This thesis has been approved by

The Honors Tutorial College and the School of Communication Studies

________________________________________________________________________

Dr. Anita C. James
Associate Professor Emerita
School of Communication Studies
Thesis Advisor

________________________________________________________________________

Dr. J.W. Smith
Honors Tutorial College, DOS
School of Communication Studies

________________________________________________________________________

Jeremy Webster
Dean, Honors Tutorial College
FUNCTIONS OF MENTORING AS CHRISTIAN DISCIPLESHIP

A Thesis
Presented to
The Honors Tutorial College
Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for Graduation
from the Honors Tutorial College
with the degree of
Bachelor of Science in Communication

by
Hiram S. Foster
May 2014
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Chad Helmer, for teaching me what discipleship is, for his unconditional love, guiding me through trials and victories--my dearest of friends.
- My mother, Shelly Foster, for listening ears, delicious dinners, and unceasing support and impetus.
- Brian McCollister and Grant Scott for their organizational support.
- Dr. Claudia Hale, Dr. Judith Lee, and Dr. Amy Chadwick, and the rest of the wonderful COMS faculty for classes, tutorials, and mentoring, going above and beyond, to make this project possible.
- Dean Jeremy Webster, Former Assistant Dean Jan Hodson, and Assistant Dean Cary Frith, for an amazing and unparalleled undergraduate experience.
- Ryan Berg, Megan York, Susan Michels, Rob Naim, Nate Ardle, Nicholas Gillispie, and all the other Cru staff who helped me gather data.
- The 130-some Cru students who took the time to participate in the survey and interviews, for honesty and time sacrifice.
- Best for last, Dr. Anita James, for her care and support, patiently pushing and encouraging me every step of the way, celebrating with me as I cross the finish-line.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** iii

**CHAPTER 1** 1

*INTRODUCTION* 1

- *HISTORICAL ORIGINS* 1
- *CONTEMPORARY USE* 3
- *PRIOR RESEARCH* 5

**CHAPTER 2** 13

*LITERATURE REVIEW* 13

*A NEW DEFINITION* 16

- *INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT* 16
- *PSYCHOSOCIAL SUPPORT* 17
- *DEVELOPMENT* 18
- *MUTUALITY* 19
- *HIERARCHY* 20

*CHRISTIAN MENTORING* 22

*FUTURE RESEARCH* 26

*RESEARCH QUESTIONS* 28

**CHAPTER 3** 30

*SUBJECTS AND PROCEDURE* 30

- *SAMPLE* 30

  - *SAMPLING FRAME* 30
Functions of Mentoring as Christian Discipleship

**Sampling Method**

**Measures**

- Questionnaire
  - Student Information
  - Psychosocial Functions
  - Instrumental Functions
  - Hierarchy
  - Mutuality
  - Development
  - Outcome

- Semi-Structured Interviews

**Data Collection**

**Chapter 4**

- Quantitative Results
  - Demographic Characteristics
  - Questionnaire Reliability
  - Results of Hypothesis Testing
  - Research Question 1

- Qualitative Results
  - Psychosocial
    - Formality
    - Friendship
Functions of Mentoring as Christian Discipleship

INVOLVEMENT 53

DEPTH 55

PROACTIVE 56

INSTRUMENTAL 57

SPIRITUALITY 58

ORGANIZATION 59

PRACTICUM 61

EVANGELISM 62

HIERARCHY 64

AUTHORITY 64

ADVANCEMENT 65

ADMIRATION 66

INTERPERSONAL EFFECTS 67

IMITATION 68

DEVELOPMENT 69

PERSONAL 70

SPIRITUAL 71

RELATIONSHIP WITH MENTOR 73

PRACTICAL SKILLS 74

MUTUALITY 75

PERCEPTION 75

FUNCTION 77
Chapter 1

Introduction

**Historical Origins.** We can all identify people who have played a significant and meaningful role in shaping and directing our lives. Such relationships hold a special place in our culture, epitomized by the popular quote, “Our fingerprints don’t fade from the lives we touch” (Cuddy & Coulter, 2010). We call the owners of some “fingerprints” friends and role models and to others we bestow the honorable title “mentor.” We often use the term “mentor” to denote a special group of people, but we are often unaware of all the different ways the term can be used, and perhaps what the term truly means.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* traces the etymology of mentor back to Ancient Greece, where the word first appeared in Homer’s epic, *The Odyssey*. The tale concerns Odysseus’ son, Telemachus, who quests to find his father and bring him home. The goddess, Athena, favors Odysseus who has been held hostage by the nymph, Calypso, for the past seven years after the Trojan War. Athena favors Odysseus and sets herself to freeing him and guiding him home to his wife in Ithaka. She begins her mission by encouraging Odysseus’ son, Telemachus, to search for his father. It is at this point Homer creates Μέντωρ (Mentor): Athena appears to Telemachus as Mentor, “a family friend,” although Mentor is a stranger to the boy (Fitzgerald, 1963, p. 4). The narrator introduces Mentor as a “comrade in arms of the prince Odysseus, an old man now. Odysseus left [Mentor] authority over his house and slaves, to guard them well,” (Fitzgerald, 1963, p. 26). Throughout the story, the
goddess Athena appears to Telemachus disguised as Mentor to guide, protect, and enable him on his journey (Roberts & Chemopiskaya, 1999, p. 85); Athena behaves similarly towards many other characters, though in different forms. It seems Mentor himself did very little to exercise responsibility over Odysseus’ household, as it was the deplorable state of affairs which prompted Telemachus (with Athena’s urging) to find news of his father. Mentor appears in eight scenes throughout the poem (Fitzgerald, pp. 4, 25, 36, 42, 72, 311, 415, 458); Mentor is not explicitly Athena in only two instances (Fitzgerald, 1963, pp. 25, 311). Athena, as Mentor, is a like a father to Telemachus, giving him instruction, courage, vision, and efficacy. Mentor, the mortal, gives little meaning to his name. However, Athena, the sublime Mentor and effective author of the story, created the foundation for what has become a powerful role in present times. “Mentor,” as a word, first appeared in the English language via the popularity of a 17th century French novel that reimagined Homer’s ancient story. Roberts and Chemopiskaya (1999) argued that this novel, Les aventures de Télémaque by François Fénelon, rather than Homer’s work, is responsible for inventing a figure with “popular educational connotations” that “counsels, guides, nurtures, advises, and enables” (p. 87). According to Roberts and Chemopiskaya, by the mid-eighteenth century, “mentor” was no longer the name of a forgotten character from ancient Homeric poems; the word had come into its own as the new and entirely different concept. The mentors we know function as “role models, as counsellors [sic], as advisors, as teachers, as nurturers, as friends and as sponsors” (p. 2).
Psychologist Daniel Levinson and his colleagues (D. Levinson, Darrow, Klein, M. Levinson, & McKee, 1978) were the first to spark modern academic interest in the term, though other scholars had also begun researching mentoring and supported his work (see Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007). Levinson et al.’s book, *Seasons of a Man’s Life*, framed “mentor relationships” within the arena of developmental psychology. They defined it as “a crucial developmental function for the young man: … the process by which he transcends the father-son, man–boy division of his childhood” (pp. 99-100). This watershed conceptualization of mentoring, which garnered a mere five pages in the book, marked the birth of a contemporary paradigm that has gained remarkable popularity over the past three decades (see Allen & Eby, 2007; Clutterbuck, 2004; Clutterbuck & Lane, 2004; Megginson, Clutterbuck, & Garvey, 2006; Ragins & Kram, 2007).

**Contemporary Use.**

Mentoring (see also mentorship, mentor/mentee, and mentor/protégé) is a popular concept used both formally and informally to describe a range of experiences, relationships, processes, and programs (see Clutterbuck, 2004, pp. xv-xvi). At the beginning of the 21st century, an array of organizations and institutions in myriad contexts had established formal mentoring programs to achieve diverse and dissimilar goals. Many of these mentoring programs have also been the subjects of much academic discourse.

Some programs establish mentorships for children and adolescents. Organizations such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters consider themselves a national
mentoring organization and many other programs and organizations model themselves after their example. These youth-centered organizations use “mentorship” to describe the formal relationships between “Bigs” and “Littles” that supposedly help youths in a variety of ways (see Barrowclough & White, 2011; Dallos & Comley-Ross, 2005; DuBouis, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002; Langhout, Rhodes, & Osborne, 2004; Sipe, 2002). Non-related adults may “mentor” younger individuals informally; such relationships are cultivated naturally, rather than as the result of some program. Additionally, individuals often identify influential, unrelated adults in their lives as “mentors” (Darling, Hamilton, & Shaver, 2003).

Within the professional world, corporations and institutions utilize mentoring for instrumental goals. Professionals or academic faculty, who are new to a specific organization or organizational setting, are often paired with “mentors” who help them assimilate to their new environment and succeed in new positions (Buell, 2004; Hicks, 2011; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). Higher education students may also label advisors and sponsors as mentors (Bullis & Bach, 1989). Corporations use “mentoring programs” to help individuals climb the corporate ladder, break the “glass ceiling,” or develop specific skills that are useful towards achieving the goals of the organization (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992).

Peers in organizational settings may serve as “peer-mentors,” offering mutual feedback and developmental support (McManus & Russell, 2007). Peer-Mentoring Theory locates individuals within “developmental networks” consisting of multiple
formative, mentor-like relationships, rather than focusing on a single, higher-level mentor (Higgins & Kram, 2001).

There are also third-party programs that pair experienced facilitators with inexperienced participants to establish “mentorships” that develop participants into better and more successful leaders (Godshalk & Sosik, 2007; Noe, 1988). McCauley and Guthrie (2007) define leadership development programs as those which are created formally, have a goal, and enable participants to promote the goals of their common work or organization, utilizing mentorship as one of many methods through which development takes place (Godshalk & Sosik, 2007, pp. 573-574).

Evangelical churches and organizations have recently branded Christian mentoring as “discipleship” (see Houston, 2002; Hull, 2006). Discipleship is a process in which the mentee, a “follower of Jesus,” submits to a teacher in order to learn from the mentor, to deepen the mentee’s personal relationship with God, and for the mentee’s life and character to become more like Christ’s (Hull, 2006, p. 68). In Hull’s treatment of discipleship, mentoring is a “personal, one-to-one [way] of being and making disciples” (p. 209). Leadership development and Christian discipleship both argue that mentorship is a necessary, but insufficient, aspect of their programs.

**Prior Research.** Levinson et al.’s (1978) seminal work defined mentors as those who function as teacher, sponsor, host and guide, exemplar (i.e., role model), counselor, supporter, facilitator, developer, friend, and parent (pp. 98-99). Kram (1985), inspired by Levinson et al.’s work, followed with a handbook on corporate mentoring and classified mentoring as a developmental relationship that contributes to
“an individual’s growth and advancement” (p. 22). She found two categories of functions concerning growth and advancement that distinguish mentoring relationships from all other work relationships: career functions and psychosocial functions. Career (or instrumental) functions serve to “enhance advancement in an organization [by means of] sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments. These functions … are possible because of the [mentor’s] position, experience, and organizational influence” (Kram, 1985, pp. 24-25; see also Darling, Hamilton, & Shaver, 2003; DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002; Noe, 1988). Psychosocial functions “enhance an individual’s sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness [through] role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship” (Kram, 1985, p. 32). She found that psychosocial functions develop more slowly and rely more on the strength of the interpersonal relationship than career functions, but that psychosocial functions may determine the success of the mentorship (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Dallos & Comley-Ross, 2005; Noe, 1988). These two functions defined by Kram in 1985 have shaped, and even monopolized, mentoring research for nearly three decades (see Bower, 2008; Brown, Daly, & Leong, 2009; Cotton, Shen, Livne-Tarandach, 2012; Ensher & Murphy, 2011; Sugimoto, 2012).

The same year Kram was identifying the two functions, Clutterbuck (1985) published *Everyone Needs a Mentor*, and defined mentoring as a significant, personal relationship characterized by mutual respect, the personal development of both parties, a need for tutoring, the potential for friendship, and the benefit of special advantages
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(p. 4). Noe (1988) developed the first instrument to measure mentoring functions using Kram’s (1985) categories of instrumental and psychosocial functions, drawing significantly from Mentoring at Work to develop the instrument. He called for future research to investigate developmental nuances and other characteristics of effective mentoring; however, development of the concept slowed at that point. Although subsequent research expanded Kram’s (1985) work to new applications and different contexts, the conceptual focus of mentoring remained limited to Kram’s original categories of instrumental and psychosocial functions (Bullis & Bach, 1989; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992).

Gibb (1994b), a European scholar, attempted to reconceptualize mentoring as a process, rather than as a systematic program, and emphasized the importance of development. Yet, Gibb (1994a) concluded, “the core elements of informal mentoring [are] a one-to-one relationship, where personal (or individual) and professional issues are both dealt with” (p. 38). Even Gibb (1994b), who supposed that terms such as psychosocial were unhelpful because they result in “obscuring rather than illuminating relevant concerns about organized mentoring at work,” related the term personal with psychosocial and professional with instrumental. Nevertheless, Gibb worked with Megginson (Gibb & Megginson, 1993), who created an alternative line of mentoring literature with Clutterbuck (Megginson, Clutterbuck, & Garvey, 2006). In 1995, Megginson and Clutterbuck defined mentoring as “off-line help by one person to another in making significant transitions in knowledge, work, or thinking” (Megginson, Clutterbuck, & Garvey, 2006, 4). They followed Gibb in distinguishing
between sponsorship-focused mentoring and development-focused mentoring, but concluded:

A much more pragmatic and intellectually challenging dialogue is now emerging, in which the diversity of mentoring and coaching is being embraced as a rich source of knowledge transfer and flexibility. Effective coaches require an eclectic mélange of skills drawn from a range of disciplines … Exactly what the mix should look like depends on the circumstances—who the mentoring pair are, what the purpose of the relationship is, the degree and type of change that is intended, the depth of personal insight required and so on. In other words, our definition of mentoring and its competences is becoming increasingly contextual. (Megginson, Clutterbuck, & Garvey, 2006, p. 253)

Indeed, the definition of mentoring has ceased to be static. Fifteen years after Kram’s (1985) seminal work on mentoring, the original definition of mentoring began undergoing a process of fragmentation. Ragins’s (2000) definition referred only to career functions, implying deterioration from the importance of psychosocial functions: “Mentors are generally defined as individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward mobility and career support to their protégés” (p. 1178). Higgins and Kram (2001) argued that mentoring is a “multiple relationship phenomenon” that takes place within a developmental network (p. 266). This was a departure from mentoring as principally between an individual and a “primary senior person,” thereby opening the door to “peer mentors.” McManus and Russell (2007) built on this direction with their chapter, “Peer Mentoring in
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Relationships,” and defined the concept as a relationship in which peers utilized psychosocial support to supplement career development while exhibiting higher levels of mutuality than “traditional mentoring.” The peer mentoring development discarded the role modeling and hierarchy implicit in earlier definitions. Ensher, Thomas, and Murphy (2001) attempted to evaluate the fragmentation of mentoring by measuring the support provided, satisfaction, and career success for traditional, step-ahead, and peer-mentors. In their use of Social Exchange Theory as a conceptual framework, they measured reciprocity/mutuality as a means of predicting satisfaction with the relationship.

Attention has shifted to youth-mentoring relationships that emphasize psychosocial functions. In a meta-analysis to determine the effectiveness of youth mentoring programs, DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, and Cooper (2002) classified programs as focused on instrumental goals, psychosocial goals, or both, but did not define either function, nor did they define mentoring itself. Lucas (2001) loosely defined mentoring as a “multi-faceted, mutual, and lengthy relationship that has great impact on the lives of both individuals” (p. 26) but later described mentors as “part guide, part friend, and part teacher” (p. 46), which is reminiscent of Levinson et al. (1978), though not quite as detailed as their definition. However, research on adolescent mentoring has been helpful in highlighting the importance of trust and friendship in mentoring relationships (Sipe, 2002). Youth mentoring research largely emphasizes psychosocial support and development as the essential functions of mentoring (Dallos & Comley-Ross, 2005; Langhout, Rhodes, & Osborne, 2004).
Meanwhile, mentoring research has only recently begun to benefit from communication-based perspectives. This is surprising given the inherent nature of mentorships as co-constructed processes enacted through communication, dependent on interpersonal relationships, and often appearing in organizational settings. Early on, Bullis and Bach (1989) examined the effect mentorships had upon organizational identification, but communication scholars have generally focused on understanding the communicative processes by which mentorships are enacted (Barrowclough & White, 2011; Buell, 2004; Kalbfleisch, 2007; Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1993; Lucas, 2001). Buell (2004) explained mentoring research in this way:

Mentoring is commonly viewed as a process involving the transfer of skills and knowledge from the mentor to the mentee—a process that inherently involves communication, but exactly how that transfer occurs is a relatively neglected aspect of the mentoring literature. Much of the mentoring research just described captures the mentorship process in general terms rather than exploring the dynamics that create actual mentoring relationships. (p. 59)

The lack of mentoring research from a communication perspective has stunted conceptual development and contributed to the complex issues surrounding mentoring literature.

Buell (2004) identified four different models of mentoring: cloning, nurturing, friendship, and apprenticeship. When compared to prior definitions of mentoring, I have interpreted Buell’s models to represent combinations of psychosocial, instrumental, hierarchal, developmental, and reciprocal functions. The cloning model
was directive, controlling, and power-oriented, aspects similar to hierarchy and instrumentality. The nurturing model was parent-like and supportive, similar to psychosocial support. A friendship model is characterized by reciprocity, equality, and learning, suggesting psychosocial functions, mutuality, and development. Finally, the apprenticeship model was developmental and instrumental. Buell (2004) also pointed out that “mentoring is commonly viewed as a process involving the transfer of skills and knowledge from the mentor to the mentee,” but observed that “the dynamics that create actual mentoring relationships” have not been adequately explored (p. 59).

Barrowclough and White (2011) implicitly restored hierarchy to the definition of mentoring in their study of relational boundaries. They also emphasized the importance of mutuality in accommodating both inequality and friendship as a definitive tension of mentoring relationships (p. 141). Kalbfleisch’s (2007) Mentoring Enactment Theory relies on hierarchy and reciprocity to initiate and maintain mentoring relationships.

Contemporary definitions of mentoring can be wildly different; there is little agreement among scholars on any other qualities of mentorships besides psychosocial and instrumental support (See Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988). Few researchers have expanded Burke’s (1984) definition that included role modeling as a significant function of mentoring. Scandura’s (2004) 9-item Mentoring Functions Questionnaire (MFQ) measures the presence of behaviors that demonstrate three core mentoring functions. The MFQ includes role modeling, alongside psychosocial and instrumental functions. Psychosocial support measures functions related to friendship, instrumental
support measures “one-on-one career coaching functions,” and role modeling measures the extent to which the mentee imitates the mentor’s “effective work behaviors” (Scandura & Ragins, 1993). However, when testing for the validity of the MFQ, Scandura, Stephanie, and Williams (1993) did not find consistent support distinguishing between role modeling and the two traditional functions. Scandura has yet to develop the role-model function and address its ambiguity. Entropy has abounded within mentoring research, creating the need for a new definition that incorporates the conceptual evolution of mentoring while integrating the nuances of mentoring not captured by traditional psychosocial and instrumental functions.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

These diverse and competing applications have effectually displaced any inherent meaning from the concept. If all of these cases represent legitimate mentoring, then mentoring is simply a relationship that helps people make progress. Such a definition does not differentiate mentors from teachers, role models, coaches, friends, trainers, leaders, managers, colleagues, parents, counselors, guides, or even critics—all these relationships help individuals to make progress in one way or another. Post-modern relativism has fragmented and devalued the meaning of mentoring. Rather than accepting this process, we should realize that some of these definitions of mentoring are mutually exclusive, unfortunately misleading researchers and lay people alike.

Incomplete research, combined with the popularity of mentoring programs in our culture, has resulted in the divergent use (and misuse) of the term, poorly constructed “mentoring” programs, and failed “mentoring” relationships. Furthermore, the lack of a viable, holistic definition for mentoring has created a pluralism of methods used to measure the effectiveness of mentoring relationships. For example, studies have judged mentorships based on, variously, a mentee’s satisfaction (Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000), transfer of concepts (Hicks, 2011), the professional success of the mentee (Noe, 1988), and the length of the relationship (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992). Competing measures further complicate the application and construction of mentoring programs. Divergent claims and definitions may actually neutralize a
program’s potential effectiveness; thus, Sipe (2002) called for “standards or benchmarks to guide the development and monitoring of quality programs and successful relationships” (p. 258).

In 1990, Little examined the proliferation of teacher-focused mentoring within the education sector. As she reviewed the literature, she concluded that despite the popularity of mentoring in the 1980s, “rhetoric and action have … outpaced both conceptual development and empirical warrant … [and] relative to the amount of pragmatic enquiry … the volume of empirical inquiry is small” (Little, 1990, pp. 297-298). More than two decades later, the academic literature on mentoring has not significantly advanced our understanding of the concept. There remains a disparity between the application of the term “mentoring” and an academic definition that would legitimize its use.

Mentoring research has traditionally taken a pragmatic focus: Buell (2004) stated, “Mentoring is commonly viewed as a process involving the transfer of skills and knowledge from the mentor to the mentee” (p. 59). Missing from academic mentoring literature are the features of mentorships that make them significant experiences in life narratives. Kram and Ragins (2007) introduced mentorships as:

Relationships that have given us the courage to do the things we think we cannot do … or even changed the course of our lives … At its best, mentoring can be a life-altering relationship … Its effects can be remarkable, profound, and enduring; mentoring relationships have the capacity to transform individuals, groups, organizations, and communities. (p. 3)
Similarly, although Levinson et al. (1978) alluded to career and psychosocial functions, they also hinted at other aspects of mentoring not present in contemporary research:

The mentor has another function [besides instrumental and psychosocial functions], and this is developmentally the most crucial one: to support and facilitate the realization of the Dream. The true mentor … fosters the young adult's development by believing in [him or her], sharing the youthful Dream and giving it his blessing, helping to define the newly emerging self in its newly discovered world, and creating a space in which the young [person] can work on a reasonably satisfactory life structure that contains the Dream. (pp. 98-99)

Levinson et al. also explained:

The mentor represents a mixture of parent and peer; he must be both and not purely either one. If he is entirely a peer, he cannot represent the advanced level toward which the younger man is striving. If he is very parental, it is difficult for both of them to overcome the generational difference and move toward the peer relationship that is the ultimate (though never fully realized) goal of the relationship. … As the relationship evolves, [the younger man] gains a fuller sense of his own authority and his capability for autonomous, responsible action [and the] relationship becomes more mutual. This shift serves a crucial developmental function for the young man: it is part of the
process by which he transcends the father-son, man-boy division of his childhood. (pp. 99-100)

These pioneers are describing the intangible qualities of mentorships unaccounted for by the psychosocial and instrumental functions. A true mentor is simultaneously a friend and a parent, one who participates in molding the mentee’s dreams, future, and personhood, and with whom the mentee yearns to share his or her life. Current research, broadly speaking, has neither remembered this ideal nor argued for it.

**A New Definition**

Research using psychosocial and instrumental attributes as the core functions of mentoring has not sufficiently captured the nuances of mentoring described by Levinson et al. (1978), Kram (1985), and others. There are additional mentoring functions that instrumental and psychosocial functions do not address. Few scholars have taken note of these “new” functions to fully develop them, but they are evident and implied in most research. Development, mutuality, and hierarchy are attributes evident and implied in much research as part of mentoring, but have yet to be sufficiently incorporated into the definition of mentoring. Before I define these attributes, I must first redefine psychosocial and instrumental functions to establish additional conceptual space for more attributes.

**Instrumental functions.** Instrumental functions, also called career functions, prima facie benefit the mentee’s specific role within an organization or profession. Kram (1985) identified career functions as those that “enhance career advancement”
The functions she identified were sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Mentors cannot perform these functions without a specific organization, profession, or role in mind; they utilize specific skills, tools, and positions that are relevant primarily because of a mentee’s tangible, definable position. The only function that may not fit here is coaching, which could focus on the mentee apart from his or her role, career, or profession (see Collins, 2009). Scandura’s MFQ (2004) measures only three functions of career support: personal interest in the mentee’s career, assistance with coordinating the mentee’s professional goals, and the devotion of time and consideration to the mentee’s career.

**Psychosocial functions.** Initially, Kram (1985) defined psychosocial support as functions that achieve “competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role” (p. 32). However, her current definition releases psychosocial support from having a professional focus. Ragins and Kram (2007) stated:

Psychosocial functions build on trust, intimacy, and interpersonal bonds in the relationship and include behaviors that enhance the mentee’s professional and personal growth, identity, self-worth, and self-efficacy. They include mentoring behaviors such as offering acceptance and confirmation and providing counseling, friendship and role-modeling. (p. 5).

Scandura (2004), however, removed role-modeling from psychosocial support and measures it as a separate function in her MFQ. For psychosocial support, the MFQ measures sharing personal problems and exchanging confidences with the mentor, as well as the extent to which the mentee considers the mentor a friend. Psychosocial
support provides the friend, parent, and cheerleader functions where the mentor emotionally engages with the mentee through encouraging, counseling, listening, caring for, and believing in him or her. These interpersonal functions require insight from communication scholars such as Rawlins’s (2009) works on friendship. Psychosocial support is not limited to any context external to the mentee, but rather focuses on the mentee’s individuality and personhood.

**Development.** I believe that mentoring research has not included personal development as a function of mentoring because most scholars have limited mentoring to development within career and professional contexts. Ragins and Kram (2007) stated, “mentoring relationships are unique in that the primary focus of the relationship is on career development and growth” (p. 5). This limitation forced certain chapters within their handbook to extend beyond the boundaries of mentoring, such as Boyatzis’ chapter, “Mentoring for Intentional Behavior Change.” Here, Boyatzis (2007) drew attention to the absence of variables that measured “deeper, more sustained changes of individuals’ behavior, their dreams and aspirations, their self-awareness [and] adaptability” (p. 448). The reasons for the deficiency, he argued, were the over-emphasis on career advancement, the conflation with psychosocial variables, and the lack of a credible theory of personal change. The mentoring of at-risk youth (see Sipe, 2002) is clearly unrelated to their career advancement or professional development. Kram (1985), along with Levinson et al. (1978), hinted at personal development as a function of mentoring. With Levinson et al., developmental functions centered on the mentee’s “Dream.” The mentor
… fosters the [protégée’s] development by believing in him, sharing the youthful Dream and giving it his blessing, helping to define the newly emerging self in its newly discovered world, and creating a space in which the young man can work on a reasonably satisfactory life structure that contains the Dream. (p. 99)

As with all mentoring literature, there is a heavy emphasis on development, yet mentoring research does not measure or conceptualize development as a function of mentorship. Like psychosocial support, development is not limited to any single context. It is different from psychosocial support in that development is a transformational process of focused effort to move the mentee to experience personal growth in specific directions over time. This transformation occurs through strategies such as coaching, criticism, identifying areas needing personal growth and making progress towards them, and empowerment. Additionally, only an individual who is more advanced than the mentee in the target area of growth can provide developmental functions; psychosocial support is not a process and can be provided by nearly anyone who has a relationship with the mentee.

**Mutuality.** Kram and Levinson et al. (1978) were also clear that the mentee is at times, but not completely, a peer with the mentor (see Kram, 1985, p. 38). Levinson et al. stated that overcoming “generational differences” and becoming a peer are the “ultimate, though never fully-realized” goals of mentoring (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 99). These functions of mutuality, reciprocation, and peer-becoming are missing from present conceptualizations of mentoring, such as the MFQ. However, Ensher, Thomas,
and Murphy (2001) have pointed out reciprocity and mutuality in previous research and have applied Social Exchange Theory to argue that as a dyadic relationship, satisfactory mentoring necessitates reciprocity within the relationship. Ensher and Murphy (2011) cited research showing that mentors expected reciprocity in the form of appreciation, a new skill, or a fresh perspective (p. 254). I use the term *mutuality* because mutuality describes the experience in a relationship that may be a result of reciprocation, whereas reciprocity is a series of actions motivated by relational imbalances (see chapter on reciprocation in Cialdini, 1993). We can define mutuality as the extent to which the mentor permits or encourages the mentee to reciprocate mentoring functions, or the extent to which the mentee seeks to provide mentoring functions for the mentor.

**Hierarchy.** The need for hierarchy as a function of mentoring has become more evident with the increase in peer-mentoring as a legitimate form of mentoring. McManus and Russell (2007) defined peer-mentoring as “a process where there is mutual involvement in encouraging and enhancing learning and development between two peers, where peers are people of similar hierarchal status or who perceive themselves as equals” (p. 278) and a relationship “characterized by increasing amounts of intimacy, vulnerability, and authenticity that span both personal and work domains” (p. 280). The authors immediately stated, “[peer mentorship] differs from close friendships because there is a conscious focus on work and career development, though that is not the exclusive focus of the relationship” (p. 280). Their argument is unconvincing—one sentence does not sufficiently differentiate peer-mentorship from
close friendship. For example, Eli and Mohammad work in the same non-profit organization and are passionate about their work. They also both have families to provide for and high aspirations for their careers. If they form a close relationship, they will obviously make efforts to discuss their work and careers with each other. Does the topic of their conversations, by mere virtue of their relational context preclude them from having a close friendship, automatically making their relationship a peer-mentorship? McManus and Russell (2007) asserted it does. I am unconvinced that what has been defined as peer-mentorship is any different from friendship. The lack of a viable distinction between peer-mentorship and friendship highlights the need for hierarchy as a function of mentorship.

Kram (1985) stated that instrumental functions rely on a mentor’s superiority and that psychosocial functions emerge from the mentee’s perception of the mentor as an idealized future worthy of “admiration, emulation, and respect” (p. 33). Levinson et al. (1978) said the mentor is an “exemplar that the protégée can admire and seek to emulate” but “if [the mentor] is entirely a peer, he cannot represent the advanced level toward which the [protégée] is striving” (pp. 98-99). The protégée “feels admiration, respect, appreciation, gratitude, and love for the mentor [and recognizes that the] elder has qualities of character, expertise and understanding that the [protégée] admires and wants to make parts of himself [sic]” (p. 100). The development of so-called “peer-mentoring” disregards this hierarchal aspect. Although there has been some recent discussion of development in mentorships (Boyatzis, 2007; McGowan, Stone, & Kegan, 2007), we know very little about the “differential” or hierarchy in mentorships.
(Hunt & Michael, 1983; Mullen, 1994). Mentors exhibit hierachal functions when they serve as a responsible, more advanced, more mature role-model and a servant leader, one who believes in the mentee, exhibits moral virtues like wisdom, patience, love, and conscientiousness, and is a motivating force in the mentee’s life. Hierarchy is also necessary for developmental functions and functions of mutuality, which is simply striving to overcome hierarchy.

Therefore, with small refinements to definitions of the psychosocial and instrumental functions, I have proposed three additional functions of mentoring. 1) Developmental functions focus on the change and growth of an individual, enacted by conscious efforts towards a specific direction. 2) Mutuality functions allow the mentoring relationship to become mutually beneficial, where the dyad moves toward becoming peers, and the mentor receives psychosocial, instrumental, or other support from the mentee. 3) Hierarchal functions position the mentor as a more advanced and idealized figure with more developed leadership abilities, power, maturity, skills, and/or influence. The development and mutuality functions both rely on hierarchal functions for enactment.

**Christian Mentoring**

It is difficult to trace when Evangelical Christians began using discipleship to refer to Christian mentoring. Bonhoeffer, a pastor-theologian during World War II, wrote *The Cost of Discipleship* in 1937, which has become a classic work in Christian literature even though it was not translated into English until 1959. His thesis is that “cheap grace” is Christianity without discipleship, but costly grace is a person
following Christ, a disciple who submits to Christ despite the cost of submission. *The Master Plan of Evangelism*, by Coleman (1963), is really about discipleship, rather than evangelism. Evangelism is the goal, but discipleship is the means. Coleman (1963) conceptualized discipleship after Christ’s example in the Gospels. Christ called specific people to follow him, built relationships with them, required obedience from them, served and made sacrifices for them, led and taught them by his own example, assigned responsibilities to them, supervised and coached them, all so that they would do the same for others, thereby multiplying his work through their lives. “Few books,” said Billy Graham, the famous evangelist, “have had as great an impact on the cause of world evangelization in our generation as Robert Coleman's *The Master Plan of Evangelism*” (Coleman, 1963, p. 9). Today, there are countless books, organizations, programs, and websites dedicated to the idea of Christian mentoring, or discipleship.

The conceptual chaos in the secular literature on mentoring is negligible compared to the state of discipleship in Christian literature. Hull (2006) defined discipleship as the state of following Jesus; in fact, discipleship is the journey *people* begin when they become Christians. Houston (2002) used *discipleship* and *mentoring* interchangeably and stated that the goal of discipleship was “to guide us to ‘build our identity’ righteously and socially guard and guide us on our own journey of faith” (p. 21). Houston’s (2002) discipleship meant following Christ by pursuing self-abandoned, other-centered, personhood, similar to Bonheoffer’s “costly discipleship.” Most Christian literature agrees there should be no difference between those who are Christians and those who are disciples. However, there is a subtle distinction between
conceptualizing discipleship as a spiritual process that occurs between the Christian and God, or whether it is a human relationship with specific goals. Bonheoffer (1937), Hull (2006), and Houston (2002) conceptualized discipleship as the former, emphasizing being a follower of Christ. Coleman (1963) considered discipleship as the latter, where discipleship was the responsibility and process of making followers of Christ. Coleman is not alone; other popular literature also conceptualizes discipleship as Christian mentoring. Johnson (2000) explained that “mentors shape lives” by believing in the mentee; they set a tone, clarify expectations, maintain trust, set an agenda, offer their network, provide a perspective strengthened by experience, ask good questions, challenge and empower, correct with accountability, and are committed to the time-consuming process of helping mentees to become effective Christians. Finally, he added, “no one outgrows … the need for mentoring” (Johnson, 2000, p. 5). Discoll (2000) quoted a mentor, who explained,

A mentor is not a director. A mentor is there as a coach, a consultant, and even a cheerleader, but not someone who is trying to clone himself. Mentoring is not about monitoring or controlling someone. Controlling creates dependency, and the role of mentoring is to grow the disciple to become strong and self-sufficient. (p. 2)

In a leadership forum on spiritual growth, Christian leaders stated “you can’t be a Christian if you’re not a disciple … discipling is for everybody …. We’re all disciple makers. … Discipling is mentoring [people] through the process [of transformation]” to “move from point A to point B” (“Measuring What Matters,”
Seville (n.d.) criticized the lack of “credence given to the usefulness and validity of discipleship-as-mentorship” (para. 14):

“Discipleship is not,” he explains, “a hierarchical system for spiritual growth, a way for professional Christians to pass on their best practices to novice Christians.”… While this is certainly true and helpful, I wonder if the Titus 2 baby has been tossed out with the hierarchical bathwater. Peers helping their friends fight sin is indeed a great thing, but what of older, more experienced believers pouring decades of gospel-centered, sin-fighting wisdom into younger Christians as we see in the New Testament and early church? (para. 14-15)

Seville points out that hierarchy is an essential part of discipleship and, thereby, mentoring. The danger is when hierarchy propagates arrogance and superiority-complexes in the mentor.

The professional-to-novice model made Dodson feel like he was following Jesus alone, as if he was at the top of a staircase peering down on those below instead of circled up in the living room with his fellow disciples. “As a result,” Dodson explains, “disciple became more of a verb than a noun, less an identity and more of an activity.” This is a needed corrective, but disciple (noun and a verb) will involve spiritual parenting at some point. (para. 16-17)

Apparently, a former mentor failed to perform functions of mutuality and psychosocial support in his mentorship with Dodson, emphasizing the importance of these functions
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to hold hierarchy in proper balance. Seville astutely points out that discipleship is both an identity and a process, validating the distinction between being and making disciples.

Today, churches and parachurch organizations are emphasizing formal disciple-making as a primary means of achieving particular goals, such as the Acts29 Network, Gospel Coach program, and 9Marks. Christian campus ministries, such as Navigators and Cru (formerly known as Campus Crusade for Christ) focus heavily on facilitating spiritual development through discipleship. Cru highlights the three major components of discipleship. “Relationship-building” incorporates mutuality and psychosocial support, functions utilizing the “Word of God” fuels development, and “doing ministry together” provides instrumental support and development functions (Henderson, n.d.).

Future Research

Perhaps the most apparent need in mentoring research is to include indicators of development, mutuality, and hierarchy. This amendment will bring much needed clarification to what constitutes mentorship. Future research will need to define and differentiate “development” and “mutuality” from the psychosocial and instrumental functions of mentoring and explore how mentors and mentees enact these functions. After conceptualizing hierarchy in mentorships, researchers will also need to explore the claim that hierarchy is necessary to impart or promote an idealized, future self-image within the mind of the mentee and that this is what makes mentorships exceptionally treasured experiences. These three new functions may tend to shy away
from empirical and quantitative measurement; it may be that they become more
tangible and clearly understood through qualitative research methods. In order to
measure these functions, researchers will need to modify or create quantitative and
qualitative instruments that will indicate the presence of development, mutuality, and
hierarchy in a relationship. With these developments, researchers will be able to
reevaluate so-called “mentoring programs” using measures that include five essential
functions, rather than two. The expansion of the mentoring concept in this way will
have profound and far-reaching implications for current understandings of mentoring,
such as the validity of formal and informal mentoring, peer-mentoring, youth-
mentoring, and professional mentoring.

Another area of research arises from the way Evangelicals have redefined
Christian mentoring as “discipleship.” This movement has resulted in creating
programs and processes that include and depend on mentoring as a necessary but
insufficient element of the program (Hull, 2006; McCauley & Guthrie, 2007). First,
researchers must determine if these programs are equivocating by substituting
“mentoring” with the name of their program, if they are oversimplifying mentorship,
or if these programs are utilizing mentorship as only a part of, rather than the sum of,
their program. Researchers could also explore whether discipleship offers any
significant insight on the mentoring process: how these programs define successful
mentoring, the extent to which the Christian brand of mentoring depends on
developmental or organizational networks (Higgins & Kram, 2001), and how the
program implements the five different aspects of mentoring (psychosocial support,
instrumental support, mutuality, development, and hierarchy). Because of the recent rise in popularity of discipleship, researchers would be wise to ask if Christian mentoring achieves greater levels of success than secular mentoring programs.

**Research Questions**

Kram’s (1985) categories of mentoring functions, psychosocial and instrumental support, have been forgotten, transformed, expanded, narrowed, and/or over-emphasized over the years. The original definitions of mentoring have fragmented and are scattered throughout the academic world. Today, they are often assumed or disregarded, and the definitions of mentoring are so splintered that any reference to Levinson et al. (1978) and Kram’s (1985) definitions seems almost irrelevant. There have been no recent efforts to gather different contributions to mentoring research and reintegrate those contributions into a comprehensible, expanded definition. The purpose of this study was to expand Kram’s (1985) definition of mentoring and promote conceptual development by clarifying psychosocial and instrumental support, and to integrate new functions of mentoring.

Hypothesis 1: Mentoring relationships will differ depending on the hierarchical levels within the mentoring dyad.

Hypothesis 2: Mentoring relationships will differ depending on the presence or absence of developmental activities within the mentoring dyad.

Hypothesis 3: Mentoring relationships will differ depending on the presence or absence of expressions of mutuality within the mentoring dyad.
Research Question 1: How do the five attributes (psychosocial support, instrumental support, hierarchy, development, mutuality) of mentoring affect the mentee’s evaluation of the mentoring relationship? [Measured with questionnaire.]

Research Question 2: How do mentees describe their mentoring relationship with respect to the five mentoring attributes? [Measured with semi-structured interviews.]
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Subjects and Procedure

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the functions of formal mentorships provided by the Christian organization, Cru. The population for the study consisted of undergraduate students who were mentored through their involvement in Christian campus ministries. These Christian mentoring relationships were exemplified as discipleship. In these relationships, a mentor was called a “discipler” and a mentee was a “disciple” or simply, a “student.”

Cru is by far the largest and most established of these organizations, present on over 1,000 campuses across the country with nearly 4,000 full-time staff and annual revenues of over 500 million dollars (About Us, n.d.; Annual Report 2011, n.d.). Undoubtedly, other campus ministries offer unique insights on mentoring, but none compare with the size and establishment of Cru. Intervarsity is present on 557 campuses and employs fewer than 1,000 staff members (Vital Statistics, n.d.). Navigators is present on 100 campuses and employs 600 staff members (About Us, n.d.). Chi Alpha is present on fewer than 300 campuses in the United States (Our Story, n.d.). In light of these comparisons, it may be fair to consider Cru’s efforts as representative of the population at hand.

Sample

Sampling frame. Subjects were limited to American-born undergraduates involved with Cru at a four-year university. The limitation to American-born students controlled for language difficulties in data collection and for cultural nuances that
might affect mentoring relationships (Blake-Beard, Murrell, & Thomas, 2007; Crutcher, 2007; Sedlacek, Benjamin, Schlosser, & Sheu, 2007). Additionally, data were collected primarily from universities with a dedicated, full-time staff team, meaning the exclusion of commuter schools and two-year institutions. These choices attempted to limit subjects to those benefiting from fully supported Cru “movements” on their campuses and mentoring relationships that were not affected by a lack of staff presence and support. Ideal subjects were students who were involved in fully established movements and had the opportunity to experience Cru “discipleship” that had not been limited by a lack of support or guidance.

**Sampling method.** Multistage cluster sampling was used to obtain lists from which to sample the population. The samples for this method were chosen first by region, then by university, and finally by students engaged in formal discipleship. The cluster method was chosen mainly because, at the time the research was conducted, a population list did not exist at the national level from which to create the sampling frame. Additionally, cluster sampling has the benefit of being compatible with stratification and probability proportionate sampling (see Babbie, 2009, p. 211).

Subjects were emailed and asked to complete an online questionnaire about their discipleship relationship. Responses were recorded anonymously and subjects were asked at the end of the questionnaire to provide their contact information if they were interested in a follow-up interview. The personal data were separated from the responses to preserve the anonymity of the actual responses. Once the quantitative data from the questionnaire had been analyzed, the subjects who had provided contact
information were asked to participate in a semi-structured interview to describe their discipleship relationship and experiences. Interviews were expected to last between 30 and 90 minutes. The shortest interview was 49 minutes; the longest was 105 minutes. In accordance with mixed-methods research, the use of qualitative data added the richness, depth, and insight lacking from quantitative data alone (see Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2011).

**Measures**

**Questionnaire.** The instrument sought to measure and evaluate five functions of mentoring relationships: psychosocial support, instrumental support, mutuality, development, and hierarchy. Additional information was collected, such as biographical and descriptive data concerning spirituality and involvement with Cru. A focus group was held where three students provided input on a draft of the questionnaire. Some items were revised or added in light of these opinions (see discussion in Appendix B).

**Student information.** Students were asked their sex, academic standing (e.g., junior), length of time they had been a Christian, length of involvement with Cru, the extent of their involvement with Cru, if they had a discipler (i.e., mentor), if they had had more than one discipler (formal and informal), and if they had participated in any of Cru’s regional or national conferences or projects.

**Psychosocial support.** Seven items measured the amount of psychosocial support provided in Cru’s discipleship relationships. Scandura and Ragins (1993) identified several factors in previous research to measure psychosocial support as a
function of mentoring. Their Mentoring Functions Questionnaire (MFQ) uses three items to measure this function: 1) I share personal problems with my mentor, 2) I exchange confidences with my mentor, and 3) I consider my mentor to be a friend (Scandura & Ragins, 1993). In previous research, Scandura had used two other items: a) I socialize with my mentor after work, and b) I often go to lunch with my mentor (Viator & Scandura, 1991). These two items were combined for a fourth item in the current research: 4) My mentor and I spend some of our free time together. Items that represented counseling functions in Noe (1988) resulted in the creation of a fifth item: 5) My mentor seeks to understand my fears, doubts, and concerns. After the preliminary focus group, two more items were added: 6) My discipler is easy to share deeply personal information with him or her, and 7) I ask my discipler for advice on things that are unrelated to Cru.

**Instrumental support.** As with the psychosocial functions, Scandura and Ragins (1993) used three items in the MFQ to measure career functions provided by mentors: 1) My mentor takes a personal interest in my involvement with Cru, 2) My mentor helps me coordinate my goals within Cru, and 3) My mentor has devoted special time and consideration to my involvement with Cru. I adapted other items Scandura and Ragins had previously eliminated into a new item: 4) My mentor presents me with important responsibilities. Noe’s (1988) work was also adapted to create four more items: 5) My mentor coaches/trains me in my responsibilities related to Cru, 6) My mentor gives me feedback on the performance of my responsibilities within Cru, 7) My mentor helps me to become a successful leader within Cru, and 8) I
have benefitted from my mentor’s status within Cru. Instrumental support is tied to the immediate organizational context in which the formal relationship occurs. Such functions are irrelevant outside of Cru. These eight items measured the instrumental functions of mentoring.

**Hierarchy.** Hierarchy was a new category of functions that included Scandura’s (2004) role-modeling functions, but also contained items that indicated a mentor’s higher level of maturity and greater amounts of power. Two of Scandura’s (2004) role-modeling items were adapted, but a third was ignored because it was redundant with other items: 1) I try to model my behavior after my mentor, and 2) I respect my mentor’s knowledge of things concerning the Christian life. Ensher, Thomas, and Murphy (2001) provided a useful item to measure a mentor’s level in an organization relative to the mentee. This adapted item asked subjects to rate their mentor as: a) at the same level, b) one or two levels more advanced, or c) at a much more advanced level with regard to 3) Cru as an organization, 4) in terms of social networking and connectedness, 5) spiritually, and 6) in terms of age. Gilbert (1985) provided another item: 7) My mentor has much more authority than I. Since no stand-alone instruments, at the time the research was conducted, were available to measure role-modeling functions (see Gilbert, 1985); the idealized influence factor was adapted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The MLQ added eight items: 8) My mentor talks about his/her more important values and beliefs, 9) My mentor instills pride in me for being associated with him/her, 10) My mentor specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose, 11) My mentor goes beyond self-
interest for the good of the others, 12) My mentor acts in ways that builds my respect, 13) My mentor considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions, 14) My mentor displays a sense of power and confidence, and 15) My mentor emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission. These fifteen items measured the extent to which hierarchy was present within a mentoring relationship.

**Mutuality.** Mutuality measures the presence of peer and friendship elements in a mentoring relationship. Four of the items in psychosocial support were adapted to measure the extent to which the mentee provided psychosocial support to the mentor: 1) My mentor shares personal problems with me, 2) My mentor exchanges confidences with me, 3) My mentor considers me to be a friend, and 4) I seek to understand my mentor’s fears, doubts, and concerns. One item was also adapted from four of Ensher, Thomas, and Murphy’s (2001) items that measured reciprocity as a variable for mentoring relationships: 5) I believe that for most benefits I receive from this relationship I should return approximately equivalent benefits to my mentor in the future. These five items measured the presence of mutuality in mentoring relationships.

**Development.** Transformational leadership was adapted as the primary indicator of a developmental relationship, measuring the factors individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. The MLQ provided eight items to measure development and were adapted to focus on the mentee: 1) My mentor helps me re-examine my critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, 2) My mentor talks optimistically about my future, 3)
My mentor treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group, 4) My mentor helps me articulate a compelling vision of the future, 5) My mentor considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from other, 6) My discipler helps me seek different perspectives when solving problems, 7) My mentor helps to develop my strengths, and 8) My mentor helps me increase my confidence that goals will be achieved.

Other items were created to measure development from Christian literature on discipleship (Collins, 2009; Thomas & Wood, 2012). Seven items were created: 9) My discipler helps me identify areas of my life that need attention, 10) My discipler believes in me, 11) My discipler challenges me, 12) My discipler confronts me when I make poor choices, 13) I have a better relationship with God because of my discipler, 14) My discipler has helped me to become someone who can disciple others, and 15) My discipler has helped me to become a stronger Christian. These sixteen items were expected to measure the amount of development that occurs in a mentorship.

[Permission to adapt parts of the MLQ was obtained from Robert Most from MindGarden Inc. See Appendix C.]

**Outcome.** Ten items measured the outcome of the mentoring relationships. This factor came from Ragins, Cotton, and Miller’s (2000) measurements of satisfaction and perceived program effectiveness. Satisfaction was measured with: 1) My mentor is someone I am satisfied with, 2) My mentor has been effective in his/her role, 3) My mentor fails to meet my needs (reversed), and 4) My mentor disappoints me (reversed). Perceived program effectiveness was measured with 5) The formal
mentoring program in my organization is effective, 6) The formal mentoring program allows me access to mentors who otherwise would have been unattainable, 7) I am satisfied with the formal mentoring program, 8) The mentoring program smoothed the way for me to get a mentor, 9) I would be unable to get a mentor if not for the formal mentoring program, 10) The formal mentoring program is a waste of time (reversed), and 11) In your opinion, how much of an impact has discipleship had upon your life? (See Appendix D for a copy of the instrument.)

**Semi-Structured Interviews.** At the end of the quantitative instrument, respondents were asked if they were interested in participating in a follow-up interview about their mentoring relationship. Respondents indicated their interest by sharing their contact information. The purpose of the follow-up interview was to enrich and illuminate the five functions in a way that a quantitative instrument could not provide. Lindlof and Taylor (2011) was referenced to create the preliminary interview protocol. The interview protocol included conceptual elements from Respondent and Organizational Narrative interview types (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, pp. 179-182). In the follow-up interviews, participants were asked to identify their formal mentor and describe their relationship with that person. Prompts were created in conjunction with the 57 quantitative items and were generalized from the seven general areas measured by the questionnaire: general information about the discipleship relationship, the five functions of discipleship, and the outcome of and satisfaction with the relationship. These data were crucial to filling in the gaps left by
the quantitative data and to more fully explain the relationships. (See Appendix E for a copy of the interview protocol.)

**Data Collection**

Initially, I planned to obtain subjects by gathering the email addresses of student leaders by contacting the MTLs (“Missional Team Leaders”) of each movement in the region. I obtained the appropriate staff contact information with the help of a local staff member, by accessing Cru’s online database, called *InfoBase*. *InfoBase* provided a wealth of information; I received a comprehensive list of teams in the Great Lakes region, complete with university name, number of students involved, and the names of each staff member on the team.

At this point, I encountered three major obstacles that made data collection difficult. First, the data on *InfoBase* concerning the number of students involved was considered by staff members as inaccurate and imprecise. Among the Cru staff teams, there was no common criterion for measuring student involvement, let alone student leadership.

Second, among campus movements there was not a common tool or means of contacting students or keeping a roster of students involved. Email groups, list-servers, Word documents, and even a staff-developed website were all utilized by different teams.

Finally, the non-profit, grassroots nature of the organization means that the fully employed staff members are essentially self-funded volunteers (Cru staff raise their own salary via monthly supporters). Although there exists a clear, but little
heeded, hierarchy of management within the organization, those in positions of authority do not carry as much influence and power as in the for-profit sector; networking and social connections are much more influential within the organization. Therefore, many MTLs did not comply with the Regional Director and other influential staff members’ requests for their participation. I was unable to gain participation from several major movements throughout the region.

These limitations made it impossible to collect a sample using Probability Proportionate to Size (PPS) sampling (Babbie, 2009, p. 221). In the first stage, the different regions of the national Cru organization were identified. They are called the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Mid-South, South-East, Great Lakes, Upper Midwest, Great Plains, Red River, Greater Northwest, and the Pacific Southwest regions. I chose the Great Lakes region as the sample population. I contacted the administrative office for the Great Lakes Region and obtained a list of schools and staff teams with their respective contact information. In the second stage, I attempted to remove from my list of contacts the schools that did not meet the requirements for my sampling frame. At that point, I would have used PPS to determine the number of schools to be sampled based on the relative size of the region. I would have identified schools as public or private institutions, and their student population, categorizing them into small, medium, or large student populations. Again, PPS would have determined the number of private and public schools to sample, as well as the number of schools with small, medium, and large student populations. I attempted to contact the movements at the schools that I had identified and obtain a list of students who are involved in formal
discipleship. These students were identified with two steps, first by asking the staff team if they had a list of students involved in discipleship, and second, by asking students completing the questionnaire if they had a formal “discipler.” Instead, I had to email the MTLs of each movement to ask for their participation. For movements that did not respond, I attempted to use my personal networking contacts, mostly made up of student leaders, to provide the movement with a link to the online instrument. My hope was to separate students into male and female categories to account for the differences in the sex of the mentorship, but I was unable to do so due to the disparate sources of potential participants (McKeen & Bujaki, 2007; Ragins & Cotton, 1991; Scandura & Ragins, 1993).

The target was to receive 400 responses (65 questionnaire items x 5 responses per item for conducting the factor analysis=325, rounded up to 400). As a preliminary estimate, there were approximately 8,000 students involved in Cru throughout the Great Lakes Region (the sampling population). Because of the complications I encountered in collecting contact data for participants, I am unable to estimate the response rate because I do not know how many students were contacted to participate.
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Quantitative Results.

Demographic Characteristics. In collecting the quantitative data, I received a total of 138 responses. Forty percent of the respondents were male, 53% were female (8% did not identify themselves). About one-third of the respondents were seniors, one-third were juniors, 15% were sophomores, 9% were freshmen or alumni (8% did not answer)—roughly two-thirds of respondents were upper-classmen, indicating my goal of having students who are involved in and committed to their Cru movements who had time to experience Cru discipleship. Sixty-eight percent of respondents were discipled by Cru staff members and 63% had more than one formal discipler. Of the nine Cru events/functions provided (Summer Project, IndyCC, Big Break, Fall Retreat, Other Retreat, Weekly Meeting, Bible Study, Discipleship, and other), 88% of respondents had participated in at least four, and 71% participated in five or more. Again, this indicated respondents were committed to and involved with the Cru movement on their campus.

Questionnaire Reliability. The analysis of the data gathered from the questionnaire attempted to determine how well each item measured the factors identified. SPSS analysis helped determine if the five factors were reliable measurements of mentoring. Forty-seven items measured the five attributes and 11 items measured the outcome of the relationship according to the student.

Reliability analysis revealed three items as outliers, meaning these items had no face validity. Item outliers were identified by running reliability analysis for a
construct; if an item had a notably different mean than other items it was removed and omitted from further analysis. For the psychosocial attribute, the item, “My discipler and I spend some of our free time together,” had a significantly different mean than other items that measured this attribute. Where the other six psychosocial items asked about sharing and communication in the relationship, the outlier asked about the de-facto manifestation of the relationship. The second outlier was found among the items that measured the instrumental attribute: “My discipler’s status within Cru gives me special benefits.” Within hierarchy, the item asking students to rate their discipler’s level with regard to “social networking and connectedness” was also an outlier.

Removing these outliers increased Cronbach’s alpha for psychosocial by 0.01, from .87 to .88, for Instrumental by .02, from .88 to .90, and for Hierarchy by .1, from .82 to .83. Cronbach’s alpha measures internal consistency, or the degree to which the items measure the same construct. The cutoff for an acceptable alpha value is .70.

Each of these measures yielded an $\alpha \geq .83$, demonstrating particularly good reliability in measuring each of these six constructs. (See Table 4.1.)
To make sure these variables are measuring different constructs, I checked for multicollinearity. Pallant (2010) recommends flagging independent variables when the Pearson correlation value is $\geq .7$. I found strong correlations between psychosocial and mutuality ($r = .77$), psychosocial and development ($r = .82$), and instrumental and development ($r = .79$). Because the colinearity statistics (tolerance and VIF) were $\geq .2$ and $\leq 5$, respectively, which do not violate Pallant’s (2010) cut-off values (tolerance $> .10$ and VIF $< 10$), I retained these variables.

**Results of Hypothesis Testing.**

My three hypotheses stated that the presence or absence of mutuality, hierarchy, and development make a difference in mentoring relationships. One of my research questions asked how the five attributes affect the student’s evaluation of the relationship. I was concerned about having a sufficient number of responses for regression analysis; however, Pallant (2010, p. 150) provides a formula to calculate sampling size requirements: $N > 50 + 8m$ (where $m =$ number of independent variables). I have five independent variables (the five attributes), so I needed 90
responses for generalizability (N ≥ 90). As seen in the table above, my variables had an N of at least 126, satisfying the minimum requirements for sample size.

\[ H_1: \text{Mentoring relationships will differ depending on the hierarchical levels within the mentoring dyad—was not confirmed. Hierarchy does not make a significant difference in mentoring relationships. Fifteen items attempted to measure this aspect of mentoring relationships, inquiring about the mentor’s relative level of advancement and various examples of role-modeling. The mean score for hierarchy was high at 4.0 (Table 4.1), but failed to reach a point of statistical significance. Thus, although hierarchy is present in mentoring relationships, it does not make a significant difference to the outcome of the relationship.} \]

\[ H_2: \text{Mentoring relationships will differ depending on the presence or absence of developmental activities within the mentoring dyad—was confirmed. The development attribute makes a significant difference in mentoring relationships. When students indicated a strong presence of development in the mentorship, the overall outcome of the relationship was significantly better. Recall that the items measuring development were a combination of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Christian literature. Generally, the MLQ inquired about the student’s future, whether the mentor catered to the student’s individuality, and if the mentor endeavored for the student’s personal growth and maturity. Items from the Christian literature similarly inquired about the mentor’s effort towards the student’s growth, both personally and spiritually. These elements make a significant and positive contribution to a student’s mentoring.} \]
H₃: Mentoring relationships will differ depending on the presence or absence of expressions of mutuality within the mentoring dyad—was also unconfirmed. Mutuality does not make a significant difference in how students rated the outcome of their mentoring relationships. Only five items measured mutuality, asking about the amount of psychosocial support the student provided to the mentor, and if the student felt indebted to the mentor. Mutuality had the lowest mean score of all five functions (M=3.8) and was the only function to have a negative beta score (Table 4.2). The mutuality function is unique in that it is clearly held in tension with other functions (such as psychosocial and mutuality).

I analyzed the effect of sex and academic standing on outcome and the five attributes and found that neither of the control variables accounted for any of the variability in the outcome variable ($R^2 = .00$). Sex and academic standing did not predict the outcome of mentoring relationships to a statistically significant degree ($p = .96, .94$, respectively).

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Analysis (Simultaneous)</th>
<th>Beta ($\hat{\beta}$)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance ($p$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standing</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $R^2 = .55$, $F(5, 127) = 30.87$, $p < .001$
Research Question 1: How do the five attributes (psychosocial support, instrumental support, hierarchy, development, mutuality) of mentoring affect the mentee’s evaluation of the mentoring relationship? The $R$ for regression ($R=.74$) was significantly different from zero, $F(5, 127)=30.87, p < .001$, with an $R^2$ value of .55. The $R^2$ value refers to the extent to which the outcome is predicted by the five attributes. Fifty-five percent of the variance in outcome is accounted for by the model, and $p$ indicates the model is statistically significant. The regression coefficients for the psychosocial attribute ($\beta=.31$, $t=2.32$, $p=.022$), and the developmental attribute ($\beta=.42$, $t=3.09$, $p=.002$), were significantly different from zero, whereas the regression coefficients for the instrumental ($\beta=.007$, $t=.07$, $p=.95$), hierarchy ($\beta=.14$, $t=1.50$, $p=.14$), and mutuality ($\beta=-.08$, $t=-.86$, $p=.39$) attributes were not significantly different from zero. The size and direction of the relationships suggest that a better outcome of mentoring relationships with higher levels of psychosocial and developmental attributes—in other words, the presence of psychosocial and developmental attributes are strong predictors of a good mentoring relationship and the other three attributes (instrumental, hierarchy, and mutuality) are not strong predictors for the outcome of the mentoring relationship.

From my analysis, the instrument was successful in measuring the presence of the five attributes of mentoring, as well as demonstrating strong internal reliability. The psychosocial and development attributes emerged as significant predictors of how students evaluate their mentorships; the instrumental, mutuality, and hierarchy attributes were not significant predictors. However, quantitative data alone could not
fully describe and evaluate mentoring relationships in this sample population. Qualitative data were also collected from the sample population and provided a more complete picture of the functions of mentoring.

**Qualitative Results.**

I analyzed my qualitative data from the fourteen semi-structured interviews using the program NVivo 10. Transcription of the fourteen interviews yielded 245 pages of qualitative data. These data were applied to my second research question, which asked, “How do mentees describe their mentoring relationship with respect to the five mentoring attributes?” Recall that the five attributes of mentoring are:

1. Psychosocial
2. Instrumental
3. Hierarchy
4. Development
5. Mutuality

For each attribute, I explained the definition of the attribute that emerged from analysis; I then demonstrated support for this definition by describing the common themes that emerged from my analysis of the fourteen interviews that were conducted. Interviews were then imported into NVivo and coded with respect to each attribute (transcripts were coded laterally, rather than coding each transcript as a whole). Each code was exported into a text document where it could be further analyzed for a more accurate identification of the attribute. Then, data were reviewed for identification of common nodes (read *themes*) within each attribute. These nodes became sub-themes
for between four and five generalized themes for each attribute. Themes for each attribute are ordered with respect to the number of identified nodes, which does not reflect the relative “strength” of each theme, but rather the complexity and conceptual depth. Finally, quotes were selected that best demonstrated the essence of each theme. The names associated with the quotes are pseudonyms to honor the agreement of interviewee confidentiality.

**Psychosocial.** Psychosocial support was one of the main tenants of traditional mentoring, mostly referring to emotional support and quasi-friendship. However, I expanded and developed the concept to provide a clearer and more specific explanation of the psychosocial attribute. The mentoring relationship usually does not begin as a friendship because it is formally established. As the mentorship grows, friendship does become a part of the relationship and the student experiences more emotional depth. The mentor is responsible for being involved and familiar with different parts of the student’s life, and is proactive about developing the relationship. The psychosocial attribute of mentoring was composed of five themes. These themes are ordered with respect to the frequency of sub-themes identified during analysis.

1. Formality (28)
2. Friendship (24)
3. Involvement (19)
4. Depth (13)
5. Proactive (12)
1. **Formality.** The relationship takes on a distinct character because it is established as a formal mentorship in which a student is assigned to a mentor. There was clarity about the purpose of the relationship, that it was centered on God and focused on spirituality. It was self-evident that the mentor and student shared similar beliefs and values. The formal basis of the relationship implied permission was granted for the mentor to ask about personal topics, and the spiritual focus eased the transition in conversation to spiritual questions and topics that may otherwise have been taboo. The mentor held a responsibility to be committed to the mentorship, which was aimed toward the student. Although the discipler was the initiator in the relationship, there was a mutual expectation of follow-through for both parties. This also granted the mentor the prerogative to confront the student about unmet expectations.

Students, and sometimes mentors, developed closeness through sharing life stories and personal tales. The relationship was further built through instrumental activities, such as bible studies. Though initially established in formality, friendship was promoted when the relationship expanded to include a more informal quality. The relationship began on a formal basis, and so the mentor was counted on to be available, reliable, and a resource for questions; the student knew he/she could confess sin, share prayer requests, and be prayed for. However, the mentor was not synonymous with a therapist because the mentorship had a clear purpose. Some believed that a mentor is a guaranteed friend and that their relationship with their mentor would not have existed without the mentorship.
We had a relationship, and then there was also God in our relationship, you know, that was kind of like our focal point of our relationship…. I have tons of relationships [that] are secular and whatnot and you know, I-I could definitely see a difference, between that, and then even with like, with like Christian friends…. You know, we have a good relationship but then it’s just like with him [my discipler] … it’s just a vulnerability that we showed each other and so, I mean, I don’t really go deep with all my Christian friends, you know, but with him, you know, he did- we did, we went [deep] with each other. (Anakin)

[With my discipler] there’s a specific purpose…. I feel like with a friendship … it’s more um, just someone that’s kind of around…. We met on a weekly basis and you know, we had a time frame when we would meet, and we have a purpose to it, and so I- I feel like it was more structured I guess than like a normal friendship would be. Um, and I feel like it was more … aimed towards me, towards helping me. (Bilbo)

Um, he was very good about like, being intentional in defining things and then following through on them…. He was very clear that he expected for me to put aside time to meet, um, at the time that we decided on, you know, every week [and] I wouldn’t be able to, you know, make an excuse that, “Oh, I had to write a paper or something,” that it was … a clear defined time for us to be in discipleship together…. He [made] sure to say like, “Hey, it’s not okay to miss this … you need to hold the commitments that you- you set up to…..” We
had a relationship, um, that was built around the gospel [and] our walks with Jesus…. Like we were very much engaging one another about um, sin in our lives, about what we were learning in the bible … and for me like that, that like really bonds me with somebody … having like, that basis in our relationship made it easier for me to transition into a spiritual question or a spiritual topic during just times of- of goofy hanging out [compared] with me and my other friends, you know? (Frodo)

We were like, really, really great friends, but I think that if it wasn’t for just being where we were, being in the same situation, like being co-leaders together and him being my discipler, I don’t think that we would have like, just kind of naturally hung out. Um, but it was like, because of this relationship that created this other bond of friendship, that wouldn’t have existed otherwise…. And he made himself available as a resource … if there was any time that I really like, needed something … I felt always like, comfortable, um, contacting him and, you know, and asking him questions or picking his brain about something…. If there was anything that I needed, he was always, like, willing to extend a hand and help as much as he could. (Harry)

2. Friendship. Nearly every interviewee considered his/her mentor a friend. Much of the student’s time with the mentor was spent catching up and talking about life. Since students tended to view a mentor as a guaranteed friend, trust and intimacy developed naturally. Students felt cared for and the friendship developed when mentors offered a listening ear and provided empathy and compassion, while also
providing encouragement and exhortation. One student said that she used to be in a two-on-one mentoring relationship, but that her mentoring experience was much better when she was assigned to a one-on-one mentorship. The qualities of a good mentoring friendship are similarity, a chemistry of personalities, and enjoying time spent with each other; informal time spent doing spontaneous activities also strengthens the friendship. Three elements in the mentorship caused students to consider their mentors a significant friend in life: when the student saw a discipler’s authenticity and shortcomings; when a student did not perceive the mentor as a superior or boss; and when the student felt the presence of mutual respect.

He’s always sending invites to, like, hang out, or like, you know go- go do something with him or with, you know, a group of people…. I’d say those are kinda the key things, um, spending time and inviting me to things and really caring about how I’m doing…. A lot of times [we would do] general things … just kind of on the spur of the moment … like sporting events or you know, even like, simple things like grocery store runs. (Eric)

I just felt like really loved and really like, actually enjoyed and- and, like, I felt liked …. We just related well, like, she- she was really- really-related really well, was really compassionate, was really, like, um, just understanding, listened well, and, like, I guess just related to me on different topics … it wasn’t just like, we were always talking about, um, discipleship stuff 100% of the time, like we related on other levels, so I think that’s why I would consider her a good friend. (Melinda)
She is a good friend because … she’s genuine and authentic, um, even when it’s not always easy…. We laugh together and we have a good time like (laughs), together … we have fun together and enjoy each other…. So I think just the authenticity and the enjoyment makes her just a great (laughs), that she’s a great friend. (Stacey)

The first time that I, like, hung out with him, um, outside of a bible study context … I just went and played racquetball with him after bible study one night. And I left that, like, really pumped about, like, getting to know him from … a more natural environment…. That was like, ‘Oh this guy isn’t just somebody [that lives] a very secluded life where he just talks about Jesus all the time. Like, he actually operates in the same spaces that I do, he also plays racquetball, he also goes to dining halls, we can hang out in those places, as well. (Don)

3. Involvement. The mentor served as a guide to the student, meaningfully involved in the student’s life. Although mentors were not therapists, they did provide advice and guidance; many students reported that they viewed their mentor as an advocate and confidant, and they received help with their romantic ventures. The mentor was the first person the student went to for advice and the mentor helped the student with important decisions. It is important that the mentoring dyad can “live life together,” and that the student can experience “life-on-life” mentoring; this allowed the mentor to know (of) the student’s friends and the context of his/her personal situations. Examples of shared experiences include rooming together at conferences
and going on mission trips together. They had mutual friends and spent time together outside of formal mentoring appointments.

[My discipler] was close with a lot of my friends, and a lot of my - she just knew my life really well.... My two earlier disciplers were both great, but ... I had to do a lot of backstory and explain a lot, whereas [with my current discipler], um, it kind of just felt like she just understood pretty much every area I was coming from, um, cause I would talk about the girls I was, um, discipling or the girls I was leading in bible study, and she knew them and she could talk about them, um, I would talk about, like, challenges with girls in our action group, or friendships there, and she knew them.... So yeah, she’s just- she just fully understood a lot of the situations in my life. (Jamie)

He also helped me in, like, when I- that fall I was pursuing a woman, um, and he really helped me a lot with, um, what that looked like and, um, how to go about that, cause that was the first time I was attempting to pursue a woman in a godly manner, so I (pause) had no idea what I was doing (laughs). So he really helped a whole lot with that, um, and what that looked like. I really appreciated his input cause I- I feel like I don’t even know sometimes what I would have done without like, talking to him. (Bilbo)

[A big turning point in our relationship was] IndyCC last year, um, we roomed together with the two other freshman from my- my bible study freshman year, um, and ... we had some talks, um, just there and- and being able to stay up late and talk about things and, um, you know, just goof around,
and that was I think where we bonded more as friends and became closer just personally. (Frodo)

4. **Depth.** The psychosocial attribute of mentoring involved a sense of relational depth for the student. Because the mentor was committed to the relationship, the student carried no fear of abandonment; the student, therefore, felt free to confess sin that he/she would have been hesitant to share with peers. As the relationship progressed and the mentor and student grew closer, the student became comfortable with increasing levels of vulnerability and was able to be “broken” and “real” with the mentor—the student felt known and understood. Then, since an implicit permission was granted to the mentor to ask about personal topics, the student was more vulnerable with the mentor; their relationship was deeper than with many others of the student’s friends.

I never really *talked* to my family or my- my friends about how I *felt* on a deep level … like my *deepest* fears and my deepest, um, emotions and, like, my biggest sins were not things that I ever told anyone, um, either out of *fear* or shame or maybe both, um, but I felt like I could tell them to [my discipler] … because, like, she has that official title of my disciple … she knows a lot more about me, we have like a more intimate relationship where I talk about a lot of things with her that I would *never* talk about with other people, um, even my close friends. (Dorothea)

One of the- the first times that we met, um, uh, we- we exchanged, like, life stories with each other and, um, we were both, uh, you know, pretty open
with each other about, um, stuff we had gone through, um, and so for- for me, like, that was- that had been like the first time in a while that I had been really, really open, um, with someone…. It was different [from other friendships] because it- that exceeded … fellowship and openness that I had with other friends. (Ryan)

5. Proactive. A mentor is proactive, initiating and being intentional about becoming involved in the student’s life. The mentor “pursued” the student in order to get to know him/her, and invited the student to optional activities. Students received encouragement and sometimes were even given gifts, such as books, that were unique to the student. Mentors were authentic and made sure the student felt cared for, that they were accepted without judgment, and welcomed into the discipler’s life. Finally, because the mentor cared about the student, the mentor would take the initiative to hold the student accountable with regard to particular areas in which the student needed support.

[My discipler] cared for me really well in that way, um, he was- I mean, he was a good, a good pursuer, just invite me to different- lots of meals and uh, different events that were going on … (Don)

[My discipler will] be praying for me often, and even when it’s not during discipleship time I feel comfortable like, contacting her and like asking her for prayer or encouragement, and also just like- like got me a really thoughtful gift, like a really encouraging book that she picked out specifically
for me because she knew my struggles … she’s just really thoughtful …

(Elliot)

She’s probably the only friend that I have who regularly calls me out on my sin … at least on a weekly basis [she] is checking on my heart and seeing what’s going on and, like, making sure I’m maintaining good boundaries in my relationship with my boyfriend, and um, maintaining good, like, disciplines on my life, and then when I, like, fail in those aspects, she’s not mean, but … tells me that, like, I need to obviously repent and fix things that are broken.

(Dorothea)

The psychosocial attribute of mentoring has been long established in mentoring literature. The qualitative analysis exposed more specific meanings for this attribute and showed that it is not made up of discrete components, but rather, each theme flowed into the next with the mentor and student contributing to this attribute.

**Instrumental.** The instrumental attribute is essential to the definition of mentoring. Instrumental activities, functions, and effects come directly from the organization. The context of the organization, its purpose, and goals, determine what skills and activities will be part of the mentoring relationship. Instrumental themes are easily identified because they are tangible and intentional.

There are four themes that define the instrumental attribute and are ordered with respect to the number of identified sub-themes.

1. Spirituality (9)
2. Organization (8)
3. Practicum (8)

4. Evangelism (7)

1. **Spirituality.** A great deal of mentoring that students received focused on their personal spiritual life. The primary focus was a true understanding of the central message of Christianity, “the gospel.” Mentors helped their students in understanding what it means to lead a Christian life such as expectations for Christian character, as well as learning different spiritual devotions and how to find spiritual resources. Mentors also went through resources called “Follow-Ups” which taught students Christian theology, how to prioritize their spiritual life, and how to read and study the bible. A large portion of the instrumental part of mentoring was dedicated to helping students understand the importance of multi-generational discipleship (mentoring), where students are mentored so that they may mentor others. Mentors focused on how student’s spiritual commitment can be expressed through their commitment to and involvement with Cru. It was essential for students to understand Cru’s mission and vision, and the strategies used to enact them. These paved the way for mentors to get students excited and passionate about their involvement with Cru, and mentors coached students with regard to these areas.

[My discipler is] the one that, like, made me realize a lot more stuff’s wrong with me and just like, completely understanding the gospel. Like, I *kinda* understood it, you know, I’d just say, you know, you know, “God died for us,” and all this stuff, but then just, like, you know, sort of like *why* he had to die for us. You know, like, how do you do that? How can you explain
this to someone? And, like, I actually, like, remember that meeting, and, like, I was just sittin’ there, I was, like, how could I not see this before? Like, (pause) and so I mean, that was- that was pretty awesome. (Anakin)

[Discipler’s are] basically teaching [students] how to disciple others and make, yeah, make more Christians. (Dorothea)

He really worked hard to instill in me … [the idea] in Timothy where it says, “entrust the gospel to faithful men,” and- and we just talked about spiritual multiplication, and so ministry wise, I feel like that was one of the biggest things that he taught me … how to do spiritual multiplication … and why Cru does the things the way that we do them. (Frodo)

[Follow ups] are the foundations of what Cru believe … [that] we take people through … just to make sure we’re on the same page…. It’s just kind of setting … the foundation for a deeper discipleship kind of relationship where we can begin (pause), yeah, and in leadership for the movement. (Jamie)

[My discipler] really got me to understand … [he] really helped me achieve a solid understanding of [what] the gospel is, um, and what it means. (Ryan)

2. Organization. The mentoring relationship is established through Cru, so mentors act as a liaison for the student's increased involvement with the organization. The mentor often challenges the student to higher levels of involvement with the organization, such as taking on leadership positions, going to conferences and on summer mission trips, and pursuing a post-graduation internship. The mentor is able to
provide information about these opportunities and serve as an advocate for the student, providing references or recommendations for positions. Parts of the spirituality theme are also present—mentors got students to understand the vision of Cru and motivated them to become more involved.

[My discipler] kinda, like, pushed me over the edge with … like, where do I want to be? Do I, do I want to be the follower or do I want to be the leader? … Am I just following the- the flow, where everyone else is going? Or am I, you know, being the one that’s going, being out there and, like, just letting people know who God is? (Anakin)

[My discipler helped with] her encouragement and prayer, and ‘cause a lot of our discipleship time has been spent, like, talking about, like, future plans. I plan to intern or go on staff with Cru or Bridges also, and just, like, trying to decide if I’m staying here … or going overseas, like she has had experience in both, and, like, recent experience in both. (Elliot)

The biggest impact that [my discipler has] had on me is, um, encouraging me to go on project, um, that was probably, like, the most life-changing part … me actually going on project … [and] as a result of that … getting a vision for what it means to really do outreach on campus, and what it means to live missionally…. If I had not gotten to know [my discipler], I don’t know if I would’ve connected that well with a college ministry on campus here. (Eric)
I kind of got in this weird situation where, um, Cru kind of didn’t know I existed, I guess? [So] I didn’t get a discipler, like no one was assigned to me…. So, um, Kristen actually went to [a female staff member] I guess she just told her that she wanted to disciple me and asked if that was okay. She already had people that she was discipling but, um, she was willing to take me on I guess (laughs), and, um, so [that female staff member] agreed. (Marissa)

Through encouragement and, like, seeing how he was, um, leading the movement, he really helped me, um, like, I guess take a step up in how active I was in Cru and then, um, um, how I was contributing to the movement and starting to, uh, lead, um, within the movement and not just follow. (Ryan)

3. Practicum. The practicum theme refers to the different skills students developed through their mentorship specifically related to their involvement with Cru. Students have a significant benefit in developing skills because their mentors facilitated hands-on experience. The mentor gives the student tangible skills, such as using evangelistic tools and other Cru resources, along with less tangible skills like how to lead Bible studies, how to mentor others, and generally how to be a leader within Cru. Mentors also helped to develop personal ministry skills that were unique to the student.

When I was doing men’s ministry … a lot of times he would leave things in my hands, I think purposefully, just, you know, so I would have to make a decision and go with it … and so I think he really helped me … just
being more confident in myself, with making decisions.... I feel like he was really good at, um, coaching me in that. (Bilbo)

[My discipler] has pretty much been the one who’s taught me most everything that I know about, um, evangelism and discipleship, and how to lead a bible study … so a lot of my skill sets in Christian ministry are from [her]. (Dorothea)

[My discipler] just tries to teach me how to … communicate better with others, and, um, learn how to share the four laws and learn how to do follow-ups with new believers. Just a lot of ministry training that she knows a lot about. (Elliot)

4. Evangelism. Since Cru’s mission and many of its activities are focused around evangelism, much of a student’s mentoring involved evangelistic principles. Mentors taught students the importance of evangelism and how to explain the gospel of Christianity clearly to others. Often in a hands-on environment, the student learns from the mentor many skills related to evangelism, including how to start evangelistic conversations and how to reach out to a particular part of campus. Students attributed their mentors with teaching them to be comfortable initiating and holding such conversations.

I think that was really important to me, was- was just that kinda stepping out of my shell sort-of-thing that happened … so, like, being comfortable talking about my faith, that was something that never happened before, I have never been comfortable talking about it.... I think the biggest [way he has helped me] is just, like, learning
that, like, talking about spiritual things is not, like, necessarily weird or whatnot, um, so I- I think for me it was just like, um, … teaching me how to- how to interact with people and how to bring up topics and, um, how to talk, like, in a bold manner, you know, to, like, people and, but also, like, loving in a way that I talk about things and talk about my beliefs and faith … so I- I’d say, like, that’s the biggest thing [my discipler] has helped me with, is just practical ministry and what it looks like on campus. (Eric)

With [my discipler] I originally went sharing with him, so I mean [he taught] me how to articulate the gospel, um, to others in a- in a way that, uh, they can understand…. He definitely tried to teach me how to sh- talk about Jesus with people. (Don)

[We talked] about ministry, like how we- how we can continue to reach out to the Quidditch Team, how can we, um, reach people in the Quidditch Team, and then a lot of times … going out and actually doing those things, um, either … doing, like, initiative evangelism, or going out and, you know … grabbing lunch with a guy from Quidditch and stuff like that…. [He] definitely actively taught me, um, initiative evangelism and going out and sharing my faith. (Harry)

When students were mentored within Cru, they received instrumental mentoring in four areas. Cru is a religious organization, so mentors were invested in students’ spiritual identity. Mentors are either student leaders or work full-time for Cru and provide a relational connection to the organization. Where the spiritual mentoring was focused on the student’s inner spiritual life, practicum mentoring provides skills
that are more outward focused. Finally, because the organization is dedicated to outreach, students learn to communicate the message of Christianity effectively. The instrumental attribute provides the basis of the relationship, but does not define it.

**Hierarchy.** Hierarchy is what differentiates the mentorship from a purely peer-to-peer relationship. The definition that emerged from the data explains that mentoring relationships clearly portray one participant as the more mature teacher and leader. The other participant admires and imitates the teacher-figure, holding them as a favored and personal role-model. However, hierarchy creates a power differential that is managed by a shared identity and common goals. The power differences in the relationship have strong interpersonal implications because of the contradiction between the mentor as both an authority figure and an equal partner.

There were five common themes that emerged in the hierarchy node. Themes are ordered by the frequency of the sub-themes identified during analysis.

1. Authority (18 sub-themes)
2. Advancement (13 sub-themes)
3. Admiration (12 sub-themes)
4. Interpersonal (12 sub-themes)
5. Imitation (9 sub-themes)

**1. Authority.** The strongest theme was the mentor’s position as a teacher and authority figure in the relationship. Mentees recognized the mentor as being more mature in general, but especially in his or her spiritual lives. Mentors (disciplers) tend to have more life experience and offer better insight and different perspectives to the
student. Mentors are recognized as being able to help the student more than the student’s peers. Mentors are a resource—they have more knowledge than the student and the student’s peers, leading to the student’s recognition that he/she actually needs the mentor’s help. Additionally, the student grants the mentor authority in the relationship. The mentor challenges the student, and the student values the mentor’s advice. However, students noted that the relationship is not one that is completely comprised of authority and the student does not see the mentor as an authority figure.

"[Our relationship is] definitely different from friendships with younger (pause) younger friends, and I think that’s a lot because of … the authority that she does have in my life, or the way she speaks with authority in my life, or it, I don’t really think, I don’t see friends of my age doing that. (Heidi)"

"There’s a clear distinction [from friendship]… There was sense of like, leadership authority… [he was] in some sense above me, just a little bit … and I was able to look up to him as a resource, um, yeah, so I think that’s the biggest difference. [emphasis in the original] (Harry)"

2. Advancement. Strong support was also given for the mentor’s position as an older, more advanced figure in the student’s life. Nearly all mentors were older than the student. Female interviewees described their mentors as an older sister, even in the case where the student was actually older than her mentor. Students reported that they saw themselves as younger than their mentor, in more ways than one. Mentors may be married, have children, and if they have not graduated from college, were at least at a higher class ranking. The difference in advancement or age significantly affects the
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relationship. Closer proximity yields a more spontaneous and more meaningful relationship. Further proximity between the mentor and student yields a more structured relationship. If the mentor was at the same age, level, or maturity as the student, the students found it hard to admire and respect their mentor. One student described a mentorship that was severely strained because of the lack of the mentor’s advancement over the student.

If I were to give her like um … like a relative name, I think that she would be like a [sic]… older sister, even though I’m pretty sure that I’m older than her [sic] (laughs), but um … I would- I would probably look at her as an older sister. (Marissa)

I definitely look up to Heidi, I, um, … see her as- as um … like I said, like an older sister, as a wiser, more insightful, more experienced person, and so, um … there is like this respect, there’s admiration, for, um, what she’s gone through and how she’s walked through it and, … um, … knowing that she’s just walked with the Lord for longer, for a longer number of years makes me admire her and look up to her. (Stacey)

3. Admiration. Students admired nearly everything about their mentor. They reported admiring the mentor’s relationship with God, but also their other relationships, like those with spouses, children, friends, even with the student's peers. Students admired their mentor’s character, interpersonal skills, ethics, including work ethic, and personality. Additionally, the mentor’s hobbies, skills, fashion sense, and even eating habits were sources of admiration. To the student, their mentor was an
infallible role-model, or even an idol. However, students recognized the dangers of idealization and attempted to view their mentors as normal people who make mistakes.

I look up to her … as a missionary … She’s just passionate about the gospel, like I’ve said, and I love how she orients her whole life around it, and I think I see that so clearly in her life. Um, I look up to her as a leader … she stretches herself outside of her natural personality in order to lead, and I respect that in a lot of ways. Um, I look up to her as a friend, I think she’s such a servant in friendship, um, very generous with her time, and … she loves giving gifts, so, yeah, I respect her as a friend, and servant. Um, I respect her, or look up to her, in the way that she, uh, reaches out to others … And I look up to her for her commitment to Cru, even through struggles with them … I look up to her for her commitment to them despite that, and her commitment to the mission and ministry, rather than the organization. (Jamie)

4. Interpersonal Effects. Students described the effects of hierarchy on the interpersonal dynamics of the mentorship. Only two sub-themes stood alone and did not overlap with other sub-themes; the other ten sub-themes appeared in conjunction with authority and advancement. The two primary sub-themes were the perception that the mentor is a “co-laborer” (i.e., equal partner) and that the mentor does not act like he/she is better or above the student. Overlapping sub-themes included the difficulties with a lack of advancement, more spontaneity with closer proximity, and that the mentor was not seen as an authority figure, nor was the relationship purely one of authority. Additionally, there was clarity in the relationship that the mentor is the
teacher, and the student is the learner. Indeed, even the relationship’s title as a “discipleship” created hierarchy which differentiated it from friendship. The contradiction between being an authority figure, while at the same time attempting to neutralize authority, was evident in many interviews.

I guess I would think of Glinda as, um, … obviously my discipler, but more so a really close friend, um, … I see her not- I don’t really see her as an authority figure, but more as like a … I’m gonna use like a really churchy word, like a co-laborer … someone who’s just like … walking through this messy, broken world alongside of me, rooting for me … I don’t see her as an authority figure necesar- [sic] I mean I do see her- I dunno, I see her as someone who has authority, but I don’t necessarily view her as someone that’s like above me … there’s a mutual feeling in our relationship that we’re both, … um, equal, yeah equal partners in something, rather than like, a boss-employee type relationship. (Dorothea)

I think that another thing too is, like, just like the age difference, like we’re like, we are literally the same age … and so … that … I think that, I feel like that makes it harder … when you … disciple someone on the, on the same level … kind of like … it gets a little bit difficult … I honestly see like a lot of … kinda like, immaturity … with him. (Anthony)

5. Imitation. In imitation, the mentee becomes like the mentor. Within hierarchy, students have a desire to become like their mentor (discipler). Students reported picking up their mentors’ mannerisms, vernacular, personal habits (e.g.,
eating habits, spiritual habits), taste in music, and sense of humor. The student recognizes ways in which he/she leads and speaks like the mentor. The mentor’s desires and passions become the student’s desires and passions. Others, especially the student’s peers, point out that the student sounds like his/her mentor.

I was talking with … one of my friends … and I just like, said a couple sentences, and it … sounded exactly like Hyde, um, and hah, my friend was like, “Wait, that sounds exactly like Hyde,” hah, and we kind of just like, chuckled for a minute … I think in that sense, like using the same language, using, you know, talking about things in a similar manner, um, having a similar mindset is one of the ways I’ve really kind of become like him in that—in that sense. Um, and then the other thing would be his being bolder and more, um, courageous in the sense of talking with people and spending time getting to know others, being intentional with that is another thing that I’ve picked up, um, and how to do that well. (Eric)

In summary, hierarchy was revealed as an important dimension for mentoring relationships. The mentor has a clear role as the teacher and the student, who admires and seeks to emulate the wiser, more mature mentor.

**Development.** The development attribute of mentoring emerges in contrast with the instrumental attribute. Instrumental functions are a manifestation of the mentorship’s context, whereas developmental functions for the student are more general and applicable beyond the current context. There were four themes that
emerged in the development node. These themes are ordered with respect to frequency of the sub-themes identified during analysis.

1. Personal (20)
2. Spiritual (18)
3. Relationship with Mentor (9)
4. Practical Skills (6)

1. **Personal.** Students were clear and elaborate about the personal development gained from their mentoring. Their mentors helped them to grow in a number of ways that were personal and unique to the student. Students grew in character and maturity, were helped in dealing with issues in their past, and learned to see new perspectives on situations. Additionally, students were grateful for the way their mentors challenged them to grow in particular areas, such as increasing their commitment to goals and to following through on tasks. Mentors helped students to understand themselves better, including gaining better awareness of their motivations, gifts, and skills, while also teaching them to better articulate their thoughts and feelings. Romantic relationships and other interpersonal skills, such as conflict management and learning vulnerability, were also areas in which mentors helped their students.

   [I learned from him] you know, just not judging [people] as much as I, you know, would judge them … instead of hurting them, you know, helping them … I’ll say his impact on me, like, is like, huge, you know? … Him just coming along and almost like helping me and like pushing me, you know, where I need to be pushed…. He kinda like pushed me over the edge with …
do I want to be the follower or do I want to be the leader? … We talked about … you know, what am I gonna do after college? Like, am I just gonna get a job, um, and then just be the Christian guy at your job? You know, and not really share your faith with anyone?” (Anakin)

I never really talked to my family or my friends about how I felt on a deep level … my deepest fears and my deepest, um, emotions and like my biggest sins were not things that I ever told anyone … but I felt I could like tell them to Glinda…. Yeah, I feel like, um, that was … one of the first times that I ever started really, um, learning how to tell people exactly what I felt about things … it was like a turning point in being honest with myself and with other people. (Dorothea)

She was very affirming and would point out my gifts or areas where, um, I was being really effective in leadership. Uh, but she was also good at pointing out areas to grow in and challenging me in those. Um, I think … she’s helped me become a better friend to people. (Jamie)

**2. Spiritual.** Spiritual development is a product of the personal and individualized aspects with the spiritual context of the mentorship. Some sub-themes are tied to the instrumental attribute. These include the students’ growth in the reasoning and motivation for evangelism and discipleship, and how their involvement with Cru affects their long-term spiritual life. As a result of involvement with Cru, students gained a significantly deeper understanding of the message of Christianity, the gospel, and the character of God. Additionally, students grew in their
understanding of theology and the purpose of discipleship. Spiritual development also contributed to areas of growth that were both abstract and more significant to students. With the help of their mentors, students grew in their ability to identify sin and areas of needed growth in their lives. They were taught how to handle sins, repent, and to make progress in these areas, most notably in the area of “sexual purity.” Finally, as a result of growth in these areas, students also grew by prioritizing and independently leading their own spiritual lives. Their faith and trust increased as they learned to place their identity in Christ and apply the gospel to their own lives. Their mentors also helped them realize that the goal is to become like Christ, not like the mentor, and bestowed an increased desire for spiritual growth.

He’s helped me a lot just to- to progress in my walk with Christ, um, which I mean obviously has a huge effect on- on who I am…. Like I wouldn’t have been able to talk to my family … about the gospel…. I can step out more in my faith … better than I could’ve a year ago. Um, and so I guess I would just like, to sum that up, I- I think I’m more spiritually mature, um, that I wa-[sic] that I was because of- of Aragorn’s like, input into my life … (Bilbo)

He always told me when I’d hang out with him, he’d say like, “Don, I’m not making, I’m not making mini Rogers, I’m making mini Jesus’, don’t be like me, be like Jesus. (Don)

We started praying once a week in the morning with a few other girls, um, she had like, invited us to commit to doing that for the year…. It wasn’t strictly a Cru like, outreach or anything…. So, yeah, I feel like that kind of
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turned our relationship even more where it became less of a Cru discipleship and more (pause) I guess it, or it just broadened because it wasn’t solely about my involvement in Cru. I could tell it was just her, um, building me up in my spiritual walk in all areas. (Jamie)

3. Relationship with Mentor. Students reported that the strength of their relationship with their mentor had a positive impact upon the development attribute, indeed the relationship was essential for their growth. The mentor identified the student’s growth and shared this progress with him/her. A good relationship fostered other areas of development, especially within the personal and spiritual aspects of development. Examples included learning vulnerability, gaining new perspectives, discovering areas of growth, and contemplating where God may be leading the student in life.

I remember Hagrid, um, just like pointing out to me and affirming in me like, ways that he had seen me grow, and ways that he had seen even this, like really hard instance working, um … and so that for me was- was huge, it was just like, um … kind of a- like a strength giving, I guess, refreshing…. I felt like that was a moment where I just felt like … that discipleship relationship was like, really key. (Harry)

I think that … without her in my life, it would have been a lot easier for me to hide some of the things that I (pause) am not so proud of, to not deal with some of the hurt that I had coming back up, or um, not even being able to
express some of the things that I hadn’t been able to express before, so I think that I wouldn’t- I would see myself as being just in a harder place. (Stacey)

4. **Practical Skills.** Mentors also help students develop practical life skills. These skills may be manifested through involvement with Cru, but benefited the student in many other areas of his/her current and future life. In their mentorship, students gained interpersonal and teamwork skills. Mentors helped them to identify their unique gifts and abilities and to capitalize on them. Student leaders learned leadership skills, such as personal confidence and decision making. Others were taught to take pleasure in serving others and doing behind the scene tasks. Mentors also taught students skills in managing their personal finances.

[I picked up] a general outgoingness, and like, excitement and joy, um, in like, the mundane … hah, does that make sense? Like, being excited about doing, you know, things that people might not label as big things … doing sort of those behind the scenes things that a lot of people think are boring, um, are really important and vital … and really set the tone for ministry. (Eric)

[He was] wanting to teach me something that like, for my personal growth, um, one of them was, uh, finances, actually, he kind of let me into his budget and his schedule with him and his wife, and so it was like this is how you can organize these sorts of things. Um, he also [liked] connecting me to resources that I could go through myself. (Perry)

Mentors worked towards the student’s personal and spiritual development and also provided them with practical life skills. These three areas extend beyond the
context of the student’s involvement with Cru and provide more long-term benefits. A strong interpersonal relationship with the mentor fueled the student’s development.

**Mutuality**. Mutuality refers to the extent to which the mentee reciprocates to the mentor certain psychosocial functions. Mutuality is critical for the mentee to feel valued and trusted. It is voluntary and yet undeniably important to the relationship. Mentees are consciously aware of the presence of mutuality or lack thereof. Mutuality serves functional purposes to propel the depth of the relationship, and also provides emotional benefits to the mentor.

Four themes materialized from the data coded for mutuality. Themes are ordered in respect to the frequency of the sub-themes identified during analysis.

1. **Perception** (25 sub-themes)
2. **Function** (20 sub-themes)
3. **Reception** (14 sub-themes)
4. **Interpersonal Dimensions** (12 sub-themes)

**1. Perception.** The strongest sub-theme in the data was the student’s perception of mutuality in the relationship. Perception of mutuality included the student’s need and desire for the presence of mutuality, as well as its effects on the student. The mentee wanted the relationship to be important to the mentor, and wished to see an increased level of vulnerability from the mentor. The mentor’s vulnerability enabled the mentee to understand the mentor. Mutuality made the mentee feel less objectified, showing the mentee that he/she was not simply the mentor’s project or duty. In the mentorship, the mentee recognized that the mentor’s vulnerability was optional. Thus,
when the mentor allowed for mutuality, the mentee felt trusted, valued, and more like an equal partner and peer. Mutuality was important to the mentee because it demonstrated that the mentor was being “real” with him/her, which, although it humanized and negated improper idolization of the mentor, also promoted a different sense of admiration for the mentor. Mutuality fueled the significance of the relationship for the mentee, and also made it easier for the mentee to be vulnerable with the mentor. Mutuality was such an important aspect to the relationship that the mentee compared levels in his/her own relationship to other’s mentoring relationships. Furthermore, when the mentee perceived guardedness and a lack of vulnerability from the mentor, the relationship suffered greatly.

[Mutuality] keeps you from putting [a mentor] on a pedestal … they’re just like a person that needs Jesus, too. … [Mutuality] keeps things on a level, on like a level plain. … I feel like I’m more willing to do things for people that … see me as an equal, or … even if not an equal, as like (laughs) someone who’s valuable. … Another reason that I think that … discipleship relationships should include [mutuality] is that … there’s a certain level of friendship that you can’t reach unless someone (pause) trusts you enough and … sees you as someone worthy of discussing hard things with … the things that hurt and the things that are painful and difficult. … It’s just easier to serve alongside someone that you feel like, loves you and values you deeply enough to tell you those things. [emphasis in the original] (Dorothea)
There was definitely some, um, opportunity [for mutuality]. I mean I went to his house … every, um, once in a while [and] see his life, and he would talk about what was going on … in his life, but it was usually more brief, you know, it wasn’t like, drawn out or anything. … I wish there was a little bit more, um, just because I would like to know a little bit more about what was going on in his life, um, I don’t feel like I really saw enough of that. (Thorin)

2. **Function.** The attribute of mutuality served functional and intentional purposes in the relationship. The mentor invited the student into his/her life and allowed the mentee to have a more accurate view of the Christian life. Mentee’s commented that mutuality broke down barriers to and was essential for his/her growth and development. The mentor led the mentee, demonstrating vulnerability first in order to make it easier for the mentee to be vulnerable. This vulnerability allowed the mentee to learn from the mentor’s mistakes. When mutuality was present, it prevents the mentor from playing the role of a therapist. Mutuality also negated the idea that the mentor was “better” than the mentee. Although mentees recognized the presence of mutuality, they also commented that the extent of mutuality is limited. Mentees stated they received more out of the relationship than the mentor, i.e. the relationship was unbalanced and reciprocity towards the mentor was limited. Mentees stated that boundaries on mutuality are important—it would be inappropriate for the mentor to be as vulnerable with the mentee as he/she was with the mentor.
At the beginning (of our discipleship relationship) we started with sharing our own testimonies … So just her openness with letting me into her life, getting to know her experiences, and just starting the relationship so open (created) a deeper relationship quickly. (Elliot)

I just think that a discipler should lead by example, and I think living a Christ-like like means confessing sin … So as much as the person who’s being discipled can see that … the more a discipler can lead… (Don)

(Our discipleship) was more aimed towards me, towards helping me. (Bilbo)

It (the mentorship) can be a two-way street, but only if the street going back is only a bike path (laughs). … it’s like a filter effect. (Marissa)

3. Reception. In mutuality, the mentee provided psychosocial support to the mentor, and the mentor permitted him/herself to receive it. Reception refers to the way in which the mentor is affected by a mutual relationship. Some interviewees shared their own experiences mentoring others, notably that receiving support from their mentees is a humbling experience. Additionally, students believed their mentors were comforted with the knowledge that they are able to rely on their mentees for support. Mentees explained that their mentors created opportunities for them to provide support, such as asking for prayer. At other times, however, the mentor was not explicit about asking for support, but rather implied a need or desire for help through conversation and vulnerability with the mentee. For the mentor, the mentee can be a valued confidant on whom they can rely and with whom they can confess sins. At
times, mentors asked their mentees for advice and opinions and acted according to their input. Mutuality can also mean that the mentor learned from the mentee. Finally, if the relationship is valuable to the mentor, this can be shared with the mentee, which promoted increased mutuality in the relationship.

She was just really drained … and so I think that was when she kind of admitted that to me and we started talking more about it … She was kind of inviting me to be a friend … and making it a little more mutual … inviting me to ask how she was doing instead of being passive in our like, discipleship relationship … I don’t think it was explicit, I think it was more just her sharing her needs and then me wanting to kind of help fill that, so (pause) I guess less than explicitly asking me to do that, she kind of … opened the door or like, made it known that she did want someone to do that for her. (Jamie)

I think a lot of times he runs ideas by me … like asking for input on things … even like advice on like a decision like, “Hey, I’m thinking of doing this, is that what you would say would be a wise decision based on what you know of me?” (Eric)

Just out of necessity he needed somebody to be there for him, and since we had grown so close through discipleship, we were just naturally close, so I was one of the people that he contacted … He opened up to me … in him just sort of like, telling me what he needed prayer for … he sort of like allowed that … and I think in a lot of ways, he could have very easily kept the relationships
… going one way … but instead he didn’t, he opened up and he allowed me to be there. (Harry)

4. Interpersonal Dimensions. Relationships that demonstrate mutuality are markedly different from those that do not. If the mentor and the mentee are relatively close in age, there is more mutuality present in the relationship, whereas increased proximity in age decreases the amount of mutuality. Time was also a factor in determining levels of mutuality—levels of mutuality increased the longer the relationship has existed. Additionally, when the mentor and mentee shared supplementary experiences, such as mission trips, the relationship grew deeper and levels of mutuality increased. As reported earlier, the lack of a mentor’s vulnerability was a significant detriment to the mentorship, and the level of the mentee’s vulnerability followed the mentor’s. Differing levels of hierarchy and power were neutralized by mutuality, allowing the mentorship to become encouraging and edifying to both parties. When the mentor was open and honest with the mentee and allowed the mentee to reciprocate psychosocial support, the mentee felt as though the relationship was bidirectional and a truly genuine relationship.

With Roger, it was so life on like that, uh, I would easily call him my best friend … And then for Sal, uh, like, now it’s pretty different, I mean … he’s like forty-five years old … and I see him just once a week at discipleship time, um, so that looks a lot different … I’m not eating meals with him, um, I’m not, um, really interfacing with him at all, except that two hour time slot…
There is a culture of openness and vulnerability, um, but … the gospel (is)
really worked out in my life in other relationships … more so than just with
my discipler right now. (Don)

It’s important to go both ways because one person won’t have … like a
power over another person. You know, that’s why I kinda feel with (my
discipler now) … he knows a lot about me, but I don’t know a lot about him …
You just need to be like, equally … on the same page … and if you’re not on
the same page, you know, it becomes difficult … like people not wanting to
meet up with you, you know, you kinda give this like presence of, um, you’re
better than them. (Anakin)

In review, mutuality is important to foster the student’s vulnerability, as well
as increase the significance of the relationship to the student. Although optional, the
intimacy and overall effectiveness suffers greatly when there is noticeable lack of
mutuality. Additionally, both parties can benefit; the mentor receives psychosocial
support and the mentee readily reciprocates.

**Conclusion.** The research question addressed here was, “How do mentees
describe their mentoring relationship with respect to the five mentoring attributes?
Throughout the interviews, students (mentees) described each of the five attributes in
their mentoring relationships. I was able to identify multiple subthemes for each
attribute that illustrated how a specific attribute can be manifested in a mentoring
relationship. I found five themes for psychosocial support. Although emerging from
formality, the relationship usually developed into a friendship. The mentor, who was
proactive in the friendship and who had become a friend, was intimately involved in the student’s life, reaching a unique level of interpersonal depth. The mentoring relationship emerged from an instrumental capacity. For this sample group, the instrumental themes emerged from the nature and mission of this Christian organization, Cru. Students were mentored in spirituality and evangelism, and they were encouraged to become more involved and committed to the organization. A continual practicum of instrumental skills was present throughout the mentorship.

Students described experiencing hierarchy in the relationship. The students admired and imitated the mentor, who was more mature or advanced than them. There were unique interpersonal implications for the presence and absence of hierarchy in the relationship. Students also described how personal development was a goal of the mentoring relationship. The development attribute was distinct from the instrumental attribute—development was focused on the long-term growth and well-being of the student and was less dependent upon the student’s relationship with the organization. Students received interpersonal development, spiritual development, and practical life-skills. The extent of development in the relationship often depended on the strength and character of the relationship with the mentor.

The mentoring relationship was not one-sided; rather, the mentee sometimes had the opportunity to return psychosocial support to the mentor—this is the mutuality attribute. Students were attuned to how much mutuality (they perceived) in the relationship. Mutuality has strong functional and interpersonal implications, and the student evaluated how the mentor received the psychosocial support that s/he offered.
These fourteen semi-structured interviews demonstrated that student’s descriptions of their mentoring relationships aligned strongly with the five attributes.

Next, I will use my findings from the quantitative and qualitative analyses to draw conclusions about Cru discipleship and the implications for mentoring as a concept and practice.
Chapter 5

Conclusions

Mentors change lives, but not all mentorships are created equal. These relationships are more complex than with our parents, friends, and teachers – they are an organic, evolving amalgamation of all three. Hence, many factors are involved in how a mentoring relationship is constructed and maintained between two individuals.

In this endeavor, I have attempted to identify the main elements that constitute a mentoring relationship. Psychosocial and instrumental support have long been the two elements thought to define mentoring. In my personal experience with mentoring, I felt that psychosocial and instrumental support alone were insufficient to define these unique relationships. Building upon my experience, I combed through literature from multiple disciplines and found support for three more elements: hierarchy, mutuality, and development. From reviewing the literature, I was able to construct the prototype of a questionnaire that would measure mentoring relationships according to five attributes, instead of two. I did not want to rely only on an untested instrument to explore these additional attributes, so I also gathered qualitative data in the form of semi-structured interviews. These interviews turned out to be essential, for I was not able to gain as many participants for the quantitative instrument as I had planned.

After completing the analyses, I realized how immensely beneficial it was to have both types of data. From the quantitative data, I learned that regardless of the presence of hierarchy, mutuality, and instrumental attributes, the presence of psychosocial support and developmental activities will determine the outcome of the
relationship (according to the student). The data do not say instrumental, hierarchy, and mutuality are not important or essential factors for mentoring, only that development and psychosocial support are the predictors (of 55% of the variance) of how students feel about the relationship, and how satisfied they are with it. In fact, all five attributes were present in the mentorships to a high degree (see Table 4 for mean values of each attribute).

Without psychosocial support, there is no real connection between the mentor and the student. With the psychosocial attribute, there is friendship and love. When the developmental attribute is present, the student feels as though the mentor really cares about him/her as a person and is invested in their long-term success. If the relationship only consisted of the instrumental, hierarchical, and mutuality attributes, there would be no true mentoring.

However, I do not believe the reverse is true, that mentoring only consists of the psychosocial and developmental attributes. First, instrumental support has long been a defining tenet of mentoring, yet was not found to be a predictor for the outcome of the mentorships I measured. Additionally, I believe hierarchy remains an important factor because developmental activities depend on a hierarchical relationship. An individual who provides the developmental activities has been called a “life coach” by some authors (Collins, 2009), indicating hierarchy in the relationship. Mutuality had the second lowest reliability score ($\alpha=.84$) and the lowest mean of all the measures (3.8/5). It also had the fewest number of items used to measure its presence (5). The measure is new, yet all of the items were adapted from other, more established
instruments. Future research should be conducted to explore this measure, and the concept at large. Such research would compare mutuality with psychosocial support, utilize focus groups to create and refine the items, and gather qualitative data which would better inform the items and instrument.

Overall, I am pleased with the results of my instrument in light of its prototypical nature, with both new items and new concepts. The data gathered from this instrument showed how vital it is, when creating and engaging with a mentorship, to have a personal relationship with long-term developmental activities. The data also demonstrated mutuality is the least present of all the attributes.

If I had relied only upon quantitative data for this research, I would have missed a huge part of understanding these incredibly complex and unparalleled relationships. The testimonies about mentoring relationships not only helped me make sense of the quantitative data, but also filled in many of the gaps the quantitative data could not. The qualitative data showed an inverse relationship between mutuality and hierarchy. When there is less hierarchy in the relationship, the dyad is able to share more life experiences and the two are more relatable to each other, but the dyad is more prone to a loss of respect for each other. With greater hierarchy, there comes more respect and admiration for the mentor, but the mentor’s life is more private and s/he has different obligations (e.g. family, career, etc.) that are not as easy to relate to by the student. A mentor who is more advanced than the student may make the student feel relatively more psychosocial distance from the mentor. Additionally, because the mentor is at a higher level than the student, the mentor may feel as if the student is less
entitled to private information than the mentor’s peers. This inverse relationship between hierarchy and mutuality may explain the lower mean for mutuality in the quantitative data. Future research should be conducted on how to test for this inverse relationship and to explore its nuances.

There are unique relationships between attributes within the context of Cru discipleship. I found that there is not a clearly separation between the instrumental and developmental attributes. Cru prioritizes a student’s time at university as well as their lifelong Christian walk. Hence, many of the skills students are taught from an instrumental standpoint are expected to be used after they graduate. This is interesting because the quantitative data showed that the developmental attribute is much more predictive for the outcome of the relationship than the instrumental attribute. Perhaps good mentors are clear in communicating between how skills are used in the current context, and how they will be used throughout the student’s life. Conceivably, the mentor even creates a sense of self-efficacy for the student as to how s/he can make an eternal impact throughout his/her life using the instrumental information.

The qualitative data informed me that the mentoring relationship is incredibly complex; the attributes within mentoring are interconnected and co-dependent. Alter one attribute of the relationship, and the others will be affected, albeit to different degrees. The relationship is initiated for instrumental purposes, yielding psychosocial support, yet flows into the developmental attribute. The relationship depends upon the psychosocial attribute, but is created in a necessarily hierarchical context. Hierarchy is held in tension with mutuality. Hierarchy benefits development and enables
instrumental functions; however, the psychosocial function is made stronger with more mutuality, which may also contribute to the development of the student. The presence of mutuality strengthens the relationship for both parties, but too much mutuality weakens hierarchy, negatively affecting the other attributes. Alter one function, and the whole mentorship is altered. The functions are not static from initiation to cessation of the mentorship; rather, they are constantly affected with each interaction (or lack thereof). Mentorship is an organism that demonstrates birth, growth, adolescence, sickness, maturity, and ends with graduation or death. Future research would do well to investigate the interrelationships of the attributes, as well as how mentorships begin, grow, and cease.

Limitations

No research is free from limitations. There are several limitations to this study with respect to the data collection, the sample, applicability, and the researcher. On the phenomenon of confirmation bias, McRaney says, “Your opinions are the result of years of paying attention to information that confirmed what you believed, while ignoring information that challenged your preconceived notions,” (McRaney, 2011, p. 27). I have spent years being mentored and mentoring others. I have loved the relationships created in my mentoring experiences, become great friends with my mentors, and have been affirmed in my skill for mentoring others. I began this undertaking passionate about the subject and convinced of its efficacy. Additionally, I was heavily invested in the organization I chose to study; I was by no means an objective observer, but rather a full participant and ethnographer. I was searching for
areas of improvement and ways to improve Cru’s mentoring program. I undoubtedly had presuppositions about where to look and what I would find.

In collecting my data, I was disappointed that I was unable to gain the participation of at least two major Cru movements in the Great Lakes region. These large movements have a great reputation, are active, have strong staff teams, and are well established. It is unclear if and how the results would have been affected if these movements had participated.

There are also cultural limitations in the data. The sample was limited to the midwest region of the country; different parts of the country may exhibit different nuances in mentoring due to unique ways of relating. Additionally, different ethnicities were not controlled for, which most certainly affect relational styles.

Finally, there are limitations on how the results can be applied. Movements are often limited by the number of staff members on campus. It is not uncommon for staff to leave after one or two years because they are interning or transfer to a different movement, limiting the longevity of transient staff’s mentoring relationships. Similarly, many students are mentored by older students, not staff members, and the mentoring relationships ends when the mentor graduates. There is also a wider variety of mentoring styles enacted by students compared to staff—Cru staff undergo significant training upon hire, which likely affects their mentoring style and content; student mentors do not have such extensive training and are limited in their time and focus because of their academic studies.
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Focus Group Results

I had three men take the survey and give me feedback. One of them had to leave about ten minutes after we had started discussing the questions. The two others had the same person in mind, but felt very differently about the relationship. One felt that he had a great relationship with this person; the other felt that he didn’t have a good relationship with this person at all. I actually did not invite the second person to be a part of the focus group because he had mentioned earlier that he did not have a very good relationship with this discipler. However, he was at the library when I met with the other volunteers, and I realized he could offer some valuable insight and feedback for that very reason.

When this person finished the questionnaire he said, “I might not have been completely honest on all of [the questions].” He said that he tried to stay mostly positive while taking the questionnaire. He agreed that it would be helpful to have a statement at the beginning of the questionnaire telling participants that it is important to be completely honest, even if their responses indicate shortcomings in the relationship or the mentor.

Suggested Revisions:

- Item No. 5: Rank top five activities that have had the most influence upon your Christian life:
  - May have been better to just ask them to indicate their top five, instead of ranking them
“personal prayer life”/“personal time with God”,
“ministering,’ and “evangelism”

- Item No. 18: My discipler helps me re-examine my critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate
  - Volunteer said they did not know what to put on there. He thought it was talking about if you had the right the discipler because “they” seems to refer to the discipler, not the critical assumptions.

- Item No. 27: I try to model my behavior after my discipler.
  - Volunteer said
    - I try to model my behavior after Jesus, not my discipler.
    - However, I do act like them and pick up certain qualities [from them]
    - I don’t try to be like [my discipler]
    - Modeling means “actively trying”
    - I never try to, I just see myself doing it
  - Maybe ask:
    - Do you find yourself imitating your discipler?
    - Do you see similarities between your discipler and yourself?
• Item No. 53: Cru Discipleship allows me access to disciplers who otherwise would have been unattainable. (and No. 55: Cru discipleship smoothed the way for me to get a discipler)
  o It’s confusing because it’s hard to differentiate between Cru discipleship and discipler.
  o Maybe replace discipler with spiritual mentor
  o Maybe change Cru discipleship to simply Cru

• Item No. 62: Within Cru, my discipler is…
  o The question is vague. Volunteers asked to which area of their life the does the question refers.
  o Could be organization, social standing, age, spiritually

• Suggestions for questions to add:
  o I feel comfortable telling my discipler about my personal problems
  o My discipler helps me to feel comfortable about sharing my problems
    • Or: My discipler makes it easy for me to open up (or be vulnerable)
  o I respect my discipler as a person
  o I trust my discipler’s advice

• It was also suggested to break up the questions into smaller groups.
## Appendix C

### Mind Garden Permission

**Invoice**

855 Oak Grove Ave., Ste. 215  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>INVOICE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2012</td>
<td>25998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BILL TO**

Hiram Foster - Ohio University  
43 West Union Street  
Athens, OH 45701

**SHIP TO**

Hiram Foster  
hf342508@ohio.edu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.O. NUMBER</th>
<th>TERMS</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>SHIP</th>
<th>VIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit Card</td>
<td>10/30/2012</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>10/30/2012</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>PRICE EACH</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ-B-1-PDF</td>
<td>MLQ Reproduction License (PDF) - 1000 licenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provided at a 50% discount per Robb Moor's June 18, 2012 email communication with Anita James (for Hiram Foster). Note: Non-discounted price = $65 each. CA Sales tax 8.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay your bills online at: <a href="https://www.intuitbillpay.com/mindgarden">https://www.intuitbillpay.com/mindgarden</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customer Phone  
740-593-4168

Customer E-mail  
hf342508@ohio.edu

**Total USD**  
$325.00

Thank you for your business.

**Payments/Credits**  
$-325.00

**Balance Due**  
$0.00

---

Ph (650) 322-6300  Fax (650) 322-6398  info@mindgarden.com  www.mindgarden.com  
Make check payable to Mind Garden, Inc. We accept Visa, MC, AmEx, & Discover.  
Vendor Federal ID# 77 0380 245. Please put your invoice number on your check.
Mr. Most,

Thank you for your prompt reply. You are correct, I meant the MLQ-5X Short. The research is intended to be self-perception and not a full self/other measurement of leadership. I appreciate the offer of a 50% reduction in the cost of the licenses for Hiram’s research; I will check with him, but I think we can make this work. Again, thank you for your response.

Cordially,

Anita

From: Robert Most [mailto:bobmost@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 12:57 PM
To: James, Anita
Cc: Mind Garden, Inc. #menlo
Subject: Re: Request to use part of MLQ-5 in undergraduate honor thesis research

Dear Anita,
Thank you for your interest in the MLQ.
First of all, the MLQ-S is not a valid form of the MLQ and should not be used.
The appropriate form is the MLQ-5X Short which we provide on the Mind Garden website.

1,000 reproductions is a pretty large study. Is this self-only and hence perception of leadership and not actually a measure of leadership or is this measuring leadership (e.g. Self form plus nine raters would be 10, hence measuring 100 people)?

I don't know what you mean by inexpensive. You are correct that 1,000 reproductions would be $650. The best we can do for unfunded research at the request of the author is a 50% discount. You would need to order via faxing an order form since you can't apply a discount to the shopping cart and you would need to include "as per Robb Most" on your order form.

I hope this is helpful
Robb Most
Mind Garden

On 6/18/12 9:08 AM, “James, Anita” <james@ohio.edu> wrote:

Mr. Most,

Dr. Avolio referred our request to you. As noted in the original message, I am supervising an undergraduate student, Hiram Foster, in his Honors Tutorial College senior thesis on mentoring in a Christian on-campus organization. Hiram is compiling a research survey and would like to include items from the MLQ-S. We have reviewed the costs for purchasing licenses but, for an unfunded undergraduate student, the cost for more than 1,000 licenses (exact number is not yet finalized) is prohibitive. If an inexpensive solution can be found, we will provide credit in the thesis, share the data with Mind Garden, and/or meet any other reasonable request. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Anita C. James
From: James, Anita  
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 4:24 PM  
To: Bruce Avolio  
Subject: RE: Request to use part of MLQ-5 in undergraduate honor thesis research  

Dr. Avolio,

Thank you for your quick response. I will contact Mr. Most.

Sincerely,

Anita James

From: Bruce Avolio [mailto:avolio@uw.edu]  
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 4:17 PM  
To: James, Anita  
Subject: RE: Request to use part of MLQ-5 in undergraduate honor thesis research  

Dr. James, I have agreed to have Mindgarden handle all of the permissions for the MLQ use. You can ask Rob Most at robmost@mindgarden.com to come up with a reduced price given the focus of the research, and I am sure he will be willing to do so.

Please try that route first.

Bruce

From: James, Anita [mailto:james@ohio.edu]  
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 1:15 PM  
To: Bruce Avolio  
Subject: Request to use part of MLQ-5 in undergraduate honor thesis research  

Dear Dr. Avolio,

My name is Anita James and, as indicated in the signature block, I am a faculty member at Ohio University. Next year, I am directing an undergraduate honors thesis for a student in the Honors Tutorial College at Ohio University. His topic is mentoring in Christian campus organizations and, as part of the overall instrument he is assembling, he would like to include the questions related to the four “Ts” from the MLQ-5. I purchased the manual and the license to reproduce one copy of the instrument for our review; however, my student will be using a sample that could top 1,000.

We checked the pricing structure from Mind Garden, but it is beyond his resources to purchase that many licenses as an unfunded undergraduate student. Would you grant permission for the use of the MLQ-5 items in an undergraduate thesis? If you need additional information, including the specific questions he would like to include, please let me know.

Cordially,

Anita James

School of Communication Studies  
Anita C. James, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
*“Leaving something incomplete makes it interesting and gives one the feeling that there is room for growth.”* ~ Karlo, Buddhist monk, 1330 AD  
Lydick 264 • 43 W. Union • Athens OH 45701  
T: 740.593.4840 • F: 740.593.4810  
james@ohio.edu • www.com.s.ohiou.edu • http://www.com.s.ohiou.edu/
Appendix D

Quantitative Instrument

Student Information

1. Sex

2. Academic Standing (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate, Other)

3. Approximately, how long have you been a Christian?

4. How long have you been involved with Cru?

5. What opportunities have you participated in with Cru? (Summer Project, Spring Break Trip, Winter Conference, Fall Retreat, Other Retreat, Weekly Meeting, Leading a Bible Study, Discipleship)

6. Do you have a discipler (i.e. mentor) through Cru?

7. Have you had more than one discipler?

Psychosocial Support

1. I share personal problems with my mentor

2. I exchange confidences with my mentor

3. I consider my mentor to be a friend

4. My mentor and I spend some of our free time together

5. My mentor seeks to understand my fears, doubts, and concerns

6. My discipler it easy to share deeply personal information with him or her, and

7. I ask my discipler for advice on things that are unrelated to Cru


Instrumental Support

1. My discipler takes a personal interest in my involvement with Cru
2. My mentor helps me coordinate my goals within Cru
3. My discipler has devoted special time and consideration to my involvement with Cru
4. My discipler presents me with important responsibilities for Cru
5. My discipler coaches/trains me in my responsibilities related to Cru
6. My discipler gives me feedback on the performance of my responsibilities within Cru
7. My discipler helps me to become a successful leader within Cru
8. I have benefited from my mentor’s status within Cru

Hierarchy

1. I try to model my behavior after my mentor
2. I unintentionally model my behavior after my mentor
3. I respect my mentor’s knowledge of things concerning Christianity
4. Within Cru as an organization, my mentor is:
   a. At the same level as I
   b. One or two levels more advanced than I
   c. At a much more advanced level than I
5. In terms of social networking and connectedness, my mentor is:
   a. At the same level as I
   b. One or two levels more advanced than I
c. At a much more advanced level than I

6. Spiritually, my mentor is:
   a. At the same level as I
   b. One or two levels more advanced that I
   c. At a much more advanced level than I

7. In terms of age, my mentor is:
   a. At the same level as I
   b. One or two levels more advanced that I
   c. At a much more advanced level than I

8. My mentor has much more authority than I

9. I agree with my mentor’s attitudes and values regarding Christianity

10. I am proud to be associated with my mentor

11. My mentor acts in ways that builds my respect

12. My mentor considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions

13. I will try to be like my mentor when I reach a similar position

14. I find myself becoming like my discipler in specific ways

15. I respect my discipler as a person

**Mutuality**

1. My mentor shares personal problems with me

2. My mentor exchanges confidences with me

3. My mentor considers me to be a friend

4. I seek to understand my mentor’s fears, doubts, and concerns
5. I believe that for most benefits I receive from this relationship I should return approximately equivalent benefits to my mentor in the future

**Development**

1. My mentor helps me re-examine my critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate
2. My mentor helps me seek different perspectives when solving problems
3. My mentor talks optimistically about my future
4. My mentor treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group
5. My mentor helps me articulate a compelling vision of the future
6. My mentor considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others
7. My mentor gets me to look at problems from many different angles
8. My mentor helps to develop my strengths
9. My mentor helps me increase my confidence that goals will be achieved
10. My mentor helps me identify areas of my life that need attention
11. My mentor believes in me
12. My mentor challenges me
13. My mentor confronts me when I make poor choices
14. I have a better relationship with God because of my mentor
15. My mentor has helped me to become someone who can mentor others
16. My mentor has helped me to become a stronger Christian

**Outcome**

1. My mentor is someone with whom I am satisfied
2. My mentor has been effective in his/her role
3. My mentor fails to meet my needs (reversed)
4. My mentor disappoints me (reversed)
5. The formal mentoring program in my organization is effective
6. The formal mentoring program allows me access to mentors who otherwise would have been unattainable
7. I am satisfied with the formal mentoring program
8. The mentoring program smoothed the way for me to get a mentor
9. I would be unable to get a mentor if not for the formal mentoring program
10. The formal mentoring program is a waste of time (reversed)
11. In your opinion, how much of an impact has discipleship had upon your life?
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Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Read Consent Form

Interviewer Self-Disclosure

- Hiram Foster, study COMS, from Cleveland
- Became a Christian in high school
- Past involvement with Cru
- Heartwarming story about discipleship

Study and Purpose

- Goal: to figure out what makes for a good discipleship relationship
- How interview will be conducted:
  - Your identity will be kept confidential by the researchers
  - How you think about discipleship. What makes it good and valuable?
  - No right or wrong response, my goal is to find out what is right
  - Express your views in your own words
  - Take as much time as you need, no rush
  - If there is something that I haven’t thought of, you have absolute freedom to tell me or ask about relevant issues

Participant Self-Disclosure

- Hometown
- Did you grow up in a Christian home? How was that?
Functions of Mentoring as Christian Discipleship

- How did you get involved in Cru?
- Who is your discipler? More than one? How long have you known them?
- How would you define a discipler/discipleship relationship?

- Tell me about moment between you and (name of discipler) that was really significant for you.
  - Tell me more about this (looking for a narrative)
    - What led up to it? (before, rising action)
    - How did it happened? (during, climax)
    - What happened afterwards? (after, falling action/resolution)
    - What made this significant? (if not already answered)

**General Questions about the relationship:**
- Who is your discipler to you? What place does he/she have in your life?
- How does it differ from friendship?
- What were a couple of turning points in your relationship (narrative)?
- How has (name of discipler) helped you?
- What do you usually do during your “d-times” (or during “d-ship”)?

**Psychosocial Functions**
- Would you consider your (name of discipler) your friend? Why/why not?
- What does (name of discipler) do that makes him/her a good friend?

**Instrumental**
Functions of Mentoring as Christian Discipleship

- Does (name of discipler) try to teach you anything?
- What else have you learned from (name of discipler)?

**Development**

- What impact has (name of discipler) had on who you are as a person?
  - How so?
- How are you different because of your relationship with (name of discipler)?

**Hierarchy**

- What makes your relationship with (name of discipler) different from other relationships that you have?
- Do you look up to (name of discipler)? In what ways and why?
- See yourself becoming like him/her?

**Mutuality**

- Do you feel like your relationship with (name of discipler) goes both ways? If so, how?
  - How does he/she give you opportunities for this?
- Should it be? Why or why not?
  - Is this aspect important to you?