Mentoring: A Conceptual Analysis From The Perspective of Attachment Theory

Al Herrera-Alcazar
Everett Waters

SUNY Stony Brook

ABSTRACT

The mentor-protégé relationship is generally described as one in which a more experienced teacher or counselor serves as a trusted friend and nurtures the development of a protégé over an extended period of time, typically preparing them for a special challenge or career and at the same time building 'good character'. A review of current literature on mentoring and mentor-protégé relationships suggests the need for a conceptual framework within which to organize the extensive and diverse literature on mentoring and mentor-protégé relationships. The goal of this paper is to see whether Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory can provide a useful perspective on mentoring. The paper highlights behaviors and processes identified in attachment study that are recognizable in mentor-protégé relationships and where mechanisms studied closely in attachment research can help focus mentoring research and suggest directions for assessment, program design, and evaluation studies. Processes in play in the initiation, maintenance, and outcomes of mentoring relationships are discussed in light of what we have learned from research on attachment development. Implications from viewing mentoring and mentor-protégé relations through the lens of attachment theory are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The term "mentor" has its roots in Homer's *Odyssey*. As Odysseus leaves for the Trojan War he places his property and family, particularly his young son, Telemachus, under the care of elderly Mentor, his wise and trusted friend. Thus a mentor is someone who plays a unique and selfless role in bringing someone to maturity. Such relationships are termed mentor-protégé relationships. (1) And because they are familiar, evocative, and significant in so many lives, they appear often in literature. For example, in the Arthurian legends (White, 1958) the wizard Merlin plays the role of teacher and wise counselor throughout the king's life. Moreover, references like Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mentor) list many examples of mentor figures from literature and from the lives of historical and modern individuals. These range from the philosopher Husserl, who was mentor to Heidegger, to Freud who was mentor to Jung. In addition, many celebrated scientists, businessmen and women, politicians, actors, and artists have worked with and today credit mentor-like figures.

The mentor-protégé relationship is generally described as one in which a more experienced teacher or counselor serves as a trusted friend and nurtures the development of a protégé over an extended period of time, typically preparing them for a special challenge or career and at the same time building 'good character'. However, Roberts (1999) points out that in Homer's few descriptions of Mentor's relationship to young Telemachus fall far short of the modern sense of mentor-protégé relationships. He suggests that the richer, more idealized image of a virtual parent, a wise counselor who is always at hand, patient, supportive and wise is attributable instead to the Francois Fenelon's (1699) popular book, *The adventures of Telemachus.* Fenelon was a French mystic, religious writer, and educator whose work foreshadowed that of Rousseau and other advocates of liberal educational practices. This, most likely, is the origin of our current concept of the mentor as educator, trusted advisor, and senior partner in a close relationship throughout a young person's development.

In contemporary use, the term *mentor* (or *men-*

toring) is applied in a wide variety of contexts. Three of the most common are workplace mentoring, faculty-student mentoring, and mentoring of disadvantaged youth (Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007). The term is often used inter-changeably with social support relationships in general, e.g., in referring to school advisors, role model, and supervisors of various kinds including coaches. Clearly, these roles and relationships are quite diverse, sharing some important characteristics and differing in others.

There is quite an extensive literature on mentor-protégé relationships, ranging from autobiographical reports to narrative descriptions of mentoring programs, to empirical research (e.g., DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002; DuBois et al., 2011; Kram, 1988). This literature contains a great deal of useful observation and experience and, at times, insight and wisdom. Unfortunately, it includes so many different kinds of helping, teaching, and supportive relationships that it is not found a coherent theoretical framework. As a result, this literature is difficult to summarize. It is also difficult to draw sound recommendations for identifying where mentoring might be useful, for designing mentoring programs, or evaluating mentoring relationships or programs.

Particularly problematic is the tendency to view mentor-protégé relationships as primarily or especially relevant to remedying deficits and disadvantages (Ayalon, 2007; Gastic & Johnson, 2009; Davis, 2008; Chan, 2008). The association is easy to understand. There is a general belief that mentoring relationships are beneficial (e.g., Rhodes, 2005). So certainly such support should be available. The risk is that associating mentoring with disadvantage tends to 'ghettoize' it, to pigeon-hole it, as therapeutic, as something for some and not others. In doing so, we risk stigmatizing mentoring relationships and discouraging people from participating in mentoring programs for fear of being identified as (or self-identifying as) "deficient" (Cohen & Steele, 2002). We also risk tainting protégé's perceptions of the goals and motivation behind mentors and mentoring programs. mentors' motivations. Associating mentoring with deficits and disadvantages, can also restrict scientific interest in mentoring relationships, suggesting that it is the province of helping professions, not a proper focus of cognitive, social, and developmental theorists and researchers.

It is much more productive to view mentoring as a general mechanism for acquiring self-knowledge, world knowledge, specific skill-sets, and social capital. Conceptualizing mentoring this way highlights that general developmental theories, ordinary mechanisms, and ordinary research methods are entirely relevant to understanding mentor-protégé relationships. In effect, this brings mentoring and mentor-protégé relationships into the mainstream of psychological research where it find new perspectives, new resources, and new respect.

The goal of this paper is to see whether Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory, a decidedly mainstream developmental perspective, can provide a useful perspective on mentoring - highlighting where phenomena identified in attachment study are recognizable in mentor-protégé relationships and where mechanisms studied closely in attachment research can help focus mentoring research and suggest directions for assessment, program design, and evaluation studies. The paper proceeds in several steps. First, I provide a brief summary of key aspects of Bowlby-Ainsworth attachment theory. Included here are ideas about attachment development, the role of sensitive, responsive, cooperative care in establishing attachment related expectations, and the role of attachment relationships as a context for learning exploration, and the development of self-related beliefs. I then draw attention to some of the key features of mentoring relationships that seem recognizable from the perspective of attachment theory. This will help establish the relevance of attachment theory to mentoring. I then discuss the importance generally of a social context for learning. This provides a foundation for discussing mentoring as an enduring relationship and further establishes the relevance of attachment theory to understanding mentoring. I then discuss processes in play in the initiation, maintenance, and outcomes of mentoring relationships in light of what we have learned from research on attachment dvelopment. In conclusion, I discuss assess the value of looking at mentoring and mentor-protégé relationships through the lens of attachment theory and discuss several topics that this perspective brings to the fore. These include the relevance of matching mentors and protégés on demographic variables and, briefly, implications for training and evaluating mentors and mentoring programs.

ATTACHMENT THEORY

Attachment theory traces its roots to Bowlby's (1958) recognition of Freud's insights into the nature and significance of early relationships, and a reconceptualization of the infant's tie to its mother as a secure-base relationship. Bowlby (1958) preserved Freud's key insight regarding the importance of early relationship experience on later development, but discarded the view of infants as needy, dependent, and motivated by drive reductions. As Bowlby's theoretical contemporaries, such as Jean Piaget, were demonstrating, children were anything but incompetent. In fact, Piaget viewed children as both mentally and physically active, and recognized this activity as directly contributing to their development (Piaget, 1936). Far from incompetency, direct observation confirmed infants to be skillful, curious, and interested in mastering their environment (Piaget, 1936). From such insights, the nature of the infants tie to its mother was no longer viewed as a source of drive-reductions, but rather as a relationship in which the infant uses their primary caregiver as a secure base from which to explore (Waters & Cummings, 2000). Additionally, the caregiver could serve as a haven of safety and a source of comfort for the infant when necessary.

The secure-base concept

The secure base concept serves as the bedrock of attachment theory and situates it as an organizational construct (Sroufe & Waters, 1977). Thus, *to be attached* suggests the ability to preferentially use someone as a secure base from which to explore. Further, *secure attachment* indicates competent secure-base use over time and across contexts, as well as confidence in the caregiver's availability and responsiveness (Waters & Cummings, 2000). The infant's confidence in the mother's availability allows him to undertake novel exploration of environments, so long as they can maintain communication and access to the secure base, whom is viewed as 'stronger and wiser,' available and responsive if called upon, competent enough to resolve problems that may arise, and provide safety when needed. Thus, the secure base phenomenon is thought to have two components: the ordinary component, where the secure base serves as a base and resource from which to explore; and the emergency function, in which the secure base responds to threat, injury, or overstimulation, and serves as a haven of safety (Waters & Cummings, 2000).

Bowlby's conceptualization of secure-base use in attachment theory was initially based on informal observations of infants (Bowlby, 1951; mal observations of infants (Bowlby, 1951;

Bowlby, 1958). However, his collaborator Mary Ainsworth made giant leaps for the theory by providing empirical support of his ideas, and formulating relevant concepts, namely maternal sensitivity. Ainsworth (1963/1967) carried out observations of infant-mother interactions in Uganda that confirmed the secure-base character ization of infant-mother relations. Ainsworth refined her method of longitudinal, naturalistic observations in Baltimore, where she system-atically observed infant-mother interactions during the first year that provided additional empirical support for the theory (Ainsworth & Bell, 1969; Ainsworth & Bell, 1970).

The importance of experience and maternal sensitivity

Another key departure from psychoanalytic theory was that Bowlby and Ainsworth thought of infant's cognitions, emotions, and behaviors as arising from actual experience. The psychoanalytic view held that such processes arose from biological maturation, and were intra-psychically generated in the infant (Klein, 1932). Contrastingly, Bowlby and Ainsworth viewed them as arising from real experience. One of Ainsworth's major contributions was to schematize the kinds of interactions best suited for the development of secure base cognitions and emotions. Ainsworth's observational studies identified four aspects of maternal sensitivity necessary for secure-base development: sensitivity to signals, cooperation with ongoing behavior, physical and psychological availability, and acceptance of the baby's needs (Ainsworth, 1969).

The first aspect of early care described is sensitivity (vs. insensitivity) to the baby's signals (Ainsworth, 1969). This not only entails perceiving the baby's communications, but also interpreting them accurately, responding to them appropriately, and responding promptly. Sensitivity to signals presupposes the mother's availability, such that necessary signals can be communicated. In addition to awareness of the child's signals, a sensitive parent would interpret the signals accurately and free of bias, and is subsequently able to communicate empathy in her response. The need to respond promptly allows the child to link his signals to the mother's response.

The second aspect, described as cooperation (vs. interference) with the baby's ongoing behavior, focuses on the mother's ability to integrate the baby's wishes, moods, and ongoing activity with her own (Ainsworth, 1969). Thus, their interactions

and shifts of activity seem more co-determined, rather than impositions of the mother's will on the child. A cooperative mother is able to capitalize on spontaneity such that resulting conflicts of interests may begin to work in concert with one another.

Another aspect of maternal care used to organize early secure-base behavior is the mother's physical and psychological availability (vs. ignoring and neglecting) (Ainsworth, 1969). This aspect focuses on the mother's accessibility to the child, as well as her responsiveness. A highly accessible mother will keep her child within her perceptual awareness, maintain awareness in spite of her individual duties and responsibilities, and never be too preoccupied to have him in the background of her awareness. The focus here is not on the accurateness of the mother's interpretation of the child's signals, but rather on her ability to continue to be available and responsive.

The last aspect of maternal care outlined by Ainsworth (1969) is acceptance (vs. rejection) of the baby's needs. It is acknowledged that any mother-infant relationship will contain both positive and negative elements. Of concern here, however, is the mother's ability to balance them, and integrate or resolve any conflicting feelings. An accepting mother senses and respects the child's growing autonomy and mastery, does not view conflicts of interest as power struggles, and feels almost wholly positive toward the child.

Attachment theory beyond infancy

As noted earlier, a Freudian insight that was preserved in attachment theory was the notion that early relationship experience shapes later development. And although the early empirical work on attachment theory focused on infant-mother relationships, Bowlby described attachment behavior as characterizing 'human beings from the cradle to the grave' (Bowlby, 1979). The application of attachment theory beyond infancy into childhood, adolescence, and adulthood has proven to be a major strength of the theory, as well as a source of continuing research in the field (Crowell, Treboux, Gao, Fyffe, Pan, & Waters, 2002; Mikulincer, Gillath, & Shaver (2002); Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003; Crowell, Fraley & Shaver, 2008). Ainsworth's (1969) pioneering work in identifying the particular features of early experience that shape secure-base behavior (sensitivity, cooperation, availability, and acceptance) has subsequently paved the way for researchers to apply the theory to close relationships across the lifespan. The features that have

been identified point to the kinds of cognitions and emotions that are central to relationships, and create conceptual parallels to the interactions that are observed between infant-mother and adult-adult relationships.

From the secure base concept, to the real life experiences that shape them, attachment as a secure base relationship suggests expectations of availability and responsiveness, a sense of comfort and safety, working closely with another figure in a dyadic relationship, commitment across time, and establishing mutual expectations for the dyad. These insights sound reminiscent of the descriptions that often arise in the mentoring literature. However, the mentoring literature has yet to weave together many of the separate findings on the nature of the mentor-protégé relationship into a theoretical framework that could provide the conceptual tools to understand and improve mentoring.

Viewing mentoring through an attachment lens, and as a secure-base relationship, offers a rich framework for conceptualizing and studying the nature of successful and troubled relationships. If mentoring is viewed as a secure-base relationship, we would expect both ordinary and emergency functions. For example, the mentor would not only serve as a haven of safety in emergencies, but we would also expect the mentor to provide support for exploration, growth, and independence. In line with attachment theory, we would expect the mentor to help the protégé achieve mastery of the world, and live a bigger life than one could without the figure (Waters, 2008). Attachment theory could also provide an outline of the kinds of experiences that make for a solid relationship, such as sensitivity to signals, cooperation, and availability.

MENTORING: DISTINCTIVE FEATURES AND SOME USEFUL DISTINCTIONS

Guided by a goal

The close relationship that develops between a mentor and protégé can typically be characterized as having a series of common threads. One of the more prominent characteristics of this kind of relationship is that it is almost always guided by a general, or more specific, goal. The emphasis of mentoring is to serve as a support system for the less experienced individual to grow emotionally, cognitively, and spiritually, in preparation for the challenges that come with living independently in the real world. Classic literature often describes the preparation of an individual for a big fight, or a

metaphoric challenge in life. For example, in The Odyssey, Mentor prepares the developing Telemachus to take on his mother's suitors, and reclaim their home. In this epic poem, we see the transformation of the young and inexperienced Telemachus into a mature, confident and able being. Similarly, in *The Once and Future King*, the wizard Merlin is responsible for the development of King Arthur, and among other lessons, prepares him to take on his illegitimate son.

Older/younger dyad

Across examples from literature, as well as in educational, business, and professional settings, this relationship is characterized with an older individual serving as the mentor for the developing protégé in a given context. As with the relationship between Mentor and Telemachus, a similar discrepancy in age is seen in a teacher-student relationship, as well as in workplace and professional mentoring relationships. It is likely that the additional years of life provide the mentor with a plethora of experiences that have accumulated to expertise in the given field. Although the mentor need not always be older than the protégé, domain-specific expertise is likely what is necessary. These experiences and expertise allow the mentor to respond to novel situations in a manner that the less experienced protégé would not yet arrive at on their own. The goal, however, is to provide the protégé with enough experiences to learn to respond in the manner of an expert.

Related terms

Although protégé is often used synonymously with other terms, such as apprentice, there are fundamental differences between these terms that set them apart. For example, in an apprenticeship, the explicit goal is likely to learn a set of skills or particular knowledge that can be used and applied in a later context. Contrastingly, the protégé's goal is often less explicit, and involves acquiring skills and knowledge that fit into a larger goal. Whereas skill acquisition is an end in and of itself in an apprenticeship, it is more closely a means to a larger end in mentoring. Also, the multi-faceted nature of mentoring allows the protégé to learn about himself and the world around him, and at the same time acquire new patterns of learning, as well as new ways of thinking which facilitate efficient problem-solving strategies.

Dyadic nature and trust

A key component that cannot be overlooked is the inherent dyadic nature of mentoring relationships. This feature highlights the reciprocal nature of the relationship, which is conditioned by a history of past interactions. Unlike an apprenticeship where the flow of information is unidirectional, the close nature of mentoring relationships provides each individual with the kinds of experiences that could not be afforded in a larger classroom setting. This history of interactions serves as the bedrock for the formation of mutual trust, another marker of a healthy relationship. The lack of expertise on the part of the protégé necessitates mutual trust in order for him to reveal his weaknesses to a mentor so as to grow one's sense of self from the experiences. Trust provides the mentor with confidence in the protégé's success, as well as provides the protégé with the confidence that the mentor will be available, and respond appropr- iately, in light of failures.

A relationship extended in time

Given the significance of a history of interactions in the formation of a dyadic and close relationship, it should come as no surprise that mentoring is typically extended in time. The goals involved in mentoring, such as burgeoning expertise and maturity into a new role, regularly require an extended period of time to be accom-plished. Further, this extended nature provides the mentor with the opportunity to monitor the developing protégé and evaluate his progress along the way. For example, Mentor was able to gauge Telemachus' physical strength and sword-readiness in order to take on his mother's suitors. Moreover, the extended nature allows for the necessary character development to take place, which is not directly linked to a specific skill, but rather ties in to the overall aims. In The Odyssey, as in real life, the true test comes when the protégé finally takes on the challenges he had been preparing for head-on, when the attendant risks and potential costs are at stake. The experiences that have accumulated over time up to that point serve as a resource on which the protégé can draw from.

A feature we can do without

Classic examples from literature character-istically involve mentoring an individual with royal standing, or someone that has been given a future task by the gods or fate. Further, a mentor has typically been someone with a distinctive characteristic that can be passed on. For example, Mentor passed on his strong character and connection to the earth

with Telemachus. Other examples include Merlin sharing magic with King Arthur, and Socrates sharing wisdom with Plato. Modern examples are more often a matter of mentoring someone who shows precocious talent.

It is not clear that a distinctive power is necessary on the part of the mentor in contemporary usage; however, some sense of pedigree appears evident. There is no parallel to this in attachment theory. The defining features of a secure base figure are assigning high priority to caring for the child (or partner), being always available, and always acting the their (not your own) interest. Indeed, the standards for providing "good enough" care to establish a solid and trusting relationship are viewed as well within the capacity of virtually all normal adults. This parallels evidence that ordinary maturity, generosity, dedication, and perhaps some domain-specific expertise are all that is required for successful mentoring. Indeed, a frequently run radio advertisement emphasizes that one need not be perfect to be a good mentor or adoptive parent. So, perhaps the emphasis on the specailness of mentors is a characteristic we can do without.

Summary

As we can see, a mentoring relationship is a multi-faceted one, with a set of common characteristics found across examples. This relationship is regularly guided by a goal, is inherently dyadic in nature, grounded in trust, and extended in time. Additionally, the mentor is typically older and wiser, with domain-specific expertise, and imparts on the protégé the skills and knowledge necessary to live a larger life. Having outlined the charac-teristics traditionally and necessarily associated with mentoring, a look at the common elements in learning in general, and acquiring expertise in particular, can help inform our understanding of the characteristics outlined above. Further, the mentor's role in learning will stress their signif-icance in normal development.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AN ENDURING CLOSE RELATIONSHIP

Mentoring Is About Learning

Mentoring, broadly construed, is grounded in learning (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000). Learning, of course, entails more than simply accumulating facts, or augmenting one's declar-ative knowledge. Rather than only consisting of the ac-

cumulation of skills, behaviors, and knowledge, it also involves elaborating, organizing, and schematizing what has been learned - especially in ways that make the information flexible and useful in various applications, accessible when called upon, and dispose the individual to more coherently take in additional information (Pressley, 1995; Pressley & Hilden, 2006; Carey, 2009; Karmiloff-Smith, 1992).

The behavior, cognitive activity, and time course of learning differs from one domain to another (Flavell, Miller & Miller 2002, Siegler & Alibali, 2004). For example, habituation - a decrease in response to repeated stimuli, perhaps the simplest and earliest form of learning, requires minimal cognitive activity and occurs among newborns and infants (Siegler et al., 2006). Contrastingly, language acquisition is a form of learning that also does not require formal instr-uction, but nonetheless requires significant mental resources and time to develop (Siegler et al., 2006). And within any domain, say language develop-ment, individual differences provide learners with different routes to understanding the same information (Wellman & Gelman, 1998; Siegler, mathematics learning; Bowlby-epigenetic landscape in attachment development). For example, children use varying styles, or strategies, to begin speaking. Some may enlist a referential or expressive style (Bates, Dale, & Thal, 1995; Bloom, 1975; Nelson, 1973), or a third wait-and-see style (Boysson-Bardies, 1999). No matter which strategy is employed, children will manage to reach proficiency in their native language (Boysson-Bardies, 1999).

Despite the great complexity involved in learning, we can outline some processes and steps that are characteristic of how a great many things are learned. This will bring into focus the role that an enduring close relationship in mentoring needs to play. It will also make clear that mentoring addresses and provides support for aspects of learning and development that every individual needs, rather than viewing mentoring as a necessary compensation for a struggling individual. Such stigmatized attributions obfuscate our understanding of the processes involved in mentoring, how we might teach it, and who can benefit from it. Further, not recognizing the beneficial aspects of mentoring in normal development may also limit the diversity of individuals seeking mentoring opportunities.

Learning beyond infancy and early childhood

Throughout our lifetime, we all continue to take in novel information, acquire new skills, and apply new strategies (London, 2011; Feldman, 2007). Learning, of course, is not a process only to be found in developing children, but continues on into adulthood. Although mentoring will certainly expand a protégé's declarative knowledge, an important goal of in the relationship is to teach protégé's how to use existing information in more strategic and flexible ways (Karmiloff-Smith, 1992). A crucial implication here is that learning in a mentoring context takes time and experience across a wide range of contexts. Time is required so that the appropriate strategies and patterns of learning are employed over the course of many trials (Pressley & Hilden, 2006). Also, critical situations that are especially well configured for illustrating a particular strategy require time to present themselves (Pressley & Hilden, 2006). In other words, some lessons can best be understood under given circumstances, and such learning opportunities will not necessarily be readily available in short periods of time.

The role of a social context for learning

We tend to think of learning as something that individuals do independently. However, one of the important conclusions from cognitive development research stresses the social nature of learning, as well as the importance of context and support for much of what we learn (Siegler, 2004). Evolution has designed us to both teach and learn, and young children use many of the same methods used by scientists to learn about the world (Gopnik, Meltzof & Kuhl, 1999; Tomasello, 2001). We learn about the world through experience and exposure, which takes time to accumulate, as well as through consequences and modeling (Siegler, 2004; Epstein – two cognitive systems). Learning in many domains is facilitated by biases in learning abilities (Pinker, 1994; Bowlby attachment and loss). Learning in some domains, language for example, is often associated with critical periods (Siegler, 2004; Pinker, 1994). These critical periods point to optimal times of learning, and mentors can help ensure that such periods are exploited by the learner. Mentors can potentially still facilitate learning past certain critical periods, although it can typically be more difficult to do so. A second conclusion from cognitive development and cognitive psychology research is that there is much more to learning than merely accumulating facts. Such declarative knowledge serves as a useful tool for navigating the world and further learning only after said knowledge has

been, so to speak, proces-sed, organized, schematized, marked for later retrieval, and integrated into existing structures to support economical generalizations, heuristics, and expectations (Pressley, 1995; Pressley & Hilden, 2006; Karmiloff-Smith, 1992). The increasingly abstracted nature of knowledge lends itself to be used more flexibly, with mounting control and creativity for other purposes (Karmiloff-Smith, 1992).

Although the mental processes involved in learning are certainly individual, much more than we once realized occurs, and is motivated by, the social context. Through interactions with an interlocutor who challenges, motivates, and questions in ways that require using information in useful ways, a learner can more readily take in new information and integrate it with already existing structures (Rogoff, 2003; Gauvain). Such an interlocutor can help the learner transition from a novice to an expert about the world and about oneself (Dreyfus, 2001). The more knowledgeable interlocutor, or mentor, can organize activities in ways that allow the less experienced learner, or protégé, to engage in them at a higher level than they could manage on their own, in a form of guided participation (Rogoff, 2003). The interpersonal nature of learning in a mentoring relationship further allows for the transmission of cultural tools, such as symbol systems, artifacts, skills and values, which add further richness and meaning for the learner.

Much of our understanding of the social influence on learning stems from Lev Vygotsky's view of children as social beings that exist in a world embedded with people that are eager and willing to help them acquire skills and understanding (Siegler, 2004). In an analogous way that parents can facilitate learning in children via social scaffolding, mentors too serve as knowledgeable persons that provide a temporary framework that supports the protégé's thinking at a higher level that could not otherwise be achieved on one's own (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). Such active participation allows the learner to use cognitive strategies and information in the environment to support further learning, and proceed independently in the future (Gauvain, 2001). Vygotsky (1978) used the term 'zone of proximal development' to identify the range of performance between what a child can do on his own and with optimal support. An understanding of the 'zone of proximal development' concept allows mentors to challenge their protégé's and provide them with tasks and goals that are within reach, with their help. Further, a close rela-

tionship ensures that instructions are appropriately abstracted to correspond with the protégé's level of understanding in the given domain. Asking challenging questions on the part of the mentor encourages memory consolidation and cognitive elaboration in the protégé. However, such quest-ions are best posed by a mentor that has some insights into the protégé's background, knowledge, skills, needs, and goals - insights that typically require a relationship of some depth.

Needed: A new perspective

Insofar as there are strong parallels between attachment theory and mentoring, and attachment theory appears to provide a valuable lens through which to study it, considering what is necessary in setting up and maintaining attachment relationships would prove valuable. The following sections take advantage of attachment theory and also the kinds of observations and measures attachment researchers have used to outline and elaborate how attachment relationship are built. Specifically, there will be a focus on the foundation that has be to be built in the early phases of mentoring relationships, as well as on the processes and strategies for building closeness and trust. This suggests a different, more relationship focused, perspective on the kinds of assets that are important for successful mentoring. Although it may be intuitively understood that building the relationship is a goal, and not something incidental, the advantage of an attachment perspective is in making this explicit and examining it systematically.

INITIATING MENTORING RELATION-SHIPS

Every mentoring relationship is unique, as each individual has their own history, set of skills and past experiences, ways of communicating and mentally representing relationships. And although this is true, it is equally fair to suggest that all close relationships—therapeutic, intimate, as well as mentoring relationships—follow a similar life-course (Keller, 2005). All relationships generally have a beginning stage, a stable, yet dynamic middle stage, and a period that marks the end or conclusion of the relationship. The initial phase is critical for setting the tone of the relationship, creating a bond, and laying the groundwork for future positive outcomes. The middle stage—perhaps the longest in duration—begins only after a bond and trust between the dyad has developed. This stage is typically where most growth takes place, as a great deal of teaching and learning occurs, obstacles are

encountered and dealt with appropriately, and many goals are accomplished. The final and concluding stage of a relationship varies most from one to the next, but can be conceived as a period where one or both individuals have outgrown the relationship, and no longer derive the benefits they once did (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000; maybe something on couple/marriage disillusionment?).

With this in mind, the following sections will outline the life course of mentoring relationships from an attachment perspective. By recognizing the conceptual parallels between a protégé-mentor and infant-mother relationship, we gain a rich theoretical framework in which to organize much of what we already know about relationships in general, and mentoring in particular. And by understanding mentoring as a secure-base relationship, we gain a clearer idea of the kinds of interactions and experiences that are necessary to building and maintaining a positive relationship throughout its life course. The following section will focus on the initial steps and interactions that lay the foundation for a secure-base relationship, and further extend attachment theory to mentoring relationships. Later, after the necessary foundations have been explored, the next section will examine the processes involved in maintaining and evolving the relationship toward new heights. Afterward, a brief discussion on the end of a relationship from an attachment perspective will be provided.

Initial contact and interactions

Typically, formal mentoring programs begin by pairing a mentor and protégé on some matching variable, such as same gender or ethnicity, or similar interests. However, basing relationships from such variables has its limits (Johnson, 2007). From an attachment perspective, a positive relationship is less interested on such 'matching' variables, and more focused on the kinds of interactions and shared experiences that build expectations about availability and responsiveness. To that end, this section will focus on the interactions and experiences that build a secure-base relationship, rather than on more passive selection and matching variables. Particular attention will be paid to the processes that develop trust, as well as cognitions of security.

From the onset of a mentoring relationship, each individual will arrive with a unique history that will subsequently shape their expectations and willingness to trust the other (Rotter, 1971). From

social learning theory, we have learned that generalized expectations of a relationship hold sway in early social interactions with another (Rotter, 1971; Rotter, 1980). Although this can pose a potential obstacle for a relationship from the start, such barriers can be overcome by relationship specific experiences that counter preconceived expectations. Behaviors that are beneficial or detrimental are both the result of an interplay of the individual's history and experiences with the environment. Therefore, individuals with negative past experiences, or unfamiliarity with secure-base behavior, can nonetheless acquire secure-base knowledge in the appropriate environment, and with ample experience.

Building trust and security

One of the hallmarks of attachment theory, as elaborated by Ainsworth, is a sense of security (Ainsworth, 1969). Security in mentoring relationships, as in infant-mother relationships, relies on expectations of availability and responsiveness, a belief that the mentor is 'stronger and wiser' and that she will 'always be there for me.' (Bowlby, CITATION). However, protégés and infants alike face a 'problem of induction'—that is, their judgments of security are always an inductive inference based on limited experience. To overcome such a problem, consistent interactions that build trust will provide a framework leading to script-like mental representations that extend beyond the evidence one has available. Because one can never be certain of the actions of others, one's judgments must be predicated on trust, and built on real interactions with the other over time. For example, an infant learns that crying will elicit feeding behavior from his mother after a succession of experiences where his mother has responded to his crying in such a manner. Similarly, a protégé will learn to trust his mentor only after recurring experiences where the mentor has responded appropriately to his needs. (perhaps insert value of illusions Holmes paper here). Although trust requires time to develop, individuals will have to demonstrate their trustworthiness from early on, and continue to do so as the relationship matures.

In order to create the conditions that lead to a sense of trust and security, an initial commitment needs to be made on the part of both the mentor and protégé. Because of the voluntary nature of mentoring, unlike infant-mother relations, where autonomous beings enter into, maintain and withdraw from the relationship based upon knowledge of the other, an explicit commitment to the other is perhaps suitable. Establishing early on that the relationship will develop and mature allows for experiences of security and evidence of trustworthiness to accumulate. This can be facilitated by a mentor's willingness to make the first encounters informal and enjoyable, as well as some light disclosure that will allow the protégé to reciprocate. These processes should follow an idiosyncratic course and should not be rushed, or else they could be perceived as a threat to the protégé's autonomy and activate any resistances based on prior experiences.

Establishing credibility

Another pillar in the early stages of a mentoring relationship requires the establishment of credibility. Unlike commitment, however, this process most naturally unfolds in an implicit manner. From an attachment perspective, security in a relationship presupposes that the attachment figure, in Bowlby's terms, is perceived as 'stronger and wiser' (CITATION). To that end, the protégé should be able to accurately judge the mentor as having access to a wider range of resources than him. The protégé can also infer credibility by reflecting on his mentor's past successes in mentoring. Such reflections will shed light not only on the mentor's interpersonal skills and ability to succeed in mentoring, but also highlight her instrumental skills. Her domain-specific expertise combined with past successes will reinforce the notion that she is stronger, wiser, and also willing to impart that knowledge with him.

Setting goals and expectations and calibrating demands

As noted earlier, mentoring relationships are typically guided by a set of broad goals. This feature of the relationship perhaps distinguishes it from a mother-infant relationship, and thus borrowing the 'therapeutic alliance' concept from the therapist-client literature can prove useful. In a therapist-client setting, another close relationship with parallels to mentoring, the therapeutic alliance involves an agreement between the therapist and client about the goals they plan to achieve and the necessary tasks to accomplish said goals (Bordin, 1979; Safran & Murran, 2006). The quality of the alliance, which also acknowledges the need for an emotional bond between the dyad to make progress, has consistently predicted outcomes (Horvath &Symonds, 1991; Martin et al., 2000). Further, the quality of the alliance is conceptualized as a function of quality of the bond, and the extent to which the dyad is able to collaborate on the goals, tasks,

and expectations involved (Bordin, 1979). Such an alliance in mentoring ensures that the goals and expectations of both mentor and protégé align, and reduces the likelihood of potential animosity arising from a discrepancy between them. At the onset, goals can be concrete in nature and within the protégé's reach, before they take on a relatively abstract and broader path.

The advantage of setting explicit goals and expectations early on allows for security to develop by providing the mentor with opportunities to respond effectively to the needs of the protégé. Over a set of initial experiences, the mentor and protégé are able to assess one another's relevant skills, and perhaps modify the tasks and demands in order to continue to challenge the protégé without overwhelming him. Here, again, a look at the therapeutic alliance highlights the interdependence of technical and relational factors which structure the unique relationship and needs based on their developmental histories and relationship schemas (Safran & Murran, 2006). By providing the appropriate resources, tasks, and guidance, the mentor can provide the conceptual scaffolding necessary to achieve early successes. This type of secure-base support is most appropriate when the goals being reached are concrete. Later on, when the nature of the goals is less clear, the mentor can provide support in the form of co-construction. That is, the mentor can continue to provide support to solve problems that may not have a definitive answer, and reach goals that are abstract in nature. Much of this behavior could be described, in attachment terms, as ordinary secure-base support. Although the emergency function of extinguishing negative emotions in attachment is often highlighted, the ordinary function of support for exploration and learning is clearly relevant.

Mentoring as multi-faceted and evolving

In a long-standing close relationship such as mentoring, it is natural for the mentor to occupy multiple overlapping roles, such as teacher, advisor, evaluator, supervisor and perhaps even employer (Biaggio, Chenoweth, & Page, 1997). As a result of these overlapping roles and the power imbalance that comes with them (at least initially), establishing and maintaining boundaries facilitates the growth of trust and security early on, and minimizes encroachments. Also, in light of the literature which suggests that working in close proximity (Festingner, Schacter, & Back, 1963) with someone who has similar interests (Byrne, 1969), along with secure-base use (which citation most relevant here?), can engender

feelings of intimacy, explicit boundary-setting can prevent inappropriate or unethical relationships from developing. Although the development of romantic or sexual relations are most egregious, subtle violations can nonetheless undermine the relationship's integrity. For example, a mentor could overreach boundaries by requesting personal favors and services that the protégé would feel obliged to complete due to the power-differential, and not as part of typical mentoring expectations and practices. The blurring of personal and professional boundaries can make objective evaluations on the part of the mentor difficult, and can lead to difficulty for the protégé to accurately convey their needs (Johnson & Huwe, 2002). Furthermore, over-familiarity undermines the secure base role that the mentor is entrusted to take on.

As the multi-faceted nature of mentoring suggests, mentors can at times serve a particular function and later, a function quite removed from the first. This, of course, depends on the protégé's needs and ability to convey them, and the mentor's ability to accurately interpret those needs and respond appropriately to them. Overtime, however, the general dynamics of the relationship will evolve as a function of the bond between the dyad, and as the protégé continues to approach independence. The shifting dynamics of the relationship, in part, can be attributed to the self-expansion that occurs in close relationships (Aron & Aron, 1996). Self-expansion, in mentoring, involves mutual growth where each individual begins to include the other in the self, thus broadening the range of activities they engage in and maintaining the closeness between the dyad (Aron & Aron, 1996). A natural progression in a mentoring relationship begins with the mentor initiating tasks toward goal-achievement, and eventually reaching a comfortable balance. The overarching goal for the mentor, and a goal that Bowlby (1956) stressed early on of attachment theory, is to foster competence and independence.

A key insight from attachment research is that inferences of trust, expectations that a secure-base will 'always be there for me,' is motivated and competent to resolve problems one encounters, are always inductive inferences. That is, one can never have enough evidence to prove that the secure-base figure will be there when they are next needed. Accordingly, individuals can reference their history of experiences for evidence that the secure-base figure can be trusted beyond one's experiences. In other words, individuals can derive more meaning from the history of experiences and interactions than ap-

pear on the surface. For example, receiving a small gift from a secure-base figure suggests more than the literal gift; it is a signal of availability and motivation. This kind of behavior is seen in parent-child relationships, as well as in couple interactions. Attachment researchers have discussed this in work on secure base use and support in infancy, childhood, and marriage. (Ainsworth, 1969; Woodhouse, Dykas & Cassidy, 2009; Crowell et al., 2002). The extent to which individuals can use others as secure-base figures depends on what attachment theorists refer to as a working model of the relationship. Now that we have reviewed the initial steps and interactions necessary for laying the groundwork of such working models, the following section will examine the ways in which the relationship evolves over time, is maintained, and the interactions that solidify secure-base working models in mentoring.

MAINTAINING AND EVOLVING MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

By having a relationship-focus of mentoring, where it is acknowledged that building and maintaining the relationship is part of the goal, and not something that occurs incidentally to other tasks, we have been able to outline the kinds of interactions that are necessary for developing a close bond between the dyad, as well as building trust and security which lays the foundation for achieving larger goals. The close bond that forms is largely what separates mentoring from roles such as advising, where a larger focus is placed on information-sharing than on relationship and nurturing (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000). Having laid the groundwork for a secure-base relationship to develop, we can continue to view mentoring through an attachment lens to understand the processes necessary in evolving and maintaining the relationship throughout its life course. Some of these processes include creating a culture for the relationship, continued secure-base support for exploration and independence, open communication and closeness, as well as continued availability and time investment. The following section will elaborate on these processes, and provide parallels from attachment theory to mentoring.

Creating a culture together

This middle stage of the relationship, which has been referred to as the cultivation phase (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000), is a time in which the expectations that emerged during the initial stage of the relationship are continually tested

against reality. That is, the expectations that the mentor will continue to be available for the protégé, and assist in overcoming obstacles, will continually be tested. In discovering the real value of relating to each other, the mentor-protégé dyad will co-create a culture for the relationship, which further clarifies boundaries and sets expectations.

Co-creation of the relationship culture is key here, as the mentor's goal is to build independence, and not to create expectations of passive following. This may involve some modeling on the part of the mentor, and also verbalizing cognitions and affect so as to minimize misunderstandings and solicit feedback. Because a protégé generally lacks expertise, he may not know what kinds of behaviors are appropriate and useful. In other words, the protégé may not yet be socialized into the relationship, and thus, the mentor can lead in co-constructing a culture that can be productive and beneficial to the dyad. This may include identifying the level of formality that the relationship will have, the balance of work and play that the dyad will engage in, and further clarification of boundaries.

In a similar way that a parent can set boundaries with a child (e.g. 'I'm your parent, not your pal.'), a mentor can also do the same and yet maintain an amicable and comfortable working and learningenvironment. Further, the protégé's reactions to the directions in the mentoring culture of the relationship provide information that should be taken into account (e.g. preferences and strengths) ((Attachment research mentions infant/child effects on caregiver. (Ref.)??). And as a parent lacks access to all the possible parent-child cultures possible, a mentor also lacks a fixed template to use. A general model of the culture is likely built from personal experiences, and the mentor's own relationship history. From here, we can easily see the benefits of mentors exchanging information and experiences with senior mentors, and deriving useful templates for productive working relationships. As in parenting, a fair amount of trial-and-error takes place in figuring out how to implement models in actual behavior.

Secure-base support for exploration and independence

Humans are incredibly adept at detecting patterns, particularly in interpersonal contexts, and this skill is even present in infancy (Waters et al, 1991). From such pattern detection abilities, as noted earlier, a history of consistent positive interactions in which the mentor is available and re-

sponsive to the protégé's needs leads to a script-like mental representation, or a working model, of the relationship in attachment development, Bowlby (1969/1982) described the infant as first coming to recognize and prefer the mother, and only then beginning to use her as a secure base from which to explore. He also outlined the need for the infant to balance the desire for exploration with proximity seeking (Bowlby, 1969/1982). Bowlby (1969/1982) described this balance similar to a thermostat, in which individuals monitor their distance from and accessibility to a secure base figure. As novelty increases in exploration, so too does the need for proximity-seeking.

In mentoring, after the secure-base has been identified, much more exploration (balanced with proximity) can take place. Effective exploration is predicated on sensitivity to signals and open communication (described further below), as well as non-interference. Support for exploration typically involves encouraging the protégé to work within their zone of proximal development, and being available when pushed beyond it. For example, a mentor can assign a novel and challenging task, and the protégé can seek help as needed. Mentors can also provide the scaffolding—that is, the temporary framework that supports the protégé's thinking at a higher level that could not otherwise be achieved on one's own (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976)—necessary for a protégé to accomplish a particularly challenging task or goal. When the intended goal is more abstract, such as developing a vision for one's future, the mentor can be an invaluable resource and assist in co-constructing that vision. Further, the mentor can foster exploration by building the protégé's social capital and extending connections and access to influential people in the field (Chan, 2008). At other points, the mentor can assist in dealing with failures, whether personal or professional (Burlew, 1991). The mentor can also serve as a sounding board for ideas, ask open-ended questions that encourage memory consolidation and cognitive elaboration, and provide feedback to sustain growth (Galbraith & Cohen, 1996).

Communication and closeness

One of the fruits of identifying and establishing a secure-base from which to explore includes little to no concern about rejection. The absence of personal rejection concerns allows open channels of communication to flow. From an attachment perspective, open and candid channels of communication would allow the protégé to readily signal for help when necessary, allow the mentor to respond

accordingly, and over time allow them both to fine tune their interactions. In a similar manner that parents are known to explicitly tell their children that they should not be afraid to share certain things with them, mentors too can explicitly make honest dialogue an operating principle of the relationship (Boyle & Boice, 1998; Galbraith & Cohen, 1996). Such openness limits distress prior to communications. Openness, however, also requires that the mentor not react negatively (e.g. alarm, disgust, rejection, punitive) in succession and subsequently reconfiguring the protégé's working model of the relationship. From mother-infant communications, we have learned that defensive processes interfere with development and functioning of working models (Bretherton, 1990). Bearing in mind that one cannot be responsive and cooperate with ongoing behavior without open communication, it may behoove formal mentoring programs to teach not only what to expect and how to react, but also the significance of the reaction.

Sharing personal stories and exchanging humor can be essential in building rapport and closeness, as well as enhancing communication and understanding between the mentor and protégé (Chan, 2008). The use of humor can signal comfort and approval with the other person, as well as an element of self-disclosure (Boyle & Boice, 1998). Used strategically, a candid, open, and friendly joke can be used to moderate mood in interactions. Further, the kind of humor employed can indicate the degree of assumed closeness (e.g. what kind of humor is 'appropriate' for the relationship), and trust between the dyad.

From an attachment perspective, self-disclosure is part and parcel of open communication and the knowledge acquired via self-disclosure (i.e. skills, strengths, preferences, weaknesses) shape the co-construction that takes place (citation necessary?). Self-disclosure also involves exchanging personal narratives, which shape the way experiences are interpreted, and are an aspect of one's self-concept and identity (McAdams, 1993). For example, although two individuals may possess the same personality profile, the life narratives used to enrich, make sense of, and support their experiences may differ significantly (McAdams & Pals, 2006).

Personal narratives are constructed in a social context (McAdams, 1993), and thus, mentors can influence the building and elaboration of protégés' narratives, and also steer the direction they take. For example, without a mentor's input, a protégé may interpret a low-point in one's academic career

as a personal failure, but the mentor may be able to relate a personal anecdote and shift the narrative toward a learning opportunity. In other words, the mentor can guide the protégé in assigning labels and attributing meaning to some experiences (i.e. the role of luck, interpreting uncertainties, failures, lessons learned, personal high and low points, importance of social support, etc.). Moreover, the mentor's level of openness can instill a sense of trust in the protégé (Chan, 2008). And an extension of continued trust, can be interpreted as an expression of confidence in the protégé's success (Galbraith & Cohen, 1996).

Availability and time investment

As noted earlier, working models of relationships are built on a history of real experiences, and thus, a major prerequisite for a genuine secure-base relationship is time. In the early conceptualization of attachment theory, Bowlby (1969/1982) described the process of 'monotropy,' which occurs in normal development, and is characterized by the infant's preferential bond with a single individual (i.e. the mother), and the bases of attachment. Later findings suggested that attachment bonds formed not only to those that the person spent most time with, but to those that were available to their needs and exhibited sensitive responsiveness (Schaffer & Emerson, 1964). That individuals form multiple, yet limited, attachments is a significant and well supported generalization (Schaffer & Emerson, 1964; maybe include another citation as well?). In the context of interpersonal relationships, we can see that monitoring the behavior, motivations, cognition and affect of a select few is more feasible than providing the same level of support for a large number. Further, when we undertake dyadic relationships, such as mentoring, we build working models of individual partners, not of groups or organizations.

Across time and space in the consolidation and growth of the mentoring relationship, physical as well as psychological availability is key (Cunningham & Eberle, 1993). Accessibility to the mentor can be signaled explicitly by maintaining a regular contact schedule, and adjusting to the needs of the protégé (Morrison-Beedy, Aronowitz, Dyne & Mkandawire, 2001). Whether contacts take place informally on an almost-daily basis, or if contacts are formally structured around certain time intervals, the protégé should nonetheless have access to the mentor in emergency situations. For example, knowing that a protégé can call their mentor's personal phone number in times of need signals avail-

ability and serves as an invaluable asset (Chan, 2008). Although exchanging home phone numbers may be less common in therapist-client relationships, accessibility in emergency situations continues to be a component of the therapeutic-alliance (Bordin, 1979).

A competent secure-base figure should also be flexible and sensitive to the context in which support is needed and offered. For example, during times of uncertainty or risk, a mentor will need to provide more support, or at least perceived support, than when a protégé is engaging in more familiar tasks. That is, the mentor's ability to provide the appropriate kind and level of support is a function of their empathic abilities and mindfulness of the protégé's point of view (Meins, 1997). Such mindfulness also contributes to the protégé's self-efficacy, an underlying goal of attachment relationships (Meins, 1997). This implies time investment, and a motivation to understand the protégé's perspective.

With a focus on the way in which a working model of the relationship develops and consolidates over time, an attachment perspective points toward key processes necessary in evolving and sustaining a healthy secure-base relationship. We can see the way in which co-constructing the relationship culture operates, the continued and evolving nature of support for exploration, as well as the functions of communication, closeness, availability and time investment in the extension of attachment theory to mentoring. The following section will extend a key insight of attachment theory to the next and final stage of a typical mentoring relationship.

ENDPOINTS OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

By viewing mentoring relationships through an attachment lens, we have been able to outline the early and middle stages of the relationship, and the corresponding interactions and processes involved in shaping a healthy secure base relationship. As noted earlier, one of the overarching goals of mentoring, and a parallel to attachment theory (Bowlby, 1956), is to foster competence, self-reliance and independence in the individual. Similarly, the mentoring literature would describe the concluding stage of the relationship as one marked by significant changes, and a time when the protégé experiences independence and autonomy (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000). Feelings of loss and anxiety may also accompany this experience (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000), much in the

way that an individual experiences grief in the loss of a secure-base figure (Bowlby, 1969/1982).

This concluding stage of the relationship involves the mentor and protégé's recognition that a shift in the developmental tasks, needs of the protégé, and support the mentor can provide has occurred, and that the previous conceptualization of the relationship is no longer needed, desired, or appropriate (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000). In light of this awareness, the relationship becomes reconceptualized and takes on different characteristics. Whereas ethical concerns (Johnson & Nelson, 1999) regarding the many roles that mentors take on may have prevented a fully-fledged collegial relationship in earlier stages, the circumstances at this stage would be conducive for a peer-like relationship to form (Johnson, 2007). That is, the more a protégé has achieved inde-pendence, with the mentor's support and encouragement, the closer the relationship can approach a level field.

In psychotherapy, another close relationship with parallels to attachment theory, one of the key concerns is a comparison of the advantages and limits of both long-term and time-limited therapy methods (Mander, 2000). A hurdle that long-term relationships face is that they may extend in length beyond the time that is necessary, and lack a sense of pressure or structure conducive to progress. If the relationship is perceived to end prematurely, the client may experience a sense of loss and betrayal if dependence has been engendered (Mander, 2000; Schlesinger, 1996). On the other hand, time-limited therapy, with a pre-determined and finite length, may possess the structure for progress, but unlike mentoring, the goals may be more focused and modest. Further, because of the pre-determined ending, some progress may be forced and occur artificially.

A look at the ways in which therapist-client relationships are brought to an effective close provides a useful schema that can be adapted in mentor-protégé relationships. For example, a patient relating to their therapist in a more egalitarian manner is a cue to therapists that the relationship's end is approaching (Kramer, 1986) -much in the way that protégés would begin to view their mentors as peers. A therapeutic ending to psychotherapy involves planning for closure, conducting and concluding treatment with termination in mind (Graybar & Leonard, 2009). That is, one of the underlying goals of the relationship is to reach this point. Just as the mentor prepares the protégé for independence, a therapeutic termination prepares

the client for life without the therapist (Graybar & Leonard, 2009). As such relationships are quite unique, and clients can experience conflicting emotions at this stage, the clinician must continue to respond effectively to their needs at this point (Graybar & Leonard, 2009). To that end, a common guideline for termination involves an 'open-door policy' which signals to clients that they may return as necessary (Kramer, 1986). Similarly, mentors will continue to serve as a resource when needed, but on a significantly different level. Successful therapeutic, as well as mentoring, relationships are dependent upon meaningful relationships that are accom-panied by meaningful closures.

Mentors are often portrayed as going away or disappearing once the protégé is ready for the task at hand. However, this appears to be more a sign of completion and independence than a necessary feature. In clinical psychology and psychiatry, it is explicitly considered unethical for the therapist and patient to socialize once therapy is completed (Pipes, 1997). In psychotherapy, the standard is no intimate relationship with the client during or for two years after therapy, and even so, only in exceptional cases where one can make a solid case that likelihood of injury is low (Pipes, 1997). Although such formal measures seek to protect the client from a severely power-imbalanced relationship, the academic mentor-protégé relationship often becomes a genuine, balanced collaboration and friendship. That said, there appear to be no need for formal measures that could prevent a continuing association between a mentor and protégé. Overall, at the core of mentoring, we find not only the significance of interpersonal learning, but also the importance of a bond and an enduring relationship between the dyad—features which suggests the relevance of attachment theory in appropriately conceptualizing and understanding the nature and processes of such a relationship.

CONCLUSION

As researchers have suggested (Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007), there is a need to identify mentoring as a distinct relational construct separate and unique from the several related terms that exist in the literature, such as role model, and advisor. These terms can be thought of as existing on a relational continuum, with role models comprising a less relational connection and mentoring involving greater relational development, intensity, and depth (Johnson, 2007). In order to shed light on the distinct relational nature of mentoring, this paper has described the many common characteristics found

across such relationships. From examples in literature, to structured programs in practice, we find mentoring is guided by a broad set of goals, is inherently reciprocal and dyadic, involves a deep level of connection, commitment and trust, and is extended in time. Mentoring involves a bonded and mutual relationship in which the mentor is deliberate about facilitating the professional and personal development of the protégé, as well as promoting growth and independence.

At the core of mentoring lies a one-on-one learning relationship (Galbraith & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2000). More specifically, the kind of learning that takes place is not merely fact, skill, and knowledge acquisition, but also involves facilitating further learning by representing know-ledge in increasingly schematized and abstracted ways that become readily accessible and flexible for use across contexts and domains (Pressley, 1995; Pressley & Hilden, 2006; Carey, 2009; Karmiloff-Smith, 1992). By highlighting the significance of the social context in learning, the role that the mentor plays in the protégé's acquisition of expertise has become clear. The mentor can serve as an invaluable interlocutor that works within the protégé's zone of proximal development to challenge and motivate the learner (Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978). Mentors also facilitate learning by providing the social scaffolding necessary to achieve new goals, and co-construct knowledge with the protégé when the answers are not definitive (e.g. creating a vision for the protégé, how long to persist on a task that is not working, etc.) (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976; Dreyfus, 2001). Further, in order for the protégé to move beyond proficiency and move into expertise and eventual independence, the protégé must be emotionally involved in the material and invested in the relationship (Dreyfus, 2001).

The fact that learning is a lifelong process, and the role that mentors play in learning has brought to bear the essential role that mentors play in normal development. That is, not only do historically disadvantaged groups benefit from mentoring, but the kind of close relationship that characterizes mentoring is beneficial to all. The extended nature of the relationship and the close bond that forms between the dyad has pointed to the benefits of attachment theory in refining our conceptualization and understanding of the nature and process of the relationship. By recognizing the extension of attachment theory to mentoring, we have been able to focus on the secure-base concept and the ways in which it is established, maintained, evolves over

time and supports independence. Particular attention has been paid to the ways in which Ainsworth's (1969) maternal sensitivity scales (i.e. sensitivity to signals, cooperation with ongoing behavior, physical and psychological availability, and acceptance of needs) manifest themselves in mentoring relationships. By focusing on the relational component of mentoring, the attachment perspective has made explicit the need to develop the relationship, and provided a lens in which to examine it systematically.

In making relationship development an explicit goal of mentoring, is the sense of a genuine, mutual, and authentic relationship lost? The role that mentors play in normal development, and the high prevalence of mentoring in graduate training (Johnson, Koch, Fallow, & Huwe, 2000; Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000) certainly suggests that protégés benefit from the relationship. Goal directedness does not preclude a genuine relationship. If the appropriate measures are taken, humans in fact develop real bonds. For example, in parenting and couple relationships, some intentional and goal-directed maintenance is important and beneficial (Marvin, Cooper, Hoffman, & Powell, 2002; Hoffman, Marvin, Cooper, & Powell, 2006; perhaps another citation from the marriage literature?).

This discussion raises some issues and points to the continued use of attachment theory in understanding, forming, and evaluating mentoring relationships. Although mentors are in demand, not all mentoring relationships are a guaranteed success. In order to prevent failed relationships, organizations often seek to select mentors on the basis of characteristics that maximize the likelihood of success. Past research has approached the task of selecting mentors based on matching variables such as race and ethnicity (Thile & Matt, 1995), but there is little evidence to suggest that matching on such variables makes them more efficacious (Johnson, 2007). Approaching the issue of selecting good predictors of success in mentors from an attachment perspective would suggest a very different strategy and focus.

A relevant insight from attachment theory in the mentor/protégé selection process is the prototype hypothesis – the notion that early relationship experiences form a working model, or mental representation, of all future close relationships (Owen et al., 1995). Researchers have demonstrated that individuals familiar with attachment representations more readily use their romantic partners as a secure-base from which to explore, than individuals

with no such mental representations (Owens et al., 1995; Crowell et al., 2002). Recent research has extended attachment theory's prototype hypothesis to mentoring.

In a sample of university students with access to mentoring programs, Zevallos, Shephard, and Waters (2007) noted that the group of mentored students had significantly stronger attachment representations than non-mentored students, suggesting that attachment representations opens students to possible mentoring relationships. Interestingly, among mentored students, those with stronger attachment representations were more critical of their mentors, suggesting that they have a clearer view of the secure-base support they need, and notice shortcomings in their expectations (Zevallos et al, 2007). Other researchers have noted that securely attached college students are not only open to close mentoring relationships, but also experience such relationship as more positive than their insecure counterparts (Zavallos, Waters, & Waters, 2009). Further, longitudinal work (Bianchini, Zevallos, & Waters, 2011) has demonstrated the persistence of attachment representations in mentoring relationship across the college years, and also highlighted the extent to which real experiences (i.e. reported more mentors during their college years) consolidate and strengthen such mental representations.

An attachment perspective may also be useful in preparing mentors and protégés for the relationship. Making the implicit knowledge of building the relationship explicit and implementing brief interventions where necessary, can enrich and benefit the working models of the relationship (Marvin, Cooper, Hoffman, & Powell, 2002). If mentors are prepared for relationships in general, and the protégé's behavior in particular, through an attachment lens, their ability to monitor and serve as a secure base can be sharpened. For example, knowing not only what to expect and how to react in particular interactions, but also being aware of one's reaction in shaping the relationship's working model can be a useful strategy. Diffi-culties in establishing productive working models may also suggest an origin in negative attachment experiences as well. In addition, the hallmark of Bowlby and Ainsworth's work of basing their ideas on observations suggests possible research endeavors in evaluating and supervising mentoring relationships in course. Possible avenues of research could include assessing mentor and protégé's secure-base script knowledge, as well as assessing their attachment classification using measures such as the Adult Attachment Interview (citations?).

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1963). The development of infant-mother interaction among the Ganda. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), *Determinants of infant behavior* (pp. 67-104). New York: Wiley.

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1967), *Infancy in Uganda: Infant care and the growth of love,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1969). Scales for assessing maternal care variables: Sensitivity to signals, cooperation with ongoing behavior, acceptance of baby's needs, physical and psychological availability. (Mimeograph.) Retrieved 11/30/2011 from http://www.psychology.sunysb.edu/attachment/measures/content/ainsworth_scales.html.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (1969). Some contemporary patterns in the feeding situation. In A. Ambrose (Ed,), *Stimulation in early infancy* (pp. 133-170). London: Academic Press.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. *Child Development, 41,* 49-67.

Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1996). Self and self-expansion in relationships. In G. O. Fletcher & J. Fitness (Eds.) , *Knowledge structures in close relationships: A social psychological approach* (pp. 325-344). Hillsdale, NJ England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ayalon, A. (2007). A model for teacher mentoring of poor and minority children: A case study of an urban Israeli school mentoring program. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership In Learning, 15*(1), 5-23. doi:10.1080/13611260601037348

Bradbury, T. & Karney, B. (2010). *Intimate relationships*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Biaggio, M., Paget, T., & Chenoweth, M. (1997). A model for ethical management of faculty - Student dual relationships. *Professional Psychology: Research And Practice*, *28*(2), 184-189. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.28.2.184

Bordin, E. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice,*

16, 252–260.

Bowlby, J. (1956). The growth of independence in the young child. *Royal Society of Health Journal, 76*, 587-91.

Bowlby, J. (1958). The nature of the child's tie to its mother. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 39*, 350-373.

Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss, Vol. 1: Attachment.* New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1979). *The Making and Breaking of Affectional Bonds*. London: Tavistock.

Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Best practices for enculturation: Collegiality, mentoring, and structure. In M.S. Anderson (Ed.) *The experience of being in graduate school: An exploration* (pp. 87–94). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bretherton, I. (1990). Communication patterns, internal working models, and the intergenerational transmission of attachment relationships. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, *11*(3), 237-252. doi:10.1002/1097-0355(199023)11:3<237::AID-IMHJ2280110306 >3.0.CO;2-X

Burlew, L. D. (1991). Multiple mentor model: A conceptual framework. *Journal Of Career Development*, *17*(3), 213-221. doi:10.1007/BF01322028

Byrne, D. (1969). Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 4, 35-89. New York: Academic Press.

Cameron, J.J., Holmes, J.G., & Vorauer, J.D. (2009).When self-disclosure goes awry: Negative consequences of revealing personal failures for lower self-esteem individuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 217-222.

Cavallo, J.V., & Holmes, J.G. (in press). The Importance of feeling valued: Perceived regard in close relationships. In C. Nathan De Wall (Ed.), Handbook of Social Exclusion. Oxford University Press.

Chan, A. W. (2008). Mentoring ethnic minority, pre-doctoral students: An analysis of key mentor practices. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership In Learning*, *16*(3), 263-277. doi:10.1080/13611260802231633

Clark, R. A., Harden, S. L., & Johnson, W. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training: Results of a national survey.

Teaching Of Psychology, *27*(4), 262-268. doi:10.1207/S15328023TOP2704_04

Cohen, G. L., & Steele, C. M. (2002). A barrier of mistrust: How negative stereotypes affect cross-race mentoring. In J. Aronson, J. Aronson (Eds.) , *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 303-327). San Diego, CA US: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/B978-012064455-1/50018-X

Crowell, J. A., Treboux, D., Gao, Y., Fyffe, C., Pan, H., & Waters, E. (2002). Assessing secure base behavior in adulthood: Development of a measure, links to adult attachment representations and relations to couples' communication and reports of relationships. *Developmental Psychology*, *38*(5), 679-693.

Crowell, J. A., Fraley, R., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). Measurement of individual differences in adolescent and adult attachment. In J. Cassidy, P. R. Shaver, J. Cassidy, P. R. Shaver (Eds.) , *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications (2nd ed.)* (pp. 599-634). New York, NY US: Guilford Press.

Cunningham, J.B., & Eberle, T. (1993). Characteristics of the mentoring experience: A qualitative study. P*ersonnel Review, 22*(4), 54–66.

Davis, D. (2008). Mentorship and the socialization of underrepresented minorities into the professoriate: Examining varied influences. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership In Learning*, *16*(3), 278-293.

DuBois, D. L., Holloway, B. E., Valentine, J. C., & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: a meta-analytic review. *American Journal Of Community Psychology*, *30*(2), 157-197. doi:10.1023/A:1014628810714

DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science In The Public Interest*, *12*(2), 57-91. doi:10.1177/ 1529100611414806

Duck, S. (Ed.) (1988). *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 367-389). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Eby, L. T., Durley, J. R., Evans, S. C., & Ragins, B. (2006). The relationship between short-term mentoring benefits and long-term mentor outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(3),

424-444. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.003

Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Definition and evolution of mentoring. In T. D. Allen, L. T. Eby, T. D. Allen, L. T. Eby (Eds.) , *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 7-20). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Black, K. (1963). *Social pressures in informal groups: A study of human factors in housing*. Oxford England: Stanford U. Press.

Galbraith, M.W., & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2000). The Mentor Facilitating Out-of-Class Cognitive and Affective Growth. In James L. Bess and Associates, *Teaching Alone, Teaching Together: Transforming the Structure of Teams for Teaching*, (pp 145-148). Jossey-Bass.

Galbraith, M.W., & Cohen, N.H. (1996). The complete mentor role: Understanding the six behavioral functions. *Mountain Plains Adult Education Association Journal, 24*(2), 2–11.

Gastic, B., & Johnson, D. (2009). Teacher-mentors and the educational resilience of sexual minority youth. *Journal Of Gay & Lesbian Social Services: Issues In Practice, Policy & Research*, *21* (2-3), 219-231.

Graybar, S., & Leonard, L. (2009). Terminating psychotherapy therapeutically. In W. O'Donohue, S. R. Graybar, W. O'Donohue, S. R. Graybar (Eds.) , *Handbook of contemporary psychotherapy: Toward an improved understanding of effective psychotherapy* (pp. 359-381). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, *5*, 1-22.

Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C.,&Adler, N. L. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction, and staying together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 980-988.

Hoffman, K. T., Marvin, R. S., Cooper, G., & Powell, B. (2006). Changing toddlers' and preschoolers' attachment classifications: The circle of security intervention. *Journal Of Consulting And Clinical Psychology*, *74*(6), 1017-1026. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.74.6.1017

Holmes, J. G. (1981). The exchange process in close relationships: Microbehavior and macromotives. In M. L. Lerner & S. *C,* Lerner (Eds.), *The justice motivein social behavior* (pp. 261-284). New York: Plenum.

Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology: Close relationships* (Vol. 10, pp. 187-219). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Holmes, J. G. (1991). Trust and the appraisal process in close relationships. In W. H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships (Vol. 2)*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Holmes, J.G. (2002). Interpersonal expectations as the building blocks of social cognition: An interdependence theory analysis. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 1-26.

Holmes, J.G., & Anderson, J. (2009). Security in relationships. In Reis, H., & Sprecher, S. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of human relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Holmes, J.G., & Murray, S.L. (2007). Felt security as a normative resource: Evidence for an elemental risk regulation system? *Psychological Inquiry, 18*, 163-168.

Homer. (2004). McCrorie, E., & Martin, R.P. (trs.) *The Odyssey.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Johnson, W. (2007). Student-faculty mentorship outcomes. In T. D. Allen, L. T. Eby, T. D. Allen, L. T. Eby (Eds.) , *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 189-210). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Johnson, W., & Huwe, J. M. (2002). Toward a typology of mentorship dysfunction in graduate school. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *39*(1), 44-55. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.39.1.44

Johnson, W., Koch, C., Fallow, G. O., & Huwe, J. M. (2000). Prevalence of mentoring in clinical-versus experimental doctoral programs: Survey findings, implications, and recommendations. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *37*(4), 325-334. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.37.4.325

Johnson, W., & Nelson, N. (1999). Mentor-protégé relationships in graduate training: Some ethical concerns. *Ethics & Behavior*, *9*(3), 189-210. doi:10.1207/s15327019eb0903_1

Johnson, W., Rose, G., & Schlosser, L. Z. (2007). Student-faculty mentoring: Theoretical and methodological issues. In T. D. Allen, L. T. Eby, T. D. Allen, L. T. Eby (Eds.) , *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 49-69). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Keller, T. E. (2005). The Stages and Development of Mentoring Relationships. In D. L. DuBois,

M. J. Karcher, D. L. DuBois, M. J. Karcher (Eds.) , *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 82-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Kelley, H. H. (1979). Personal relationships: Their structures and processes. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Klein, M. (1932). *The psycho-analysis of children.* London: Hogarth Press.

Knee, C., Nanayakkara, A., Vietor, N. A., Neighbors, C., & Patrick, H. (2001). Implicit theories of relationships: Who cares if romantic partners are less than ideal?. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(7), 808-819. doi:10.1177/0146167201277004

Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Lanham, MD England: University Press of America.

Kramer, S. A. (1986). The termination process in open-ended psychotherapy: Guidelines for clinical practice. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *23*(4), 526-531. doi:10.1037/h0085652

London, M. (Ed.). (2011). *The Oxford handbook of lifelong learning*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Owens, G., Crowell, J. A., Pan, H., & Treboux, D. (1995). The prototype hypothesis and the origins of attachment working models: Adult relationships with parents and romantic partners. *Monographs Of The Society For Research In Child Development*, *60*(2-3), 216-233. doi:10.2307/1166180

Mander, G. (2000). Beginnings, endings and outcome: A comparison of methods and goals. *Psychodynamic Counseling*, *6*(3), 301-317. doi:10.1080/13533330050132099

Marigold, D.C., Holmes, J.G., & Ross, R. (2007). More than words: Reframing compliments from romantic partners fosters security in low self-esteem individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 232-247.

Marigold, D., Holmes, J.G., & Ross, M. (2010). Fostering relationship resilience: An intervention for low self-esteem individuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46,* 624-630.

Marvin, R., Cooper, G., Hoffman, K., & Powell, B. (2002). The Circle of Security project: Attachment-based intervention with caregiver-preschool child dyads. *Attachment & Human Development, 4*(1), 107-124. doi:10.1080/14616730252982491

Markus, H. & Zajonc, R. (1985). The cognitive perspective in social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. 3rd ed. Vol. 1 (pp. 137-230). New York: Random House.

McAdams, D.P. (1993). *The stories we live by.* New York: Guilford Press.

McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, *61*(3), 204-217.

McKnight D.H., Chervany N.L. (1996). *The meanings of trust. Technical report.* University of Minnesota Management Information Systems Research Center. Retrieved 11/30/2011 as *misrc.umn.edu/ wpaper/WorkingPapers/9604.pdf*

Meins, E. (1997). *Security of attachment and the social development of cognition*. Hove, England: Psychology Press/Erlbaum (UK) Taylor & Francis.

Mikulincer, M. (1998). Attachment working models and the sense of trust: An exploration of interaction goals and affect regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 1209–1224.

Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1995). Appraisal of and coping with a real-life stressful situation: The contribution of attachment styles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21,* 406–414.

Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1997). Are emotional and instrumental supportive interactions beneficial in times of stress? The impact of attachment style. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping: An International Journal,10,* 109–127.

Mikulincer, M., Gillath, O., & Shaver, P. R.

(2002). Activation of the attachment system in adulthood: Threat-related primes increase the accessibility of mental representations of attachment figures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83,* 881–895.

Mikulincer, M., & Nachshon, O. (1991). Attachment styles and patterns of self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61,* 321–331.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2003). The attachment behavioral system in adulthood: Activation, psychodynamics, and interpersonal processes. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 53–152). New York: Academic Press.

Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., Gillath, O., & Nitzberg, R. A. (2005). Attachment, caregiving, and altruism: Boosting attachment security increases compassion and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89,* 817–839.

Morrison-Beedy, D., Aronowitz, T., Dyne, J., & Mkandawire, L. (2001). Mentoring students and junior faculty in faculty research: A win-win scenario. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 17* (6), 291–296.

Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., Griffin, D. W., Bellavia, G., & Rose, P. (2001). The mismeasure of love: How self-doubt contaminates relationship beliefs. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 27(4), 423-436.* doi:10.1177/0146167201274004

Murray, S., & Holmes, J.G. (1994). Story-telling in close relationships: The construction of confidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 650-663.

Murray, S. L., Holmes, J.G., & Collins, N.L. (2006). Optimizing assurance: The risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychological Bulletin, 132,* 641-666.

Murray, S.L., Rose, P., Holmes, J.G., Podchaski, E., Derrick, J., Bellavia, & G., Griffin, D.W. (2005). Putting the partner within reach: A dyadic perspective on felt security. J*ournal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 327-347.

Murray, S.L. & Holmes, J.G. (in press). Seek connection or avoid rejection? Trust as a motivational gate-keeper in adult romantic relationships. In L. Horowitz & S. Strack (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal psychology: Theory, research, assessment, and therapeutic interventions.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Murray, S.L., & Holmes, J.G. (2009). The architecture of interdependent minds: A motivation management theory of mutual responsiveness. *Psychological Review, 116,* 908-928.

Murray, S.L., Derrick, J., Leder, S., & Holmes, J.G. (2008). Balancing connectedness and self-protection goals in close relationships: A levels of processing perspective on risk regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94,* 429-459.

Murray, S.L., Holmes, J.G., Aloni, M., Pinkus, R. T., Derrick, J.L., Leder, S. (2009). Commitment-insurance: Compensating for the autonomy costs of interdependence in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97,* 256-279.

Piaget, J. (1936, English translation 1953). *The Origins of Intelligence in the Child.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct.* New York, NY US: William Morrow & Co.

Pipes, R.B. (1997). Non-sexual relationships between psychotherapists and their former clients: Obligations of Psychologists. *Ethics & Behavior, 7*(1), 27-41.

Pressley, M. (1995). What is intellectual development about in the 1990s? Good information processing. In F.E. Weinert & W. Schneider (Eds.), *Memory Performance and Competencies: Issues in Growth and Development.* Erlbaum.

Pressley, M. & Hilden, K. (2006). Cognitive Strategies. In D. Kuhn & R.S. Siegler (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol 2, Cognition, Perception, and Language* (6th edition). (pp. 511-556).

Reis, H., Clark, M., & Holmes, J.G. (2004). Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing construct in the study of intimacy and closeness. In D. J. Mashek & A. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of intimacy and closeness* (pp. 201-225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Reis, H. & Partick, B. C. (1996). Attachment and intimacy: Component processes. In T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 523-563).

New York: Guilford.

Reis, H. & Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an inter-personal process. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 367-389). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Rhodes, J. E. (2005). A Model of Youth Mentoring. In D. L. DuBois, M. J. Karcher, D. L. DuBois, M. J. Karcher (Eds.) , *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 30-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Roberts, Andy. (1999) "The origins of the term mentor". *History of Education Society Bulletin*, No. 64, November 1999, p. 313–329.

Rotter, J. B. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. *American Psychologist*, *26* (5), 443-452.

Rotter, J. B. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist*, *35* (1), 1-7.

Safran, J. D. (1993). Breaches in the therapeutic alliance: An arena for negotiating authentic relatedness. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *30*(1), 11-24.

Safran, J. D., & Muran, J. (2006). Has the concept of the therapeutic alliance outlived its usefulness?. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *43*(3), 286-291. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.43.3.286

Schaffer, H. R. & Emerson, P. E. (1964). 'The Development of Social Attachments in Infancy'. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 29, 94.

Schlesinger, H. J. (1996). The fear of being left half-cured. *Bulletin Of The Menninger Clinic*, *60*(4), 428-448.

Simpon, S. & Matsuda, P.K. (2008). Mentoring as a Long-Term Relationship: Situation Learning in a Doctoral Program. In: Casanave, C.P., & Li, X.M. (Ed.), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation.* Ann Arber: University of Michigan Press.

Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Nelligan, J. S. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,62,* 434–446.

Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., Orina, M., & Grich, J. (2002). Working models of attachment, support giving, and support seeking in a stress-ful situation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 598–608.

Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an organizational construct. *Child Development, 48*, 1184-1199.

Sroufe, L. A., Jacobvitz, J., Mangelsdorf, S., DeAngelo, E., & Ward, M. J. (1985). Generational boundary dissolution between mothers and their preschool children: A relationships systems approach. Child Development, 56, 317-325.

Sroufe, L. A., & Ward, M. J. (1980). Seductive behavior of mothers of toddlers: occurrence, correlates, and family origins. Child Development, 5l, 1222-1229.

Thile, E. L., & Matt, G. E. (1995). The Ethnic Mentor Undergraduate Program: A brief description and preliminary findings. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling And Development*, *23* (2), 116-126. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.1995.tb00605.x

Thomson, N., & Zand, D. H. (2010). Mentees' perceptions of their interpersonal relationships: The role of the mentor–youth bond. *Youth & Society*, *41*(3), 434-445.

Vorauer, J.D., Cameron, J., Holmes, J.G., & Pearce, D. (2003). Invisible overtures: Fears of rejection and the signal amplification bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 793-812.

Waters, E., Kondo-Ikemura, K., Posada, G., & Richters, J. E. (1991). Learning to love: Mechanisms and milestones. In M. R. Gunnar, L. Sroufe, M. R. Gunnar, L. Sroufe (Eds.), *Self processes and development* (pp. 217-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Waters, E., & Cummings, E. (2000). A secure base from which to explore close relationships. *Child Development*, *71*(1), 164-172. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00130

Wellman, H.M., & Gelman, S. (1998). Knowledge acquisition in foundational domains. In. D. Kuhn & R.S. Siegler (Eds.), H*andbook of Child*

Psychology, Vol. 2, Cognition, Perception, and Language (5th edition). (pp. 523-577).

Woodhouse, S. S., Dykas, M. J., & Cassidy, J. (2009). Perceptions of secure base provision within the family. *Attachment & Human Development*, *11*(1), 47-67.

Footnotes

1. Although the 'or' ending often signifies someone who does something (e.g., a sailor sails, a guarantor guarantees). And perhaps the Latin *mens* (thinking) has suggested that the mentor is one who teaches thinking. However, a mentor is not one who mentates, nor is the student a mentee (one who receives mentation). The origin is Greek, not Latin, and the letters 'or' are merely the final letters of a proper name. Thus, I follow Roberts' (1999) preference for the terms mentor and protégé.