

## **Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Guidelines for Research Mentorship: Development and Implementation.**

By: DiAnne L. Borders, Kelly L. Wester, Darcy Haag Granello, Catherine Y. Chang, Danica G. Hays, Jennifer Pepperell & Shawn L. Spurgeon

[Borders, L. D.](#), [Wester, K. L.](#), Granello, D. H., Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., Pepperell, J., & Spurgeon, S. L. (2012). Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Guidelines for Research Mentorship: Development and Implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 51(3), 162-175. DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012.00012.x

Made available courtesy of the American Counseling Association: [www.counseling.org](http://www.counseling.org).

**This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following article: Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Guidelines for Research Mentorship: Development and Implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 51(3), 162-175, which has been published in final form at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012.00012.x/abstract>.**

### **Abstract:**

The authors describe guidelines endorsed by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision for research mentorship, including characteristics of mentors and mentees. Suggestions for implementing the guidelines at the individual, program, institution, and professional levels are focused on enhancing mentoring relationships as well as mentees' research quality and productivity. Research on research mentoring, based on the guidelines, is encouraged.

**Keywords:** counseling | counselor education | counselor student mentorship | academic research | research mentorship | counseling research

### **Article:**

There is growing evidence that research mentoring has a critical and distinct role in enhancing the research productivity of graduate students and new faculty members (e.g., Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Dohm & Cummings, 2002; Hollingsworth & Fassinger, 2002; Okech, Astramovich, Johnson, Hoskins, & Rubel, 2006). Hollingsworth and Fassinger (2002) found that research mentoring mediated the relationship between the research training environment and counseling psychology students' research productivity, suggesting that "a research mentoring relationship is the vehicle through which the training environment has greatest impact on individual students' research production" (p. 327). In counselor education, research mentoring was highlighted by new faculty members in a 6-year longitudinal study. Magnuson, Norem, and Lonneman-Doroff (2009) reported that, at each stage of data collection, faculty members indicated that supportive mentoring relationships were critical to their success

and satisfaction. Such support is vital because the development of an independent research program is a challenging task for new faculty (Evans & Cokley, 2008).

Not all graduate students and new faculty members, however, have a research mentor, or an effective mentor in any area (Johnson, 2002; Okech et al., 2006; Rheineck & Roland, 2008; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). In a survey of 139 pretenured counselor educators (Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008), 77% of the participants reported that they received research mentorship, but only 30% said the relationship was focused on their needs. Respondents also indicated that they received more guidance about the promotion and tenure process than they did about research methodology, data analysis, and scientific integrity. Lack of research mentoring is particularly an issue for female and African American faculty, including counselor educators. In a survey of 115 tenured and untenured female faculty (Hill, Leinbaugh, Bradley, & Hazler, 2005), 70% said that there was little or no research collaboration in their programs, and only 45% reported that mentoring programs were available to them. Similarly, tenured and untenured African American counselor educators reported that the lack of mentorship and collegial support was a major barrier to attaining promotion and tenure; they rated research and publishing as their highest source of stress. Low research productivity for some counselor education faculty and doctoral students (Benishek & Chessler, 2005; Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Hill et al., 2005) could be linked to the lack of effective research mentoring.

Several authors have suggested reasons for “the discrepancy between the promotion and the practice” (Black, Suarez, & Medina, 2004, p. 44) of research mentoring: Research mentoring is poorly defined (Black et al., 2004); guidelines and criteria for evaluating effectiveness of research mentoring are limited (Brown, Daly, & Leong, 2009); and few professionals have received training to be a mentor, which could lead to negative outcomes for mentors and mentees (Johnson, 2002; Johnson & Huwe, 2002). Some authors have offered preliminary suggestions for addressing these deficits. Regarding mentoring counseling professionals in general, Black et al. (2004) presented a set of questions to guide mentors and protégés through a self-assessment of their strengths and limitations related to their respective roles, their knowledge about mentoring, expectations, and goals for the mentoring relationship. Casto, Caldwell, and Salazar (2005) emphasized woman-to-woman mentoring; their suggestions included brief statements specific to research mentoring. Rheineck and Roland (2008) described a model for women who mentor female doctoral students that included both personal and professional domains. They suggested that mentoring of research should move from giving advice to collaborating for publication during the 3-year span of doctoral students’ time in their doctoral program. Brown et al. (2009) also emphasized a developmental approach and listed their top 7 characteristics of research mentors (i.e., moves mentee toward independence, provides hands-on role modeling, has strong communication skills, exposes the mentee to a variety of research methods, provides constructive

and timely feedback, creates professional networking opportunities, and promotes scientific integrity). Johnson (2002) proposed strategies at the individual, departmental, and organizational levels to promote mentoring of students. At the latter level, Johnson encouraged professional organizations to establish specific guidelines as one way to begin educating mentors about and preparing them for their role and responsibilities.

It appears that only the medical field has formal guidelines for research mentoring. The Compact Between Postdoctoral Appointees and Their Mentors (Association of American Medical Colleges [AAMC], 2006) was developed to foster communication between the mentoring dyad about their respective responsibilities in the research lab (e.g., “I will seek regular feedback on my performance” and “I will leave behind all original notebooks, computerized files, and tangible research materials” [p. 3] for the postdoctoral appointee; “I will strive to maintain a relationship that is based on trust and mutual respect” and “I will acknowledge her/his contribution to the development of any intellectual property” [p. 4] for the mentor). In addition, the Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (COSEPUP; 2009) published a guide on research mentoring, but it is specific to mentoring students about how to conduct research responsibly.

All published suggestions, formal and informal, provide helpful yet limited guidelines for counselor education professionals who are seeking a research mentor or seeking to become one. The guidelines either are not specific to research mentoring (e.g., Black et al., 2004; Johnson, 2002), are focused on one mentee population (e.g., Casto et al., 2005; Rheineck & Roland, 2008) or are one part of the mentorship dyad (e.g., Brown et al., 2009), or address research environments that are typically outside the counseling field (e.g., AAMC, 2006). Guidelines that include characteristics and roles of both mentor and mentee and that are specific to counselor education could be a starting point for enhancing the availability and effectiveness of research mentoring in the counseling field.

Leaders of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) recognized this need in their 2007 strategic plan, which included a vision statement indicating that the association was committed to “providing and disseminating premier research and scholarship” (ACES Strategic Planning Committee, 2007, p. 2). To accomplish this goal, several initiatives were specified, including the development of research mentorship guidelines. A part of this plan was the establishment in fall 2008 of a committee for research mentorship; the committee was charged with developing guidelines for research mentorship that could be implemented by ACES, ACES regions, counselor education programs, and individuals within the counseling field. The committee held its first meeting at the 2009 American Counseling Association (ACA)

conference, during which members discussed the status of research in the counseling field and the need for research mentorship guidelines. Overarching principles and specific guidelines were identified through reading the literature on research training and mentorship both inside and outside the counseling field; findings were shared via e-mail. An initial draft was reviewed in May 2009 by members, and the final draft was presented to the ACES executive council at its June 2009 meeting. The document was formally endorsed at that meeting (for the full report, see Wester et al., 2009; portions of the document are presented in the Appendix).

In this article, we present the ACES research mentorship guidelines and offer suggestions for implementing them. Our discussion is grounded in the literature on mentorship, research mentorship, research training, and research integrity; relevant ethical codes (ACA, 2005); and our collective experiences as research mentees and mentors. Relevant literature is cited in our overview of the guidelines.

### Research Mentorship Guidelines

The ACES research mentorship guidelines (see Appendix) comprise two main sections. The first section outlines the characteristics of mentors (Black et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2009), including knowledge and skills as a researcher, ethical research behaviors, and personal characteristics and traits that enhance effective mentoring. Research mentors are not expected to be knowledgeable about all aspects of research. Instead, they are expected to be aware of their limitations both as researchers and mentors (Black et al., 2004; COSEPUP, 2009; Johnson, 2002), inform mentees of their limitations, and help mentees find other resources as needed. Research mentors, then, share their areas of research expertise, whatever these are, with mentees.

The second main section outlines the characteristics for mentees, which are similar to those for mentors. A discussion of ethical research behaviors is followed by characteristics and traits of effective learners (e.g., Casto et al., 2005; Chandler & Kram, 2007; COSEPUP, 2009; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004), including stating their needs and renegotiating these as appropriate, being open to feedback, and following through on the mentor's suggestions. Some of the responsibilities of mentor and mentee are complementary, similar to the traits of effective teachers (mentors) and effective learners (mentees). For example, the commitment of mentors to fulfill mentoring behaviors (e.g., Characteristic 3.n., provide honest feedback) is balanced by the responsibilities of mentees to be forthcoming about their needs (e.g., Characteristics 6.a., 6.b., and 6.c., clearly state preferred topics to be covered, learning style, and desired outcomes).

Both instrumental and relational (Kram, 1985) mentoring activities are included in the guidelines. Instrumental tasks are emphasized by providing guidance and instruction regarding all aspects of the research process (e.g., Characteristics 3.i. and j.l.) and critical feedback (e.g., Characteristic 3.k.). The relational guidelines include asking mentors to be available (e.g., Characteristics 3.a. and 3.g.), encouraging autonomy (e.g., Characteristic 3.p.), and modeling ethical behavior (Characteristic 2.h.).

Ethical behavior is highlighted for the mentor (e.g., Characteristic 2.) and the mentee (Characteristic 5.) so that negative outcomes of the mentorship (e.g., Johnson & Huwe, 2002) can be avoided. In particular, attention is given to the power differential (e.g., Characteristic 2.e.) and potential conflicts of interest (e.g., Characteristics 2.f. and 5.f.; see Black et al., 2004; COSEPUP, 2009; Johnson, 2002). Mentors are encouraged to take responsibility for ensuring that cultural differences are addressed in the relationship (e.g., Characteristic 3.q.; see Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Brown et al., 2009; Casto et al., 2005; Chandler & Kram, 2007; Evans & Cokley, 2008; Johnson, 2002). Scientific integrity, such as appropriate “ownership” of research ideas and products and appropriate authorship (e.g., Characteristics 2.b., 3.d., 5.c., 6.b.) are covered (e.g., Brown et al., 2009; COSEPUP, 2009). The guidelines state clearly that the purpose of the mentorship is mentee development rather than career advancement for the mentor (Characteristic 3.m.; Brown et al., 2009; Russell & Adams, 1997), although mentors may also benefit from the relationship (Borders et al., 2011; Johnson, 2002). An evolving developmental approach (see Black et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2009; Rheineck & Roland, 2008) is suggested (e.g., Characteristics 3.m., 3.o, 3.p., 6.c., 7.f.).

Finally, the research mentorship guidelines were written so that they can be applied to formal and informal mentoring relationships (Borders et al., 2011; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Johnson, 2002; Lucas & Murry, 2002); a mentor–mentee pair or multiple relationships (developmental networks; Borders et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2009; Chandler & Kram, 2007; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Evans & Cokley, 2008); and a variety of relationship configurations, including senior faculty-to-junior faculty, faculty-to-student, and peer-to-peer (Borders et al., 2011; Chandler & Kram, 2007; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). The range of potential research products and processes also are identified (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004).

## Discussion

The ACES research mentorship guidelines have some similarities with other formal (AAMC, 2006) and informal (Brown et al., 2009) characteristics. One prominent common message in these guidelines is that the mentorship is focused on the mentee, not the mentor. The mentee's

needs as a researcher, across a developmental spectrum, take precedence. Mentees should vocalize their needs, but mentors also should assess needs and intentionally seek to meet them in ways that educate and move the mentee toward more independence and autonomy. Another theme is that feedback is the major conduit of mentoring. Mentors provide honest, constructive, and supportive feedback; mentees seek, accept, and act on feedback. A related theme is the emphasis on the mentor's strong relationship and communication skills. Mentors use these skills in collaborating with the mentee to create clear expectations and responsibilities of each. Mentors are available, flexible, and accomplished research role models. A final theme is the attention to scientific integrity, both in the conduct of research projects and the conduct of the mentorship relationship itself. Such similarities across published guidelines might enhance mentoring across disciplines and thus encourage the cross-disciplinary research currently being touted by many funding agencies.

The ACES research mentorship guidelines also have some fairly unique emphases. Although the guidelines outline comprehensive research knowledge, skills, and activities for mentoring, it is stated that the mentor is not expected to be an expert in all of these areas. The guidelines do emphasize, however, that mentors are to communicate their strengths and limitations to mentees and help the mentee find other needed resources. In addition, the guidelines encourage initial and ongoing conversations about roles, expectations, and responsibilities, which might be initiated by either the mentor or mentee. Relatedly, explicit attention is given to potential conflicts and power dynamics as well as cultural differences. Although role modeling is included in other research mentoring recommendations, the ACES guidelines also suggest modeling that encourages the mentee to become a mentor.

### Implementing the Research Mentoring Guidelines

The creation of the ACES research mentorship guidelines was only a starting point for a discussion of their implementation. Guidelines can spell out expectations and define terms, but guidelines cannot guarantee success or indicate how the expectations can be implemented (COSEPUP, 2009). Indeed, barriers to implementation exist at the individual, departmental, institutional, and professional levels (Bigelow & Johnson, 2001; Evans & Cokley, 2008; Johnson, 2002; Keyser et al., 2008). Individual faculty members have competing demands on their time, and research mentorship, as defined by the guidelines, requires time and resources. Faculty mentors may not have all of the requisite skills in research or mentoring, and potential mentees may not have access to a research mentor. At the departmental level, good mentoring may not be honored or rewarded (e.g., released time, financial compensation). In addition, mentoring is hampered if mentees perceive racial or gender bias or a culture of competition in the counseling program. Similar limitations can exist at the institutional level, especially if

criteria for promotion and advancement do not include expectations regarding research mentoring. To date, professional organizations rarely specify research mentoring guidelines and offer limited attention to mentoring practices in the accreditation process. Clearly, then, implementation of the guidelines requires intentional efforts. We offer some suggestions for operationalizing and applying them in ways that may address some of the many challenges.

### Mentor–Mentee Interactions

Good practice, as described in the guidelines, suggests that open and frank discussions should occur early and often about expectations, responsibilities, strengths, and limitations of both participants (Black et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2009; Johnson, 2002). The ACES guidelines provide a checklist or agenda for these conversations. Mentors and mentees might read through the guidelines together in early meetings to structure their discussion around responsibilities of each, what topic or skill will be taught and learned, the desired outcome, a timeline for meetings and producing a product, and how they will communicate when things are not going well. Through open and honest dialogue, explicit attention would be given to potential conflicts, existing power dynamics, and the impact of cultural differences on the mentor–mentee relationship. Mentors might normalize the challenges that likely will arise during the mentoring process as one way to establish the expectation that renegotiating agreements is typical and emphasize those guidelines that invite feedback from mentees if they perceive a conflict or other problematic relationship dynamic. These early conversations also might include decisions around specific times when the mentor–mentee team would revisit the initial agreement as well as the research guidelines as a check-in on these relational issues. This approach parallels the informed consent process required in counseling and supervision. Mentors could use the guidelines as a basis for creating a professional disclosure statement around their research and mentoring abilities, such as that described by Sangganjanavanich and Magnuson (2009); the statement could be presented to mentees during an initial meeting.

### Counselor Education Program and Institutional Efforts

Assuming that program faculty are in agreement with the research mentorship guidelines, then their program's commitment to the guidelines could be stated in several other ways. For example, faculty might review and discuss the guidelines as part of a programmatic review of research mentoring in the program. Individual faculty members could be encouraged to use the guidelines as a self-assessment tool when preparing for meetings with mentees or for constructing professional disclosure statements (Sangganjanavanich & Magnuson, 2009). Faculty members might ask students to rate the research mentorship in the program using relevant guidelines as assessment items. Such assessments could result in the identification of areas of strength in the organization's mentorship and areas that need attention, from individual students lacking

sufficient mentorship to issues that seem more broadly characteristic of the program environment (e.g., confusion about authorship, limited resources for qualitative designs); these issues could then become the basis for evaluating interventions that are designed to enhance research mentorship within the program. The guidelines also could be included in published materials (e.g., the program's website and student handbook) to stress the faculty's interest in supporting good practices in research training and mentorship for all mentoring relationships.

The guidelines also might serve as a springboard for faculty discussions about the support, or lack of support, for quality research mentoring and, thus, the barriers to effective mentoring of students. Are all faculty expected to serve as research mentors? If not, do research mentors receive released time or other resources to support their work? If all are expected to serve, do faculty have equitable numbers of mentees? What incentives exist to encourage quality research mentoring of students and faculty? Is effective research mentorship recognized in annual faculty evaluations, merit reviews, and promotion and tenure documents? Similar questions may need attention at the college and university level. Counseling faculty also might encourage the creation of awards and other kinds of recognition for research mentoring at those levels.

Counseling faculty members also might share the guidelines with the individuals who are responsible for formal mentoring programs for new faculty at their universities. Research results regarding formal mentoring programs are mixed (see Allen et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2009; Johnson, 2002). The guidelines might prove to be a useful tool for assessing these programs and for evaluating outcomes.

The research mentorship guidelines also could be infused into the counseling curriculum. Doctoral students could be introduced to the research mentorship guidelines in a professional seminar early in their program. Discussion of the guidelines could focus on roles and responsibilities of mentor and mentee, appropriate expectations, what students perceive they need from a mentor, their own strengths and areas for growth as researchers, as well as how to approach a mentor about a problem in the relationship. Faculty might assess current curricular offerings to ensure that topics in the guidelines are covered, such as social validity, ethical codes of the ACA and the Office of Research Integrity, and scientific integrity; if some of these guidelines are not included in a specific university's program, then the discussion should also direct the mentee to other sources within the same university that provide instruction around these topics. For example, some universities provide centralized training in responsible conduct of research and informed consent policies.

## Professional-Level Efforts

ACES initiated a more systematic consideration of research mentorship by requesting the creation of the guidelines and then endorsing them. Additional and ongoing efforts are needed, however, because effective implementation of the guidelines is dependent on mentors' skills in both research and mentoring. The lack of training for mentors, including research mentors, has been widely documented across a range of academic fields (e.g., Johnson, 2002; Walker, Golds, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). The ACES guidelines provide one framework for designing mentoring training programs, which might be offered at national and regional ACES conferences. Such programs might target mentors, mentees, and mentoring pairs. Particular attention is recommended for research ethics and power dynamics in mentoring relationships and the unique considerations for mentoring women and persons of color (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Brown et al., 2009; Casto et al., 2005; Johnson, 2002). These programs could be conducted as preconference training sessions, augmenting current efforts such as ACES INFORM and ACES regional forums (e.g., research boot camps), which are designed to enhance counseling professionals' research knowledge and skills.

ACES also has recognized the importance of research mentoring through its annual mentoring award. Criteria for the award and statements of nominations might reference the knowledge, skills, and characteristics of the meritorious mentor as described in the guidelines.

Finally, the research mentorship guidelines are consistent with current counseling accreditation standards (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, 2009) on research and scholarship and might serve as a resource for future standards revision efforts.

## Limitations

The feasibility and adequacy of the research mentorship guidelines have yet to be determined. We are aware of several limitations that need to be explored in future considerations of the standards. Although not stated explicitly, the current guidelines seem most applicable to mentorship of doctoral students and new faculty members. Different mentor skills and characteristics may be needed for mentoring master's-level students who are interested in counseling research, such as facilitating a research team that includes master's- and doctoral-level students at varying stages of research competence. It might also be necessary to adapt the guidelines for clinical research settings or for research partnerships between faculty and community agencies or schools. In addition, counselors who practice in a variety of settings have reported that they recognize the relevance of research to their daily work (Granello & Young, 2012), and, thus, could benefit from opportunities to be mentored in some aspects of the research process. It also is not clear whether the guidelines are easily applied to long-distance mentoring relationships, such as those facilitated by the New Faculty Interest Network within ACES.

The current guidelines do not address the multiple relationships a mentor may have with a mentee. A mentor may hold an evaluative position with a mentee wherein the mentor provides guidance about program completion or promotion and tenure review. The feedback component of the research mentoring may complement or complicate these other relationships. Relatedly, the guidelines do not provide direction for resolving mentor–mentee conflicts, although it has been suggested that this issue might best be resolved through institutional policies (Keyser et al., 2008).

There is a great need for research on research mentoring (Black et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2009; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). Thus, those who implement parts of the ACES research mentorship guidelines are encouraged to document their efforts and results. We offer the guidelines as a starting place for identifying relevant contributing variables and desired outcomes.

## Conclusion

The publication of the ACES research mentorship guidelines promotes the importance of research within the counseling profession. The guidelines provide a concrete structure and format that both mentors and mentees can use to formulate relationships that are mutually beneficial and have the potential for increasing research productivity within the profession. Increasing research mentorship is critical to the future of our profession, because those who were mentored are more willing to become mentors themselves (Dohm & Cummings, 2002).

In an editorial commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Counselor Education and Supervision (CES) journal, former editors Black and Helm (2010) stated, “CES is no longer in its infancy, and we believe counselor educators are collectively responsible for defining the future of CES—the scholarly voice of our profession. Without rigorous standards, training, and mentorship, some of the scholarship in our field has become predictable and lacking in interest or imagination.... Therefore, we encourage potential contributors to engage in research mentoring partnerships and writing teams in which ideas and research designs can be shared, discussed, examined, and improved in ethical and supportive relationships” (p. 3). We echo their call to all counselor educators to further embrace research mentorship, and we hope that the initial statement of research mentorship guidelines is instructive in these efforts.

## References

ACES Strategic Planning Committee. (2007, October). ACES strategic plan. (Available at [http://files.acesonline.net/doc/2007\\_aces\\_strategic\\_plan\\_final\\_october-07.doc](http://files.acesonline.net/doc/2007_aces_strategic_plan_final_october-07.doc)).

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 127–136.

American Counseling Association. (2005). ACA code of ethics. Alexandria , VA : Author.

Association of American Medical Colleges. (2006). Compact between postdoctoral appointees and their mentors. Washington , DC : Author. (Available at <http://www.aamc.org/postdoccompact>).

Benishek, L. A., & Chessler, M. (2005). Facilitating the identity development of counseling graduate students as researchers. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 44, 16–31.

Bigelow, J. R., & Johnson, W. B. (2001). Promoting mentor-protégé relationship formation in graduate school. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 20, 1–23.

Black, L. L., & Helm, H. M. (2010). Defining moments: The golden anniversary of Counselor Education and Supervision, 50, 2–4.

Black, L. L., Suarez, E. C., & Medina, S. (2004). Helping students help themselves: Strategies for successful mentoring relationships. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 44, 44–55.

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

Bradley, C., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2004). African American counselor educators: Their experiences, challenges, and recommendations. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43, 258–273.

Briggs, C. A., & Pehrsson, D.-E. (2008). Research mentorship in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 48, 101–113.

Brown, R. T., Daly, B. P., & Leong, F. T. L. (2009). Mentoring in research: A developmental approach. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40, 306–313.

Casto, C., Caldwell, C., & Salazar, C. F. (2005). Creating mentoring relationships between female faculty and students in counselor education: Guidelines for potential mentees and mentors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 83, 331–336.

Chandler, D. E., & Kram, K. E. (2007). Mentoring and developmental networks in the new career context. In H. P. Gunz & M. A. Peiperl (Eds.), *Handbook of career studies* (pp. 241–267). Thousand Oaks , CA : Sage.

Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine. (2009). *On being a scientist: A guide to responsible conduct of research* (3rd ed.). Washington , DC : National Academies Press.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). 2009 standards. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20cover.pdf>.

de Janasz, S. C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professional network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 263–283.

Dohm, F.-A., & Cummings, W. (2002). Research mentoring and women in clinical psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 163–167.

Evans, G. L., & Cokley, K. O. (2008). African American women and the academy: Using career mentoring to increase research productivity. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2, 50–57.

Granello, D. H., & Young, M. E. (2012). *Counseling today: Foundations of professional identity*. Boston, MA : Pearson.

Hill, N. R., Leinbaugh, T., Bradley, C., & Hazler, R. (2005). Female counselor educators: Encouraging and discouraging factors in academia. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 83, 374–380.

Hollingsworth, M. A., & Fassinger, R. E. (2002). The role of faculty mentors in the research training of counseling psychology doctoral students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 324–330.

Johnson, W. B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33, 88–96.

Johnson, W. B., & Huwe, J. M. (2002). Toward a typology of mentorship dysfunction in graduate school. *Psychotherapy: Theory/Research/Practice/Training*, 39, 44–55.

Keyser, D. J., Lakoski, J. M., Lara-Cinisomo, S., Schultz, D. J., Williams, V. L., Zellers, D. F., & Pincus, H. A. (2008). Advancing institutional efforts to support research mentorship: A conceptual framework and self-assessment tool. *Academic Medicine*, 83, 217–225.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL : Scott, Foresman.

Lucas, C. J., & Murry, J. W., Jr. (2002). *New faculty: A practical guide for academic beginners*. New York, NY : Palgrave Macmillan.

Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Lonneman-Doroff, T. (2009). The 2000 cohort of new assistant professors of counselor education: Reflecting at the culmination of six years. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 49, 54–71.

- Okech, J. E. A., Astramovich, R. L., Johnson, M. M., Hoskins, W. J., & Rubel, D. J. (2006). Doctoral research training of counselor education faculty. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 46, 131–145.
- Rheineck, J. E., & Roland, C. B. (2008). The developmental mentoring relationship between academic women. *Adultspan Journal*, 7, 80–93.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. Washington, DC : American Association for Higher Education.
- Russell, J. E. A., & Adams, D. M. (1997). The changing nature of mentoring in organizations: An introduction to the special issue on mentoring in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 1–14.
- Sangganjanavanich, V. F., & Magnuson, S. (2009). Averting role confusion between doctoral students and major advisers: Adviser disclosure statements. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 48, 194–203.
- Walker, G. E., Golds, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass.
- Wester, K. L., Borders, L. D., Briggs, C., Chang, C., Haag-Granello, D., Hays, D., ... & Spurgeon, S. (2009, June). *ACES research mentorship guidelines*. (Available at <http://www.acesonline.net/aces-research-mentorship-guidelines/>).

## **Appendix**

### Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Guidelines for Research Mentorship Characteristics

Mentor 1. Is an effective researcher whose knowledge, skills, and abilities have been obtained through education, training, and experiences as a researcher, as exhibited through a well-defined research agenda or line of scholarship and the dissemination of empirical products (e.g., presentations, publications). “Researcher” may entail many different things and may include one or more of the following:

- a. Is knowledgeable of available resources concerning research.
- b. Demonstrates the ability to synthesize research findings/scholarly literature in an area/or topic and use this information to conceptualize a research idea and/or question.
- c. Has an understanding of the research process, from idea inception to final scholarly product and the ability to explain and teach this process to others.
- d. Demonstrates knowledge in different research designs and methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative.
- e. Has an understanding of program evaluation and quality assurance in designing, implementing, and evaluating programs.
- f. Has an understanding of and ability to use various statistical analyses

and data analysis. g. Demonstrates the social validity of research questions to encourage intentional research projects for the field of counseling. h. Ensures quality research through the evaluation and accountability of follow-through with projects.

2. Is an ethical researcher who is skilled at educating and applying this knowledge and behavior, including the following:

- a. Is knowledgeable of ACA ethical codes of research, and the Office of Research Integrity's nine core areas of responsible conduct of research.
- b. Respects appropriate authorship and acknowledgements of the research project and idea.
- c. Consistently protects the rights of human subjects within his/her research, specifically ensuring beneficence, justice, and autonomy of human research participants. Also is knowledgeable of the Institutional Review Board process and federal regulations related to research with human subjects.
- d. Encourages ethical behavior in the area of publications in that the mentor does not publish duplicate manuscripts nor publish in the smallest publishable unit of a study.
- e. Understands the potential power differences that might exist in the mentor–mentee relationship.
- f. Acknowledges when a conflict of interest may exist in the research mentorship.
- g. Avoids, at all costs, engaging in research misconduct and respects others' work by not plagiarizing, falsifying, or fabricating data.
- h. Promotes scientific integrity within the relationship through modeling and providing education when necessary.

3. Exhibits personal characteristics or traits that demonstrate a commitment to the role of mentor, including the following:

- a. Makes time available to commit to the mentee's stated needs in the mentoring relationships or, if mentor determines he/she is not available, is forthcoming with the time limitations and attempts to renegotiate the relationships or refers mentee to another mentor.
- b. Remains committed to mentorship relationship until the expected and discussed product or process is achieved.
- c. Has a conversation at the outset of the mentoring relationship and throughout the process, as appropriate, regarding expectations, collaboration, and roles.
- d. Understands that the research idea and process is the mentee's and the mentor is there for support and assistance, unless otherwise stated or desired by mentee.
- e. Understands the differences that may exist across settings and engages in these discussions as appropriate.
- f. Offers support throughout the research process, including education, knowledge, or referral to resources.
- g. Engages in and/or attends regular meetings or contacts with mentee.
- h. Communicates ideas effectively.
- i. Provides education about the research process, from idea inception to final product, including the idea that the research question drives the design and methodology of the research study.
- j. Provides education in statistical data analysis where appropriate.
- k. Provides critical analysis of ideas and steps throughout the research process.
- l. Provides feedback on writing.
- m. Focuses on mentee development within the relationship rather than solely on furthering the career, publications, or research agenda of the mentor. The mentee and mentor discuss what the relationship will entail (e.g., propriety of the research idea, authorship).
- n. Provides honest feedback on the process, knowledge, skills, ideas, and products of the mentee.
- o. Models effective mentorship to encourage future mentorship of others by the mentee.
- p. Empowers mentee's autonomy and independence in the area of research once the mentee has the knowledge to be autonomous.
- q. Discusses potential cultural differences (e.g., age, race, gender, sexual orientation) between mentor and mentee when appropriate.

4.

Recognizes one's limitations as a mentor and researcher and understands where one's expertise lies. The mentor does the following:

- a. Has a conversation with the mentee at the outset of the relationship regarding one's knowledge and skills.
- b. Engages in the research mentorship only if areas of strength meet the needs of the mentee.
- c. Consults with others or refers to other resources or mentors when a mentee's need arises in the relationship that is outside the scope of the mentor's strengths, knowledge, or expertise, or, at minimum, is forthcoming that this is not an area of strength or knowledge, and works with mentee to gain this knowledge.

Mentee 5. Is an ethical researcher who applies this knowledge in practice:

- a. Has working knowledge of ACA ethical codes of research and Office of Research Integrity's nine core areas of responsible conduct of research.
- b. Is willing and able to listen to and follow through on the ethical suggestions of the mentor.
- c. Understands that the research idea is the mentee's; however, the mentor may also provide his/her own ideas throughout the process, and the mentee will provide accurate and appropriate authorship and/or acknowledgement where appropriate.
- d. Consistently protects the rights of human subjects within his/her research, specifically ensuring beneficence, justice, and autonomy of human research participants, and is knowledgeable of the Institutional Review Board process and federal regulations related to research with human subjects.
- e. Encourages ethical behavior in the area of publications in that the mentee does not publish duplicate manuscripts, "salami-slice" publications, or publish in the smallest publishable unit of a study.
- f. Acknowledges when a conflict of interest may exist in the research mentorship relationship.
- g. Avoids, at all costs, engaging in research misconduct and respects others by not plagiarizing, falsifying, or fabricating data.
- h. Discusses with the mentor when a conflict arises or belief that the mentor is not engaging in ethical conduct.

6. Is forthcoming about one's needs in the mentoring relationship:

- a. Clearly states at the outset of the mentorship relationship what his/her needs are from the mentor, including topic areas, research design, methodology or analysis needs, current knowledge, time commitments expected, and learning preference and style.
- b. Discusses potential outcomes of the project (e.g., products) and what ownership these may entail.
- c. Communicates with the mentor when the needs change, renegotiates the mentoring relationship, and understands if these changed needs are no longer under the expertise of the mentor.

7. Is an effective learner who enters the relationship with a desire to learn and gain knowledge or skill in a particular area of research, including the following:

- a. Follows through on suggestions for resources, readings, and other educational suggestions provided by the mentor that relate to the needs and/or topic areas of the mentee.
- b. Is dedicated to learning the research process or particular research area for which he/she is seeking guidance.
- c. Understands his/her limitations in the area of research and seeks, through conversations and discussions with the mentor, readings, and other activities, to fill this void.
- d. Maintains curiosity in understanding the process of research and the various components of being a competent researcher.
- e. Is open-minded in the research mentorship process and is willing to try new ideas as appropriate.
- f. Is able to be autonomous and self-directed, thus, is not dependent on the mentor for every aspect of carrying the research through but can come to the mentor for guidance in specific areas of the process.