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Abstract

My goal for this research project was to explore the levels of mentoring within a disability-focused service learning context known as the Special Needs Activity Program (SNAP). At present, research on mentoring within specific service learning contexts remains largely unexamined. In an effort to assess service learning and mentoring, I completed a comparative case study across three distinct years of SNAP. Undergraduate student leaders, known as coordinators, organize and implement SNAP as a thesis project. I focused specifically on the mentoring experience of particular coordinators of SNAP. My thesis presents and describes the findings of several levels of analysis across three SNAP coordinator cohorts. The analysis focused on key words, idiomatic expressions, patterns and dissonances. In my conclusion, I offer three metaphors that describe mentoring within the SNAP experience and relate these to my discussion about how mentoring functions as a component of service learning.
Experiencing Mentoring within a Particular Service Learning Context

**Introduction**

This study goes beyond the current research in service learning and takes a deeper look at first-hand experiences and elements embedded within service learning, as form of pedagogy. This research focuses on examining service-based learning in programming areas specifically oriented to children with disabilities. Through this research, I explore the mentor/mentee relationship; focusing on the learning potential of the mentee’s (Coordinators) running the program.

In this introductory chapter I will present the background and context of the study, discuss the professional significance of the study, outline the research questions and provide a brief overview of the methodology. I will conclude the chapter with a definition of terms that are significant to the study. I will foreground my research questions below.

**Research Questions**

There is one main question selected for this study and four sub questions:

1. **How does mentoring function as a component of Service Learning?**
   a. How is mentoring utilized within service learning?
   b. What are the roles or functions of a mentor within a service learning context (like SNAP?)
   c. What comprises/ defines an effective mentor?
   d. What issues might be associated with single or multiple mentors?

**Personal Background**

My name is Ally McEachen, and I am a graduate student completing my Masters in Child and Youth Studies. I am deeply involved in SNAP (Special Needs Activity Program).
Program) and it has influenced my interests in investigating mentorship within this service learning context. Throughout my first years of my undergraduate education, I initially identified my area of interest broadly in the area of disability studies. My passion for assisting individuals with disabilities within a least restrictive environment emerged through two service based learning experiences, ASD Autism Movement Camp and SNAP. These innovative learning experiences intrigued me to continue working with children with exceptionalities at a Masters level within the pedagogy of service learning. My current Master’s thesis focuses on examining mentorship within service learning in programming areas specifically oriented for children with disabilities. I have been involved in SNAP as a volunteer for two years and completed my undergraduate thesis as a Coordinator of the program. Following the role as a coordinator, I was an Intermediary Graduate Student Mentor for SNAP Coordinators for two years. This project has personal relevance for me as I have experienced a very reflective and effective mentoring relationship with my faculty mentor while I was a Coordinator in the 2008-2009 academic year. I am interested in how other service learning coordinators of the SNAP experience mentorship and if it was significant to their self-directed learning. I am interested in the significance of mentoring in the learning of service learners?

**Background of Study**

“Turtles may struggle on land, but in the proper environment they will thrive.”

This quotation is attributed to SNAP, at Brock University, which is a service-learning initiative that provides a quality physical education experience in a non-threatening environment. SNAP involves Brock student volunteers facilitating one on one movement based activities for children with disabilities in the surrounding Niagara region.
Undergraduate student leaders, known as coordinators, organize and implement SNAP as a thesis project. SNAP's complexity has increased with regard to students attending, the number of volunteers interacting with children and the number of coordinators who facilitate the program. A larger coordinating team requires more focused and diversified facilitation of student coordinators through mentoring.

**Context of Study**

SNAP is held at Brock University and is facilitated by students under the supervision of Dr. Maureen Connolly. SNAP is a service learning context that has been an active program at Brock University since 1994-95 academic year, filling a gap in community programming. This community-based program involves volunteers and children interacting within a one to one environment.

SNAP fulfills the service learning requirements of meaningful consultation, the provision of a needed service in the community partner, the ability to offer a practical experience for student learning and the inclusion of an assessed reflective component in the evaluation of learning. The children who attend SNAP have the benefit of being involved in activities that are developmentally and physically appropriate, providing them with gross and fine motor skill-building and social skill-building opportunities, as well as physical exercise. Brock students involved in any year of study, as well as program volunteers, provide movement based activities to children who attend SNAP. In designing, operating and coordinating SNAP, fourth year Brock students apply the content that they have been taught through coursework. Coordinators of the program learn real-world skills related to community programming and children with special needs. Students involved in the coordination of SNAP come from several different
academic disciplines and are involved in an independent project, or a thesis course. Primary assessment is involved within the coordinators’ experience through completion of the mandate, reflection, photo analysis and recommendations for next years coordinating team (please refer to Appendix F).

Coordinators of SNAP are divided into four portfolios and within each portfolio group, coordinators are responsible for specific administrative aspects of the program. Each portfolio has a specific mandate of responsibilities and academic requirements that they are required to complete. Areas of responsibility for the Volunteer/Recruitment portfolio include: volunteer awareness, recruitment, training, ongoing communication, appreciation, supervision, professional development, volunteer sign in and sign out, reference letters, liaison with School Liaison team, co-ordination of profile form distribution and collection and announcements as necessary. The School Liaison portfolio is responsible for all matter relating to the schools that attend SNAP. Areas of responsibility include: call in days/booking, announcements and correspondence to schools, profiles and record keeping, school sign in and pay in, ongoing liaison with schools and school baskets and signage. Curriculum and Equipment is the third portfolio group and is responsible for providing developmentally appropriate activity stations and strategies for utilizing them. Other responsibilities include: the provision of a gym plan as well as an equipment room plan, equipment purchase and maintenance, coordination of the delivery of programming activities and boomer (the Brock Badgers mascot). The last portfolio is Communications and Fundraising and is responsible for internal and external communication within SNAP and raising money for SNAP. Areas of responsibility include: email, website, banner, logo, letterhead, posters and signage, intra-term
communication, announcements and public awareness and team t-shirts. All coordinators are expected to be on the floor during SNAP and engage in supporting the volunteers and children that attend the program.

SNAP is an established program that involves consultation with participants that is both reciprocal and robust. As this program has evolved over time, its complexity has increased with respect to the number of children attending, the number of volunteers interacting with the children and the number of coordinators who facilitate the program. Volunteers have engaged in more thorough training and relationships of people involved are enhanced. A larger coordinating team requires more focused guidance and support and this can be accomplished by offering intermediary mentoring that will assist with further learning for Coordinators.

Intermediary graduate student mentors work closely with the Coordinators of the SNAP program and their responsibility is to provide assistance and guidance to encourage a meaningful learning experience. Intermediary mentors involved within SNAP must have an undergraduate degree with experience in service learning contexts and/or the context of SNAP. An intermediary mentor must display strong interpersonal skills, leadership skills, writing/editing skills, time management skills, provide evidence of decision making abilities and previous Teaching Assistant experience is an asset. The mentor meets weekly with groups involved in the Coordination of SNAP to assist with and facilitate group planning, timelines, decision making, managing meetings, minute taking, accountability structures, developing and implementing mandates, conflict management, project management, peer assessment and report and reflective writing. The mentor liaises with the faculty mentor/instructor on the groups’ progress and challenges.
Mentoring is a crucial component within service learning initiatives. The mentor maintains a journal and keeps field notes on groups and instructor meetings as well as has access to any electronic/online supports for the course. Here is a visual to demonstrate the roles of mentoring within the SNAP context. The Faculty Mentor and the Intermediary Graduate Student Mentors are responsible for the SNAP Coordinators. The Coordinators are responsible for the mentorship of the Volunteers and the Volunteers have a mentoring relationship with the children.

Table 1

Levels of Mentoring

Mentoring plays a distinctive role within this service learning experience; however, there is minimal literature that focuses on mentorship with a service learning context.

**Professional Significance**

According to Kain (2006), critiques of higher education have noted a gap between traditional curriculum and society's needs for new competencies for workers and citizens (Association of American Colleges, 1991; Boyer, 1987). Within the literature, there is an obvious disconnect between higher education and the application of what is learned (Kain, 2006). There seems to be a lack of connectedness between classroom learning,
public issues and community involvement outside of the classroom and this is an area of concern (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Implementing service learning, a form of experiential education, into the curriculum is one way this lack of connectedness has been addressed (Kain, 2006). Service learning is a collaborative teaching and learning strategy that is designed to promote academic enhancement, individual growth and civic engagement. Service learning helps students deepen their understanding of what they know, who they are, how the world around them works, and their place in it and responsibility to it (Ash, Clayton & Moses, 2007).

Much research done on service learning focuses on impacts for student participation, improved academic achievement (Scales, Roehlkepartain, Neil, Kielmeier, Benson, 2006), gains in skill development and altered attitudes towards others and society, guided assessment and reflection (Ash & Clayton, 2004), civic engagement and service learning, and the impact of service learning on a community (Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). Some research focuses on student engagement and academic achievement; however, majority of the literature fails to look at the role a mentor plays within the quest for self-directed, meaningful learning.

Unanswered Questions

Mentoring, as well as service learning, is a structured educational strategy for enhancing student development and academic achievement. At present, research on mentoring within a specific service learning context such as SNAP remains largely unexamined. Therefore, in an effort to assess service learning and mentoring, this research project outlines a comparative study within the Special Needs Activity Program across three distinct years. Here the mentoring experience of coordinators across three
years of the SNAP program will be studied. This study involves both inductive and
deductive analysis that explore several components of mentoring and investigate how
mentoring works within a service learning experience.

**Overview of Methodology**

The research questions are examined using a qualitative methodology to explore
the proposed research questions. This comparative study is a within-case/cross-case
design and that includes an informant pool spanning three years. Coordinators of SNAP
involved in the 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic year, completed a
written response form reflecting the participant’s experience with mentorship. Content
and thematic levels of analysis were used to explore the responses generated from the
survey response form. A descriptive, interpretive hermeneutic analysis was used as a
method of analysis to identify common patterns across responses, and relate these with
literature and inductively derived indigenous themes.

The reader will be advised later of the precautions/limitations that the Research
Ethics Board (REB) of Brock University placed on me as the “participant-researcher” for
the protection of human subjects.

**Definitions**

*Service Learning* - a course based educational experience where students a) participate in
a community activity that identifies need and b) reflect on the experience in such a way
that it furthers course content and educative development (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995)

*SNAP* - a disability focused, community-based program facilitated by forth year Brock
students. This movement program is a site for service learning and provides a quality
physical education experience to school age children within a least restrictive environment.

**Mentoring** - a form of professional socialization whereby a more experienced individual acts as a guide, role model, teacher and patron of a less experienced protégé. The aim of the relationship is to further the development and refinement of the protégé's skills, abilities, and understanding (Jacobi, 1991).

**Intermediary Graduate Student Mentor** - a previous SNAP coordinator who is responsible in providing assistance and guidance to encourage a meaningful learning experience to current SNAP coordinators.

**Faculty Mentor** - faculty supervisor who oversees the operation of SNAP. Responsibilities include providing feedback and assessment to the coordinators as well as ensuring that the program is safe for all parties involved.

**Coordinator** - fourth year undergraduate thesis writers from any faculty or discipline. Coordinators are involved in the administrative and organizational components of the facilitation of SNAP. There are four portfolio groups that the team of coordinators are split into. These portfolio groups are: School Liaison, Volunteer and Recruitment, Communication and Fundraising and Curriculum and Equipment.

**Volunteers** - Brock student, graduate or undergraduate, who engages one on one with a child facilitating movement-based activities within a least restrictive environment.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"I hear and I forget. I see and I remember. I do and I understand" (Confucius).

If we hear something, it might be interesting...if we see something, it might be beautiful...but only when we feel it happening in ourselves can we really know how it is. Information is processed through our senses; however, we learn ultimately by actively doing. We first observe and listen to others and then we try and do things on our own. It is not until we are active agents that our interest becomes meaningful and generates the motivation to self-discover (Conner & Pokara, 2007).

In this review of the literature, I will initially focus on an overview of experiential education theory and the goals of experiential learning. Secondly, I will explore service learning as a sociocultural activity and talk about the benefits of service learning. I will then discuss the importance of a disability-focused service learning practicum and will lead into literature pertaining to mentoring. Here, I will discuss definitional diversity within mentoring, talk about mentoring towards self-directed learning and lastly I will mention the functions of mentoring according to Cohen (1995). I will conclude with examples of mentoring programs in Canada, specifically Ontario and discuss briefly the role of faculty mentors within a mentoring experience.

Experiential Learning

Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) emphasizes the importance of experience, as it plays as a central role in the learning process. ELT is distinctive from other learning theories such as cognitive or behavioural (Kolb, 1984). Cognitive learning theory values cognition over affect, and behavioural learning denies any role for subjective experience in the learning process. ELT provides a holistic model of the learning process and is a
multilinear model that is consistent with what we know about how people grow, learn and develop (Kolb, 1984). Experiential learning is a philosophy of education based on what Dewey (1938) called a “theory of experience.”

Experiential learning theory defines learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience” (Kolb 1984, p. 41). Kolb (1984) describes learning as a four-step process or cycle. The cycle begins with a concrete experience, develops into a reflective observation, proceeds into an abstract conceptualization and ends in active experimentation. The learning can begin at any point on the cycle and reflection is essential to this learning process. Kolb draws on the works of Dewey (who emphasized the need for learning to be grounded in experience), Lewin (who focused on the importance of learners being active) and Piaget (who described intelligence as the result of a sociocultural interaction of the person and the environment) (Kolb, 1984).

Dewey’s (1938) idea of experiential learning focuses specifically on the idea that the educational experiences of students and their lives outside of educational institutions should be connected (Underwood, Welsh, Gauvain & Duffy, 2000). Experiential learning makes conscious application of students’ experience by integrating these experiences into the curriculum. Giles and Eyler (1994) review Dewey’s work in Experience and Education (1938) and How We Think (1933) and place emphasis on the principles of experience, inquiry and reflection as the key elements of a theory of knowing in service learning.
Service Learning

Service learning is a form of experiential learning and is an innovative pedagogical model that allows students to contribute to their community. Dewey’s experiential learning places much emphasis on the principles of experience, inquiry and reflection that are key elements of service learning. According to Giles and Eyler (1994), Dewey’s first premise is that student experience results from the interaction between the student and the environment. This is known as the principle of interaction. Factors that affect student experience include those that are internal to the student and those that are objective parts of the environment (Giles and Eyler, 1994). The second and final premise of Dewey’s theory is called the “principle of continuity.” Here, all experiences take up something from previous ones and occur along a continuum. These experiences need to be directed for further growth and development (Giles and Eyler, 1994). Together, these two principles interact to form what Dewey (1938) calls the “longitudinal and lateral aspects of experience” (p. 44). Giles and Eyler (1994) discuss the implications of Dewey’s principle of interaction and principle of continuity and stress the importance of context. The acquisition as well as application of knowledge is dependent on the context. The purpose of the interaction is to develop learning from experience through reflective thinking that leads to inquiry. According to Dewey (1938) “reflective thinking impels to inquiry” (p.7). Reflection is a key component within a service learning experience and encourages learners to make meaningful connections outside of the curriculum.

There is no one, generally accepted definition for service learning; however, similar commonalities are apparent between the various definitions. According to Bringle and Hatcher (2000), service learning is defined as a course based educational experience
where students a) participate in a community activity that identifies need and b) reflect on
the experience in such a way that it furthers course content and educative development.
Students should gain a more extensive appreciation of the discipline and experience a
sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). According to Ash, Clayton and
Moses, (2007) service learning is a structured process that integrates meaningful learning
and service goals. It is designed to be reciprocal in nature between the community partner
and the university and it involves critical reflection. The duration of a service learning
experience has to be long enough to produce meaningful outcomes in the areas of
personal, academic or civic learning (Ash, Clayton & Moses, 2007).

Service learning specifically benefits students by empowering them and allowing
them to enhance their personal skill sets and apply knowledge at a practical level. Service
learning provides students with engagement in active, relevant and collaborative learning
and it is an effective way to enhance learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). The service
learning experience is characterized by ‘a reciprocal relationship in which the service
reinforces and strengthens the learning and the learning reinforces and strengthens the
service’ (Prentice & Garcia, 2000, p. 20).

Service learning is distinctly different from volunteerism and community service.
The main difference between service learning and volunteerism is that volunteerism is
completed solely for the benefit of the organization being served (Prentice & Garcia,
2000). Both community service and service learning contribute to the community’s needs
through volunteer efforts; however, service learning uses those needs as a corner stone
for students to reflect upon themselves and the community members. In comparison with
volunteering or community service, service learning offers students the opportunity to
directly benefit from their service (Prentice & Garcia, 2000).

**Disability Placement**

Integrating a disability placement as a service learning experience fits with the
trend toward expanding teaching techniques. A disability service learning experience
moves beyond the course curriculum and assists in better preparing students for teaching
or disability programming. Facilitating programs conducive for this population brings
awareness to disability issues and legislation. Many issues critical to the lives of people
with disabilities often go unnoticed and unaddressed by people without disabilities. By
facilitating a movement program for children with disabilities, coordinators of the
program have to be aware of accessibility requirements, the removal of architectural
barriers, developing a curriculum that offers developmentally appropriate activities,
providing activities that are safe for the children, as well as interacting with the
community. A disability service learning experience provides a meaningful context for
exploring issues and tensions underlying disability. Through this form of experiential
learning, students are able to integrate real life experiences allowing students to engage
with the community. Through a disability service learning experience students learn
about a complex and growing area of programming for children with disabilities and
form relationships with children, teachers, educational assistants and school boards
within the community. Within a disability service learning context, there is much
potential for mentoring opportunities. Mentorship plays a significant role within a
disability focused service learning context, whether it is with the faculty advisor, an
onsite supervisor, a volunteer interacting with a child or mentoring a peer.
Mentoring

According to Jacobi (1991), Parsloe and Wray (2000), and Jonson (2008) mentoring has been largely associated with the apprenticeship model. From this perspective, service learning may be viewed as a form of learning through apprenticeship where novices engage with more expert participants in productive activity that serves multiple goals and needs (Underwood, Welsh, Gauvain & Duffy, 2000). In this case, the novice learns through the active collaboration with the expert with the intent of meaningful production. Learning through apprenticeship does not just focus on the expert being a mentor, rather novices can serve as a resource for one another. As Rogoff (1990) states, the apprenticeship model is a collaborative process of distributed cognition involving not only experts’ support of novices, but also peer support for each other (Underwood, Welsh, Gauvain & Duffy, 2000). The apprenticeship model includes the concept of mentoring as an expert facilitating learning for a novice as well as the potential for novice learners to learn from each other.

There is an abundance of literature regarding mentoring; however; there is minimal literature regarding mentoring within service learning. There is an absence of a widely accepted operational definition of mentoring as there are numerous definitions, some of which conflict. According to Olian, Carroll, Giannantonio and Feren (1988); Jacobi (1991); Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978) and Zey (1984) the prevalence rate of mentoring varies as a function of several factors, including: operational definitions of mentoring; populations, academic levels; institutional characteristics and fields of study. After reviewing the literature on mentoring, there is considerable disagreement about the characteristics of the mentor in relation to the novice
With regard to age, Levinson et al. (1978) describes the mentor as typically 8-15 years older than the novice. Others, however, are much less specific about the age difference (Kram, 1985; Zey, 1984) and some suggest that mentors could be any age as long as they are in a position to fulfill the mentoring roles and functions (Phillips-Johns, 1982). Jacobi (1991) also mentions the disagreement regarding the length of the mentoring relationships. As mentioned in Olian, et al. (1988), Levinson et al. (1978) describes the typical mentoring relationship as lasting from 2-10 years and others suggest that a mentoring relationship can be as brief as a single encounter (Phillips & Johns, 1982).

Empirical research reflecting mentoring includes several distinct kinds of interpersonal relationships (Jacobi, 1991). Although many researchers have attempted to provide concise definitions of mentoring, definitional diversity continues to characterize the literature. Most researchers have defined mentoring in terms of the functions provided by a mentor or the roles played by a mentor in relation to a novice (Jacobi, 1991). According to Parsloe and Wray (2000) the most basic description of a mentor involves a “process that supports and encourages learning to happen” (p. 81). More specifically Moore & Amey’s (1988) definition of mentoring, that was discussed in their study regarding mentoring and academic success in higher education can be applied to a service learning context. “By our definition, mentoring is a form of professional socialization whereby a more experienced individual acts as a guide, role model, teacher and patron of a less experienced protégé” (Jacobi, 1991, p. 507). Jacobi (1991) views mentoring relationships as helping relationships usually focused on achievement. The primary dynamic of the mentoring relationship is the assistance and support provided to the
protégé (novice) by the mentor. This support can take many forms but is always intended to help the protégé succeed (Jacobi, 1991).

The task of mentoring is a complex process and Jonson (2008) outlines characteristics of a ‘good’ mentor. These mentoring characteristics are in relation to teaching. Some characteristics of a mentor involve the mentor involve teaching skills, a thorough command of the curriculum being taught, the ability to transmit effective teaching strategies, open and effective communication with protégé, strong interpersonal skills, credibility with peers and administration, eagerness to learn and a commitment to improving the academic achievement of all students (Jonson, 2008). Requirements for mentoring go beyond these general characteristics and good mentors understand the needs of the protégé. Problem solving skills and the ability to think critically and reflectively are not only important for the protégé, but they also play an essential component for mentors.

Similarly, mentoring can play a significant role in assisting individuals towards being self-directed learners. According to Galbraith (2003) a true mentoring experience provides a learner with three things (a) promotion of the enhancement of self-directness in learners, (b) encouragement of transformation change in the way mentees’ view their world in which they live, work and play and (c) enhancement of independence, creativity and autonomy. Mentoring towards self-directedness is a cumulative process where the ultimate goal is to promote independence, reflection and a sense of autonomy (Galbraith, 2003).

Cohen (1995) believes that effective mentoring involves six interrelated behavioural functions that lead the mentee towards becoming a self-directed learner. The
first function is *relationship emphasis*. Here, the mentor creates a comfortable climate where the mentor focuses on listening, acceptance of feelings, provides feedback on observations and builds a safe, social environment and connection with the mentee. The second function is *information emphasis* and here the focus is on requesting detailed information from mentees and offering specific instructions and questions that are aimed at factual understanding. This is the starting block toward the pursuit of what the mentee’s perspectives mean. The *facilitative focus* is the third function and the mentor facilitates the mentee through a detailed academic review of interests, abilities and ideas. Here, the mentor considers alternate views and poses hypothetical situations and scenarios to the mentees. The mentor fosters a sense of transformation and meaning and provides opportunities for reflection. The third function, *confrontive focus*, is where the mentor challenges the mentee’s explanation and gives constructive and critical feedback on the relationship (Galbraith, 2003). This function provides the most opportunity for critical thinking and discourse. Challenging is an imperative component of this stage of the mentor/mentee relationship. The fifth function, *modeling*, encourages mentees to take risks and make decisions that reflect their journey towards their educational and career goals. Here, the mentor shares experiences with mentees and provides assessment of mentees abilities. The mentor encourages the mentee to take action and engage in new challenges. The sixth function is *visioning*. This function encourages mentees to become an independent learner and pushes mentees to gain a sense of autonomy and transfer the skills learned to new environments (Galbraith, 2003). The discussion of these six functions indicates that the role of a mentor goes well beyond that of giving information
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and advice. Galbraith (2003) states, “good mentoring is about creating a mini learning community that ultimately seeks to create for both the mentor and mentee” (p. 11).

The Mentoring Resource Series (2003) provides an overview of mentoring within Canada and outlines some of the Best Practices of Mentoring throughout the country. The research done by The Mentoring Resource Series (2003) primarily focuses on the mentors’ response to their mentoring experience, not the mentee, across Canada. Specifically for Ontario, thirty organizations with mentoring programs were considered. There were a variety of mentoring programs such as: formal structured mentoring programs, internal mentors, external mentors, informal/less structured mentoring programs, networking programs and one-on-one mentoring. Representative mentoring programs in each major sector were sought out: community based, corporate/private sector, government, education, health care and associations across the province. The Mentoring Resource Series (2003) specifically focused on organizations that employ mentoring programs as a means of enhancing career, work and professional development in the Ontario workplace. After assessing various mentoring program within Canada, they asked focus group members to discuss what they considered to be the definition of mentoring and some issues affecting the development of mentoring in Quebec. Responses to the definition of a quality mentoring relationship involved: “a special, genuine relationship between two individuals, one more experienced and one wishing to learn and to receive. The mentor acts on the mentee’s personal, social and professional development and its end purpose is to allow mentees to surpass themselves, to achieve some degree of autonomy” (The Mentoring Series, p. 366). In this case, the mentoring relationship develops over a period of time and it involves genuineness, commitment, and
mutuality, in an atmosphere of respect, honesty and openness. The focus groups discuss how mentors should know how to listen, support, question, inform and guide and encourage mentee’s to critically think. Availability is an important component of an effective mentoring relationship as well as mentees trusting their mentors.

In regards to Cohen’s (1995) mentoring functions, The Mentoring Resource Series, (2003) investigated where most mentoring programs were located along the continuum of mentoring functions. Major findings demonstrated that few programs knew whether mentoring relationships were developing according to Cohen’s model. Of the six functions recognized by Cohen (1995) relationship, information and facilitation were dominant. Developing an atmosphere of trust, providing advice in the form of information and supporting choices were the functions that were most often exercised. Surprisingly, few mentors stated that they confronted mentees, acted as role models or helped the mentee make their vision a reality (The Mentoring Resource Series, 2003). Some programs mentioned that some mentors primarily focused on their own desires and demonstrated difficulty focusing on mentees’ needs (The Mentoring Resource Series, 2003). Some programs also noted there was a lack of time for building a strong rapport between mentor and mentee. There was also difficulty in distinguishing the difference between mentoring and coaching and mentors seemed confused about their role. The Mentoring Resource Series (2003) established three factors that influence the development of the mentoring relationship which are: the roles assumed by mentors; follow-up by program coordinators; and the time taken to develop the mentoring relationship.
Galbraith (2003) looks at the mentoring relationship between faculty professors, specifically Adult Education, and students. Galbraith’s (2003) article, suggests that mentoring is a subrole of the adult education professor and not all faculty members are disposed to be an effective mentor. Faculty professors wear many hats (eg. curriculum developer, researcher, lecturer, discussion leader, assessor, and so forth) and being a mentor is just one subrole they are involved in. Zachary (2002) states “some teachers gravitate quite naturally towards mentoring...others find themselves uncomfortably thrust into their role” (p. 27). Galbraith (2003) continues on to investigate the foundational underpinnings of mentoring with a focus on desired attributes of a “good” mentor and discusses the roles and functions of an effective mentor. Galbraith (2003) concludes with the importance of understanding the role of the complete mentor as this can be a template for instructors. The complete mentor involves Cohen’s (1995) six functions of mentoring towards a self-directed learner that has previously been mentioned. Ideally, mentors support their learners, challenge their students, and help them identify a vision to further their self-directed learning (Galbraith, 2003). Perhaps professors as mentors can generate sustainability within the teaching and learning process and can enhance the learning environment. This literature is relevant to this study as the role of the faculty mentor will later be investigated.

Mentoring, as well as service learning, is a structured educational strategy for enhancing student development and academic achievement. The review of the literature suggests that there is an abundance of research on service learning and significant amounts of research done on mentoring; however, the connection between the two is not apparent. There is much focus on the mentor’s perspective of the mentoring experience
but the perspective of the mentee is missing. There are many opportunities within a service learning experience that involve mentorship and this relationship is vital for self-directed learning. At present, research on mentoring within a specific service learning context such as SNAP remains largely unspoken and unexamined. Therefore, in an effort to assess service learning and mentoring, I have conducted a comparative analysis within SNAP across three distinct years.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Within this chapter, I will include a detailed description of the methods used throughout this study. Furthermore, I will explain details describing the recruitment and participation selection, the research design, procedures, the phases of data analysis, consent and ethical issues and limitations.

Participants

I recruited participants for this study from the service learning experience known as SNAP. The participants were fourth year Brock University students completing their independent study or thesis credit as a SNAP Coordinator. The informant pool included the most of the SNAP Coordinators from 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 and were contacted via email and post. This minimized the likelihood of identifying who the informant was by his/her presumed membership in a particular SNAP portfolio subgroup.

I sent out 41 survey response forms to potential participants via post. Twenty-Three participants completed the survey response form and sent it back to the third party informant via post. More specifically, of the 2008-2009 cohort, 70% responded. In regards to the 2009-2010 cohort, 50% of the participants responded and of the 2010-2011 cohort 53% of the participants responded. Below is a visual chart of the participant feedback.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Administered</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Returned</td>
<td>7 – 70%</td>
<td>7 – 50%</td>
<td>9 – 53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were three different mentorship approaches examined across the proposed three years of study. The coordinators of 08/09 cohort had one faculty mentor. The coordinators of the 09/10 cohort as well as 10/11 cohort had a faculty mentor plus two intermediary graduate student mentors. One intermediary graduate mentor was involved for both years, and the other intermediary mentor changed each year. Having different mentors each year provided a rich opportunity to examine how each cohort defined effective mentorship and how mentoring was experienced within SNAP.

Research Design

I used a within-cohort and cross-cohort comparative case design to describe how mentorship was experienced within SNAP. SNAP is a single program that comprises multiple complex levels of relationships. As such, examining this program's coordinating cohorts over three years constitutes a cross-case comparison of mentoring experiences across three distinct SNAP cohorts. The goal of this analysis is to identify important themes of mentorship within the SNAP context and to provide a rich description of the social reality created by these themes through inductive and deductive reasoning. The results of this qualitative content analysis support the development of new theories and validate existing theories. The long-term nature of this study will generate significant theoretical insight into the meanings that Coordinators derive from being mentored, as well as the learning process that enhances deep learning.

Procedure

I sent the letter of intent, consent form, third party informant information and a response form to prospective informants including a stamped return address envelope. When the participant returned the envelope, the contents included the signed consent
form and the completed response form and was addressed to an uninvolved third party.

The third party received the envelopes, opened them, separated the consent form from the response form, destroyed the envelopes and kept the consent forms in a secure location. The coded response forms were then given to me (the student investigator). Each form had a distinctive pre code (ex. 0809A, 0809B, and so forth). The informant retained a front page with contact information for the third party so that if he/she wished to withdraw from the study he/she could contact the third party and do so via the pre-code and maintain anonymity and confidentiality with the student and principal researcher.

Please refer for Appendix C for third party information.

Response Form

All participants responded to the same series of pre-established questions that were generated with the influence of Patton’s (2002) notion of effective question options. The survey questions focused on: Behaviors/Experiences, Opinions/Values, Feelings/Emotions, Knowledge, Sensory and Background. These effective question options are mainly used when conducting interviews, but they also apply to a survey response form. Due to the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants, there were limited questions asking about the participant’s age, background and characteristics of the person that can be identifiable. The behaviour and experience questions on the survey response form focus on what a person does or has done within the SNAP experience. These first four questions on the response form set up the foundation for the context of the program. Opinion and value questions focus on what participants think about their mentorship experience. Feeling questions elicit feeling responses to their mentorship experience. This question asked participants to discuss experiences within their
mentorship relationship which had potential for them to feel frustration, anxiety, annoyance, happiness and fulfillment. Knowledge questions asked the participants what characterized a good mentorship experience and what the roles and functions are of an effective mentor. Sensory questions allowed the researcher to enter into the sensory apparatus of the participant. This question asks what the participant might see or hear during SNAP in progress and a mentorship experience. A follow-up of other senses was also asked. These types of questions provided a framework within which participants could express their own understanding in their own terms of mentoring within a SNAP context. Please refer to Appendix D for specific response questions.

Data Analysis

In this study I employed both inductive and deductive approaches to the process of analysis. The inductive approach to the process is the heart of this analysis. Since there is minimal literature on mentorship within a service learning context, it is obvious that an inductive analysis is appropriate. During an inductive analysis, the categories and themes are derived from the data set. Deductive analysis involves the data being analyzed according to an existing framework. Deductively, all three data sets were analyzed with a specific focus to see if Cohen’s six functions of mentoring and Johnson’s (2008) notion of a ‘good’ mentor resonated within them. The patterns and themes of these inductive and deductive analyses are presented within the Findings section.

I used triangulation to enhance the accuracy and credibility of the findings. There are two sites of triangulation within this study. Firstly, there are three separate cohorts (2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011). By including three distinct cohorts of participants, the analysis of mentorship within this context is more robust. Secondly,
there are three types of analysis conducted here. There is a within-case, cross-case and thematic analysis employed within this study. Combining these three types of analysis will provide an in depth analysis of mentoring within SNAP.

**Phases of Data Analysis**

*Phase 1* – I condensed participant responses by survey question (1-11) within case within cohort. Inductively, I generated patterns and categories within each cohort. Throughout my interactions with the data, I established a first level of patterns of similarities and differences within each cohort. With these patterns, I then did a comparison of survey questions across each cohort. These patterns are presented in two sections of the findings chapter. First, the analysis of survey questions 1-4a are shared and then the analysis of survey questions 4b-11 are outlined. Here, I employed cross triangulation data sets (cohorts). I did this by analyzing the patterns across cohort by question. With all three data sets present, I did a comparison and looked for ideas/patterns that were alike and different. When comparing the established inductively derived categories, I was able to discern patterns.

*Phase 2* - This phase of the analysis was research question driven. I organized the survey response forms by survey question by thesis question within each Cohort and patterns were generated. With a focus on the research questions, I was able to generate patterns and categories specific to each cohort. I then compared these patterns within case by cohort across each of the three cohorts. Two distinct analyses were done within this phase. Survey questions 1-4b were first analyzed and were specific to the context of the study. Questions 4b-11 were then analyzed and were specific to the experience of mentorship.
Phase 3- With an inductive orientation to the raw data, I analyzed for key words, and concepts across each case within cohort. Firstly, the data sets were analyzed for key words through each case, within cohort, with an open perspective. Secondly, I analyzed the key words for each case, within cohort, with a mentoring focus. Thirdly, I developed indigenous typologies that consolidated keywords and concept patterns within the participant’s experience. Here, I was able to explore typologies indigenous to the particular cohort year and then compared each cohort with the others for similarities and differences. Thus, I achieved a triangulated analysis across three cohorts.

Phase 4- According to Kyngas and Vanhanen (1999) deductive analysis is used when the structure of the analysis is based on previous knowledge and the literature guides the analysis. I used Cohen’s six functions of mentoring to guide the deductive analysis and investigate if Cohen’s functions of mentorship work within a complex context such as SNAP. The mode of analysis that will be generated will be helpful to discern patterns and confirm or disconfirm the literature regarding mentoring. Also, comparative analysis between cohort was employed.

The significance of the combination of inductive and deductive analysis was to demonstrate the richness of the data and the complexity of the context. I used the literature on Cohen to guide phase 4 of the analysis in relation to his functions of mentoring; however, it was also important to include an inductive analysis, as Cohen’s research is not based on a service learning experience.

Consents and Ethical Issues

Primarily, ethical clearance for conducting this research was secured from Brock University Research Ethics Board (File # 09-285 Please see Appendix F for Certificate of
ETHICS CLEARANCE). Research participants had the right to informed consent and participants who were interested in participating in this study, based on the information provided in the letter of invitation, were required to return a signed informed consent form. Participants were informed of any potential physical, psychological or social risks related to participation of the study. After the participants were informed of the risks and consequences, participants had the right to decline at any time. A copy of the letter of invitation and informed consent is attached. (Please see appendix A and B).

There were a variety of other ethical issues to consider when conducting research with this population. There was the possibility that the Coordinators would feel coerced to participate in this study because of regular contact between the researcher and the participants. To avoid coercion, I told participants that they had the right to decline involvement in the study and be allowed to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Participants were also be informed that there was no assessment or evaluation attached to their participation in the study. By doing so, the aim was to emphasize that participation was strictly voluntary and that no consequence would come to those who chose not to participate.

Further, issues of informed consent, voluntary participation and voluntary withdrawal were heavily discussed prior to commencement of the study. I assured participants that they had the right to withdraw from the study at any point and if they did so, their data would be destroyed and they would face no consequences. All data remained confidential and were placed in a locked cabinet on the Brock University campus until completion of the study. For the all the Coordinating Cohorts, I did not analyze the data until all grades had been submitted. In addition, it was important to note
that confidentiality was respected and maintained for all participants within the study. In
order to accomplish this, the researcher ensured that all qualitative data were coded so
that the data could not be linked to any individual participant. The intermediary graduate
student mentors who were previous SNAP coordinators were not participants within the
study.

There was one master copy that included all participants’ names and cohort year
and the third party informant (TPI) had access to this information. (Please refer to
Appendix E). Personal identifiers were collected during the course of the research to
allow the opportunity for to withdraw. Personal identifiers included cohort year (08/09,
09/10, 10/11). This copy was kept in a separate folder and was locked in a controlled
access room. Personal identifiers were retained so I was able to audit back to raw data if a
participant chose to withdraw. This allowed me the possibility to track which data to
eliminate.

During this study, anonymity is not ensured in case of participant withdrawal;
however, the data were confidential and only coded data were released. All written data
were transferred to a data stick that will be wiped upon completion of the project. This
ensured the data were secure. Only researchers working on this project had access to this
data. Participants will not be identified in any way should findings be published.

As a researcher, it is important for me to engage in reflexivity throughout my
work. (Macleod, 2002; Parker, 2005). Parker (2005) discusses reflexivity as “a way of
attending to the institutional location of historical and personal aspects of the research
relationship” (p. 25). That is to say, a researcher must locate herself within the research in
order to highlight the assumptions being made (Macleod, 2002). As a previous SNAP
Coordinator and as a mentor it is beneficial for me to be reflexive during the research process. Therefore, it is my goal that by positioning myself as a white, female researcher and constantly reflecting on my own assumptions and biases throughout the research process that I will engage in reflexively.

Limitations

I will now elaborate on the ethics process, which influenced the conduct of my study. Because of my involvement with SNAP and my position as the researcher, the Research Ethics Board (REB) placed precautions/limitations on my study. I involved third party assistance to address confidentiality and coercion risks. Here, is an explanation of the expectations that were placed on me as the author of this study.

1. REB requires that any and all data must be collected, secured and coded by a third party that is disconnected from SNAP. Since my supervisor is the faculty instructor and assessing student work, REB voiced a concern for potential bias. The stipulation was met by the collection and coding of the data orchestrated by a disconnected third party. She also acted as the contact person in the event that students had any questions or concerns regarding their participation in the study.

2. REB required that I would not see the collected data for the 2010/2011 Coordinator Cohort until after the grades for the course were submitted at the end of the semester. The data were collected and coded and not delivered to me until final grades were recorded by the registrar’s office at the end of the April semester.

3. Any graduate students that were previous SNAP coordinators, and are currently working with the Faculty Supervisor involved in SNAP were not allowed to participate in the study. This was a concern as the faculty supervisor is their assessor.
4. Initially, data collection included a triangulation between interviews document analysis and observation. The REB had concern with analyzing documents of student work as well as interviewing past coordinators. Since I was a coordinator and interviewing peers within that cohort, REB posed this as a conflict of interest. Initially, I was interested in conducting triangulation within data collection through observation, interviews and document analysis. However, with REB’s requests in mind, I modified my data collection to a survey response form that was both confidential and anonymous.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

I will organize this chapter by the phases outlined in the methodology chapter. I will introduce this chapter with Phase 1 which looks at the survey questions from the survey response form (see appendix D). With this inductive approach to my analysis, I will begin with a summary of Survey Questions 1-4a and then lead into the findings regarding Survey Questions 4b-11. Phase 2 of the data analysis involves the research questions. This phase of the data analysis will outline the patterns of the across cohort analysis of the research questions. I will then move into phase 3 that involves the analysis of key words. First an analysis of key words across the three cohorts with a broad focus is mentioned and then an analysis of key words across the three cohorts with a specific focus in relation to mentoring is included. Phase 4 involves a deductive approach and involves a cross case analysis with Cohen’s six functions of an effective mentor.

Phase 1

Across Cohort By Survey Questions (1-4b) Summary

To generate a snapshot of the context of SNAP through the perspective of the coordinator, I have summarized the Coordinator’s responses below. Questions 1-4b on the survey response form are dedicated for explanation of the SNAP experience. Regarding the Coordinator’s personal expectations of their involvement within SNAP, Coordinators expected to gain hands on experience working with children and youth with disabilities, enhance skills and personal growth, and assist with future career development. Gaining insight into programming for children with disabilities was important to many Coordinators as they felt it was satisfying to give back to the
community. A participant from the 2010-2011 cohort expected to learn from a leadership role and learn from her mentor (04). Another participant from the 2010-2011 cohort expected the coordination experience of SNAP to be slightly less time consuming and did not realize how large of a commitment it was (06).

According to the Coordinators across all of the cohorts, the experience of coordinating SNAP was attractive to them because of the constant engagement with students, community and faculty, their ability to apply skills learned, to enhance future career opportunities, the opportunity to earn a full credit, and the collaboration and teamwork it involved. Most Coordinators had some interaction with SNAP previous to this Coordination experience.

There are many learning outcomes through the experience of coordinating SNAP. Coordinators responded that they wanted to learn how to be an effective leader, learn how to adapt activities to suit the needs of every student, learn from the real world, and enhance personal and professional skills.

Coordinators were asked what they might see and hear during SNAP in progress. Most respondents mentioned some sort of interaction, whether it is with the volunteers, students attending SNAP, other coordinators or mentors, the children engaging in movement activities and everyone having fun. Coordinators heard lots of conversation, encouragement, praises, yelling, screaming, sometimes crying and noises from the equipment being used.

Across Cohort By Survey Questions (4b-11) Analysis

4b. Tell me what you might see and hear during your experience of mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


MENTORING WITHIN SERVICE LEARNING

Patterns:

**See**
- Mentoring guiding mentee
- Teamwork
- Mentors observing
- Mentees asking questions

**Hear**
- Mentors making suggestions
- Encouragement, laughter, feedback
- Advice
- Discussions
- Thank you’s from participants
- Being asked questions
- Mentors providing new ideas
- Hear meltdowns
- Instructions from mentors

5. Tell me the highs and lows you experienced within the mentorship process at SNAP

| Table 4 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Patterns:**   | **2008-2009**   | **2009-2010**   | **2010-2011**   |
| **Highs**       | - Satisfaction... | - Accessibility to | - Coordinator as |
|                 | - program        | mentor           | mentor          |
|                 | - personal       | - Positive experience | - Happiness of kids |
| **Lows**        | - Lack of        | - Feedback       | - Failures     |
|                 | collaboration    | - Communication | - Expectations |
|                 |                  |                  | - Taken advantage |
|                 |                  |                  | of             |

6. Tell me about experiences within your mentorship relationship, which had potential for:

<p>| Table 5 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <strong>Patterns:</strong>   | <strong>2008-2009</strong>   | <strong>2009-2010</strong>   | <strong>2010-2011</strong>   |
| <strong>Frustration</strong> | - Ignoring of   | - Miscommunication | - Lack of      |
|                 | Volunteers      | - Not working as a | communication   |
|                 | - Role Expectations | team             | - Lack of      |
|                 | - Feedback      | - Style of mentorship | commitment   |
|                 |                  |                  |               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>- Personal insecurities</th>
<th>- Role definition</th>
<th>- Not performing to mentors standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nervousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyance</td>
<td>- Conflicting Views</td>
<td>- With mentor (feedback)</td>
<td>- Coordinators not taking things seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- With peers (collaboration)</td>
<td>- Not listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>- Positive feedback</td>
<td>- Team work with mentor</td>
<td>- Being a mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teamwork and collaboration</td>
<td>- Team work with other coordinators</td>
<td>- Interacting with the kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reflection</td>
<td>- Program satisfaction</td>
<td>- Being mentored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment</td>
<td>- Reflection</td>
<td>- Being successful</td>
<td>- Being a mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback</td>
<td>- Independent</td>
<td>- Positive feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How did you utilize the mentorship process available during your year?

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How?</strong></td>
<td>- Face to face</td>
<td>- Face to face</td>
<td>- Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Email</td>
<td>- Email</td>
<td>- Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clarification on academic components</td>
<td>- Meetings</td>
<td>- Asking about scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Issues</td>
<td>- Questions</td>
<td>- Asking about disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What for?</strong></td>
<td>- Used Maureen’s – Catalogues</td>
<td>- Meetings</td>
<td>- Asking about disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Email</td>
<td>- Brainstorm ideas</td>
<td>- Asking about disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meetings</td>
<td>- Advice</td>
<td>- Asking about disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conversation about how the day went</td>
<td>- Asking about disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How was mentorship helpful to you?  
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Become an independent learner</td>
<td>- Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>- Learned how to be a mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop Skills</td>
<td>- Individual growth</td>
<td>- Mentors were non-judgmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Helped me grow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Finish the following statements...
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A good mentor...</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promotes self-directed learning</td>
<td>- Available</td>
<td>- Supports and guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is a good leader</td>
<td>- Encourages independent learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reliable</td>
<td>- Provides a meaningful learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Allows mentee to be successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A meaningful mentorship experience provides...</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Allows mentees to be independent</td>
<td>- Provides a meaningful learning</td>
<td>- Personal growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reciprocal learning</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>- Professional, meaningful relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Allows mentee to be successful</td>
<td>- Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What would you suggest for improving the quality of mentorship process?  
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More interaction with mentor</td>
<td>- Clearer role definition</td>
<td>- More training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More reflection</td>
<td>- More available</td>
<td>- More interaction with mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meet more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What are the roles and functions of a mentor within a service learning context like SNAP?  
Table 10
Phase 2

Across Cohort By Research Question

After I analyzed each cohort within cohort by thesis questions, I then did an analysis across the three cohorts. Here, I took the patterns that I generated within each cohort and compared them across the cohorts. I documented similarities and differences among the three cohorts and I will elaborate on my findings below.

How is mentoring utilized in Service Learning?

All three cohorts reported that they mainly utilized mentoring through face-to-face interaction and email. Respondents elaborated on what they used their mentors for. All three cohorts mainly utilized their mentor for questions, advice, clarification on assignments, brainstorming, discussions, input, feedback or suggestions.

However, the 2008-2009 Cohort placed more emphasis on the aspect of meetings and sharing of knowledge. “There needs to be more formal conferencing sessions with the team and the mentor...if we set up weekly or biweekly meetings this would be helpful...if we had more meetings we could receive more feedback” (04/06/07). “Having previous coordinators mentor us could be helpful and allow us to utilize the mentor more. It may be helpful to have a mentor that is similar in age” (03)
The 2009-2010 cohort placed emphasis on the relationship to the mentor, communication and availability in order to utilize the mentoring more. "Being on the same page, being available and knowing the goals and roles of each party and knowing the people you are mentoring would allow for more interaction with the mentor" (01/06/04/07).

The 2010-2011 Cohort varied in their responses and elaborated in more detail regarding how they utilized their mentor. "I was constantly asking my mentors for scenarios, for advice, ideas and guidance which then I relayed this information to those I was mentoring" (10/11/02). "Through reflection, listening and observing my mentors I was able to utilize the process. This was appropriate for me" (10/11/04). "I think just taking the time to talk to the mentors and find out their stores and how mentorship impacted them". These respondents took a deeper approach to utilizing their mentors and valued the interactions they had with their mentors. They were still concerned with assignments and questions of that sort; however, more interested in listening to what the mentor had to say and observing.

What are the roles and functions of a mentor within a service-learning experience such as SNAP?

All three cohorts were very similar in their responses regarding the roles and functions that their mentors portray during an experience such a SNAP. After comparing the patterns of the roles and functions of all three cohorts some similarities developed. It is evident that a mentor must establish a concrete relationship with the Coordinator, be an information provider and promote and encourage learning. These were the most prominent three roles and functions across the three cohorts.
Establishing a concrete relationship with mentor and coordinator and the coordinator being positive role model was a frequent pattern that emerged throughout the analysis. With establishing a concrete relationship, the idea of clear role definition was also frequently mentioned. The 2009-2010 cohort mentioned the importance of a mentor being encouraging, positive and personable but emphasized the value of role definition. Having an obvious role was a constant pattern that arose within this cohort group. They valued and placed emphasis on the importance of role definition and everyone being aware of what the mentor wanted. “It made me anxious not knowing what mentors were looking for. Clear role definitions may have helped... It is important that the mentors and mentees are on the same page and it is important that everyone I aware of the goals of each party.... It is important to get to know the people you are mentoring and asking for both sides of a story before accusing anyone of not doing their job” (04/05/06/07). Role definition and the relationship to the mentor was a common pattern and this cohort felt like they were both integral function for effective mentoring.

The 2010-2011 cohort also mentioned the importance of being aware of the mentor’s role; however, placed more importance on being a positive role model. “The greatest experience of mentorship was through Maureen and the Graduate Student Mentors always providing new ideas or ways of seeing situations that I might never have” (03). “I felt happy when I know I was doing a good job. I was always provided with compliments and feedback and I was aware that I was becoming a more confident coordinator by using advice and knowledge that I had gained from my mentors”. “During SNAP I would see my mentors being a role model, giving positive and constructive
criticism, providing knowledge such as tips and strategies and working on enhancing relationships and getting to know one another” (04)

The 2008-2009 Cohort mentioned the function of a mentor being an information provider. Here, coordinators discussed the importance of mentors providing background information of the program and the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved (03). “A mentoring relationship at SNAP provides mentors to share past experience to teach others and give examples to further the Coordinators thinking” (06). It is important that a mentor is an information provider and can relay professional insight and constructive criticism. “It is helpful when my mentor provided information regarding background of the program and outlined specific roles and responsibilities (03) “SNAP mentors need to have extensive knowledge on the program and be able to give examples and explanations” (06). A coordinator from the 2010-2011 cohort mentioned “I was constantly asking my mentors about scenarios, for advice, and guidance and sometimes which I then relayed to those I was mentoring” (04). Another 2010-2011 respondent said, “just taking the time to talk to the mentors and find out their stories and how mentorship impacted them was a helpful form of mentoring”(05).

In relation to the function of promoting and encouraging learning, the 2008-2009 cohort clearly outlined this function. They emphasized the importance of a mentor being able to guide a mentee towards self-directedness. “My mentor allowed me to work independently and make decisions on my own but still guide when necessary” (04). “My mentor allowed me to do my own work. I was able to explore things independently but provided insight or guidance when needed” (06). “She provided me the opportunity to make mistakes and learn to improve. She used a sink or swim approach and didn’t
interfere” (07). “I was able to learn from my mistakes and apply them to tomorrow” (05).
“My mentor challenged me to explore and learn things on my own and acknowledged my
mistakes to help me in the future (06).

The 2009-2010 Cohort discussed the function of promoting self-regulated
learning as well. “With my mentor allowing us to do it our way, with very little guidance
when we did something, it felt very good when we completed the task because we knew
it was our work” (02). “It was very powerful realizing my own potential. My mentor
taught me to be proactive, discover creative solutions to several obstacles and this
enhanced my knowledge” (02). “She was very helpful in letting me grow and mature as a
student and a person. She wouldn’t just give you the answer, she would make you work
to earn it, which is something that you have to do in life since everything is not handed to
you” (01).

What comprises/defines an effective mentor?

After I analyzed the patterns across the three cohorts regarding the thesis question
of defining an effective mentor, there were a lot of similarities among the data. All three
cohorts mentioned the importance of being passionate and friendly, facilitating learning,
guidance and support and strong leadership skills.

“Effective mentors cultivate authentic growth in mentee and support mentee to be
a self-directed learner. Effective mentors allow mentees to make mistakes and challenge
mentees to make mistakes and learn things independently” (08/09/01-09-06-03) in
relation to learning...“effective mentors provide a mentee with skills to become an
independent learner and encourage mentees to be active agents when they are
experiencing cognitive dissonance” (08/09/07). The 2009-2010 cohort describes effective
learning as “an effective mentor provides an optimal opportunity for meaningful learning experiences...an effective mentor provides meaningful growth for the student, both as a scholar and a person....an effective mentor instills a sense of fulfillment and accomplishment as well as allowing others to want to pursue the same experience...my mentor provided me with confidence and allowed me to be successful in the SNAP program and any task I was given” (10/11/02-01-06-05-07). The 2010-2011 cohort describes an effective mentor by “letting you be the learner and lets you learn through failures but only allows you to fail to a certain point...the mentor would never let you fail so it would ruin you physically or mentally” (07). “Effective mentors provide you with knowledge about instructional methods, giving advice and learning approaches” (02).

The 2008-2009 cohort also placed emphasis on mentors providing guidance and support. “Effective mentors encourage in difficult times, listens actively to questions and concerns, supports the mentee when needed but challenges them to explore and learn new things independently” (01/07/06). Another pattern that continued to occur was a mentor providing opportunity for critical reflection. “When a mentor can provide opportunities for deep reflection it facilitates deeper learning because I am able to think about new skills I have developed and apply them to future situations” (07). The 2010-2011 cohort mentions that “an effective mentor supports and provides knowledge and guidance that you need or not even know you need” (03). “An effective mentor is always willing to search for an answer for an answer to help if they do not know it already” (02).

The 2009-2010 mentors must have extensive leadership skills. “An effective mentor is someone who is responsible, respectful, easy to talk to, communicates with others and is calm...an effective mentor must act as a leader, optimizing the chances that
the group will succeed” (02/05). “A good mentor guides, does not give answers and uses prior experiences and knowledge” (01). Having strong leadership and communication skills are essential for an effective mentor within the SNAP setting. “A mentor has to have strong leadership skills, similar to a coach where learning is reciprocal in nature and constant feedback is provided” (04). The 2010-2011 cohort mentions, “a meaningful mentorship experience provides assistance in personal growth and understanding of a leadership role” (01). “A good mentor leads by example, is attentive to the mentee, and allows them to grow and learn on their own with support when needed” (04).

Lastly, effective mentors must be passionate about their area of expertise and friendly. A 2010-2011 coordinator stated, “an effective mentor always has a friendly face and positive attitude. There wasn’t a time when I felt like I couldn’t go over and ask my mentors anything” (08).

What issues might be associated with single or multiple mentors?

Throughout the analysis of the data there was a limited focus on this question. It was difficult to discern if the issues that were mentioned by the mentees were associated with multiple or single mentors. Within the survey response form, I did not properly distinguish instances where the coordinators can reflect on specific issues associated with either having a single or multiple mentors. For future reference I would ask a more open and specific question such as, What issues might be associated with your mentoring experience?

Phase 3

Across Cohort By Key Words with a Broad Focus

2008-2009
Firstly, I analyzed each survey response and reported repeating key words. Secondly, I merged all of the key words together and categorized them into significant patterns. I did this for each Cohort. This first time this analysis was conducted there was no mentoring focus in relation to key words. After analyzing the survey response forms natural occurrences of key words were categorized into the following categories: mentor, learning and independent learner. For the mentor category, significant key words were one on one mentorship, reciprocal learning, constructive criticism, leader, role model, supportive and insightful. In regards to learning, common key words were hands on learning, learning by mistakes and the sink or swim learning approach. The last pattern that emerged while analyzing the key words was the drive to be a self-directed independent learner. More specifically, words like: conflict resolution, mentees trying new things, decision making, cognitive dissonance, critical reflection were constantly emerging throughout the survey response forms.

2009-2010

A preliminary analysis was done with the survey response forms of the 2009/2010 cohort. This first analysis was general with a broad focus. Significant patterns that developed were: ‘enhance skills’ and ‘mentoring’. The ‘enhance skills’ category appeared after many response forms and included keywords such as: gain leadership skills, gain experience with disabilities, apply skills, learn from the real world and adapting activities. In relation to the ‘mentoring’ category, words such as: reciprocal learning, advice, feedback, many people involved and benefitting appeared.

2010/2011
After completing an analysis of key words with a broad focus of the 2010/2011 cohort, some obvious patterns included: 'enhance leadership skills', 'dissonance' and 'personal growth'. Many participants mentioned that the SNAP experience assisted with enhancing leadership skills such as, delegating tasks, communicating with one another and managing large amounts of people. The 2010/2011 cohort repeatedly mentioned that sometimes they would feel outside of their comfort zone. Experiencing dissonance assisted with their learning and these participants were not afraid to ask for help. Lastly, many coordinators mentioned personal growth. The SNAP experience allowed them to develop academic skills as well as life skills and they began to apply things they had learned to new experiences.

Across Cohort by Key words with specific mentoring focus

2008-2009

The 08/09 Key Words Analysis was conducted again; however, this time with a mentoring focus. Patterns included, 'encourage independent learning', 'types of mentoring', 'benefits of mentoring experience', 'effective mentors' and 'relationship with the mentor'. Within the 'encourage independent learning' category, the following key words were repeated: able to make mistakes, allowed me to work independently, learned from my mistakes, apply new knowledge, explore things on own, self-directed learning, independent learner, confident in the moment and ability to act autonomously. Within the 'types of mentoring' category, repeated key words consisted of: arms length leadership, trial and error learning and sink or swim approach to learning. The category of 'effective mentors' was very apparent within the survey response forms. Common key words consisted of: gave me immediate feedback, is flexible, has good communication skills,
gives constructive criticism, acts like a coach, encouraging and passionate, leader and role model, committed, gives good feedback and advice, informative and gives insight and guidance. Lastly, 'relationship with the mentor' was the last pattern that emerged through the survey response forms. Significant key words relating to the mentoring relationship were: open for consultation, open communication, partake in decision making, consult mentor for assessment and evaluation, comfortable relationship, open for questions and reciprocal learning.

2009-2010

After the analysis was completed, with a mentoring focus in mind, the following patterns emerged: 'role definition', 'types of learning', 'conflict' and 'effective mentorship' were prominent within the survey responses. 'Role definition' was a consistent pattern within each survey response form. Key words included: understanding and knowing one's role, not being a middleman, knowing what mentors are looking for, lack of communication, unsure of expectations and mentor clarification. 'Types of learning' was a significant pattern and included key words such as: trial and error learning and problem solving. 'Conflict' emerged as a pattern and words such as: more feedback, ineffective feedback, not knowing roles, mentor has other obligations, conflict between portfolios, lack of communication, miscommunication and mentor clarification. Lastly, 'effective mentoring' was a common pattern within the key words. This included key words such as: strong relationship, good advice, guiding, positive reinforcement, available, strong friendship, role model, reliable, optimism, supportive and knowledgeable.

2010/2011
Lastly, I completed a key word analysis of the 2010/2011 cohort with a specific mentoring focus. Some patterns that developed were: ‘mentoring others’, ‘utilizing the mentors’ and ‘teamwork’. A very common pattern in the data analysis was the idea of mentoring others. This cohort took pride in mentoring others and being effective mentors to each other, volunteers and children. This cohort was also not afraid to use the mentor. They frequently asked questions, engaged in conversation and were open to their mentor’s opinion. This cohort took the time to get to know their mentors and valued what the mentor had to say. Lastly, this cohort mentioned teamwork as a constant pattern throughout my interaction with the key words. They relied and depended on each other and would work together to solve problems.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Focus</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mentor</td>
<td>- Enhance Skills</td>
<td>- Enhance skills</td>
<td>- Enhance leadership skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning</td>
<td>- Mentoring</td>
<td>- Out of comfort zone</td>
<td>- Personal Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Independent Learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Focus</td>
<td>- Encourage independent learning</td>
<td>- Role Definition</td>
<td>- Seeking Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Types of mentoring</td>
<td>- Types of learning</td>
<td>- Conflict</td>
<td>- Mentoring Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Benefits of mentoring experience</td>
<td>- Effective Mentorship</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Utilizing my mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Positive Attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4

Cohen’s Mentoring Functions Cross Cohort Analysis

Cohen (1995) views mentoring as a blend of six interrelated functions that constitute a complete mentoring role. The goal of this relationship is to guide the mentee towards self-directedness (Galbraith, 2001). The complete mentor is grounded in the work of Cohen (1993, 1995) and is extended through the writings of Cohen and Galbraith (1995), Galbraith and Cohen (1995, 1996, 1997), Galbraith and Maslin-Ostrowski (2000), and Galbraith (2001). As mentioned within the literature review Cohen’s six functions of mentoring include: relationship emphasis, information emphasis, facilitative focus, confrontive focus, mentor model and mentee vision. This study has taken the foundation of the six functions and utilized them within a different perspective. Cohen’s six functions of an effective mentor are directed to the perspective of the mentor; however, this study views mentorship through the lens of the mentee. The use of Cohen’s functions of an effective mentor is an application of a deductive analysis.

Relationship Emphasis

According to Galbraith (2003) the relationship emphasis involves the mentor practicing active listening, asking good questions that are related to immediate concerns about actual situations and provides descriptive feedback.

Support for relationship emphasis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>“During the SNAP process we enhanced relationships with one another” (01).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We were constantly developing rapport with other mentors (coordinators)” (02).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We used each other to bounce ideas around and I was happy when all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parties were on the same page in relation to ideas and suggestions. There was great communication within our team” (03).

- “The cohesiveness of JABA made me very happy. We were productive and used each other as mentors” (06).

- “There was a comfortable relationship between coordinators and the mentor where the passing of knowledge took place” (05).

- “Mentoring involves a new relationship with a mentee and both parties learn from each other as it should be reciprocal in nature” (06).

- “Our mentor mentored us verbally and with visual examples and used humor to keep us interested and made the program more fun” (05).

- “A high of my mentoring experience was developing a strong rapport with my mentor” (06).

- “Having good feedback and affirmation was very helpful” (04).

- “Getting good feedback and making changes to the program was very rewarding and witnessing how these changes helped was very neat” (06).

Improvements in this function:

- Some coordinators asked for more feedback from mentors and more formal conferencing sessions (02, 04).

- “These sessions would provide more opportunity to reflect and consult the mentor based on my assessment and evaluation” (04).

- “Providing more feedback through questions would be helpful so the mentee and can reflect and question their own practice” (06).

2009-2010

- “Within this relationship, the mentor observes and converses with mentee” (06).

- “There is lots of conversation between the mentor and mentee discussing problems that might come up that day” (01).

- “SNAP was a very supporting environment that allowed for questions, responses, positivity, respect and feedback” (05).

- “Sometimes the mentor gave us ineffective feedback because she didn’t tell us how to fix it” (04).

- “Sometimes it seemed like mentor was not available for meeting to talk” (01).
Improvements in this function:

- There was sometimes ineffective feedback, sometimes is seemed like the mentor was not available, it is important that the mentor and mentee are on the same page and knowing the goals of each party (04/07/04/03).

- There needs to be more group meetings with mentees and mentors to get to know each other (03/07).

- The mentors need to make themselves more available and schedule mandatory weekly meetings (01/02).

- A few mentees reported their issues with the feedback given by the mentors. Some mentees would have liked more feedback during the process (especially at the beginning), some were frustrated at time because the feedback was not effective and sometimes not given. It also made mentees anxious when they didn’t know what the mentors were looking for. Clear role definitions would have helped (04).

- “Sometimes miscommunication between the mentor and coordinators” (07).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>“Once I figured out what my mentor wanted I felt competent through guided self-leaning and felt a real sense of accomplishment and self worth” (04).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was happy in moments of success and learning and forming relationships (04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I felt fulfilled when I received compliments from my mentors after a successful SNAP. Seeing their emotion at our last SNAP meeting when it was all over and knowing that true and lasting relationships were built” (06).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Informational Emphasis**

In the *information emphasis* function, the mentor gathers information from the mentees and offers specific suggestions to mentees about progress in achieving personal, educational and career goals (Galbraith, 2003).

**Support for Informational emphasis:**

| Table 13 |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2008-2009 | “My mentor was informative, encouraging and passionate” (05).                                                                                                                                                  |
|           | “It was great to work along side with thesis advisor, especially because she                                                                                                                                  |
helped me to answer any questions I had” (02).

- “When my mentor was present I did not hesitate to ask questions in regards to clarifying assignments or issues I was having. I would try and have frequent meetings with my mentor when she was around” (02).

- “It would be nice to get more feedback and have more formal conferencing sessions so that there is more opportunity to reflect and consult the mentor based on the assessment and evaluation and any questions I might have.” (02, 04).

- “If mentors would provide more feedback through asking questions…perhaps the mentee can reflect and start questioning their own practice” (06).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mentoring Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>“Mentors making suggestions and providing information about how to deal with children’s behaviour” (03).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Giving pointers or helpful hints” (05).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Mentors providing insight into what was effective and what wasn’t” (04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Mentees asking questions and offers specific suggestions of how the day went” (02).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“If we had any questions before, during or after SNAP our mentors were the ones I went to for advice. Because she has been there before and has experience, she usually had great advice” (01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Using the mentors to brainstorm ideas was helpful. They were extremely helpful in the first month of the year when we were learning the way still” (04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I asked questions when I was unsure, expressed my frustrations and concerns and asked for advice on how to deal with certain challenges. Asked for further information about certain disabilities and children with special needs” (03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>“I don’t normally like to ask for help especially when I can handle the situation; however, using a mentor is a good way to step back and look at the situation from a different light” (08).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Greatest experience of mentorship was through the faculty mentor and graduate student mentors. They were always providing new ideas or ways of seeing situations that I might never have” (03).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | “I was constantly seeking advice from those who have gone through the SNAP program before and likely had the same questions or dilemmas I
Facilitative Focus

The third function is called *facilitative focus*. Here, the mentor guides the mentee to review their interests, abilities and ideas that are relevant to learning. The purpose is to encourage the mentee to take a different perspective and consider alternative opinions while attaining their own goals. During this phase, the mentor poses questions and offers multiple viewpoints.

Support for facilitative emphasis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Maureen guiding us through the school liaison process in regards to phones, policies and previous enrollment issues. Our mentor kept us on track and gave us guidance when necessary” (01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “My mentor helped me develop skills to help children work outside of their comfort zone and team work skills” (02).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I was very happy when the advice I was given to work with a child actually worked and the student had a great day” (05).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I became frustrated when I had a different opinion than my mentor or my giving me advice and it not working “(01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “My mentor provided helpful strategies and questions” (02).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “My mentor provided assistance if needed and provided insight into what was effect and what wasn’t” (04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I had access to mentors with extensive knowledge and experience” (02).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • “I believe that a mentor is someone who is approachable, offers different perspectives and willing to put forth the effort to make individuals have a
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positive, successful experience” (05).

- “A good mentor needs to be a good role model and needs to be there to answer questions and give quality feedback when needed” (01).

- “I felt fulfilled when I was told an idea worked well. It encouraged me to try new things” (04).

2010-2011

- “My mentor helped develop my leadership role and understanding what good presence of a coordinator was. My mentors assisted when they thought it was appropriate” (01).

- “Thought reflection, attentiveness including listening to and observing my mentors I was able to utilize the process” (04).

- “I think just being there an absorbing what we were taught was half the battle. All of our mentors were beyond knowledgeable and each had something new to teach” (07).

- “An effective mentor leads by example, is attentive to the mentee, and allows them to grow and learn on their own with support when needed” (04).

- “A meaningful mentorship experience provides the feeling of fulfillment by helping someone and feeling supported when you are unsure” (03).

Confrontive Focus

The fourth phase is the Confrontive Focus function. Within this stage the mentor challenges the mentee be critical with decisions. The mentor focuses on constructive feedback that is critical in nature. The mentor promotes meaningful change and encourages self-assessment.

Support for Confrontive Focus:

Table 15

2008-2009

- “There was a situation where the teachers were booking their kids to come to SNAP at the appropriate time and we wanted them in, but not mentor not allowing us. Here we had a different opinion with the mentor” (01).

- “It was frustrating not being able to read the facial expressions of the mentor during positive or negative experiences. However, this mentorship experience provided me with opportunities to make mistakes and learn how
Mentoring within Service Learning

| 2009-2010 | • “When I didn’t know how our mentor taught, I got frustrated because it seemed like she wasn’t giving us guidance but I soon realized she likes learning from trial and error” (01).  
• “I was happy when I was told how things were going and given examples of how there is room for improvement” (04).  
• “Having previous SNAP coordinators constantly criticizing what you were going was discouraging at times” (06).  
• “Sometimes my mentor and I would have conflicting ideas and it was frustrating” (05). |
| 2010-2011 | • “It made me anxious as I was trying to be a mentor to just one person the way my few mentors were to me. Being sure you are leading them down the right path” (03).  
• “I was anxious being thrown into such a practical experience right away and I was anxious to get to know and form relationships with mentors” (04). |

**Mentor Model**

The second last function of Cohen’s six functions of a complete mentor is **mentor model**. Here, the mentor shares with the mentee personal experiences as a role model and this experience makes the relationship more personal. The goal here is to encourage mentees to take risks and make decisions in the moment. This function involves sharing feelings that emphasize the importance of learning from difficult experiences.

**Support for Mentor Model:**

| Table 16 | 2008-2009 | • “My mentor provides me with the skills to become an independent learner. She did not do everything for me however encouraged me to engage |
independently and my mentor shared her experiences” (06).

- My mentor was an amazing role model and provided guidance for us to become leaders and role models to others” (05).

- “My mentor provides support and insight about ideas and uses their past experience to teach others and give explanations and examples” (01).

### 2009-2010

- “My mentor was always fun and energetic and this rubbed off of me and made me happy when I was working along side of her” (01).

- “A good mentor is an effective role model and leader, she does not give answers; however, helps by sharing previous experiences and knowledge and makes themselves available when needed” (01, 02).

- “An effective leader leads by example and optimizes the change that the group will succeed. A good mentor will step in if they feel it is important” (04, 06).

### 2010-2011

- “I think just being there an absorbing what we were taught was half the battle. All of our mentors were beyond knowledgeable and each had something new to teach. Also, asking questions whether they seen dumb or not because it only teaches you more. I think just taking the time to talk to the mentors and find out their stories and how mentorship impacted them is useful” (07).

- “an effective mentor leads by example, is attentive to the mentee, and allows them to grow and learn on their own with the support when needed” (04).

- “An effective mentor has to be a positive role model and encourage the mentees to try new and challenging activities” (05).

- “A good mentor demonstrates good role model behavior, provides strategies and feedback for mentees, reflect together and develop a positive relationship, provide support and guidance when necessary” (04).

---

**Mentee Vision**

The final function of Cohen’s six functions is called *mentee vision*. Here, the mentor encourages the mentee to take initiatives to manage change, engage in critical thinking with regard to envisioning their own future and developing their personal and professional potential. The mentor discusses and shows respect for the mentees capacity
to determine their future. Here, mentees gain a sense of autonomy and make choices and critical judgments.

Support for Mentee Vision:

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Support for Mentee Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>• &quot;Mentorship allowed me to work independently and decision make with the team with confidence because of affirmation through mentorship&quot; (04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;My mentor made me realize everyday won’t be perfect. Everyday has its own set of challenges that we must overcome and if we are not successful then we learn from our mistakes and apply the new knowledge to tomorrow&quot; (05).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;a good mentor promotes me to learn by mistakes and for me to be independent&quot; (01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;A good mentor guides me to become a self-directed learner, allows me to make mistakes and learn from them through feedback immediately” (07).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>• &quot;I felt fulfilled when I was successful when mentor allowed us to do it our way, with very little guidance, felt very good when we did something or completed something because we knew it was our work” (01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Mentorship was very helpful in growing and maturing as a student and as a person. The mentor wouldn’t just give you the answer, she would make you work to earn it, which is something that you have to do in life since everything isn’t always handed to you” (01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Mentorship made me realize my own potential, becoming proactive and discovering creative solutions to several obstacles” (02).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>• &quot;Once I figured out what my mentor wanted I felt competent through guided self-learning and felt a real sense of accomplishment and self-worth” (04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;I felt fulfilled when I reflected back at the end of the day and realizing it went well, we did it and now let’s make it even better. It was great that everyone was there and having fun and working hard” (01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Mentoring gave me more confidence and provided me with valuable skills I will take with me and be able to use in various career opportunities” (06).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Through the mentorship process I learned a lot, I improved, I developed a greater passion for the program and experience through the positive mentorship I became inspired” (04).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | • My mentoring experience taught me a lot about who I am and and so I
learned a lot of valuable information. I think it is also taught us how we can be mentors and what a good mentor is and the uses a good mentor can be to someone. They were also there for support when you weren’t sure what to do or when you felt like you couldn’t handle a situation anymore” (07).

- “I learned a lot, I improved, I developed a greater passion for the program and experience through the positive mentorship and I became inspired” (02).

- “A meaningful mentorship experience provides an understanding of who you are and how they can help you. Also, the happiness and fulfillment you need to survive everyday (being there for you when you need them) but also allowing you to discover who you are” (07).
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

"Mentors are guides. They lead us along the journey of our lives. We trust them because they have been there before. They embody our hopes, cast light on the way ahead, interpret arcane signs, warn us of lurking dangers, and point out unexpected delights along the way (Daloz, 1993).

As mentioned earlier, mentoring, as well as service learning, is a structured educational strategy for enhancing student development and academic achievement. The gap in the literature outlines that there is an absence of research on mentoring within a service-learning context. This study helps fill this gap and explores mentoring within a specific service-learning context. Here is a review of the research questions:

1. How does mentoring function as a component of Service Learning?
   a. How is mentoring utilized within service learning?
   b. What are the roles or functions of a mentor within a service learning context (like SNAP?)
   c. What compromises/defines an effective mentor?
   d. What issues might be associated with single or multiple mentors?

In this chapter I will introduce and expand on three metaphors that describe the mentoring experience from a mentee’s perspective within the SNAP context. Throughout the discussion, I will revisit the research questions and make connections with Cohen’s six functions of effective mentoring as well as Rogoff’s collaborative apprenticeship model. Next, I will discuss the benefits of my research project. Lastly, I will conclude with mentioning areas for future research regarding mentoring with specific service learning contexts.

After I analyzed the patterns across the three cohorts regarding, key words, research questions, survey response questions and applied Cohen’s (1995) model, I
recognized three metaphors which characterized possible mentor/mentee relationships. These metaphors are active across all cohorts and likely are interdependently integrated in both Cohen’s six functions of an effective mentor and Rogoff’s collaborative apprenticeship model. The three significant metaphors housed in my analysis of raw data are shadow, mirror and window. These three metaphors are creative and artistic statements that describe mentoring within a service-learning context such as SNAP. Coordinators that enacted the shadow metaphor displayed qualities such as: utilizing the mentor to complete tasks at hand, asking the mentor for advice regarding assignments and observing the mentor. These coordinators preferred to remain within the shadow of the mentor. Coordinators that exhibit characteristics of the window metaphor implemented change and viewed new experiences as opportunities to apply the skills that they had learned throughout their mentoring relationships. Participants that demonstrated the mirror metaphor internalized their mentoring practice and implemented it within other mentoring experiences. As the coordinators are mentors to the volunteers and to each other, the coordinators that enacted the mirror metaphor saw these other relationships as opportunities to practice being a mentor. That is, their mentoring refracts from their reflection on their own mentor. These metaphors conveyed how the Coordinators experienced their mentorship relationships with the faculty mentor, the graduate student mentor, coordinator peers, or as a mentor of others (volunteers).

Shadow

A shadow can be a mysterious image, which can be still or can move about, depending on the positioning of the subject from which the shadow emanates. A shadow, like most metaphors, can be utilized and interpreted in different ways. Sometimes a
shadow can look dark and gloomy and other times it can have an effect of joyful movement. In relation to movement, the direction of a shadow usually “lines up” with the person who casts it and runs in a direct straight line. In this study, the shadow represented the way that some of the coordinators responded to their mentorship experience. A mentee in this case shadowed the mentor and rarely moved outside of the boundaries of the mentor’s shadow. These Coordinators preferred being lead and having a mentor that guided them through the process.

In relation to movement, a shadow may appear in relation to person casting it and that persons positioning relative to the light source. Coordinators that enacted this metaphor were task oriented and their focus involved completing the task at hand and then moving on to a different task. Coordinators who demonstrated this metaphor utilized their mentors for confirming ideas, asking about thesis assignments, performing for the mentor and not consistently applying skills to other experiences. These individuals were interested in knowing the expectations of the mentor and tended to complete tasks to impress the mentor or gain a good grade. Skills that were learned within their experience were applied via completing tasks for the program, and not extending further.

For example, 09/10/06 stated, “When I used my mentor’s ideas and catalogues for ordering equipment”. This Coordinator was dependent on the mentor (ie, in the mentors shadow) and instead of independently searching for equipment approaches, she was adamant on using the mentor’s thoughts and resources. The following quotes from participants provide more examples of shadowing the mentor: “Mentorship aided in aspects of my thesis (Academic component). My mentor answered questions, helped in communication with other coordinator groups (09/10/07). “I felt anxious not knowing if
we would ever have enough volunteers show up to withstand the ratio we wanted to provide (09/10/??). “Mentorship was helpful for me because it gave me a sense of responsibility and insight on how to run SNAP” (09/10/05). “I utilized the mentorship process if I had any questions regarding suggestions for activities to be planned” (10/11/09). “I expected the coordination experience of SNAP to be slightly less time consuming, I knew it was a large commitment, but I didn’t realize how large” (10/11/06). “I didn’t really do much outside of showing up on SNAP days and portfolio group meetings” (10/11/05). In this case, this coordinator’s learning was limited to the scope of SNAP. She did not attempt to apply the skills she learned to new or unfamiliar experiences; however, would rather remain within her comfort zone of what she knows. These coordinators’ concerns were strictly in relation to completion of the mandate (see appendix) and they did not expand outside of it. They remained inside their mentors’ shadow.

Participants whose responses demonstrated a shadow relationship with the mentor brought particular assumptions about the mentor’s responsibilities. Here, coordinators wanted to know the expectations of the mentor as they were completing tasks to impress the mentor. “When I didn’t know how my mentor taught, I got frustrated because it seemed like she wasn’t giving us any guidance but she likes us to learn from trial and error” (09/10/01). “It made me anxious not knowing what the mentors were watching for, clear role definitions may have helped” (09/10/04). “It is important for mentors and coordinators to be on the same page...knowing what the goals of each party is. Not acting as the ‘middle man’ between the faculty mentor and the group, which is seemed like for a while” (09/10/04). “A suggestion would be to get to know the people you are mentoring”
These coordinators thrived on knowing what the mentor’s expectations were. “I felt happy being told how things were going (09/10/04).” “At times feedback from mentors wasn’t effective and direct which led to some frustration” (09/10/04). The common theme among all of these responses is the significance the coordinators placed on the relationship to the mentor.

Relationship to the mentor was a distinct pattern within the analysis that coincides nicely within the shadow metaphor. Coordinators wanted to establish a relationship with the mentors where they were aware of the expectations and roles, and utilized them when it was needed. Referring to Cohen’s functions of a complete mentor, the first function is relationship emphasis. This demonstrates the importance of establishing a sound relationship with the mentor early into the mentorship process. In regards to the first research question how is mentoring utilized in Service Learning?, coordinator’s that enacted the shadow metaphor utilized their mentor face-to-face and email. How they utilized their mentor was different in comparison to the other metaphors. These coordinators used their mentor primarily to answer questions, seek advice, input, feedback or suggestions, clarification on assignments, and engage in brainstorming.

In the relation to the research question what are the roles and functions of a mentor within SNAP?, coordinators that enacted the shadow metaphor reported the significance to establishing a concrete relationship with the mentor and the coordinator. For example: “being on the same page, being available, knowing the goals and roles of each party and knowing the people you are mentoring would allow for more interaction with the mentor” (08/09/01-06-04-07). These coordinators placed significance on role definition, communication, feedback and relationships, and were highly dependent on the
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mentor(s’) ideas and advice. With establishing a concrete relationship, the idea of clear role definition was also frequently mentioned by the coordinators. Having an obvious role was a constant pattern that arose within this metaphor. These coordinators valued and placed emphasis on the importance of role definition and everyone being aware of what the mentor wanted. “It made me anxious not knowing what mentors were looking for. Clear role definitions may have helped... It is important that the mentors and mentees are on the same page and it is important that everyone I aware of the goals of each party....It is important to get to know the people you are mentoring and asking for both sides of a story before accusing of anyone not doing their job” (04/07). Role definition and the relationship to the mentor was a common pattern and this cohort felt like they were both integral functions for effective mentoring. These coordinators placed significance on role definition, communication, feedback and relationships, and were highly dependent on the mentor(s’) ideas and advice.

Here is a final example of a coordinator in the 2010/2011 cohort demonstrating the shadow metaphor. “I used the graduate student mentors when a situation was out of my control. Someone I know every well was having trouble with the child he was working with. In fear of ‘stepping on his toes’ I got the Graduate Student mentor to help my friend” (10/11/08). In this case the Coordinator was in the shadow of the Graduate Student Mentor and utilized the mentorship process in a way that the Coordinator would feel comfortable.

The participants that enacted the shadow metaphor had the same access to mentoring opportunities as the other Coordinators did; however, they utilized the mentor in a different way. It seemed to me that their mentorship experience was not as deep a
learning process as it had the potential to be. Here, the mentee did not seek opportunities
to engage outside of the mentor's vision and did not utilize the mentor assist with
developing their skill sets for broader application.

Window

The premise of the window metaphor involves participants applying the skills
they have learned through the mentorship experience to new experiences. Typical
behaviours associated with the window metaphor include: independence, foreseeing an
opportunity and implementing change, being decisive in the moment, trying new things
and utilizing the mentorship process for application that is larger than the scope of SNAP.

Coordinators that enacted this metaphor were independent in most aspects of
their learning and utilized their mentor to generate ideas and to implement change. For
example, many of the 2008-2009 cohort exhibited these behaviours. During this cohort
year, the mentor was on a teaching fellowship for two months and was not available for
face-to-face interaction during that time. The limited access to the mentor on the SNAP
mornings did not discourage this group of learners; rather most coordinators embraced
the challenge and continued to try new things. When obstacles arose while the faculty
mentor was absent, the Coordinators took the initiative to find solutions to the issue and
report the findings to the Faculty Mentor via email. This group used email to
communicate with the faculty mentor and reported the happenings of the day as well as
asked for advice for future changes. These Coordinators were not confined to being
within the mentor's shadow; rather preferred to be independent and have the mentor be
there for support.
Here are some examples of the 2008-2009 cohort demonstrating characteristics of the window metaphor: “My mentor made me realize that every day will not be perfect. Every day has its own set of challenges that we must overcome and if we are not successful then we learn from our mistakes and apply new knowledge to tomorrow” (08/09/05). “My mentor allowed me to reflect and make mistakes. She provided feedback through questions so I could question my own practice” (08/09/07). “A high during my mentoring experience was the ability to consult my mentor at any given moment while having the ability to act autonomously” (08/09/04). “The mentorship experience provided me with opportunities to make mistakes and learn how to improve them. I learned valuable information that I have been about to apply outside of this experience” (08/09/03). “My mentor was very supportive. She would not intrude; however, let us make mistakes but children were never in danger. She took a sink or swim approach to learning and allowed us to experience cognitive dissonance and didn’t interfere with how we reacted to it” (08/09/07). “I felt anxious when I failed in the moment (trying something my mentor encouraged me to do and it not working)” (08/09/07).

Coordinators that demonstrated the window metaphor valued independence; however, they were aware their mentor(s) were always there for support. The window metaphor coincides nicely with Cohen’s (date) sixth and final function, mentee’s vision. This function encourages mentees to act as independent learners, to take initiative to manage change, and to constantly reflect on present and future happenings. Here are some examples from the raw data of the overlap between the window metaphor and Cohen’s vision function. These examples were from any of the three cohorts:

“Mentorship allowed me to work independently and decision make with the team with
confidence because of affirmation through mentorship” (08/09/04). “A good mentor promotes me to learn by mistakes and for me to be independent” (08/09/05). “A good mentor guides me to become a self-directed learner, allows me to make mistakes and learn from them through immediate feedback” (08/09/07). “Mentorship was very helpful in growing at maturing as a student and as a person. The mentor wouldn’t just give you the answer; she would make you work to earn it, which is something that you have to do in life since everything isn’t always handed to you” (09/10/01). “I felt fulfilled when I reflected back at the end of the day and realizing it went well, we did it and now let’s make it even better” (10/11/01). “Mentoring gave me more confidence and provided me with valuable skills I will take with me and be able to use in various career opportunities” (10/11/06). “A meaningful mentorship experience provides you with an understanding of who you are and how they can help you. Also, the happiness and fulfillment you need to survive everyday (being there for you when you need them) but also allowing you to discover who you are” (10/11/07). The mentorship process these coordinators experienced allowed them to gain a sense of autonomy, make choices and follow their passion.

Different to that of the coordinators in the shadow metaphor, a constant pattern that arose throughout interaction with the analysis within the window metaphor was relationship to learning. These coordinators utilized their mentor to enhance their learning and placed emphasis on the outcomes of the experience. The interaction with their mentor(s) was reciprocal and emphasized the importance of a mentor being able to guide a mentee towards self-directedness. These individuals were not dependent on their mentor; however, interested in growing as a learner and knowing that their mentor(s)
would be there for support. They were not interested in impressing the mentor or staying within the mentor’s shadow, but would rather challenge the mentor’s ideas and work collaboratively to accomplish tasks. This relates to Johnson’s (2008) characteristics of a ‘good’ mentor. He says that effective mentors have strong interpersonal skills, demonstrate an eagerness to learn, shows a commitment to improving the achievement of the mentees and share the ability to think critically and reflectively with the mentee (Johnson, 2008). The Coordinators that enacted the window metaphor utilized the mentorship process as an opportunity to enhance their learning. They were not afraid of failure, but rather used failure as a catalyst for learning.

In relation to the research question what are the roles and functions of a mentor within a service-learning experience such as SNAP?, repeating functions within the responses were the mentors promoting and encouraging learning. Many coordinators that enacted the window metaphor emphasized the importance of a mentor being able to guide a mentee towards self-directedness. Examples of this include: “My mentor allowed me to do my own work. I was able to explore things independently but provided insight or guidance when needed” (08/09/06) “I was able to learn from my mistakes and apply them to tomorrow” (08/09/05). “My mentor challenged me to explore and learn things on my own and acknowledged my mistakes to help me in the future” (08/09/06). “With my mentor allowing us to do it our way, with very little guidance when we did something, it felt very good when we completed the task because we knew it was our work” (09/10/02). “It was very powerful realizing my own potential. My mentor taught me to be proactive, discover creative solutions to several obstacles and this enhanced my knowledge” (02).
Mirror

“If you become like a mirror
Those who look at you
See themselves in you
You are then invisible”.

- Yves Klein

*Mirror* is the third metaphor that describes many coordinators across the three cohorts. These coordinators utilized their interactions with their mentor as a learning opportunity to enhance their abilities to be a mentor to someone else. Essentially, coordinators are mentees to the faculty mentor and the graduate student mentors as well as mentors to the volunteers, each other and the children. Several coordinators made this connection and learned how to be effective mentors to others. These individuals worked diligently to provide a positive mentoring experience to their mentees and were effective role models to others.

Coordinators that accompany the *mirror* metaphor became effective mentors to others. They used the expertise of their mentors to apply new skills they had learned to their mentorship experience with the volunteers or the children. Many of their responses about the mentoring relationship characterize themselves being a mentor. “I became anxious when I was trying to become a good mentor to just one person the way my few great mentors were to me. Being sure you are leading them down the right path” (10/11/03).

As mentioned previously in the literature review, Rogoff (1990) discusses movement of mentees from the novice role to an expert role. Rogoff (1990) discusses the
apprenticeship model being a collaborative process and does not just focus on the expert being a mentor, rather novices can serve as mentors for one another. Here, experts (mentors) are in support of novices (mentees) and novices are also in support of each other (Underwood, Welsh, Gauvain & Duffy, 2000). In this study, there were many opportunities and experiences where the coordinators acted as mentors for each other, volunteers and children. Empirical research reflecting mentoring includes several distinct kinds of interpersonal relationships (Jacobi, 1991). Here are some examples of what the coordinators had to say: “A high in my mentoring experience was developing a rapport with other coordinators” (08/09/02). “A high in my mentoring experience was how well our coordinators helped each other out and worked together to improve” (08/09/06). “There was a lot of communication between the coordinators to either run ideas past them or get their input or suggestions” (08/09/06). Coordinators acted as mentors to each other and supported one another and this reflects Rogoff’s (1990) discussion on the apprenticeship model.

Here are some examples of Coordinators utilizing their mentors to enhance their skills so that they can mentor others: “I was acting as a mentor, yet still had so many questions myself and felt as though I needed help too! I was constantly asking my mentors about scenarios, for advice, ideas and guidance, sometimes which I then relayed to those I was mentoring” (10/11/02). “I felt fulfilled when you see a volunteer putting into action advice or an idea that I have shared with them and they are successful. Made me feel as though I was an effective mentor (10/11/02). “Mentorship was helpful to me because I was able to ask for assistance when needed. Shared experiences with my mentor gave me knowledge and guidance for my own encounters as a mentor at SNAP”
A high in my mentoring process was when volunteers were grateful to impart my wisdom and a low is when I failed as a mentor to someone else” (WHO) “If I was struggling with issues, I could talk to Graduate Student Mentors or the Faculty Mentor for assistance and as a mentor to volunteers, I made sure I was reachable and approachable and there to help during the SNAP day” (09/10/03).

“Mentorship was helpful for me because I became better at overseeing teaching and learning rather than always being directly involved. It helped me to get used to taking a step back and being there for assistance only when needed” (10/11/02). This coordinator reflected on the feedback given to her by her mentor and took the time to reflect on how she was being mentored and how she can apply it when she is in the role of a mentor to the volunteers or children. “I think that I personally would have been more confident as a mentor if I had some great background knowledge about disabilities and strategies for dealing with them. I know the main ones, but there were so many that I had never even heard of” (02). This coordinator was eager to enhance her experience as a mentee and an acting mentor. She was actively seeking her mentors for advice and aware of how it would benefit her own mentoring abilities. These coordinators did not feel constrained to the boundaries of the mentor, they embraced their positioning relative to the window and refracted their knowledge to others as a mirror.

Conclusions

In relation to Cohen’s six functions of a complete mentor, the inter-dependency of the three metaphors best symbolizes the Mentor Model function. Mentor Model is the fifth function and here the mentor shares with the mentee personal experiences as a role model and the goal is to encourage mentees to take risks and make decisions. For
example, “My mentor was an amazing role model and provided guidance for us to become leaders and role models to others” (08/09/05). “My mentor was always fun and energetic and this rubbed off on me and made me happy when I was working along side of her and others (09/10/01). “I think just being there and absorbing what we were taught was half the battle. All of our mentors were beyond knowledgeable and always had something new to teach. Also, asking questions whether they seemed dumb or not because it only teaches you more. I think just taking the time to talk to the mentors and find out their stories and how mentorship impacted them is useful” (10/11/07). It is important to note that one metaphor does not hold power over the other. All three metaphors are interdependent and important. Within the shadow metaphor, mentees develop knowledge and allow for safe risk taking. Here is where the mentee is actively learning and becoming familiar with the experience. The shadow metaphor is instructive in nature and foundational before proceeding into a risk-taking experience such as the window or mirror metaphors. Being in the shadow metaphor could actually describe a window or mirror experience as the mentee could be mentoring themselves and being aware of knowing when each metaphor is appropriate.

The main research question within this study is: how does mentoring function as a component of Service Learning? What are the coordinators within the SNAP experience looking for in order to have an effect mentoring relationship? All three cohorts mentioned that an effective mentor carries the importance of facilitating learning, guiding and supporting, having strong leadership skills, and is passionate and friendly. Here are some examples of how the coordinators defined effective mentoring: “Effective mentors cultivate authentic growth in mentee and support mentee to be a self-directed learner.
Effective mentors allow mentees to make mistakes and learn things independently" (08/09/01-09-06-03) In relation to learning...“effective mentors provide a mentee with skills to become an independent learner and encourage mentees to be active agents when they are experiencing cognitive dissonance” (08/09/07). The 2009-2010 cohort describes effective learning as “An effective mentor provides an optimal opportunity for meaningful learning experiences...an effective mentor provides meaningful growth for the student, both as a scholar and a person....an effective mentor instills a sense of fulfillment and accomplishment as well as allowing others to want to pursue the same experience...my mentor provided me with confidence and allowed me to be successful in the SNAP program and any task I was given” (10/11/02-01-06-05-07). The 2010-2011 cohort describes an effective mentor by “letting you be the learner and lets you learn through failures but only allows you to fail to a certain point...the mentor would never let you fail so it would ruin you physically or mentally” (07). “Effective mentors provide you with knowledge about instructional methods, giving advice and learning approaches” (02).

These mentoring characteristics seem to describe the experience of the *shadow, window* or *mirror* mentoring metaphors. As mentioned earlier, these metaphors are interconnected and one may precede the other. Depending on the situation, coordinators may partake in a *shadow, window* or *mirror* metaphor, depending on the mentoring experience.

**Benefits of study**

Service learning is an integrative, team-based, structural approach that is an influential technique for learning. SNAP represents a powerful context providing service
to children with disabilities within the community. Within this context, there are many
degrees and kinds of mentorship and enactments of the three metaphors that convey how
mentoring might work within the SNAP experience. The findings of this study and the
integration of the *shadow, window and mirror* metaphors enhance the literature regarding
mentorship particularly within Disability Based Service Learning.

The role of faculty mentoring in this process is fundamental because they are the
agents for institutionalizing the program’s ongoing presence in the community. With the
implementation of graduate student mentors, it increases the sustainability of this service
learning initiative. The SNAP context involves rich training sites as well as rich research
sites and there is growing sustainability in regards to motivation for researchers.

This study provides immense opportunity for coordinators to reflect on their
mentoring experiences and provides insight reflecting how mentoring works within this
service-learning context. This study also impacts the mentors themselves. It allows
opportunity for mentors, as leaders, to phase the dissonance for mentees. For example,
perhaps the mentee needs more time in the *shadow* metaphor and the mentor can control
the amount of dissonance experienced. If mentees are in the *mirror* metaphor, perhaps the
mentees need to experience more dissonance and the mentors can provide them with
more opportunities to be a leader. Perhaps being a mentor is an opportunity to step
outside of their comfort zones to be an effective leader. There are various benefits within
this study, not only for mentees, but for mentors as well.

**Future Directions**

Nevertheless, this study’s sampling strategy provided multifaceted levels of
information and opportunities to analyze robust data sets, thus forming the basis for
future studies of mentoring within a service-learning context. Since service learning and mentoring are both collaborative processes it would be interesting to hear the mentoring experience from all the parties involved. There are many areas of mentoring within a complex context such as SNAP. It would be intriguing to view the perspective of the children and their mentoring experience with the volunteer, the volunteer’s perspective of mentoring with the coordinators as well as the mentors themselves. The children, volunteers, coordinators and mentors are integral for the functioning of SNAP and it would be helpful to hear from all perspectives. The shadow, window and mirror metaphors are helpful vehicles for conveying the indigenous typologies of the SNAP experience; however, perhaps viewing the significance of these metaphors within other service learning initiatives would be interesting for a further area of research.

The coordinators of SNAP reported positive and enlightening mentoring experiences working with their faculty and graduate student mentors. In the words of one mentee, “My mentor made me realize that everyday will not be perfect. Everyday has its own set of challenges that we must overcome and if we are not successful, then we learn from our mistakes and apply new knowledge until tomorrow” (08/09/05).
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Appendix A
LETTER OF INVITATION

October, 2010

Title of Study: Examining Mentoring within a Particular Service Learning Context

Principal Student Investigator: Ally McEachen, Masters Student, Department of Child and Youth Studies, Brock University
Faculty Supervisor: Maureen Connolly, Faculty, Department of Applied Health Science, Brock University

I, Ally McEachen, Masters Student, from the Department of Child and Youth Studies, Brock University, invite you to participate in a research project entitled Examining Mentoring Within a Particular Service Learning Context.

This study will focus in the area of the learning potential for service learning as a site which develops various competencies in future practitioners serving children and youth with disabilities. This study aims to explore and examine issues relating to a) identifying characteristics/competencies of effective mentors in this particular service learning context and b) identifying strategies for developing these mentoring characteristics and competencies

The expected duration of your participation includes 20-30 minutes of your time. You will be asked to complete a written response form discussing your mentoring experience within the Special Needs Activity Program.

This study will provide insight for a balanced approach to effective guidance as well as will hopefully increase the sustainability of SNAP as it in an integral program within the Niagara Community. There are also many direct benefits to the participants’ involvements within the study. These benefits include: meta-cognitive benefits through a reflective experience, development of instructional and leadership skill sets, and some understanding of the forms of mentoring that best suits the participants.

If you have any pertinent questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Officer (905 688-5550 ext 3035, reb@brocku.ca)

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Ally McEachen
Masters Student
am05gs@brocku.ca

Maureen Connolly
Faculty, Applied Health Science
905-688-5550 X 3381
mconnolly@brocku.ca
Appendix B
INFORMED CONSENT

October, 2010

Title of Study: Examining Mentoring within a Particular Service Learning Context

Principal Student Investigator: Ally McEachen, student
Department of Child and Youth Studies
Brock University
am05gs@brocku.ca

Faculty Supervisor: Maureen Connolly, professor
Department of Applied Health Science
Brock University
(905) 688-5550 ext.3381
mconnolly@brocku.ca

INVITATION
You are invited to participate in a study that involves research. The purpose of this in-depth case study is to examine a mentoring component within a service learning experience. This study will focus in the area of the learning potential for service learning as a site which develops various competencies in future practitioners serving children and youth with disabilities. This study aims to explore and examine issues relating to a) identifying characteristics/competencies of effective mentors in this particular service learning context and b) identifying strategies for developing these mentoring characteristics and competencies.

WHAT’S INVOLVED
As a participant, you will receive a stamped return addressed envelope that includes a letter of invitation, a consent form and a written response form. If you choose to participate in the study, you will send the stamped addressed envelope containing the signed consent form and the written response form to the return address. The written response form will allow you to discuss your experiences with mentoring within the Special Needs Activity Program. A third party informant, the Administration Assistant of Child and Youth Studies, Ellen Carter, will receive these forms, open them, and separate the consent form from the response form, destroy the envelope and keep the consent forms in a secure location. The response forms will be given to the student researcher, Ally McEachen. Each form will have its own distinctive pre code. You will retain a front page with contact information for the third party and the pre code so that if you wish to withdraw from the study you can contact the third party and do so via the pre-code and maintain anonymity and confidentiality with the student and principal researcher. Written responses will not be read until final grades have been submitted.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND RISKS
Possible benefits of participation include metacognitive benefits through a reflective experience, development of instructional and leadership skill sets, some understanding of the forms of mentoring that best suits you and understanding the sustainability of SNAP in relation to personal and program development. There may be potential for participants to feel obligated to participate in the study because of regular contact between the researcher and the coordinators. To avoid coercion to participate in the study, you have
the right to decline involvement in the study and are allowed to withdraw at any time without penalty. If you choose to withdraw from the study, please inform Ellen Carter at Brock University (905-688-5550 ext. 3151). There is no assessment or evaluation attached to your participation in the study. Participation in the study is strictly voluntary and no academic consequence will come to those who choose not to participate.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The information you provide will be kept confidential. I have taken the precaution to include third party to pre-code your responses to maintain anonymity. The response questions allow you to expand on your mentorship experience. It is possible, based on your responses that the student investigator may discern the identity of the informant. Your name will not appear in any thesis or report resulting from this study; however, with your permission, anonymous quotations may be used. Written forms collected during this study will be stored in a locked cabinet to keep it secure. All written data will be transferred to a data stick which will be wiped upon completion of the project. Access to this data will be restricted to Maureen Connolly and Ally McEachen.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish, you may decline to answer any questions or participate in any component of the study. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time and may do so without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS
Results of this study may be published in professional journals and presented at conferences. Feedback about this study will be available through contacting Ally McEachen at am05gs@brocku.ca Feedback will be available upon completion of the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ETHICS CLEARANCE
If you have any questions about this study or require further information, please contact the Principal Investigator or the Faculty Supervisor using the contact information provided above. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Research Ethics Board at Brock University (09-285). If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca.
Thank you for your assistance in this project. Please keep a copy of this form for your records.

CONSENT FORM
I agree to participate in this study described above. I have made this decision based on the information I have read in the Information-Consent Letter. I have had the opportunity to receive any additional details I wanted about the study and understand that I may ask questions in the future. I understand that I may withdraw this consent at any time.
Name: ____________________________
Signature: _________________________ Date: _______________________
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Please retain this page. If you wish to withdraw from the study, please contact Ellen Carter via the pre-code. The purpose of the pre-code is to maintain anonymity and confidentiality with the student and principal researcher.

Precode:

Third Party Informant:
Ellen Carter
Course Coordinator
STH 432
905-688-5550 Ext. 3151
ellen.carter@brocku.ca
Appendix D

Response Form

1. What were your personal expectations of your involvement at SNAP?

2. What made this opportunity (SNAP) attractive for you?

3. What do you want to learn from this experience?

4. Tell me what you might see and hear during
   a. SNAP in progress
   b. Your experience of mentorship
      i. Follow-up- Any other sensations to consider? (eg. Smell, taste, touch)

5. Tell me the highs and lows you experienced within the mentorship process at SNAP.

6. Tell me about experiences which had potential for:
   a. Frustration
   b. Anxiety
   c. Annoyance
   d. Happiness
   e. Fulfillment
      ....within your mentorship experience
      i. Follow-up – What steps did you take when you felt: frustrated/anxious/annoyed/happy/fulfilled?

7. How did you utilize the mentorship processes available during your year?

8. How was mentorship helpful to you?
9. Finish the following statements:
   a. A good mentor……
   b. A meaningful mentorship experience provides...

10. What would you suggest for improving the quality of the mentorship process?

11. What are the roles or functions of a mentor within a service learning context like SNAP?
Appendix E
Third Party Informant Form:
For Ellen Carter ONLY!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Portfolio Mandate

School Liaison Group:
Areas of Responsibility
- Call in days/booking
- Announcements to schools
- Profiles and record keeping
- Sign in and pay in
- Ongoing liaison with schools
- School basket and signage

Expectations Weekly
- Attend SNAP, assist on floor, set up/clean up
- School sign in and pay in
- Profiles picked up; name tags; no photo; floor passes
- Record keeping
- Liaise with volunteer group
- School call backs as necessary
- Entrances and exits clear
- Baskets, signage, tables
- Communicate updates with communications and fundraising

Curriculum and Equipment Group
Areas of responsibility
- Developmentally appropriate activity stations and strategies for utilizing them (eg. Posters, visual schedules, instruction cues, progressions)
- Gym plan; equipment room (s) plan (eg. Diagrams)
- Equipment purchase and maintenance
- Coordinating delivery of program (ie. Activity)
- Boomer

Expectations Weekly
- Check supplies
- Tidy, organize equipment
- C&R equipment order
- Set up stations/clean up of stations
- Tables as necessary
- Attend SNAP, assist on floor, setup/clean up; volunteer table
- Supervise and check equipment and station status
- Modify set up for age, stage, and size of participants
- Communicate any changes and updates through communications and fundraising
- Boomer

Volunteer Recruitment and Training
Areas of Responsibility
• Volunteer awareness, recruitment, training, ongoing communication, appreciation, supervision, pd
• Sign in and sign out system and record keeping
• Reference letter distribution
• Liaise with School Liaison group
• Coordinating profile form distribution and collection

Expectations Weekly
• Attend SNAP; assist on floor; set up; clean up; volunteer table
• Weekly communications to volunteers
• Best practice awards
• Profile management
• Onsight interventions and supervision
• Communicate any changes or updates through communications and fundraising
• Coordinate sign in and sign out
• Space/ line-up control

Communications and Fundraising
 Areas of Responsibility
• Email
• Website
• Banner
• Logo; letterhead; posters; signage
• Intro-team communication
• Announcements and public awareness
• T-shirts (team)
• Fundraising events, minimum of 1 per term
• Make more $$ than you spend

Expectations Weekly
• Attend SNAP; assist on floor; set up; clean up; volunteer table
• Post SNAP updates at snap@brocku.ca
• Gather information from each portfolio and post it @ snap@brocku.ca
• For weekly anticipatory set
• Provide information on each SNAP to Brock Press
• Check on status of signage and banner
• Invite a variety of people on the Brock Campus and off the campus to attend, observe and appreciate
• Update on any fundraising upcoming or completed.
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Certificate of Ethics Clearance for Human Participant Research
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