment, professional competence and confidence, and satisfaction with the training program. A more individualized account of benefits by Hall and Maltby (2013) allows a look into the mentoring dyad and includes discussion of gender and religion within that context. Burney et al. (2009), in one of several articles in a special section on mentoring in *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, discussed benefits derived from four programs for graduate students through experienced psychologists developed by various psychological organizations. Such benefits include a diversity initiative to increase diversity in psychology leadership, and a focus on advocacy. These findings, in conjunction with the growth of different models of training for psychologists and the growing diversity of students in training, lead to important questions about mentoring practice and experience. For psychologists involved in training students in health service psychology, the following questions seem relevant and timely: How have we expanded the concept and experience of mentoring, and how can we broaden and deepen them further?

Some past studies have indicated that clinical psychology students in traditional doctoral (PhD) programs report experiencing mentorship more often than students in Doctor of psychology (PsyD) programs (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000). This discrepancy has sometimes been interpreted as a weakness or disadvantage of practitioner-scholar training programs. However, findings regarding rates of mentoring vary depending on the definition of mentoring. For example, Groody (2004) asked 102 PhD and 105 PsyD psychologists to describe their graduate school relationships with faculty and with clinical and research supervisors prior to having the participants categorize them as mentoring or nonmentoring relationships. Use of this method resulted in virtually equal reports of being mentored across degree types (81% of PhDs and 84% of PsyDs). It is clear that the definition of “mentor” has a large impact on estimates of frequency of mentoring.

Questions around mentoring of more diverse populations, such as women and diverse racial and ethnic groups, have also arisen as the population of psychology graduate students has changed dramatically in the last few decades. (See the American Psychological Association’s report for current statistics on the larger realm of psychology master’s and doctoral graduate students, found at the following Web address: <http://www.apa.org/education/grad/survey-data/2017-student-demographics.aspx>.) A more traditional male-male pairing of mentor and mentee may not work as well with current demographics, which includes a larger number of female graduate students (Campbell & Anderson, 2010). Johnson and Ridley (2008), in their very accessible “how to” book on mentoring, offered specific advice on being sensitive to gender, race, and ethnicity, and Schlosser, Talleyrand, Lyons, Kim, and Johnson (2011) authored a comprehensive review and conceptualization of the current state of multicultural advising, linking it to mentoring also.

We sought to address questions around mentoring through an exploratory electronic survey of advanced students and mostly early career professionals from programs representing the two largest clinical psychology training models to assess how they define mentoring and what they have and have not experienced as mentoring. We were particularly interested in mentoring that went beyond traditional research mentoring, and in looking at the foundation of mentoring as residing in the relationship competency, as described by Mangione

and Nadkarni (2010). The survey, designed through faculty-student collaboration, asked respondents for their descriptions, definitions, and ideas about mentoring (see the Appendix). We were interested in how mentoring was defined by the person being mentored. Specifically, we asked about mentoring broadly defined to include mentoring by advisors, professors, teachers, supervisors, advanced students, and directors of clinical training. We included questions about mentoring experiences of women and diverse populations, given that students from these groups have grown in number in the past few decades in psychology and because their needs and wishes may not fit with traditional views of mentoring. We thought that this expanded concept of mentoring would more thoroughly describe what actually happens in programs, and would inform programs seeking to enhance opportunities for future mentoring relationships and experiences.

After a brief review of relevant mentoring literature, we present our descriptive mixed-methods study and our analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data. We received usable data from 290 participants, including 235 doctoral students and 55 early career psychologists, and read many thoughtful, reflective responses on the value of the relationship as the foundation for mentoring, issues of cross-cultural mentoring pairs, and the value added to graduate school from a sound mentoring relationship.

Literature Review

Is There a Single Definition of Mentoring?

The value of mentoring in psychology education and training has been studied and discussed, and “mentoring” is starting to be seen as a competency for educators (see Johnson, 2014, for a review and commentary), yet there remain multiple views of the definition and description of mentoring. A helpful starting place for that definition comes from Johnson (2014) who, after surveying the field, called upon his earlier work to offer a definition: “In academic and clinical training settings, mentoring has generally been defined as a dynamic, reciprocal, personal relationship in which a more experienced trainer (mentor) acts as a guide, role model, teacher, and sponsor of a less experienced trainee (protégé) (Johnson, 2002; Johnson & Ridley, 2008)” (p. 273). Johnson (2014) goes further to distinguish psychology mentoring:

In sum, mentorships in psychology training environments have been distinguished by these characteristics: (a) positive emotional valence, (b) increasing mutuality, (c) a range of career and psychosocial functions, (d) an intentional focus on the development of the protégé’s career and professional identity, and (e) a generative interest on the part of the mentor in passing along a professional legacy (Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007; Schlosser, Talleyrand, et al., 2011). (p. 274)

Despite this comprehensive and helpful definition of mentoring, in a field in which many different definitions are offered, and in which mentoring, advising, and supervising sometimes seem discrete and at other times shade into one another, our interest included the trainee’s view of what mentoring was, what it included, and how it felt to the person being mentored.

Different Models of Training

Given the differences in models and approaches to pedagogy and training (Belar & Perry, 1992; Kenkel & Peterson, 2010) it would not

be surprising to find differences in mentoring among training models, even though Rodolfa, Kaslow, Stewart, Keilin, and Baker (2005) have questioned the use of training models in internship and postdocs, and the Commission on Accreditation has largely moved beyond the individual training model paradigm for programs. Clark, Harden, and Johnson (2000) suggested that any such differences might be due to larger student–faculty ratios, less student–faculty research collaboration, or training diffusion in practitioner–scholar programs. On the other hand, it may be that practitioner–scholar programs have a different framework for mentoring, a framework that lays the groundwork for expanded ideas about mentoring. Campbell and Anderson (2010) described the different models of PsyD and PhD cultures, values, and training, broadly speaking, and noted how mentoring might be distinct in light of those differences. They commented that

The successful outcome of mentoring is usually described in terms of graduate students securing additional grant-funded research or obtaining an assistant professorship in a college or university. Clinical activities such as assessment, psychotherapy, supervision, and consultation tend not to be the focus on mentoring in these traditional mentoring programs. (Campbell & Anderson, 2010, p. 239)

Given the practitioner–scholar foundational competency of relationship (Mangione & Nadkarni, 2010) that is supposed to underlie all practice, research, and pedagogy in practitioner–scholar programs, the emphasis on the relational or social support components may speak more to mentoring that occurs in programs adhering to that model. Campbell and Anderson (2010) added that personal as well as professional growth often comes from supervisors as mentors in clinical settings. However, the purpose of this survey was more exploratory and not specifically to explore whether there was a difference between models. Instead, we sought to more inclusively find out what seemed important to students in clinical psychology, broadly speaking, across two models of training, particularly when they are asked what mentoring means to them.

Diversity and Mentoring

More work has been done recently on racial and gender diversity and mentoring in the broad field of education. In their article on gender and racial matching between mentor and mentee in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, Blake-Beard, Bayne, Crosby, and Muller (2011) offered a review of studies, concluding that the results of earlier research were mixed in terms of outcomes. Their study also had mixed results, with students noting that it felt important to have a mentor of one's own race or gender, and receiving more help if they did have that, but academic success was not affected. In their words, their findings suggest a "much more complex picture" (Blake-Beard et al., 2011, p. 637). Schlosser, Lyons, et al. (2011) addressed race, sex, and sexual orientation in advising relationships, broadly considered, speaking to the increase in diversity among students in graduate training, and bringing in the significant issue of power dynamics that can be "race and racially mediated" (p. 25) in advising relationships. These authors also addressed the feeling of isolation that has been reported by students of color and the important issue of cultural mistrust (Gay, 2004, as referenced by Schlosser, Lyons, et al., 2011). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual students are also noted to "face a number of obstacles when it comes to forming authentic relationships with faculty in which sexual orientation is transparent" (Schlosser, Lyons, et al., 2011, p. 33). Overall, the

authors suggested more work needs to be done in these areas and they offer a multilevel framework for understanding and researching these issues.

Curtin, Malley, and Stewart's (2016) study focused on three different aspects of mentoring and the mediator variable of self-efficacy. Their study included graduate students from all fields at a large research institution, and looked at mentoring students around academic career interests. They found different rates of mentoring among different groups of students, such that

Women doctoral students were less likely than their male counterparts to report that their primary advisor mentored them on the practical aspects of conducting successful research and professional development (instrumental support), and [nor] that their mentor advocated on their behalf and recommended them to others (sponsorship). (Curtin et al., 2016, p. 731)

The same authors advocated for looking at race and gender intersectionality, and discussed the mixed results around identity congruence and successful mentoring. A "relational approach to mentoring" (Gammel & Rutstein-Riley, 2016, p. 27) was described in a small *N*, exploratory, qualitative study of female mentors and mentees from a single academic department of education. After a robust review of feminist perspectives on mentoring, they concluded that "[a]ll these models seek to re-define the power imbalance, hierarchy, formality, objectivity, directionality, and limited focus of traditional models" (Gammel & Rutstein-Riley, 2016, p. 29).

In psychology specifically, Campbell and Anderson (2010) wrote at length about the necessity to rethink some traditional male models of mentoring given the large number of women who have entered the field of psychology in the last few decades. They offered a review of research on some of the pitfalls women might experience in the academic world, and what may not be understood by male mentors, and emphasize attention given to "how to weave together professional and personal roles" for women (Campbell & Anderson, 2010, p. 241). In a qualitative study of successful mentoring relationships involving ethnic minority counseling and clinical psychology students, Chan, Yeh, and Krumboltz (2015) offered what they call a multicultural, ecological, and relational model of mentorship. The excerpts they offered from their interviews really showcase these aspects of mentorship, and they highlighted the need for mentors to be both culturally competent and culturally humble, among other skills and abilities. A new mentoring program at a Veterans Health Administration hospital internship (O'Neil et al., 2015) developed at least partly with the idea in mind that "trainees from underrepresented cultural backgrounds may be particularly inclined to participate in the mentoring program" (p. 115) was described in detail. The authors made a point of separating out the roles of supervisor and mentor, particularly given the fast-paced and limited time of an internship. Their focus was on mentoring that could provide "transformational guidance and focus on their personal and career development, independent of supervision" (O'Neil et al., 2015, p. 115). A conceptual article on masculinity and male–male advising dyads in psychology training (Sbaratta, Tirpak, & Schlosser, 2015) looked at men in psychology training as a "privileged minority" (p. 337) and offered ways of working with men that involve gender role journey theory and working with the issues men bring to training around masculinity, including the intersection of race and sexual orientation for men.

Present Focus

Given the amorphous and variable nature of how mentoring is defined and how it is experienced by students across the two most common training models in the context of changing race, ethnicity, and gender demographics among clinical psychology doctoral students, our study focused on student perceptions and ideas in these three broad areas. We were interested in how students perceived the mentoring relationships in which they had participated or were participating, what they might ideally want in mentoring, issues of culture and gender around mentoring, and the experiences of students and recent graduates from scientist-practitioner and practitioner-scholar models of training.

Method

Recruitment of Participants

An e-mail was sent to 258 individuals listed as directors of doctoral programs in clinical psychology, including 87 National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology (NCSPP) member program directors and 169 Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology (CUDCP) member program directors. Each set of program directors received a unique link to a Qualtrics electronic questionnaire. Program directors were asked to distribute the invitation to participate, including an implied consent form and a link to the questionnaire, to students in their programs. It is not possible to determine how many program directors forwarded the questionnaire.

We received usable responses through the CUDCP link from 81 participants including 65 current students and 16 graduates ($M = 8.73$ years postdegree, ranging from <1 to 24 years). We received usable responses through the NCSPP link from 209 participants including 170 current students and 39 graduates ($M = 8.98$ years postdegree, ranging from <1 to 11 years). This resulted in a grand total of 290 usable questionnaire participants, ranging in age from 22 to 58 ($M = 29.72$, $SD = 6.44$). Regardless of which training council link they received (CUDCP or NCSPP), 62% of respondents identified as being from a PsyD program ($n = 178$) and 38% from a PhD program ($n = 111$). Out of students currently in doctoral programs, 15.9% were in their first year ($n = 46$), 14.2% in their second year ($n = 41$), 18% in their third year ($n = 52$), 14.9% in their fourth year ($n = 43$), 11.8% in their fifth year ($n = 34$), and 6.2% were beyond their fifth year ($n = 18$; as noted above, 19% were postdegree [$n = 55$]).

Participants were primarily female (82%) and Caucasian (71%). There was a difference in age, with PsyD participants tending to be older than PhD participants, $t(285) = -2.286$, $p < .05$, PhD, $M = 28.62$, and PsyD, $M = 30.40$. However, no differences were found with respect to gender ($N = 287$), $\chi^2(3) = .742$, $p > .05$, between the PhD and PsyD participants. Similarly, the respondent groups did differ in terms of racial/ethnic identity ($N = 284$), $\chi^2(6) = 6.787$, $p > .05$. See Table 1 for a summary of sample demographics by degree type.

Instrument

A questionnaire was developed using past literature on variables likely to influence student experiences of mentoring. Questions were developed to assess how the concept of mentoring could be broadened to better describe what occurs in a wide range of clinical psychology

Table 1
Demographics by Degree Type

Demographic	PhD respondents	PsyD respondent
Age, years ($N = 287$)	$M = 28.62$ ($N = 110$)	$M = 30.40$ ($N = 177$)
Race/ethnicity ($N = 284$)		
White	$N = 79$	$N = 122$
African American	$N = 8$	$N = 14$
Latino/a	$N = 3$	$N = 10$
Asian	$N = 12$	$N = 14$
Arab/Middle Eastern	$N = 1$	$N = 3$
Native American	$N = 2$	$N = 0$
Bi/multiracial	$N = 4$	$N = 12$
Gender ($N = 287$)		
Male	$N = 19$	$N = 26$
Female	$N = 89$	$N = 147$
Trans	$N = 1$	$N = 3$
Other	$N = 1$	$N = 1$
Year in program ($N = 288$)		
1st	$N = 18$	$N = 28$
2nd	$N = 18$	$N = 23$
3rd	$N = 23$	$N = 29$
4th	$N = 19$	$N = 24$
5th	$N = 12$	$N = 22$
Beyond 5th	$N = 10$	$N = 8$
Postdegree	$N = 11$	$N = 43$

programs, and to better describe experiences of being mentored using this broadened concept of mentoring. The final questionnaire contained 31 items. In addition to demographic questions, participants were asked about topics such as whether they felt mentored in graduate school, how they defined mentoring, who provided mentoring, areas in which they felt mentored, the importance of racial and ethnic identity in mentoring, and other topics. The survey consisted of open-ended questions and forced-choice questions. There were no Likert-scale questions.

Procedure

Participants received an e-mail containing a description of the study, information on consent to participate, and a link to the questionnaire. Participants clicked on the link that directed them to the questionnaire, and completed the questionnaire at a time and location of their choosing. All program directors were sent a reminder e-mail after the link had been open for 1 month with a request to resend the e-mail link to their students and alumni.

Data Analysis

Eleven of the questions generated qualitative data and were selected for the initial qualitative analysis. Because several of the questions appeared to yield similar responses, those questions were grouped together prior to qualitative data analysis. For example, Questions 7 through 10 and Question 28 all addressed the definition and roles of mentors, and were grouped together for thematic analysis.

Following Braun and Clarke's (2006) general framework for thematic analysis, we followed these basic steps: open-coding, creating coding manuals, and thematic abstraction. Given the importance of coder agreement to rigor in qualitative analysis, we paid particular attention to checking for coder agreements while coding and creating coding manuals. We describe our process specifically below.

The first two coders randomly selected 10 responses from each of these questions for the first training council data and developed a set of themes. For thematic abstraction, each coder grouped the text segments by code and then pulled themes from like text segments. Themes were intended to present meanings from across text segments and participants. The first two coders then compared notes and through discussion agreed upon any themes that did not initially converge. Themes were then reviewed and several were combined. This process was repeated for responses received through the second training council until agreement on themes for each question and from each training council were developed. Using these themes, a coding manual was developed. Finally, an auditor reviewed the manual against the raw data and confirmed the faithfulness of the manual to the data.

The coding manual was then used to code the remaining responses to a cluster of five questions that adhered together around description of mentoring by two additional coders. Coders 3 and 4 both coded the same first 20% of text segments for each cluster of questions to try to reach 80% agreement. When agreement was not reached, disagreements were reviewed, the coding manual revised, and the next 20% of text segments were double-coded until 80% agreement could be reached. Once 80% agreement was reached, coders individually coded the remaining data for that question before abstracting themes. The same procedure was repeated for the next cluster of two questions, which both addressed the way mentors contributed to the personal and professional growth of students, and for the third cluster of two questions, which both addressed the role of cultural background in mentoring relationships. Checking for rater consensus on codes was the reliability process we chose for that process, and then the researchers who originally developed the coding manual reviewing the themes acted as another level of assessing reliability.

In addition, answers to closed answer questions were analyzed using SPSS. Items which did not have an identified response stem were coded for ease of analysis.

Results

Quantitative Results

The presentation of the data is structured around the closed-ended, quantitative questions, and the more detailed qualitative questions. We initially provide some context for the findings by presenting data about respondents' experiences in having a mentorship relationship during graduate school and their ideas about the most facilitative manner in being in that relationship. The descriptive findings provide the framework from which we further explore the qualitative responses.

As mentioned earlier, we had 290 respondents to our online survey. All respondents were asked if they had found a mentor since starting in graduate school. Out of the respondents who provided an answer to this question ($n = 173$), overwhelmingly the response was in the affirmative ($n = 137$, 79%). While the majority of respondents had found a mentor since starting graduate school, there was a significant difference in the percentage of PsyD and PhD respondents who had found a mentor, with Ph.D. students being more likely than PsyD students to have found a mentor since starting in their program ($n = 172$), $\chi^2(1) = 9.071$, $p < .01$. Respondents were asked who had served in the role of mentor for them, with many of them choosing more than one categorical response. The following were listed as the

nonmutually exclusive mentor categories: clinical supervisor ($n = 78$, 27%), academic advisor ($n = 65$, 22%), faculty mentor ($n = 59$, 20%), doctoral or dissertation chair ($n = 56$, 19%), outside supervisor ($n = 38$, 13%), seminar professor ($n = 15$, 5%), practicum colleague ($n = 14$, 5%), student supervisor ($n = 9$, 3%), program administrator ($n = 9$, 3%), and clinical capstone advisor ($n = 1$, <1%).

Since programs might have varied in terms of providing formal and informal mentorship opportunities, we asked respondents how they connected with their mentor and whether the mentorship relationship had to be explicitly stated or acknowledged. As some respondents indicated that they had more than one mentor, multiple ways of connecting with their mentors were offered by the respondents. Approximately 21% of respondents said that they were assigned mentors ($n = 60$), while 26% said they sought out their mentors ($n = 75$) and 21% said they developed a mentorship relationship around similar interests/projects ($n = 60$). Only 3% of respondents said that their mentors sought out a relationship with them ($n = 9$). Regardless of the way they connected with their mentors, almost all respondents who indicated that they had a mentor felt that having a mentor enhanced their training, experience in graduate school, or both ($n = 122$, 97%). Of those with mentors who responded to this question, 48% ($n = 60$) said there was not a need for the explicit agreement of the relationship, whereas 24% ($n = 30$) said they thought the relationship should be explicit; 29% ($n = 36$) of respondents thought it did not matter one way or the other. Of the small percentage of respondents who did not have mentors ($n = 42$) in this study and who responded to this question, 83% ($n = 35$) expressed an interest in a mentor relationship.

The role and impact of cultural identity on the mentorship relationship was examined. Respondents with mentors were asked if the mentor's cultural identity impacted the mentorship relationship, to which 45% ($n = 56$) responded in the affirmative, 29% ($n = 36$) responded that it had not, and the remaining 26% ($n = 33$) were either unsure or did not know. While we did not ask respondents if cultural matching or mismatching occurred in their mentorship relationships, there was no significant racial difference in the response to the role and impact of cultural identity on the mentorship relationship. Respondents were also asked about whether the identity of either the mentor or mentee played a role in the mentorship relationship. Overwhelmingly, 72% ($n = 96$) of respondents to this question thought it played a role in the relationship. Again, there was no significant racial difference in response to this question.

Respondents were asked for their preferences in the formation of mentorship relationships. A majority of respondents ($n = 78$, 52%) said they would prefer to seek out a mentor on their own, while 19% ($n = 29$) said they preferred to be assigned, and 29% ($n = 43$) said they did not have a preference. A majority of respondents ($n = 93$, 62%) said they felt comfortable seeking out their own mentor, with 65.6% ($n = 69$) feeling somewhat or very confident in finding a mentor in their doctoral program.

To gather information to help doctoral programs facilitate effective mentorship relationships, respondents were also asked about the settings and times in their doctoral training when mentors were or would have been helpful. Most respondents ($n = 122$, 81%) preferred that the mentorship relationship occurred on an individual, one-on-one basis, with none of the respondents indicating their preference for a group setting; the remaining respondents voiced no preference for type of setting ($n = 28$, 18.7%). While respondents voiced some preference for when it would be helpful to have mentors, the majority of respondents ($n = 137$, 89.6%) said that it would be helpful to have

a mentor during all aspects of their graduate training, including transitioning into graduate school and transitioning into internship.

About half of respondents expressed that it would be helpful to have different mentors at different times in their training ($n = 74$); but almost equally, respondents were either unsure or did not know if having different mentors at different times in training would be helpful to them ($n = 69$). When respondents were asked the type of settings/tasks for which having a mentor would be most helpful, many identified multiple categories: 37% ($n = 106$) stated that it would be helpful to have a mentor in a clinical or field placement setting and 27% ($n = 77$) said it would be helpful in a research setting. Respondents said they would find it helpful to have a mentor to assist in navigating the publishing of or presenting of papers ($n = 70$, 24%), and also in assisting with networking ($n = 77$, 27%). Only 17% ($n = 50$) thought a mentor would be helpful in managing the academic portion of their graduate training, while 5% ($n = 15$) offered other ideas for mentoring, such as work-life balance, early career opportunities, teaching, and support when engaging in new frontiers.

Qualitative Results

In this section we present themes from the data and offer one example, in italics, for each theme.

Definition and description of mentor. Results from several questions that all seemed to offer commentary on the definition and role of a mentor, from a few different angles, were analyzed together. Because there was a large amount of data, themes were organized into the following categories: Interpersonal Relatedness, Academics, Professional Development, and General Mentor Traits. The following themes emerged within the category of Interpersonal Relatedness:

- **Emotion:** Respondents described mentor relationships with an emotional component. Subthemes include warmth, caring, empathy, and support. *Use of kindness, empathy, humor, and so forth to engage others; interest in the field by creating a meaningful relationship in which the new person feels comfortable and safe to share vulnerabilities.*
- **Connection:** Respondents identified a good mentoring relationship as feeling personal and connected. *Mutual respect, honesty and openness, resolving of any issues that may arise, the creation of a holding environment that feels safe.*
- **Openness and Communication:** Respondents identified openness and communication as an important aspect of the relationship. *I think vulnerability and authenticity from mentors are very important. A mentor who is willing to admit to their mistakes is someone I will respect for years to come.*

The following theme emerged within the category of Academics:

Growth and Investment: Mentors are committed and proactive (availability, providing additional time, going above and beyond). *I think the investment of the mentor in your career development takes them beyond that of simply an advisor. Someone who is proactively involved in my development.*

The following theme emerged within the category of Professional Development:

Guidance and Support navigating graduate school: Respondents described advice and guidance in academics and their graduate program as an important aspect of mentorship. *A professional who takes*

on a guidance role above and beyond that required by their position of supervisor or faculty.

The following themes emerged within the category of General Mentor Traits:

Imparting Knowledge: Respondents described mentors as a source of wisdom and wanted mentors to share their knowledge through teaching, self-disclosure, role-modeling, and advising. *The availability and knowledge to respond to deep and specific questions about the skill or knowledge base in which the mentee is training.*

Connectors: The mentor provides and connects mentees to professional opportunities. *My mentors provided me with knowledge, wisdom, or advice professionally and, at times, personally. They opened doors and introduced me to new opportunities. They wrote recommendations, made introductions, and opened their professional networks up to me.*

Qualified and Experienced: Respondents sought mentor relationships in which the mentor embodies a certain expertise or knowledge. *I think that a mentor is someone who is expected to have experience, wisdom, and knowledge in a particular area, who then offers what they know to students who are interested in seeking their guidance.*

Professional: Respondents described mentors as professional role models, who conveyed respect and were reliable. *To serve as a model of professionalism, knowledgeable of the program and someone who takes pride in their work inside and outside the classroom.*

Contributions and enhancements of the mentor to the mentee's experience. Results from two questions that sought to understand the mentor's impact on personal and professional development and the training experience were analyzed together. The following themes emerged:

- **Connection to greater context:** Respondents are drawn to mentors that provide a roadmap of how their current experiences impact their future goals. *In my experience, students who have fostered a mentoring relationship with a faculty member have felt more secure in their pursuits and have a clearer "path" through the program. Those students who have not fostered a mentoring relationship (for whatever reason) have been less clear and shakier in their program path and pursuits.*
- **Role Modeling:** Respondents are positively impacted by mentors who embody and provide an example of a professional role model. *Provides modeling when working with him or her regarding execution of specialized tasks (e.g., grant writing; planning a clinical intervention; clinical judgment and problem solving). Thinks of me when they hear of a resource that would interest me in my studies (e.g., upcoming relevant conference). Thinks about what would be a next-best challenge or task for me to improve/advance my skills.*
- **Development of Clinical Identity:** Mentors foster confidence and help broaden perspectives. *My mentors provide critical feedback that I use to modify my approach to clinical practice and research endeavors, while being supportive of my opinions and being mindful of balancing work with self-care practices.*
- **Professional Development:** Respondents are drawn to mentors who provide resources and feedback that build upon their professional experiences. *I have learned more from my mentors than any classes or clinical experiences. They also helped me translate my personal and professional experi-*

ences into lessons in professional development. They also were supports for me to rely on during stressful times in graduate school and helped me to continue to function professionally while in personal crisis.

The mentor's cultural identity having an impact on the relationship. Respondents were asked specifically about their mentor's cultural identity having an impact on their mentoring relationship. The following themes emerged:

- Respondents did not view cultural differences as a barrier to mentorship while acknowledging the role of cultural identity in the mentor relationship. *Cultural components have the potential of impacting relationships whether they be in supervision, therapy, or a mentorship relationship. Some may be in more positive ways and others in more negative ways. My mentor and I have many similarities and many differences. Our differences allow us to see things in different ways from different perspectives and our similarities help us see eye to eye on things and build a strong working relationship.*
- Respondents were able to use similarities to develop a good relationship. *It does. If you are from a minority and your mentor is from the same minority they will be familiar with the struggles they have faced and give guidance in how to navigate them if they arise. We would like to think there is no discrimination in our field, but that is not real life and to talk with someone who has had to deal with racism or sexism in one form or another is invaluable.*
- Respondents used differences as an area of learning and exploration. *My mentor identifies as a different religion from me, and it's one of the reasons that I've really enjoyed her mentorship—because I can learn something from her that I would not have learned through my program.*

Cultural identity of mentor and mentee. A more general question was asked about the role of cultural identity in a mentor/mentee relationship. The following themes emerged:

- Respondents were sensitive to the presence of cultural identity and diversity on the mentorship relationship. *Identity plays a role in every relationship. Identities might be more salient or be more influential if there is a power differential, differences master statuses, or areas of privilege that are not addressed.*
- The mentor relationship mediated students' experiences of both similarities and differences regarding cultural identity and diversity. *I think it plays the same role it plays in all relationships. For some people, it may be harder to address race/class/and so forth openly if their supervisor is perceived to be very different than a mentee, but both parties should be open about this and try to address it.*
- Subthemes include positively mediated and negatively mediated. Positive: *I think identity does play a role in that it can help further bolster an individual that is marginalized or feels alone within a training program.* Negative: *Absolutely. My advisor really doesn't understand what it's like experiencing the level of loneliness and isolation that other minority students and I experience and its impact on our work.*

Discussion and Implications

What Is a Mentor?

The results of this study indicate that the majority of students and graduates (79% overall) from both scientist–practitioner and practitioner–scholar clinical psychology programs do consider themselves to have found mentors in graduate school. While there was a significant difference between students and graduates from programs granting the PsyD and those granting the PhD degree, the present overall mentoring rate is somewhat higher than in previous research, and the PsyD–PhD difference appears to be smaller. Perhaps this deviation from prior research resulted because the present study allowed participants to provide their own definition for mentors and define mentoring broadly (Borden & McIlvried, 2016; Groody, 2004).

Mentoring was viewed overwhelmingly positively, with 97% of those with mentors stating that having a mentor enhanced their graduate school experience. They valued the guidance, wisdom, and experience their mentors shared with them, and found mentors to be important role models who helped them navigate graduate school and connect to others for collaboration and for employment. The metaphor of “the path” that the mentor helps the student to see and to negotiate, mentioned in the results above, provides a visual image of such guidance. Programs are doing well and should continue what they are doing to foster and develop mentorship relationships and to see mentorship in a broader range of relationships than might have previously been assumed for doctoral students in clinical psychology. Given that, some suggestions throughout this discussion might contribute to this important development of mentorship relationships.

Mentoring: Start Early and Continue

Of all participants, 81% felt it would be helpful to have a mentor from the beginning of their studies through the end, and about half felt that mentoring could be offered by different people for different aspects of the doctoral program and career. Participants connected with mentors in a variety of ways (assigned, sought them out, etc.) in relatively equal numbers, and no method was clearly more common than the others. However, slightly more than half (52%) would have liked to find a mentor on their own, while about a fifth (19%) preferred for a mentor to be assigned. Graduate programs might consider how to help students establish at least one mentoring relationship upon admission or matriculation into the first year of studies, and might arrange meaningful interactions between students and faculty early in the program to facilitate this. Even if students switched to another mentor later on, having a mentor at the beginning was important to respondents. Future research might examine whether one method of connecting with a mentor has a higher rate of success than others.

Similarly, respondents valued continued relationships with mentors after graduation. Recent graduates believed ongoing mentoring relationships were important for publishing research and finding initial jobs. This supports the work of Johnson and Huwe (2003), which found that mentoring was associated with obtaining jobs, higher income, and increased job satisfaction. Again, programs might consider ways to stay in close contact with graduates to help them through the postdoctoral and early career years, consistent with the recommendations by Green and Hawley (2009).

Important qualities of mentors mentioned by participants included expertise, experience, availability, and investment in the

growth and success of the mentee. As such, mentors were helpful in work–life balance, professional development, and the development of an identity as a clinical psychologist. The mentor is thinking ahead as to what might be the “*next-best challenge or task*” for the student, something most students are unlikely to know at that point. Having the bigger picture of the field is certainly a great contribution of mentors.

Interpersonal Connectedness

While the qualifications of the mentor are important, the focus on the development of the mentee is essential. Furthermore, because relationship is so central to the mentoring process, and because we cannot accurately predict what relationships will succeed, the matching process is important, yet difficult to optimize. Future research might look at mentoring dyads to study this.

Referring back to part of the definition provided above, Johnson (2014) has described mentoring as “a dynamic, reciprocal, personal relationship in which a more experienced trainer (mentor) acts as a guide, role model, teacher, and sponsor of a less experienced trainee (protégé)” (p. 273). The results of this study confirm that this is the perspective of clinical psychology students, as well. However, our participants’ views of mentorship take Johnson’s definition further, emphasizing the quality of the interpersonal connection as the key to successful mentoring. Consistent with Kram’s (1988) work, which concluded that mentoring involved both career and psychosocial functions, many respondents mentioned the importance of mentoring that went beyond career and professional issues into personal and self-care realms. The frequency with which our participants mentioned emotion, connection, openness, and communication points to the activity of mentoring having a firm foundation in the relationship competency (Campbell & Anderson, 2010; Mangione & Nadkarni, 2010). It is a reminder that graduate school and starting a career can be stressful times for students, and the presence of a caring figure as a mentor can be quite important in navigating such stresses and hurdles. This may also be why students definitively preferred individual to group mentorship.

Cultural Identity

Almost half of all respondents believed that the cultural identity of the mentor and mentee impact the mentoring relationship, with the remainder split between not perceiving an impact or not being certain. A meta-aspect of these responses that struck the researchers was the flexibility many students voiced, such that one could learn from both differences and similarities, which seems consistent with the literature on mixed mentorship relationships. However, even given that flexibility and ability to learn from others, the very real situation exists that some students feel marginalized, lonely, and isolated in a program due to their minority status. We would suggest that students be offered the opportunity for a mentorship relationship with potential mentors who are similar to them in some basic identity variable such as race or ethnicity. We would also suggest a greater role for a designated faculty member or administrator to check in with students in this category periodically to see if their needs for relationship and mentorship are being met within the program.

Broadening of Mentorship

Our participants have found mentors within many of their roles as students. Mentors included the more traditionally considered dissertation chairs, research supervisors, and advisors, but also included clinical supervisors, faculty members, seminar leaders, and less frequently, practicum colleagues, other students, program administrators, and clinical capstone supervisors. As the integration of research and practice is required for accreditation in health service psychology for programs based on all training models, and because we have moved to more intentional training for multiple roles, this expansion to include both research and practice mentors from a variety of settings seems appropriate. While some participants discussed having a single mentor, others mentioned that they used different mentors for guidance in different areas of their education and careers. We view this access to multiple mentors, and the development of multiple mentoring relationships, as a positive development, providing additional support beyond a single relationship.

Limitations to This Study and Suggestions for Future Research

The present study has shed light on an updated view of mentorship in clinical psychology academic programs. However, this was a descriptive and exploratory study. As such, it was not designed to specifically highlight differences based on variables such as program model or degree, gender, age, race, or ethnicity. Future research might examine whether students’ views and experiences of mentorship differ based on these or other group memberships.

In addition, our participants were largely female and White. This made the analysis of factors associated with gender, race, and ethnicity difficult. Related to this, we did not ask participants to distinguish experiences of mentorship that occurred with mentors of similar demographics as themselves. Some of our participants noted advantages of working with both, mentors who match the students on demographic variables, and mentors who do not match on these variables, and future research might more specifically study the effects of matching. Furthermore, the needs of diverse groups of students might be examined in more detail to explore how to foster the most helpful mentoring relationships.

Conclusion and Implications

Mentoring continues to be a valued aspect of the experience of clinical psychology graduate students. Our data demonstrate that students value a supportive relationship with mentors serving different roles (supervisor, advisor, etc.), and find the relationship particularly helpful when it involves mutual respect and genuine caring about both personal and professional development. However, there is probably a range of ways to be a true mentor, and to be mentored well as a student, such that those in positions to mentor students might want to become more intentional and aware of cultivating such relationships that fit the range of students in clinical psychology.

References

- Belar, C. D., & Perry, N. W. (1992). The national conference on scientist–practitioner training for the professional practice of psychology. *American Psychologist*, *47*, 71–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.47.1.71>

- Blake-Beard, S., Bayne, M., Crosby, F., & Muller, C. (2011). Matching by race and gender in mentoring relationships: Keeping our eyes on the prize. *Journal of Social Issues, 67*, 622–643. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01717.x>
- Borden, K. A., & McIlvried, E. J. (2016). Teaching. In J. C. Norcross, G. R. Vanden Bos, & D. K. Freedheim (Eds.-in-Chief) and R. Krishnamurthy (Assoc. Ed.), *APA handbook of clinical psychology: Vol. 3. Applications and methods* (pp. 551–564). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77–101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Brewer, A. (2012). Positive mentoring relationships: Nurturing potential. In S. Roffey (Ed.), *Positive relationships: Evidence based practice across the world* (pp. 197–214). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2147-0_12
- Burney, J. P., Celeste, B. L., Johnson, J. D., Klein, N. C., Nordal, K. C., & Portnoy, S. M. (2009). Mentoring professional psychologists: Programs for career development, advocacy, and diversity. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*, 292–298. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015029>
- Campbell, C. D., & Anderson, T. L. (2010). Mentoring in professional psychology. In M. B. Kenkel & R. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Competency-based education for psychology professionals* (pp. 237–247). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12068-014>
- Chan, A. W., Yeh, C. J., & Krumboltz, J. D. (2015). Mentoring ethnic minority counseling and clinical psychology students: A multicultural, ecological, and relational model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 62*, 592–607. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000079>
- Clark, R. A., Harden, S. L., & Johnson, W. B. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training: Results of a national survey. *Teaching of Psychology, 27*, 262–268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15328023TOP2704_04
- Curtin, N., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. (2016). Mentoring the next generation of faculty: Supporting academic career aspirations among doctoral students. *Research in Higher Education, 57*, 714–738. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-015-9403-x>
- Gammel, J., & Rutstein-Riley, A. (2016). A relational approach to mentoring women doctoral students. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2016*, 27–35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tl.20196>
- Gay, G. (2004). Navigating marginality en route to the professoriate: Graduate students of color learning and living in academia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*, 265–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001653907>
- Green, A. G., & Hawley, G. C. (2009). Early career psychologists: Understanding, engaging and mentoring tomorrow's leaders. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*, 206–212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012504>
- Groody, A. (2004). Mini-mentors: Differences in mentoring between PsyD and PhD psychology doctoral students. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B. The Sciences and Engineering, 64*, 5199.
- Hall, E. L., & Maltby, L. E. (2013). Mentoring: The view from both sides. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 32*, 70–74.
- Johnson, W. B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 88–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.33.1.88>
- Johnson, W. B. (2014). Mentoring in psychology education and training: A mentoring relationship continuum model. In W. B. Johnson & N. J. Kaslow (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of education and training in clinical psychology* (pp. 272–290). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, W. B., & Huwe, J. M. (2003). *Getting mentored in graduate school*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Johnson, W. B., & Ridley, C. R. (2008). *The elements of mentoring*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Johnson, W. B., Rose, G., & Schlosser, L. Z. (2007). Student faculty mentoring: Theoretical and methodological issues. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Erby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 49–69). Malden, MA: Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470691960.ch4>
- Kenkel, M. B., & Peterson, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Competency-based education for professional psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12068-000>
- Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Mangione, L., & Nadkarni, L. (2010). Relationship competency: Broadening and deepening. In M. B. Kenkel & R. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Competency-based education for professional psychology* (pp. 69–86). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12068-004>
- O'Neil, J., Chaison, A., Cuellar, A., Nguyen, Q., Brown, W., & Teng, E. (2015). Development and implementation of a mentoring program for Veterans Affairs psychology trainees. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 9*, 113–120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000065>
- Rodolfa, E. R., Kaslow, N. J., Stewart, A. E., Keilin, W. G., & Baker, J. (2005). Internship training: Do models really matter? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 36*, 25–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.36.1.25>
- Sbaratta, C., Tirpak, D., & Schlosser, L. (2015). Male–male advising relationships in graduate psychology: A diminishing dyad. *Sex Roles, 72*, 335–348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0466-0>
- Schlosser, L., Lyons, H., Talleyrand, R., Kim, B., & Johnson, W. B. (2011). Advisor–advisee relationships in graduate training programs. *Journal of Career Development, 38*, 3–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894845309358887>
- Schlosser, L. Z., Talleyrand, R. M., Lyons, H. Z., Kim, B. S. K. K., & Johnson, W. B. (2011). Multicultural issues in graduate advising relationships. *Journal of Career Development, 38*, 19–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894845309359285>

Appendix

Graduate School Mentoring Study Informed Consent

Researchers at Antioch University New England, University of Denver—Graduate School of Professional Psychology, and Palo Alto University are asking you to fill out a survey about your mentoring experiences in graduate school.

The Researchers are interested in learning more about what current and former graduate students think about their mentoring experiences in graduate school. We will use the results of the survey to help shape better mentoring experiences for graduate students in clinical psychology. There are no risks to you in taking part in this survey, and the survey is anonymous. It takes about 20 min to complete.

Taking Part Is Voluntary

You may choose not to fill out the survey. If you do choose to fill out the survey, you may leave any question blank, but we ask you to answer as many questions as you can.

If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Dr. Lorraine Mangione at (603) 283–2176 or lmangione@antioch.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact Dr. Kevin Lyness, Chair of the Antioch University New England IRB, at klyness@antioch.edu or 603–283–2149 or Dr. Melinda Treadwell, Vice President for Academic Affairs (603) 283–2444.

Indication of consent is provided by continuing with the survey.

- Q1. What is your age?
- Q2. What race or ethnicity do you most identify with?
- Q3. What gender identity do you most identify with?
- Q4. What year are you in your doctoral program?
- Q4.2. What type of doctoral program are you in/what type of degree do you have?
- Q4.3. What type of model does/did your program use?
- Q5. How do you define “mentor”?
- Q6. How would you describe the role of mentor?
- Q7. What kind of support do you expect from a mentor while in your program?
- Q8. What are the key ingredients to a successful mentoring relationship?
- Q9. Have you found a mentor(s) since starting graduate school?
- Q10. Who serves as a mentor for you?
- Q11. How did you and your mentor connect?
- Q12. What areas/topics does your mentorship relationship provide support around?
- Q13. What areas would you like support around that you are not currently getting?
- Q14. In what way(s) does your mentor(s) contribute to your personal and/or professional development?
- Q15. Do you feel that having a mentor enhances the quality of your training or your experience in the doctoral program?
- Q16. If yes, how so?
- Q17. Do you think you and your mentor have to agree explicitly that you are in a mentoring relationship?
- Q18. Does your mentor need to care as much about you as you do about them in order for it to be a mentorship? Why or why not?
- Q19. Do you think your mentor’s cultural identity (e.g., race/ethnicity, religion, gender or sexual identity) has an impact on your mentorship relationship?
- Q20. Why or why not?
- Q21. If you do not have a mentor, would you be interested in having one?
- Q22. Would you prefer to be assigned a mentor or seek one out?
- Q23. Would you feel comfortable seeking one out?
- Q24. Why or why not?
- Q25. If you did seek someone out in your program for mentorship, how confident do you feel you would be able to find one?
- Q26. What takes a close (advisory) relationship to the level of mentorship?
- Q27. Do you think identity (e.g., race/ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual identity) of the mentor or mentee plays a role in the mentorship relationship?
- Q28. When working with a mentor, would you prefer a one-on-one setting or a group setting?
- Q29. At which points in your training would it be most helpful to have a mentor?
- Q30. Would it be helpful to have different mentors at different times in your graduate training depending on your needs?
- Q31. In which settings would having a mentor be most helpful?

Received December 15, 2016

Revision received April 24, 2017

Accepted May 26, 2017 ■