

Chapter 1

Introduction

Music takes up where speech leaves off, it utters the ineffable. It makes us discover in ourselves depths we had not suspected, and conveys impressions and states of being that no words can render.

(Camille Saint-Saens, *The Composer as Psychologist* , 1903)

Mentors in music

Mentoring and mentor relationships have long been a traditional pedagogical method for the training of musicians for a career in music. Such relationships are a unique phenomenon as the meaning and construction of the relationship is as unique as the individuals who choose to engage in the relationship. For the purposes of this study, the term *mentor* is defined as the teacher, the person who is older and more experienced as a musician, and acts as a guide for the protégé. The term *protégé* is defined as the junior partner in the relationship and is the aspiring musician seeking guidance and instruction from the mentor.

Most music training today, whether it be of beginners, intermediate or advanced, is taught on a one-to-one basis. It could, therefore, be argued that music is the one specialised area of education today that still uses and values mentorship as a form of pedagogy, and whether it be instrumental lessons, conducting coaching or composition, most musicians have had a mentor experience as part of their initial training, and later in the establishment of a career in music. The concert pianist, Claudio Arrau, when referring to teachers said:

A teacher, a guide, is important because they help you unfold and develop and (therefore) is absolutely necessary. The teacher needs to be the right one for you, because the teacher-pupil relationship is a two-sided affair involving mutual responses. Concentration should not be on music alone; to better understand music the artist must embrace the total universe (Mach 1981, p.2).

Classic mentorship examples in music history might include Monteverdi and Cavalli (Harnoncourt 1989), Haydn and Beethoven (Scott 1975), Beethoven and Czerny (Schonberg 1963), Schumann and Brahms (Litzmann 1973), Czerny and Liszt (Dubal 1984) Liszt and Von Bulow (Dubal 1984), Rachmaninov and Horowitz (Chasins 1988; Plaskin 1983), Busoni and Greig (Schonberg 1963), Mitropoulos and Bernstein (Burton 1995; Peyser 1982), Boulez and Messiaen (Peyser 1977). One only has to read the volume of literature on the great musicians to realise that almost every notable performer, composer, conductor or pedagogue has had a mentor whom he/she considered significant and influential at some stage of their professional life. Torrance (1983) suggests in his book *Guiding Creative Talent*, wherever independence and creativity occur and persist, there are people who play the role of mentor for aspiring protégés.

When concert pianist, Alfred Brendal reflected on his lessons with teacher and mentor, Edwin Fischer, in his book, *Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts*, he provided a glimpse into the depth and meaning of mentor relationships. This included the influence by the mentor on the psyche of the music student, as well as the dual nature of the relationship for the mentor and the protégé. The experience can go beyond the conveying of knowledge, with each individual benefiting in different ways from the interaction. The data collected from the 15 informants in this study who are musicians (including teachers,

performers, musicologists, and music administrators), supports this concept of mentorship when Brendal says:

He was electrifying by his mere presence. A few conducting gestures, an encouraging word, could have the effect of lifting the pupil above themselves. When he outlined the structure of a whole movement, the gifted ones among the participants felt they were looking into the very heart of the music. He sometimes helped us more by an anecdote or a comparison than would have been possible by factual instruction. He was happy to be surrounded by young people who trusted in him, and his playing for us was at its most beautiful. Those were the greatest, the unforgettable impressions (Brendel 1976, p.123).

Claudio Arrau, when discussing his approach to teaching advanced students wishing to undertake a career in piano performance, stated that when he taught:

he tried to awaken not only musical elements in the young artist, but also tried to inculcate the importance of developing the completely cultured personality including reading, theatre, opera, study of art and classical literature, as well as psychology (Mach 1981, p.3).

Rosalyn Tureck also gives us an insight into the meaning of mentor relationships when she described her studies with Chiapusso as being 'the period that was the great and rich fertile source of her life' (Mach 1981, p.164).

From such descriptions of mentor relationships we develop an appreciation of the importance and strong emotional interaction between mentor and protégé. Relationships in which 'the mentor is trusted, loving, and experienced in the guidance of the younger and who significantly shapes the overall development of the protégé' (Merriam 1983, p.160). According to Kern (1998, p.351) 'mentors can also be excellent instructors in the art of living and aging'.

Importance of mentors in the training of musicians

The role and importance of the 'mentor' relationship is not new to the training and development of musicians. For generations, musicians have received their training from private instrumental studio teachers using the tradition of master teacher and apprentice student. History records the great composers, conductors and performers as having had significant people in their lives who have helped them establish careers. At the secondary and tertiary levels of music training the same pedagogical approach has been maintained, and sufficed for aspiring music professionals whether their interest be performance, composition, or musicology.

For secondary and tertiary music students (whether they be studying performance, musicology or composition), it is likely to be the experience of one-to-one tuition that they have in the teaching studio that will eventually involve the teacher in many developmental aspects of their lives either as confidant, counsellor, adviser or friend (Bridges 1973). As Chapter 5 will show, mentor relationships tend to be synonymous with the training of musicians, and the mentor often plays the role of teacher, confidant, and sponsor for the protégé. It is, therefore, not unusual, if the conditions are right, for the student and teacher to develop a mutual relationship based on similar interests, goals and needs. Alfred Brendal, when discussing the teaching of music students, suggests the following approach:

One is to build up a student over a long period and be totally responsible for them, not only musically but also psychologically, so that the teacher is his/her confidant, his/her motivator, and/or love-hate object (Mach 1981, p.31).

One-to-one teacher/student relationships, by their nature, are unique and often lead to the development of a special bonding and type of

interaction referred to as a 'mentor' relationship. Cohen (1995) refers to mentoring as a dynamic interaction which requires mutual commitment to truly evolve into a satisfying and meaningful learning experience. 'If properly approached, the mentor and protégé should take pleasure in the enriching interpersonal exchange of offering and receiving which is the essence of the adult mentoring relationship' (p.xi, Preface). The phenomenon of the music teacher and the development of mentor relationships with talented protégés has also been documented in such films as 'Madam Souza', 'The Music Teacher', 'The Getting of Wisdom', 'Shine', 'Tous les Matins du Monde' and the novel *Maestro* (Goldsworthy 1990).

The research question

The question remains as to why mentor relationships are important in the training of musicians. How are these relationships constructed and what is the meaning of the relationship for the mentor and the protégé? What are the dynamics of such relationships? How do they evolve? What are the functions and skills required by the mentor and the protégé, so that the relationship develops and is mutually beneficial to both individuals?

This study attempts to address these important questions by directly asking informants who are faculty staff from 12 different music institutions within Australia for their understanding and perceptions of mentorship and how it relates to the training of musicians. These informants represent a cross section of music faculty staff working with young people in their training and development as professional musicians and include academic lecturers, instrumental tutors, senior administrators, and conductors.

In recent years much has been written about mentorship and its application in the educational and corporate worlds. However, after reviewing the literature, no studies were found regarding mentor relationships and how they might apply to musicians. This would seem rather odd when (i) most of the literature indicates that the great musicians and pedagogues of today and the past have had some kind of mentor figure in their lives, and (ii) most music teaching is still taught on a one-to-one basis in a music studio, whether it be a beginner, intermediate or advanced student.

Aims of the study

This study aims to document the importance of the 'mentor' relationship in the training of musicians by describing the essence and breadth of the mentor experience for musicians. This will be achieved by:

- (i) uncovering the diversity of the mentoring experiences
- (ii) identifying the differences and similarities of the experience in how people give meaning to, and define the mentorship
- (iii) identifying the elements of the relationship experience perceived by musicians as important or critical to mentor relationships
- (iv) examining the issues that relate to the functions of the mentor relationship, and that effect both the mentor and protégé.

In reviewing the literature and considering the origins of the term 'mentor', one discovers that there is no concise or definitively accepted understanding of the term. The literature review in Chapter 2 examines the meaning and importance given to mentoring, as it applies to both the educational and corporate settings of today, and outlines the conceptual development of the mentoring process.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Teaching is pre-eminently an act of care. We must be concerned not simply with how much knowledge our students acquire but also with how they are making meaning of that knowledge and how it effects their capacity to go on learning, framing the world in ever more inclusive and comprehensive ways.

(Laurent Daloz, *Effective Teaching and Mentoring*, p.237)

Origins of the term 'mentor'

The mentor-protégé relationship is possibly the oldest pedagogical relationship. For centuries wise men have given counsel to the young novice entering a profession, where he (the novice) was placed under the tutelage of an older, wiser and experienced expert within the field. Gerstein (1985) believes mentoring may date back to the Neolithic Age or earlier, where wise elders, and perhaps the aged and less mobile, would have sat around the fire giving instruction to younger generations on how to drive the mastodon into the pit or kill it with stones and spears.

In ancient Greece young males were partnered with older experienced males that were often friends or relatives of the boy's family. From these partnerships the boys were expected to emulate and assimilate the values of the older mentors (Morton-Cooper & Palmer 1993). In the middle ages mentoring occurred within the master guilds, with young teenage boys being apprenticed to an older craftsman for a number of years to learn the skills and traditions of the profession.

The term 'mentor' is derived from Homer's *Odyssey* whereby Athene took the image of Mentor who was Odysseus' loyal and most trusted friend. It was Mentor who was given the responsibility for caring and nurturing Telemachus (Odysseus' son) when the father was away from home on a ten year journey and fighting at the Trojan War (Bova & Phillips 1984; Merriam 1983; Roche 1979). The relationship of Mentor to Telemachus was a role of responsibility requiring Mentor to be guide, counsellor, tutor, coach, sponsor, defender, and at times protector — in short, 'locus in parentis' for Odysseus. It required an emotional and professional involvement in Telemachus' life so that he grew and developed in knowledge and wisdom. It is within the nature of this relationship between Mentor and Telemachus that we find common ground for defining the nature and function of a mentor/protégé relationship.

The mentor of mythology has a role in the safe and proper development of younger associates. It is with the concept of protection that we come to consider and use the word 'protégé', originating from the French verb 'protéger' meaning protector. Protection and development are two of the core functions that mentors provide for protégés.

The mentor archetype can be of either sex, according to Jung (1958), and represents 'knowledge, reflection, insight, wisdom, cleverness and intuition'. In Greek mythology Athene was the goddess of wisdom and would sometimes assume the form of Mentor. As in Homer's *Odyssey* the figure appears in a situation where insight, understanding, good advice, determination and planning are needed but cannot be mustered by oneself and often the mentor arriving just in time for the protégé. However, Fager (1988) states that Mentor and Telemachus did

not constitute the first mentor-protégé relationship and that such relationships were to be found in the Hebrew Bible. He cites Moses and Joshua as an example, as well as Elijah and Elisha. It is, therefore, the source of the term 'mentor' which lies in Homeric times and not the relationship (Caldwell & Carter 1993).

Mentors usually hold a senior and trusted position of responsibility within an organisation. They have professional status and recognition within the profession that help protégés develop technical skills, achieve academic or executive credibility and career advancement through their established professional networks (Blackburn, Chapman & Cameron 1981). In history there is no shortage of examples of mentor relationships between the older and more experienced expert in the field and the aspiring novice or protégé. Such notable relationships might include Socrates and Plato, Freud and Jung, Medici and Michelangelo, Boas and Mead, Sartre and de Beauvoir (Merriam 1983; Wright & Wright 1987).

Defining the concept of mentorship

In 1965 the United States Department of Labor in its publication *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* of over 35,550 job titles, defined mentoring as 'dealing with individual students in terms of their total personalities in order to advise, counsel, and/or guide them (p.649). This classification was expanded by Breen (1975) to include the following interpersonal skills as critical requirements for mentoring (pp.101–3). These included:

- (i) listening
- (ii) asking questions
- (iii) reflecting back feeling and informational responses
- (iv) guiding conversation

- (v) diagnosing and evaluating feelings and information, feeding back diagnosis
- (vi) making suggestions
- (vii) prescribing treatments and approaches
- (viii) instructing and presenting information, explaining
- (ix) forecasting possible outcomes, predicting consequences of alternative courses of action
- (x) giving assurances and support
- (xi) motivating, plus providing feedback and evaluation of students' progress.

Cross (1976) outlined mentoring as requiring a higher level of interpersonal competence than traditional teaching in terms of its behavioural components. Cain (1977) went further and suggested that the delivery of academic services is the primary responsibility of mentors who also perform other functions that include counselling, advising, designing individual degree programs, assessing and evaluating, and managing and developing instructional resources.

In the mid 1960s the term 'mentor' came into vogue when educational sociologist Torrance (1980) noted that the descriptives 'patron', 'sponsor' or 'coach' were insufficient to describe the depth of the relationships that were instrumental in the development and guidance of creatively gifted children. In the 1970s Shapiro (1977), Sheehy (1976) and Levinson (1978) freely associated the term 'mentor' as a description for these types of relationships.

Since the late 1970s the importance of the mentoring relationship has sustained much interest in terms of academic research and discussion. This has mostly been conducted in the areas of health, business professions, adult education and academia (Hjornevik 1986; Lester &

Johnson 1981). Mentoring has since been considered the basic form of education for human development because it provides a holistic, yet individual and experiential approach to learning. Blackburn (1981) described the phenomenon as a 'symbiotic partnership' as the relationships exist because of the benefits that both mentor and protégé give to each other. These benefits are discussed in detail later in the chapter.

Levinson (1978) describes this period in the young adult's life as 'getting into the adult world' where he/she makes career choices and forms attachments outside of the family. Levinson defines the four developmental tasks for the individual aged between 17–32 years as being: (i) forming the dream, (ii) finding a mentor relationship, (iii) forming a career, and (iv) marrying and having a family. Osherson (1980) classifies this stage in life as having meaning and purpose.

It is important to note that mentoring is not defined by formal roles but in terms of the relationship and the functions it serves (Levinson 1978). The relationship requires a personal and professional interest in the development of a younger protégé by the older mentor who, in turn, acts as a teacher, sponsor, host, guide, counsellor, defender and realiser of the professional 'dream' (Barnes & Stiasny 1995; Levinson 1978). It is an exclusive relationship that facilitates the sharing of information, attitudes, insights, life experience and professional philosophy.

For many years in universities mentoring has been an essential part of graduate education (Rogers 1986), and often is considered as a 'mutual admiration society' (Moore 1982; Phillips 1977). Hanson (1983) describes the 'classic' mentor relationship as one characterised by a unique interaction between two individuals where learning and

experimentation takes place, coupled with the gaining of skills and competencies and occurring within a supportive atmosphere. Yet the mentor relationship is undemocratic and exclusionary, as not everyone is chosen, or has the experience of being mentored (Shapiro et al. 1977). For the music student, the prerequisite in finding a mentor is to, firstly, have musical talent and, secondly, find a teacher who recognises the talent and is prepared to nurture and develop the talent through a personal and professional interest.

The meaning and functions of the mentoring relationship

In the process of developing and maintaining a trusting, working relationship, Playko (1990) notes that mentors and protégés both encounter good and bad times and where the relationship can falter and be tested to its limits. It is, therefore, an important undertaking by both parties in the initial stages that a commitment is made to maintaining, improving and continuing the partnership by means of open communication. Only when this occurs can both mentor and protégé reap the professional and personal benefits of the relationship.

One of the first most significant studies concerning mentoring was undertaken by Levinson (1978), who interviewed 40 men between the ages of 30 and 45 years and documented the meaning, function and importance of mentoring in their lives. He concluded that mentoring is one of the most complex and developmentally important relationships that a person can have in early adulthood. The dynamics range from 'love' to a paternal relationship, and the relationship is defined by Levinson in terms of the quality and functions it serves and not its formal roles. Sheehy (1976) confirms this description but suggests that the mentor is more a guide who supports a protégé's young adult dreams, and then helps him/her to attain reality. Sheehy,

unlike Levinson, did not consider the relationship to be parental in nature.

Daloz (1986), in his book, *Effective Teaching and Mentoring*, suggests that education is something we neither give nor do for students, but rather the way we stand in relation to them. It is the nature of the relationship that is best understood by the metaphor of a journey in which the teacher serves as a guide. The guide assists the protégé by giving him/her travel directions, travel tips, smoothing the bumps in the road, navigating difficult turns, providing maps, and repairing the road and the vehicle. Mentors serve as trusted guides but are not tour directors. They are the gatekeepers of the old and the new worlds, holding the keys for the successful passage of the protégé.

Levinson (1978) noted that the function of a mentor can be to act as a teacher to enhance the younger person's skills and intellectual development. Mentors may also serve as sponsors or use their influence to promote the young person's entry and advancement in their profession. They may be host and guide to welcome the initiates into the occupational and social world and acquaint them with its values, customs, resources, and cast of characters. Through the mentors' own virtues, achievements, and way of life, they may be an exemplar that protégés admire, and seek to emulate. They may also provide counsel and moral support in times of stress.

Kram (1985b) and Merriam (1983), in a review of Levinson's research, suggest that Levinson's functions can be classified as either 'career' or 'psycho-social' functions. Career functions include sponsorship, exposure, visibility, coaching, protection and challenging assignments, whereas psycho-social functions include role modelling, friendship, counselling, acceptance and confirmation. Other factors that affect the

functions of mentor relationships include the developmental tasks that each individual brings to the relationship that in turn shape the particular functions sought by protégés and offered by mentors. The interpersonal and communication skills of both the mentor and protégé will affect how the relationship develops and the range of functions offered. The organisational context will also shape the formal or informal role of the relationship (Kram 1985b).

Benefits of mentor relationships

Mentoring relations are generally accepted as having benefits for both the mentor and the protégé, although each individual benefits in differing ways. Lester and Johnson (1981) observes that adults working with mentors grow in their own sense of intellectual competence, their sense of purpose, feelings of autonomy and personal integrity. Accepting this axiom we begin to see mentoring as the pinnacle of the education process, assuming that the dynamics between mentor and protégé are in harmony. Daloz (1986, p xii Preface) comments:

we know that the quality of education is high when students show intellectual, emotional and ethical growth; we know that teaching is excellent when it fosters such growth, when we have teachers who are willing to care both about their subjects and for their students.

Benefits of mentoring apply not only to the protégé and mentor, but also to the institution. Institutional advantages include improved individual performance, development for all the participants, smoother transitions of personal and organisation change, increased networking, better communication, greater teamwork and better morale (Barnes & Stiasny 1995; Blackburn et al. 1981). The benefits of good mentoring for the organisation, according to Farren (1984), are the passing on of the culture and traditions, increasing the loyalty within the organisation, the ongoing fostering of staff and student

development, the keeping of top people motivated by being appreciated, exposing the older generation to new ideas, and helping mentors to clarify and articulate their own ideas. This is supported by Furlong and Maynard (1995) who adds that mentoring has career effects for the mentor by creating greater recognition and visibility within and outside the organisation.

Mentors begin to fulfil their own 'seventh' developmental life stage described by Erikson as 'Generativity verses Stagnation' that usually occurs in an individual's late forties or fifties (Osherson 1980). It is a stage whereby becoming a mentor to a younger protégé the older person comes to understand and gives meaning to his/her own life, as well as passing on particular knowledge and skills (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike & Newman 1984; Bova & Phillips 1984; Hjernevik 1986; Schmidt & Wolfe 1980; Wright & Wright 1987). It can also bring a sense of pride and continuity to the mentor's own work. Bensahel (1977) takes the concept further by suggesting that there can be intimations of immortality in realising that the mentor's own endeavours will continue through someone younger. Rudolf Firkusny, when talking about the passing on of knowledge to protégés, expands the concept of 'generativity' by raising the issue of artistic responsibility:

eventually we will be judged on what we did to educate a new generation of artists to carry on the tradition that history gave us through a general attitude toward music. The art of music has persisted through the ages, and it is the job of the present artists (teachers) to show the young, how that art is, and to share it with them (Mach 1981, p.87).

Kram (1985b) also notes that individuals who are usually in mid-career gain from the technical and psychological support of a loyal and devoted protégé. Other benefits include professional and/or career development by either advancement or intellectual and creative

rejuvenation (Hunt & Michael 1983; Kram 1985; Levinson 1978; Schmidt & Wolfe 1980; Wright & Wright 1987) Networking as a mentor within the professional field can help bring increased visibility among the mentor's colleagues who see the development of a talented protégé, as well as greater recognition by the organisation for fostering and promoting new talent that may also lead to promotions. This might be in the form of being advanced to the next level, being placed on committees or advisory boards, or being given greater responsibility within the organisation by the executive management.

The benefits of mentoring to protégés are considerable and include access to people with specialised skills, a role model whom he/she may choose to emulate in terms of skills or a particular professional philosophical perspective. Protégés are usually privy to personal knowledge and the politics of the institution, while being groomed in the unwritten rules of the profession. It also brings status and visibility for protégés in being chosen and associated with someone experienced and accepted within the profession (Barnes & Stiasny 1995; Playko 1990; Wright & Wright 1987). Personal benefits include increased self esteem and confidence by being provided with a 'safe' environment where the protégé is able to take risks while developing personal style and professional values (Moore 1982; Schatzberg-Smith 1988).

Erkut and Mokros (1984), in a study of undergraduates, found that protégés learn from their role model how to formulate thoughts better, set priorities, interact with others more effectively and organise time more efficiently. Kaufmann et al (1986), who studied 139 gifted scholars who were selected as Presidential Scholars between 1964–68, these found that protégés rated support and encouragement as the highest functions served by their mentors. Other functions included the

creation of opportunities that expanded the protégés' experiences, and the encouragement of protégés to take on new challenges that tested their limits. Busch (1985) reported that professors as mentors recognised the value of the relationship both to their students and for themselves. Younger professors reported more depth to their mentoring relationships and the older professors a greater sense of breadth. Busch, like Roche (1979), believed that professors who had been mentored were more likely to become mentors themselves.

The process of mentoring

Mentoring 'begins by engendering trust, issuing a challenge, providing encouragement and offering a vision for the journey. Throughout the journey the mentor alternately supports and challenges their protégé to keep moving, to sustain the quest' (Daloz 1986, p.30). It is the mentor who propels the protégé forward by providing ongoing assessment and feedback which allows the protégé to recognise his/her own strengths and weaknesses while developing skills in a rigorous, but nurturing, environment (Johnsrud 1990). The relationship tends to be exclusionary and discriminatory in nature, allowing for high level cognitive and technical skills to be cultivated by the close and involved one-to-one relationship between mentor and protégé.

Rogers (1986) argues that clinical and performance students need to have role models. He also notes that mentors need to be practitioners and not just theorists as protégés do not learn skills by simply listening to lectures, watching videotapes or interacting with computers. Blackburn (1981) supports this argument and concludes that mentors tend to be more productive in their own scholarly output. Applying this concept to music mentors, the issue would be whether mentors

play the repertoire they teach, and whether they practise the art of performance by giving concerts.

One of the most important benefits of having a mentor is the extra curricular knowledge, professional information and advice given to protégés about areas such as dress, travel, organisational politics, self control, working with people, learning to judge others, being objective, analysing problems and finding effective solutions (Moore 1982). Other benefits include: learning to take risks, developing good communication skills, surviving in the organisation, respecting other people, setting high standards, being a good listener, becoming a leader, knowing how to get along with a range of people, and becoming a professional (Bova & Phillips 1984).

Roche (1979) found that mentors in the corporate world generally derive greater satisfaction from their careers, earn more money at a younger age, are better educated and more likely to follow a career plan. His respondents were more likely to sponsor young protégés in their profession. Levinson (1978), however, reminds us that the fundamental question for adult educators and researchers is not how mentoring can lead to material success, but how it relates to adult learning and human development.

After a 22 year longitudinal study of mentor relationships, Torrance (1983) concluded that mentors made a difference in the creative achievements and educational attainments of protégés, and generally wherever independence and creativity flourish there usually is some kind of sponsor or patron. These patrons (later called 'mentors') usually possess prestige and power within an institution, and those respondents who had a mentor generally complete a greater number of years of formal education than their peers.

The following section will now examine the conceptual developments of the mentor relationship. There have been numerous studies undertaken by researchers with either an educational or corporate perspective and, although producing slightly differing conceptual models, they are generally in agreement about the different phases of development.

The conceptual development of the mentoring relationship

The development of any relationship is evolutionary and the mentor relationship is no exception. The developmental processes of mentorships are characterised by the functions provided within the relationship, the individual experiences, and the quality of interaction (Kram 1985; Levinson 1978; Merriam 1983; Moore 1982), with most descriptions of the mentor evolutionary process converging in terms of its delineated phases. Levinson (1978) concluded that mentor relationships generally begin with a sense of excitement and strong mutual attraction, and are often developmental, like a 'love' relationship, and in the same way can end in divorce after several years, in anger, disagreement or resentment. However, it is the separation from the mentor by the protégé that allows the protégé to continue with other relationships which are necessary for the protégé's ongoing developmental needs.

Shapiro et al (1977) suggests that mentoring is part of a continuum of advisory support relationships which, in turn, are part of the larger patron system. The concept of only having a 'role model' is limiting as the junior colleague may wish to emulate the behaviours, personal style and specific skills of the senior colleague. However, this type of interaction does not require professional or personal involvement by either party. Instead, Shapiro et al proposes a system of professional

patronage and sponsorship, with 'peer pals' at one end of the spectrum and mentors at the other end. Between these two points are included 'guides' and 'sponsors'. This continuum is summarised in Table 2.1, with the advantages and/or functions listed below each type of patron.

Table 2.1: Shapiro et al conceptual model of career relationships

PATRON SYSTEM			
Peer Pals	Guides	Sponsors	Mentors
sharing information	explaining the system	strong patrons	intense
discussing strategies	pointing out pitfalls	benefactors	paternalistic
	pursuing short-cuts	'old boy/girl'	
	valuable intelligence		networks
more egalitarian			more hierarchical
peer related			parental in nature
less intense			intensive
less exclusionary			exclusionary
more democratic			elitist
allows more access to other professionals			network limited
creating one's own network			restrictive

Source: Shapiro, et al. 1977, pp.51–58

Schmidt and Wolfe (1980) refers to the guides and peer pals within Shapiro et al patron continuum system as consultants or advisers, where the relationship is based on competency and is rewarded by good faith and some degree of *quid pro quo*, as in the case of a boss/employee relationship. This type of consultant/adviser relationship may not have the same influence on the protégé as a mentor, but can help in the explaining of the political system for the new person to the organisation (Hanson 1983). 'Peer pal' refers to supportive relationships between equal status peers. By sharing

information and strategies, peers can develop support systems for themselves and others within the organisation.

Phillips (1977) found that mentoring was one of five key factors identified as critical to the career success of 331 women managers and executives in business whom she interviewed. Phillips defined the mentor development phases as mutual admiration, development, disillusionment, parting and transformation. She delineated the role of mentor also into primary and 'secondary' classifications. Primary mentors were more like volunteers who took personal and professional interest in their protégés, and demonstrated their care by going out of their way to assist in the careers. Secondary mentors, however, were less involved on the personal and professional level and saw mentoring the protégé as part of their assigned duties.

Moore (1982) suggests that the phases of development begin with the recognition of talent in protégés, followed by additional tests that are constructed and administered by the mentor. The next phase is the personal invitation to work closely together. This is described as being 'selective and specific' which includes a certain degree of prestige and status for the protégé. This is then followed by a development phase where the protégé is assigned real assignments (as opposed to test assessments). The last phase is usually assistance with career advancement via either personal support or professional networks.

Missiriam (1982), in a critical review of the literature with particular reference to adult learning, business and the academic setting, outlines specific phases of the mentor relationship. These phases are initiation, development and termination. She also stated that the mentor phenomenon leads to confusion as to what is measured or offered in the relationship because it is not clearly conceptualised. Mentoring as a

result means different things depending on whether one is a psychologist, business person or academic.

Kram (1985b) argues that the descriptive models of Phillips and Moore are limited in value because: (i) they were both collected from retrospective accounts of managers who were describing relationships experienced early in their careers; (ii) the findings were derived from only one perspective (not both parties); (iii) there was the possibility of distortion due to faulty memory, and (vi) the sample only included female managers. The phase model proposed by Kram includes *initiation* when the relationship starts, *cultivation* when the functions provided expand to a maximum, *separation* when the nature of the relationship is changed as a result of organisational or psychological changes in the two individuals and, finally, the *redefinition* phase when the relationship either evolves into a new personal or professional friendship. This conceptual development is derived from a study of mentor relationships within an organisational context. The research was a study of junior and senior managers in a corporate setting with the primary purpose of presenting an intricate and realistic view of mentoring with particular reference to benefits and limitations that occur in the work place.

These four descriptive models of mentoring phases are summarised in Table 2.2. Each phase is characterised by particular experiences, developmental functions and interaction that are determined by individual needs. What individuals seek in relationships and what they offer others shifts with the movement towards a higher career stage. When the relationship responds to the needs of both individuals it is complementary and can address developmental tasks that are important to both mentors and the protégés (Kram 1985b).

Table 2.2: Comparison of conceptual phases of the mentoring relationship

Levinson (1978)	Phillips (1977, 1982)	Missirian (1979, 1982)	Kram (1985)
love relationship (parental in nature)	mutual admiration	initiation	initiation
	development	development	cultivation
	disillusionment	termination	separation
	parting		redefinition
	transformation		

Source: [Levinson 1978; Phillips 1977; [Missiriam 1982; Kram 1985b

Another conceptual framework was suggested by Collins and Scott (1978), who outlined four interpersonal phases. Collins and Scott associates respective developmental requirements with an attendant outcome that can be either favourable or unfavourable. She believes that mentorship cannot be imposed but often emerges as a phenomenological experience between supervisors and their students as an extension of their supervisory role relationship. This particular conceptual framework was derived from qualitative interviews with social workers. Like Kram's model, these outcomes are determined by the developmental needs of the mentors and/or the protégés as the attachment and separation process unfolds.

A favourable outcome or function of a mentor relationship is one that is conducive to the development or continuance of the interpersonal relationship and also to the development and growth of both the mentor and protégé. An unfavourable outcome or function is one that is considered detrimental to the development or continuance of the interpersonal relationship and the growth and development of either party. Collins' and Scott phases are classified as *interaction*, *investment*,

facilitation and *adaptation*, and she refers to these phases as the ‘interpersonal vicissitudes’ of mentorship. These phases are summarised in Table 2.3, with the functions and outcomes described and listed with each phase.

Table 2.3: Collins’ and Scott conceptual framework of the mentoring process

Interpersonal Vicissitudes of Mentorship			
Interpersonal Phase	Developmental Requirement	Outcome Favourable	Unfavourable
1. Interaction	Emulation	Positive Model	Negative Model
2. Investment	Identification	Mutuality	Asymmetry
3. Facilitation	Internalisation	Individuation	Dependency
4. Adaptation	Accommodation	Acceptance	Estrangement

Source: Collins and Scott 1993

The O’Neil (1981) conceptual model of mentorship was formulated from research conducted at the University of New Mexico with the aim of determining what knowledge protégés learned from their mentors, and the different ways they learn. The design gives six different stages through which the mentoring relationship moves. These include entry, mutual building of trust, risk taking, teaching of skills, professional skills and finally dissolution as outlined in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: O’Neil’s conceptual development of mentoring

Developmental Stages of Mentoring					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Entry	Mutual building of trust	Risk taking	Teaching skills	Professional standards	Dissolution

Source: O’Neil 1981

Barnes and Stiasny (1995), author of the book, *Mentoring: Making it Work*, outlines the functions and skills necessary of a mentor for a mentor relationship to be successful. This model emphasises the need for the mentor to have well develop interpersonal skills and includes communication; counselling’ reflective, analytical and intellectual skills; clinical experience, and the ability for the mentor to let go of the protégé at the end of the relationship. These functions and skills are summarised in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5: Barnes’ and Stiasny conceptual model of necessary functions and skills required of a mentor

Successful mentor relationships: mentor requirements	
Functions	Skills
impart knowledge	adequate communication skills
develop critical thinking	adequate counselling skills
develop analytical skills	adequate analytical skills
lift protégé’s self esteem	adequate reflective skills
help network	adequate intellectual skills
train for independence	experience in the field
	able to let go

Source: Barnes & Stiasny 1995

The phenomenon of the mentoring relationship is not always ideal, as outlined in models already discussed. There are pitfalls and hazards to be avoided, and conflict in the personal relationship. One of the most common complications is a breakdown in communications and lack of interpersonal skills from either or both mentor and protégé. The following section outlines some of the hazards and limitations of ‘mentor’ relationships.

Limitations and hazards of mentor relationships

The advantages of mentorship have already been outlined for mentors and protégés; however, not all such relationships meet the ideal. Barnett (1984) stated that people who are at the ‘seventh stage’ of

Erickson's life and career cycle, known as 'generativity versus stagnation', must find new ways to combine authority and mutuality. 'Generativity', described by Elkind (1970), can be found in any person who actively concerns him or herself with the needs and welfare of a younger person. It is also a time when the older person is coming to terms with life's finiteness of time, and the choice of generativity or stagnation is also associated with the choices of either integrity or despair. Individuals who focus on the next generation by passing on their knowledge and skills by teaching and mentoring tend to have a greater sense of integrity in their later years (Kern 1998).

Mentoring as a phase of the 'Age of Generativity' described by Erickson is primarily concerned with establishing and guiding the next generation through generating creatively and productively. If mentoring is successful, with the protégé becoming independently productive, then a new link of the past (collectively) and toward the future has been accomplished. The protégé can then go forth to greater accomplishments than the mentor had dreamed (Barnett 1984).

By accepting responsibility and offering leadership to protégés, mentors foster the growth and development of aspiring young professionals, and this in turn can lead to independence and professional authority. The ideal mentoring relationship is one that consciously leads protégés towards independence and autonomy. This requires mentors to have a strong sense of self and an understanding of their own developmental needs, whereby they are able to 'let go', having played their role in the realisation and development of the professional dream as described by Levinson (1978). At this stage, mentors and protégés should be able to redefine the nature of their relationships.

If the mentorship has been successful, then protégés should be independently productive and go forth to greater accomplishments (Barnett 1984). It is at the separation stage that the relationship is most vulnerable. Levinson (1978), who likened the relationship to one of 'love', suggests that the mentor relationship is also difficult to terminate in a reasonable and civil manner. He states that much of the value of the relationship is often realised after its termination. If the relationship has been less than ideal, or has ended prematurely, then the result can often be a loss of self esteem, frustration and a sense of betrayal (Hunt & Michael 1983). Using the Levinson descriptive model, this is a stage when there can be self-denying gratitude or arrogant ingratitude on the part of protégés, and manipulation or smothering control on the part of mentors.

Cesa and Fraser (1989) stated that a good mentor-protégé relationship is determined only in part by the initial choice, and like other relationships, it requires the attention of mentors and protégés to be perceptive to each other's changing needs. It also requires each to have the flexibility to accommodate these needs. Such relationships depend on 'individual attributes such as quality performance and personal integrity' (Johnsrud 1990, p.58). Like most other types of relationships, the mentor-protégé model requires time and personal commitment.

The balance of power in mentoring relationships is non-democratic and heavily weighted in favour of the mentor. It is usually the mentor who chooses the student as a protégé and the student who must prove him or herself worthy of the attention. It is a scenario that, at worst, can lead to emotional, professional and, at times sexual, exploitation of protégés. This exploitation can lead to dependency and an inability for the protégé to develop self esteem and confidence. It is the mentor who

has the power to punish either in terms of grade assessments or emotional control (Moore 1982). This can be a result of feelings of jealousy and insecurity on the part of the mentor with the competition presented by the younger protégé, who might be viewed as possibly replacing the older mentor some time in the future (Levinson 1978). Carruthers (1993) refers to this as the 'Salieri syndrome', as suggested by the plot in the film 'Amadeus'. It is a syndrome associated with the blocking of opportunities and visibility of the student by protecting the mentor's interests. The protégé, however, is powerless and cannot punish the mentor whom he/she may feel has let him/her down or betrayed his/her loyalty and trust.

Exploitation is often associated with the status of the mentor within an institution, where the mentor can use his/her influence over the protégé who usually feels a sense of duty and gratitude for being chosen. Protégés can be seen by the institution at large, including the mentor's supervisors and colleagues, along with the protégé's peers, as being especially chosen. This in turn can allow the protégé to be privy to the politics and working knowledge of the 'inner' circle. Hennecke (1983) referred to this as the 'crown prince/princess syndrome'. This usually occurs by informal information associated with the history of the organisation, personal information, informal norms and 'in-jokes' (Moore 1982). This places added pressure on the protégé to maintain what Schmidt and Wolfe (1980) described as 'maintaining the relationship status quo'. Although protégés are accepted into the 'inner' circle they are only observers and usually have no real voice.

Detrimental facets of the relationship can include being limited to only one person's perspective, the mentor losing status within the organisation (or leaving altogether), sexual harassment and attachment

to a mentor with limited experience and professional skills (Kram 1985). This can mean loss of valuable career time for the protégé, and possible negative feedback from the organisation or institution. Mentors with poor skills are more likely to be rejecting, very critical and not have a vision or focus for their protégés (Hunt & Michael 1983). Hjernevik (1986) and Bensahel (1977) argue that mentors need to be very careful not to limit protégés in their development by the mentor's own professional skills and limitations. They should also not be over-protective of protégés, but allow them to take risks and learn by their successes and mistakes. Mentors should avoid moulding protégés too much in their own likeness, or taking too much professional kudos from the protégé's accomplishments. It is the mentor's major responsibility to channel the protégé's talents, energy and drive without destroying these attributes (Moore 1982).

For women, there are often problems confronting them as either protégés or mentors. In certain professions women can find themselves ostracised because it is considered a 'male' domain. In such cases it may be difficult to find a mentor or be selected as a protégé. If chosen as a protégé they may be an only female in an all male group.

Moore (1982) reminds us that while the circumstances that help create 'mentor' relationships are the same for either male or female, women's status can often have different results. She found that the sense of 'specialness', of being exceptional, that makes a female protégé feel good about being recognised and selected, may also cause her to feel or be treated as though she were an exception to other women, thereby, encouraging her to participate in keeping other women out of the group. It was for this reason that Moore found women at times to be less inclined to act as mentors to others within their profession.

Another discrimination faced by women is the mixed gender dyad that can lead to overt sexual harassment or possible malicious gossip from other members of faculty or organisation (Merriam 1983; Sheehy, 1976).

Despite the relevance of these issues, there is a lack of research concerning gender and the mixed gender dyad in mentoring. Much of the major research carried out since the 1970s has a particular bias towards males, including Levinson (1978), Sheehy (1976), Roche (1979) and Collins and Scott (1978). Erkut and Mokros (1984) suggests that women tend to be neither attracted to, nor avoid having, a female mentor. On the other hand, males prefer male mentors because they perceive them as having greater professional status. However, in studies of women with successful professional careers, it was a mentor relationship that was cited as one of major reasons for their success, although they did not necessarily earn as much in salary as their male counterparts (Merriam 1983; Phillips 1977).

Zey (1995) suggests that mentoring does have risks. These include: the time and energy factor that can distract the mentor from his/her own work, the emotional factor of exposing one's self to the protégé so that he/she may learn from the weaknesses and failures of the mentor as well as his/her successes. If the protégé fails to perform as well as the mentor had predicted within the organisation the failure may be reflected back on the mentor, with the mentor losing his/her position of influence and/or status within the organisation, which ultimately affects the future of the protégé. This last scenario Zey describes as the 'black halo' scenario because the protégé who holds the mentor in high esteem also suffers because of his or her association with the 'out of favour' supervisor.

Ways of facilitating a mentor relationship

If we accept the theory and research regarding the need for mentors in our personal and professional lives, then the next question would be: How do we then set about to find a mentor? This is usually not difficult for the intellectually bright or creatively gifted (Hennecke 1983; Kaufmann et al. 1986). However, not everyone is creatively gifted, intellectually bright or has had the opportunity of being mentored. One of the important questions for many people is: How does the average individual get to experience a mentoring relationship? Should potential mentors in institutions be selected and trained in communication and interpersonal skills?

Farren (1984) states that the principal ways in which an organisation could establish a successful mentor program should include:

- (i) assuring staff that the program is voluntary, given that any mentorship takes time and commitment
- (ii) minimising the rules for the participants and maximising the mentor's freedom
- (iii) creating network possibilities for protégés
- (iv) sharing and negotiating expectations between mentors and protégés
- (v) rewarding mentors by increasing their visibility within the organisation.

Alleman et al (1984) suggests that one means of increasing the number of mentoring relationships in an organisation is by the establishment of a developmental group specifically for potential mentors. There would then be a need to schedule special sessions that would help the

mentors focus on issues and functions of the mentor relationship. These sessions would include:

- (i) discussion of the benefits to the individuals
- (ii) consideration of the dynamics of the relationship, including its various stages and phases of development
- (iii) ways to increase the protégé's competence
- (iv) ways to increase the protégé's self esteem
- (v) ways to facilitate the protégé's entry in the profession
- (vi) how to anticipate possible problems with the mentor relationship
- (vii) learning to adapt mentoring practices to a particular setting or circumstance.

For the prospective mentor, Cohen (1995) suggests that the interpersonal skills of the mentor are vital in the establishment of the dynamics early in the mentor relationship. The dynamics of the relationship need to incorporate a facilitative, confrontive, role modelling and visionary focus for the protégé. Ultimately the mentor needs to have empathetic behaviours that help in the understanding and development of the protégé. He outlined five different behaviours that he identified as contributing to a positive, empathetic and evolving relationship (p.29). These are:

- (i) practising responsive listening (including verbal and non-verbal behaviours that signal sincere interest)
- (ii) asking open-ended questions that are related to specific crucial situations
- (iii) providing descriptive feedback that is based on observations
- (iv) using perception checks to ensure comprehension of feelings
- (v) offering non-judgemental sensitive responses that assist in the clarification of emotional states and reactions.

The principal factors that are responsible for the disintegration of mentor relationships were outlined by Zey (1995, p.162). These related primarily to problems in the mentor relationship, and problems between members of the relationship and the organisation. They include:

- (i) Problems in the mentor relationship
 - failure to communicate needs
 - failure to communicate goals
 - protégé's failure to correctly assess mentor's intentions
 - emotional over dependence.
- (ii) Problems between members of the mentor relationship and the organisation
 - both parties' failure to assess political environment
 - mentor's inability to control political environment
 - protégé's failure to establish other alliances
 - mentor's failure to upgrade protégé's status and position within the organisation.

Zey (1995) in his book *The Mentor Connection*, provides advice to protégés by suggesting several factors that an aspiring protégé should keep in mind when considering their choice of a possible mentor. These factors include:

- Is the mentor good at what he/she does?
- Is the mentor supported by his/her organisation?
- How is the mentor judged within the organisation?
- Is the mentor a good teacher as well as a good practitioner?
- Is the mentor a good motivator?
- What are the protégé's specific needs and goals?

- What are the needs and goals of the prospective mentor in the relationship?
- How powerful is the mentor? What is his/her status within the organisation?
- Is the mentor secure in his/her position within the organisation?
- What is the chemistry and rapport that the protégé has with the potential mentor?

Importance of mentorship in the training of musicians

As outlined in this literature review, 'mentoring' can have a profound influence on a person's professional and personal life. These relationships are intense and charged with energy and emotion (Hanson 1983; Levinson 1978; Shapiro et al. 1977). Regardless of the hazards and limitations of the relationships, mentors are highly sought after and valued by aspiring executives, academics, musicians, managers and people in upwardly advancing careers.

The importance and need for mentoring in education is best summarised by Daloz (1986), author of *Effective Teaching and Mentoring* :

If we are serious when we assert that education is most successful when students 'grow', that it is intellectual development we are about, rather than simply knowledge acquisition, then the evidence is strong that emotional engagement must be a part of the learning process. The recognition that passion is central to learning and the capacity to provide emotional support when it is needed, are hallmarks that distinguish the good mentor from the mediocre teacher (p.33).

Mentors provide career and psycho-social functions to protégés by acting as sponsors, teachers, guides, coaches and role models. This also includes visibility, exposure, professional networking, skill development, friendship and counselling for protégés. Protégés grow

in their own intellectual competency, their sense of purpose, personal integrity, confidence and self esteem. They are usually accepted by the mentor's colleagues and privy to the knowledge and politics of the 'inner' circle.

This research addresses the shortcomings of the literature in terms of mentorship related to the training of musicians and describes the functions of mentor relationships as they apply to the training of musicians. In studying the development of mentor relationships as they relate to the training of musicians we will be able to construct and give meaning to the importance and need for developing mentoring programs within music institutions.

By means of 'in-depth' interviews and analysis of data collected from people already working within selected music faculties, it will be possible to devise guidelines and design programs that can be implemented for more efficient and productive training of talented and creative students, by helping teachers to become more effective mentors to the next generation of musicians. Most tertiary music teachers in Australia have come to teaching from a background in instrumental performance. They have spent much of their own training in developing instrumental skills, learning repertoire and giving concerts to establish themselves as music professionals. These teachers usually have no training in pedagogy, psychology, communication or interpersonal skills (Comte 1994).

Chapter 3

Theoretical Perspective

Reality is inextricably linked to our mental processes ... and our in-built, innate capacity to construct meaning.

(Spinelli, *The Interpreted World*, 1995, p.2)

The research question and qualitative research

We need to choose a theoretical and methodological perspective that can adequately explore and describe how the 'mentor' process is experienced and socially constructed by the people directly involved. Denzin (1978) reminds us that the function of theory is to give order and insight to the research activities, while the function of methodology represents the principal ways that researchers investigate their environment through, for example, experiments, surveys, life histories, etc. This process is inescapably tied with human experience and, therefore, it is argued that the choice of a qualitative research method is essential because it allows data to be collected on the complexity, meaning and interpretation of the mentoring experience from the individual's personal perspective. As Kvale (1996) states in his book, *Interviews*, 'if you want to know how people understand their world and their life, why not talk to them?' (p.1).

The main intellectual undercurrents of qualitative research with its distinct epistemology are phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, *verstehen*, naturalism and ethogenics (Bryman 1995). What all of these intellectual traditions have in common is their attempt to describe and provide insights into the inner world and behaviour of people. The

sociological perspective of symbolic interactionism provides an appropriate conceptual foundation to contemplate the breadth of the 'mentoring' experience in terms of human behaviour and interactions as experienced by the informants. This particular theoretical perspective sees society as being a loose arrangement of heterogeneous groups, and is based on the assumption that the organisation of social life develops from within society and out of the processes of interaction between individual members of society (Wild, 1985).

Applying these concepts, Osherson (1980) and Hanson (1983) describe the 'classic' mentoring relationship as one characterised by a unique interaction between two individuals where learning and experimentation can occur, coupled with the gaining of skills and competencies within a supportive atmosphere. The relationship also can be considered as undemocratic and exclusionary, given that not everyone is chosen or has the experience of being mentored (Shapiro et al. 1977). Blackburn (1981) described the mentoring phenomenon as a 'symbiotic partnership.'

A qualitative research approach allows the researcher to gather a rich tapestry of descriptions and life histories which will highlight and describe the complexity of meaning and interpretation of the 'mentor' process. This understanding will be achieved by analysing the individual as well as the sum of each informant's personal views, reflective meanings and experiences of becoming a mentor and describing its role, purpose and contradictory nature. Denzin (1978) describes the act of engaging in social research as a process of symbolic interaction that reflects a continual attempt by the researcher to lift his/her own idiosyncratic experience to the level of the consensual and the shared meaning of the informant. It is through qualitative research

that the researcher may be able to uncover the feelings, thoughts and perceptions experienced by people in the context of their daily lives and how these in turn influence their action. Minichiello et al (1995) reminds us that the focus of qualitative research is not to reveal casual relationships, but 'discover the nature of the phenomena as humanly experienced' (p.7).

Origins of qualitative research and symbolic interactionist theory

It was Blumer (1969) who formulated the phrase 'symbolic interaction'. He was an ardent follower of the philosopher, George Mead, who had developed the concept of 'self'. Mead believed that the 'self' is an acting organism and not a passive receptacle in life. He proposed that people have the ability to form and guide their own conduct via the mechanism of self-interaction and that each of us has a 'self' that is capable of reflection. Meaning and significance of events in the everyday world are selected by the reflective mind and thus help to shape our lives by influencing our own actions and the actions of other people we interact with.

The 'self' is conceptualised as a process that is reflective in nature and allows humans to be able to consider themselves as unique identities. This follows that we, as individuals, are able through our own imagination to stand aside of our behaviour and actions to view them from different perspectives (Hammersley 1989). Wild (1985) paraphrases this perspective by stating that it is via the internal conversations and taking the part of 'others' that individuals make sense and organise their lives. This provides an important framework to begin to understand how people may use their very common,

divergent experiences and interpretation of events to derive a particular significance to the mentor relationship.

Blumer (1969) expanded Mead's work and concluded that the meaning of experience develops from social interaction between people. It is through social interaction that individuals come to interpret each other's behaviour through shared symbols and meanings. The meaning for the individual comes from the processes of social interaction and interpretation. He also stressed that people do not live in a world of pre-constituted objects with intrinsic natures, but in a world of objects created through the process of human perception and cognition, and the meanings people have for objects are neither universal or fixed (Hammersley 1989). This conceptualisation of reality and meaning is particularly important as this study attempts to focus on how people give meaning to the mentor relationship, identifying the key features of a successful mentor as defined by the informants via their own experiences and human interaction.

Spinelli (1995) expands this concept of interaction and interpretation by stating that reality is linked to our mental processes and our individual capacity to construct meaning, that awareness of our 'self' emerges from the *noematic* (the content of the experience) and the *noetic* (the associated meaning). By reflecting on this experience we can come to understand and give meaning to our lives. This particular study does not assume that there is a single definition of mentorship, but that mentorship may hold different relevance, purpose and meaning to different people.

Blumer's interpretations of Mead's work on 'self' and his fundamental premises of symbolic interaction are summarised as follows:

- (i) as individuals we act towards things on the basis of meanings associated with them
- (ii) meanings are a product of social interaction
- (iii) meanings are modified and handled through an interpretive process.

These premises form the key conceptual arguments which will shape the collection and analysis of the data in this study.

Choice of qualitative research method

Using a qualitative approach to study the mentorship phenomenon allows us to understand and describe the meaning and social reality of the informant's experience. Phenomenology as a sociological perspective is concerned primarily with (a) describing people's conceptions of reality and experience, and (b) comparing and systemising these descriptions and perceptions (Svensson 1994). According to Svensson (p.20), the nature of conceptions or experience is based on the following premises:

- (i) knowledge is assumed to be based on thinking, and created through thinking and personal interaction
- (ii) knowledge is dependent upon the world or reality external to the individual
- (iii) knowledge and conceptions have a relational nature
- (iv) conceptions are dependant on human activity and the world or reality external to any individual
- (v) knowledge is relational (not empirical or rational) and created through thinking about external reality
- (vi) knowledge is seen as dependent upon context and perspective.

Our understanding of life comes from our sensory experience of phenomena and that it is *the experience* that needs to be described, explicated and interpreted so that we can make sense of the world. There is no separate or objective reality, only experience. It is human experience that, after reflection, provides meaning (Patton 1990). This particular approach to qualitative research differs from other 'descriptive' methods because the focus is on the informant's experienced meaning, instead of describing their actions or behaviour. It has its grounding in the teaching and writing of Edmund Husserl, who was the first to use the term 'phenomenology'. His most basic philosophy was that we can only know about life as we experience it through our senses and conscious awareness (Marton 1994; Patton 1990; Wallace & Wolf 1991). Polkinghorne (1989) summarises this concept when he writes:

Experience, as it is directly given, occurs at the meeting of person and the world ... it is a reality that results from the openness of human awareness to the world, and it cannot be reduced to either the sphere of the mental or the sphere of the physical (p.43).

The important reality is what the informants perceive it to be, and that the subject matter of phenomenology includes consciousness, experience, the human life world and human action (Kvale 1996). It is the experience that must be described, explicated and interpreted, and often the description and interpretations of the experience are so intertwined that they become one (Patton 1990). However, it is the specific purpose of the phenomenographic interview to seek variation in people's experience or understanding of the particular phenomenon being investigated (Bruce 1994).

Polkinghorne (1989) states that research methods are used to pursue knowledge and are outlines of investigative journeys, laying out

previously developed paths which if followed will lead to valid knowledge. He also states that these paths are sketched on maps that are based on assumptions about reality and the processes of human understanding. By using the phenomenological map of inquiry, we choose to mark different aspects of the terrain than would be normally considered. Instead, it:

locates geographical features of human awareness and reminds us that the research journey needs to attend to the configurations of experience before moving on to the assumptions about independent natural objects (Polkinghorne 1989, p.41).

Van Manen (1990) states that we cannot reflect on lived experience while we are living through the experience and, therefore, reflection from a phenomenological perspective is retrospective and recollective. It is van Manen's specific approach to phenomenological research as outlined in his book, *Researching Lived Experience*, that will be incorporated into my research of mentoring of music students. This includes:

- (i) *Seeking out the very nature of the phenomenon; that is the essence without which it could not be what it is.* These are the core meanings that are mutually understood by the informants in their reflective understanding of the meaning of being mentored or mentoring others, while at the same time looking for deeper meanings and descriptions for the individuals.
- (ii) *Systematically uncovering and describing the internal meaning and structures of lived experience.* An essence may only be understood by a study of the particulars of people's lived experience. It is the assumption of essence that culture exists and is important (Patton 1990). This will be done by reading the

transcripts and listening to the recorded interviews to produce clear, precise and systematic descriptions of the meaning that Polkinghorne (1989, p.44) refers to as 'the activity of consciousness'.

- (iii) *Attempting to describe and interpret people's meaning with a certain degree of depth and richness.* This done by focusing the informant during the interview is to describe and reflect upon his/her mentoring experiences as their present approach to the mentoring of students. The focus of the analysis is to describe the actions and assumptions that lead to types of mentoring situations.
- (iv) *By reduction, approaching the study without presuppositions or prejudices.* Van Manen refers to this process as 'epoche'. It is also referred to by other phenomenologists as 'bracketing' or suspension of presuppositions (Polkinghorne 1989; Spinelli 1995) or 'phenomenological reduction' (Bryman 1995).
- (v) *Using reflection* to focus the informants on their particular experiences and knowledge of mentoring.
- (vi) *Being explicit about meanings and interpretations.* The study will attempt to articulate the structures and meanings behind the social construction of mentorship that are provided in the interviews.
- (vii) *Validating the described phenomenon by getting feedback from the participants.* The participants in the study will have the opportunity to read the research report and give feedback as to validity and accuracy of the data.

(viii) *Being attentive in the practice of 'thoughtfulness', that is for deep reflection on the meaning of the whole experience.* Van Manen (1990, p.12) believes that the word 'thoughtfulness' most aptly characterises phenomenology as it is the 'heedful, mindful wondering about the project of life, of living of what it means to live life'. As a music educator I am particularly interested in how tertiary music institutions might recognise and develop 'mentoring' programs. The training of musicians is one of the few remaining areas of education practice these days that relies on one-to-one teaching.

(ix) *Exploring and describing the phenomenon through the examples provided by the informants.* Phenomenology is often described as the science of 'examples', and by providing examples of lived experience, the reader should have a broader and more comprehensive understanding of the construction and meaning of 'mentoring'.

In-depth interviews: the search for depth and meaning

In this study the researcher interviewed 15 informants using in-depth interviews. The informants are people directly concerned with the education and training of tertiary music students, and are presently teaching staff of music faculties within universities. They include teachers, composers, conductors, performers, musicologists and faculty administrators/directors.

The qualitative research interview is a construction site of knowledge that is generated by conversation, narrative, language, contextual meaning and the interrelational nature of knowledge and experience Kvale (1996). Kvale notes that the seven stages of an interview investigation are: (1) Thematising, (2) Designing, (3) Interviewing, (4)

Transcribing, (5) Analysing, (6) Verifying, and (7) Reporting; and outlines 12 different modes of understanding in a qualitative research interview that are the core structure for any qualitative research interview. These are summarised as follows:

- (i) *Life world, where the topic is the lived world of the subjects* — The purpose is to describe and understand the central themes of the informant's experiences and to recall these through the interview.
- (ii) *Meaning* — To describe and understand the meanings of the central themes in the life world of the subjects. The researcher registers and interprets what is said and how it is said while seeking both the factual and meaning level of the informant's description.
- (iii) *Qualitative* — using language for a precise description.
- (iv) *Description* — aiming to obtain un-interpreted description of the informant's experiences, actions and feelings.
- (v) *Specificity* — seeking to describe specific situations and action sequences from the informant's world.
- (vi) *Deliberate naivete* — the researcher tries to be as presuppositionless as possible, as well as open to new and unexpected phenomena.
- (vii) *Focus* — to choose and investigate specific themes for the research.
- (viii) *Ambiguity* — to explain or describe possible ambiguous and contradictory meanings that are presented in the data.

- (ix) *Change* — to explore the possibility of change of meaning as a result of the informant's reflection during an interview.
- (x) *Sensitivity* — to be sensitive toward and knowledgeable about the topic of the interview, thus making it possible to comprehend different nuances and depths of the themes as they occur in the interview.
- (xi) *Interpersonal situation* — to recognise that the interview is an interaction between two individuals. This can be characterised by positive feelings of mutual intellectual curiosity and reciprocal respect. The researcher needs to be conscious of the interpersonal dynamics within the interaction and to take these dynamics into account when analysing the data.
- (xii) *Positive experience* — that the interview can be a positive, favourable and enriching experience for both the researcher and the subject.

Summary

The focus of the study is to describe how social factors construct the meaning of mentoring through an analysis that includes the influence and impact of social interaction between the mentor and protégé, life experiences, as well as the beliefs and perceptions relating to learning and imparting knowledge. The next chapter outlines in greater detail the research design used in the study.

Chapter 4

Methodology

If you want to know how people understand their world and their life, why not talk to them.

(Steiner Kvale, *Interviews*, 1996, p.1)

In this study, the researcher uses an eclectic borrowing of heuristic research methods, phenomenology principles (to describe the experience of being mentored) and hermeneutics (as interpretation of the mentoring experience) to investigate the topic. These perspectives include focusing on the life world of the informant, and searching for descriptions and meanings of the mentor experience. The study is about the informants' perspective of the experience, and attempts to document the essence and breadth of the mentor experience. Van Manen (1990) states that a person can only reflect on lived experience after he/she has lived through it, and that meaning comes from conscious reflection.

The research is thus concerned with descriptions, process, and meanings. The informants are able to formulate these conceptions by way of an in-depth interview where they are focused by the researcher to reflect and give meaning to their own experiences. The focusing process also helps the researcher to identify the qualities of the mentor experience that have remained in the unconsciousness of the informant because the individual has not reflected to date on his/her experience of the phenomenon. This focusing process enables the

researcher to identify core themes and categories that constitute the mentor experience (Douglas & Moustakas 1985).

Informants were asked to reflect on their own experiences and discuss their present ideals regarding the concept of mentorship. The data collected do not differentiate between the protégé's and the mentor's perspectives. That is, there is no differentiation between the informant reflecting on the experience as a protégé or his/her description of the experience of mentoring students. This is later discussed as a possible limitation of the study, as the ideal research, if time permitted, would be to undertake two separate investigations: firstly, those of the mentor and, secondly, those of the protégé. The argument for taking this approach is that the informants are not only recalling and reflecting on their experiences and meanings of the mentorship from the past, but also are reflecting on the development of their philosophy of mentorship as it applies to the teaching of their own music students.

Sample

The total number of informants in this study was 15, comprising six women and nine men. All the informants are presently employed as music faculty staff at university level, teaching undergraduate and graduate students. Twelve of the interviews were held at the homes of the informants, and the remaining three in the informants' teaching studios, with the interviews lasting approximately 45 minutes to an hour. When given the option, the researcher suggested that the interview be held in the informant's home so as to provide a relaxed and familiar environment for the informant. This also helped to maximise reflective thought for the informant by decreasing the possible anxiety associated with a busy teaching schedule, and the possibility of interruption by having the interview in the workplace.

The interviews were informal, with the informants being told at the beginning of the interview that the process would be in the form of an open discussion about the meaning of mentorship and how it applied to their lives and those of their students. The interview schedule was semi-structured to allow a free-flowing, recursive style where the informant reflected on the topic with little interruption from the interviewer. This enabled the researcher to follow a more conversational style that created a context which facilitated treating the informants and the situations as unique.

Recursive questioning relies on the process of conversational interaction between the informant and the researcher. The researcher decides the extent to which what has been said previously will influence the structure and content of what will be asked of the informant in subsequent interviews (Minichiello, Madison, Hays, Courtney and St-John 1998). It is for this reason that in-depth interviewing is a data collection method in which information is collected through extensive non-structured conversations with informants. Qualitative researchers also prefer to use the word 'informant' rather than 'subject' or 'respondent' as in the case of quantitative researchers, because it is the participants who inform the interviewer about issues which they see as being relevant to the research topic (Minichiello et al. 1998). It is role of the researcher to make the links between the various concepts or issues raised during the interview.

The interviews were conducted over a 12 month period, beginning in May 1997 and finishing in early June 1998. The informants were contacted by phone initially and asked to participate in the study, followed by a letter outlining the nature of the research. The letter also

raised matters of confidentiality and requested the informant to suggest a convenient time for them to meet with the researcher. The informants were informed that their identity would remain anonymous and only a brief description of their position, age and sex would be used in the informant profiles.

All the interviews were audio tape recorded and then transcribed into texts. The reason for recording the interviews was to obtain an accurate verbatim account of the dialogue between informant and researcher. Recording the interviews also allowed the researcher to be more attentive to the informant's verbal and non-verbal dialogues.

The transcripts constituted the material that was interpreted for meaning. All of the participants except one are associated with tertiary music institutions within Australia. They were specifically chosen to represent a broad cross-section of professional musicians holding positions in teaching institutions where they are responsible for the training of the next generation of musicians. The sample includes informants who work with students in the areas of performance, departmental and faculty administration and general academic studies.

The informants were asked to participate in the study because of their individual reputations for excellence in teaching and performance. Associated with this excellence was a particular interest on the part of the researcher to record the mentorship stories of the informants, who themselves have been tutored by renowned pedagogues and performers of this century, For example, Informant 2 studied with Auturo Benedetti Michaelangeli, Informant 10 with Alfred Corteau, Informant 5 with Ronald Smith, Informant 6 with Claudio Arrau, Informant 14 with Rudolf Serkin.

Snowball sampling (Frank 1979; Rothbard 1982; Spinelli 1995), otherwise known as chain sampling (Miles & Huberman 1994), where several informants recommended other possible informants, was used to gain access to further informants and their networks from the initial round of interviews. Table 4.1 outlines the profiles of the informants, including institution, age and gender of the informants. Examples of *snowballing* include Informant 2 recommending Informant 13, Informant 5 recommending Informant 14, and Informant 6 recommending Informant 7. The response rate for this study was 15 participants out of a total 17 who were asked to participate. The reasons given by the two non-respondents for not participating were (i) a heavy examining schedule and (ii) interstate conducting engagements.

Table 4.1: Profiles of the informants interviewed in the study

Informant Profiles		
Informant	Position	Gender/Age
Informant 1	Professor of Conducting	Male, age 46
Informant 2	Lecturer in Performance Studies	Male, age 57
Informant 3	Former Dean/Performer	Male, age 66
Informant 4	Conductor/Lecturer in Operatic Studies	Male, age 63
Informant 5	Senior Lecturer, Performance Studies	Female, age 60
Informant 6	Piano Lecturer and Performer	Female, age 53
Informant 7	Senior Lecturer Performance Studies/Performer	Male, age 53
Informant 8	Professor of Music/Dean	Male, age 49
Informant 9	Lecturer in Performance Studies/Conductor	Male, age 44
Informant 10	Professor of Music/Former Dean	Male, age 63
Informant 11	Lecturer in Performance Studies/Performer	Female, age 46
Informant 12	Director of Music/Conductor	Female, age 57
Informant 13	Conductor/Cellist	Male, age 50
Informant 14	Senior Lecturer/Performer	Female, age 55
Informant 15	Lecturer in Performance Studies	Female, age 43

The informants interviewed were drawn from various music faculties in Australia, and include one from New York State in the United States of America. The institutions included: Monash University, Melbourne; Westminster College, Princeton, USA; University of Melbourne; Newcastle University, New South Wales; Griffith University, Queensland; University of Queensland, Brisbane; Victorian College of the Arts, Melbourne; National Academy of Music, Melbourne; University of Sydney, New South Wales; and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, New South Wales.

Method

The data collection method used for this research was in-depth interviewing. Taylor and Bogdan (1984, p.77) defined this method as:

repeated face-to-face encounters between the researcher and informants directed toward understanding the informants' perspectives on their lives, experiences or situations as expressed in their own words.

In-depth interviewing is a type of data collection that allows informants to discuss their experiences of being mentored, as well as capturing their understanding of mentorship as it applies to their daily teaching. As Minichiello et al. (1995, p.61) state, 'it is a means by which the researcher can gain access to, and subsequently understand, the private interpretations of social reality that individuals hold'. The informant is the only person who understands the social reality in which he/she lives (Burns 1995; Frank 1979; Moustakas 1990; Rothbard 1982; Spinelli 1995).

In-depth interviewing is directly linked with the theoretical conceptualisation of symbolic interactionism, where social reality is understood to exist as meaningful interaction between individuals, and allows the researcher to gain this knowledge through listening to

others and developing an understanding, from the informant's understanding of the phenomena. The depth of understanding is achieved by concentrating on the individual's perception of the experience.

Perception, according to Rosenfeld and Berko (1990), is the process of becoming aware of objects and events, including one's self. How we, as individuals, perceive ourselves forms the basis for our perception of the world, and how we perceive the world affects and reflects how we communicate. Rosenfeld and Berko also notes that perception is not a passive process. The world offers an infinite variety of details for us to comprehend and interpret, and it is 'we', the individuals, who determine what we perceive, how we organise the information, and how we interpret it. That is, 'we', as individuals, are the *cause* for what we perceive. By using in-depth interviewing the researcher has the opportunity to enter the world of the informant and to explore and record the understanding, perspective and meaning of events that effect his/her life.

When using an unstructured approach to data collecting it is possible to explore in greater depth a variety of points of view. Burnard (1994) suggests that it also allows the interviewer to take a free lead and explore the issues raised by the informant that can give an insight into the layers of meaning and perception. This approach is much like the counselling approach advocated by Rogers (1967), where the client's lead can structure the counselling session or, in this case, the interview. It requires analytical listening skills on the part of the interviewer who may be led by the informant to new and unexpected topics associated with the research question that the researcher had not considered to be relevant prior to the interview.

The interviews were semi-structured with an interview schedule specifically comprised of open-ended questions designed to elicit the informant's life experience and personal thoughts on the concept of mentorship. Burns (1995) states that the advantages of this type of interview include the high level of rapport established by the researcher with the informant, obtaining the informant's perspective, the informant using his/her own language and style of description to explain the concept, and the informant feeling that he/she is of equal status to the researcher and contributing to the research question by means of an open dialogue.

The focus of the interview was on the personal meaning of the experience. The interview schedule was designed to focus the informants on their own mentorship experiences, and then to discuss the meaning and construction of such relationships, as it applied to them in their training, and as a teacher today. These questions often led to further focused exploration of the topic as raised by the informant.

The schedule was developed and refined as the number of interviews proceeded and incorporated techniques described by Minichiello et al. (1995) as *funnelling*, where the questions were general and broad, to *story telling*, where the questions were to elicit the informant's personal story, and *probing* questions designed to elicit further details or clarification than provided with the original question. The types of questions that served as the core interview schedule for the interviews are found in Appendix II, although many of the informants did not need as much prompting or focusing.

These questions formed the basis of the interview guide, although the guide was not fixed in its structure of questions or answers, and was part of an evolving process dependent upon the questions identified as

relevant as a result of the on-going data collection. As a result, the schedule was revised, edited and developed as the interviews progressed. The interview schedule was designed by the researcher so that the questions would be sequential and developmental, leading the informant to disclose relevant information regarding his/her mentor experiences that would help in the understanding of the meaning and construction of mentor relationships as they applied to the training of musicians. This required the informants reflecting on the meaning and the importance of the mentor relationship for them, the dynamics of the relationship, perceived benefits to themselves and their institution, relevant gender issues and the degree of satisfaction they received by engaging in such relationships.

The interview schedule questions reflect Patton's (1990) summary of question types that are geared to collect information on different aspects of informants' knowledge and experience of mentoring. These included questions that were directly associated with:

- (i) experience and behaviour
- (ii) opinion and values
- (iii) knowledge
- (iv) senses
- (v) demographics and background
- (vi) time frame.

Analysis of data

The main focus in analysing and interpreting the data from the interviews was to search for the ways in which the informants understood the concept of mentorship, and how they gave meaning to the relationship and experience within their lives from either the student or teacher perspective. By using an inductive process of

analysis, the patterns, themes and categories came from the data and were not imposed prior to data collection or analysis.

Qualitative data analysis is the process of systematically searching, interpreting and arranging data in order to understand it and present it to others (Browne 1998). The principles and processes of analysis should consider the following concepts:

- (i) analysis is synonymous with interpretation of the data
- (ii) social phenomena are complex
- (iii) analysis and data collection are integrated through the process of theoretical sampling
- (iv) a combination of induction, deduction and verification should be used to generate an explanation, to test propositions and support or contradict explanations
- (v) categorising data (coding) and identifying how categories link together should be used to organise ideas
- (vi) conceptual density is obtained using the processes of asking questions, making multiple comparisons and using an analytical model
- (vii) propositions can generate further data collection and analysis, thereby allowing the researcher to draw and verify conclusions.

Qualitative data analysis involves a detailed examination, interpretation and breaking down of textual data into their descriptive and conceptual elements, and reconstructing those components into a meaningful whole. This is achieved in several ways. Firstly, all the interviews with the informants were recorded and then transcribed verbatim. These transcripts were then examined for meaningful descriptions and meanings that directly related to the mentor experience. Each transcript was carefully subdivided up into meaning

units as suggested by Mostyn (1985) that consisted of discrete phrases, sentences or series of sentences that conveyed related sets of perceptions regarding mentoring. Secondly, the transcripts were then cross-case analysed by comparing and grouping the different meaning units together. This helped to also provide a validity check for the coding of the data.

When beginning to analyse the transcripts the researcher had two primary sources to draw from in organising the analysis according to Patton (1990). These included, firstly, the questions that were included in the interview schedule and developed during the interviewing process and, secondly, the analytical insights and interpretations that emerged during the data collection. Within the framework of documenting of meaning, there was also the need to identify areas of the relationship considered to be detrimental or possible hazards to impede the growth of the relationship which could ultimately be a hindrance to the development of a career in music. These included issues relating to gender, discrimination and power imbalance and are discussed in Chapter 6.

The interpretation of texts is the study of hermeneutics with the purpose to obtain a valid and common understanding of the meaning of the text (Kvale 1983). Hermeneutic methods aim to decode the expressed meaning of the texts to provide a co-understanding of the phenomenon experienced by the informant. According to Radnitzky (1970), the interpretation of meaning is characterised by a hermeneutical circle that centres around seven canons. In summary, these canons are:

- (i) the continuous back and forth process between the parts and the whole of the text

- (ii) interpretation of meaning is reached when there are is a lack of inner contradictions
- (iii) the testing of part interpretations against the global meaning of the text
- (iv) the autonomy of the text where the text is understood on the basis of its own frame of reference
- (v) the researcher's knowledge about the theme of the text
- (vi) the interpretation of the text is not presuppositionless as the interviewer and informant both contribute to the text
- (vii) that every interpretation should involve innovation and creativity to bring forth new differentiation and interrelations within the text.

The understanding of the text takes place through a process where the meaning of the separate parts is determined by the global meaning of the text, as it is anticipated. The closer determination of the meaning of the separate parts may also come to change the originally anticipated meaning of the totality, and this again may influence the meaning of the separate parts.

Informants spoke about their personal experiences of being mentored and reflected upon their experiences of being a mentor to students today. In analysing the data, the descriptions have purposely not differentiated between the informant's experience or perception of what the meaning of the experience is as it applies to their teaching. This is largely because the mentor experience is based on the informant's memory and perception of events that now date back to an average of 35 years ago, but also because these experiences have informed and shaped the development of the informant's philosophy

of what the mentorship experience should be for the present day protégé.

These meaning units were then collated and categorised according to similarities and differences. The data were organised in terms of the following categories: general descriptions and definitions, types of mentorship relationships, skills and attributes, negative aspects of the relationship, meaning and importance. This process is referred to by Guba (1978) as ‘convergence’, which is the process of deciding what concepts fit together and are related. The coding of the concepts and the abbreviations used in organising the data of each transcript can be seen in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: The coding of concepts and their associated abbreviations used in analysing the mentorship data

Concept	Abbreviation
Attributes	A
Career	Ca
Challenging	Ch
Coach	C
Counsellor	Co
Description	D
Facilitator	F
Gender issues	G
Hazards	H
Involvement	I
Networking	N
Opportunities	O
Parent figure	Pf
Personal importance	PeI
Professional importance	PrI
Protector	P
Role modelling	Rm
Satisfaction	Sa
Skills	Sk
Sponsorship	Sp

Using this system the transcript files were then sorted in order according to the various categories. This then created an analysis transcript that consisted of discrete categories with a range of meaning units sorted within each category. These categories were then double-checked so that the meaning units did adequately fit the categories. At this point the interesting discovery was that some units were applicable to one or more category depending on the particular issue or function of the mentor relationship; for example, counsellor, protector and parent figure or sponsorship, networking and opportunities.

From this coding emerged the two primary categories (or functions), one that relates directly to the personal developmental aspect of mentor relationships, and the other that directly influences professional skills training and career development. Kram (1985b) refers to these primary functions as psycho-social functions and career functions. This is supported by Caldwell and Carter (1993), whose definitions of mentorship fall into one of two categories: firstly, the mentorship that emphasises the professional development of the protégé only and, secondly, the mentorship that emphasises the professional and personal development of the protégé.

Breaking down the texts into meaning units and categorising these units to illustrate particular points allowed the researcher to look for patterns within the data. These patterns helped to formulate the construction and meaning of the mentor relationship as it applies to the training of musicians. One of the main aims when developing this category system was to create a system that remained true to the transcripts by reflecting the concepts discussed during the interviews. As a validity check these categories were discussed and cross-checked with other qualitative researchers who also studied the transcripts.

The use of verbatim quotes

In the analysis presentation, verbatim quotes are used to illustrate and validate particular issues, functions and concepts raised by the informants during the interviews. Sandelowski (1994) supports the use of verbatim quotes because qualitative researchers should have less licence to 'embroider' and a greater obligation to report what an informant has said or meant during the course of an interview. By using quotes, researchers gain a greater balance between scientific reporting and artistic licence. Patton (1990) supports this concept by stating that the presentation of actual data upon which the analysis is based helps the reader to make his/her own determination of whether the concept makes sense. It permits the reader to make his/her own analysis and interpretation by being a facilitator, without dominating the analysis. 'What people say, and the description of events observed, are the essence of qualitative research' (Patton 1990, p.392).

Richardson (1990) states that the skilful use of quotes adds both to the documentary and aesthetic value of a qualitative research report while drawing more attention to the voices of the informants, who otherwise would remain silent or unheard. 'Quotes privilege individuality and model the diversity within generality' (p.516).

Validation and verification

Validation and verification of the analysis was achieved by constant re-examination and cross checking of meaning and categories with the transcripts, either through referencing to individual transcripts or the transcripts as a collective set.

The analysis of the mentoring data was also validated by returning the researcher's findings of the study to four of the informants, plus four

research colleagues, for objective verification feedback. All agreed that the categories, functions and meanings of the mentor research reflected the essence and breadth of the experience.

In the following chapter the analysis of the data is presented. It includes the informants' descriptions, and outlines the functions of the mentor relationship as it has applied to the informants' learning and teaching experiences.