

SOJOURNERS OF THE MASTER MENTOR PROGRAM:

A STUDY OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE

by

Cynthia L. Williams

MARSHA COVINGTON, Ph.D., Faculty Mentor and Chair

HOWARD JACOBS, Ph.D., Committee Member

ELIZABETH WINSTON, Ph.D., Committee Member

Barbara Butts Williams, Ph.D., Dean, School of Education

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Capella University

July 2011

© Cynthia L. Williams, 2011

Abstract

The Master Mentor Program (MMP) housed at the University of Colorado, Boulder for two years, and then subsequently moved to Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, served as the research focus for the concepts, philosophies, and outcomes produced by the mentee-focused mentoring promoted by the MMP. The study was designed to analyze the efficacy of the MMP and its unique philosophies and varied approaches in preparing mentors for the field of American Sign Language–English interpreting. The study examined graduates’ perceptions of how effective the philosophies and practices of the MMP are in their work as Master Mentors. A qualitative ethnographic case study design was used for this research. The case study explored the depths of the MMP as it is bound in time and activities. This method invoked descriptive research based on a real-life situation. The design provided the opportunity to collect detailed information, using data from four cohorts of students in the MMP. Inductive logic was used to discover the reality behind the data collected in a case study. In presenting these findings, a multidimensional perspective of those who participated is conveyed. Examining the MMP offered an excellent way to gather qualitative information and use such research to establish effective practices within the field of mentoring for American Sign Language–English interpreters.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my mother, Phyllis J. Speer, who died September 22, 2010. Although you didn't see the final work accomplished in this endeavor, you can see it now from your Father's home! Thank you for being so proud of me and encouraging education to all of your children and grandchildren. I love you, Mom!

Acknowledgments

To Eileen M. Forestal, my spouse, my friend, my mentor: A decision to continue our academic endeavors towards our Ph.D.'s together was a God-send. We sat together side-by-side encouraging each other on both good days and bad days. How can I ever thank you for inspiring me the way you do? You are such a blessing in my life and always will be.

To my parents, Kenneth and Phyllis Speer: There are no words that express my thankfulness that you are my parents. I promised you would see this Ph.D., and you will!

To my children and grandchildren, Andrea, Bruno, Rocco, Lauren, Joe, Leo, Sean, Megan, Ashley, and Caitlin, Colin, Robyn, Darla, and Kara, John, Taylor, Johna, Alex, George, Lana, Vasilios and, now, David, Dawn, Ross, Alexa, and Rhett: I thank you for your support throughout this process.

To my friends: What special people you are in accepting the times I did not have the time to socialize as much as I wanted and understood that it would not be forever.

To Betsy Winston, my teacher and mentor in the Master Mentor Program: The Master Mentor Program changed my life, my teaching, and my perspectives on working with others.

To Dr. Marsha Covington, my mentor, and Jonathan Gehrz, my advisor: Thank you for your patience, understanding, and guidance throughout this process and making this an amazing journey!

Finally and most importantly, to God: I thank You for Your guidance every day and in always placing me exactly where You want me to be!

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
List of Tables	viii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction to the Problem	1
Background of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Rationale	7
Research Questions	9
Nature of the Study	10
Significance of the Study	11
Definition of Terms	11
Assumptions and Limitations	13
Organization of the Remainder of the Study	14
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	15
Introduction	15
The Master Mentor Program Philosophies and Approaches	15
The Master Mentor Program	36
Conclusion	44
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	45
Research Design	45
Sample	46

Instrument	47
Data Collection	48
Data Analysis	50
Validity and Reliability	52
Ethical Considerations	52
Conclusion	53
CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS	55
Data Analysis: Characteristic Questionnaire	57
Data Analysis: Semistructured Questionnaire	70
CHAPTER 5. RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	116
Overview of the Study	116
Results	118
Conclusions	126
Recommendations for Replications of this Study	127
Suggestions for Future Research	128
Summation of the Study	129
REFERENCES	131
APPENDIX A. MENTOR CHARACTERISTIC QUESTIONNAIRE	135
APPENDIX B. SEMISTRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE	137

List of Tables

Table 1. Cohort Representation	56
Table 2. Age, Years of Interpreting, and Credentialing	59
Table 3. Mentoring Approaches (prior to MMP)	62
Table 4. Adult Learning Theory	71
Table 5. Fees for Service	105

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

It is difficult to say when the concept of mentoring was unveiled as a reality in people's lives. It seems humans are mentored from their birth by someone close, someone responsible for them, or someone who found promise in them and what they were doing. If that is not enough, mentors come in an array of forms as characters in children's storybooks, myths, and fantasies. Daloz (1999) told readers that mentors range "from the grandmotherly fairy godmother to the elfin Yoda to the classic bearded Merlin" (p. 17). In the 1970s, the concept of mentors and mentoring gained contemporary popularity for career enhancement in the fields of education, medicine, social work, law, and business (Hicks, 2007). Daloz also explained that Carl Jung labeled the mentor as an archetype, which for most can be represented by either female or male and represents "knowledge, reflection, insight, wisdom, cleverness, and intuition" (p. 17). This figure (archetype) ensures the beholder a myriad of insights that cannot be found on one's own. Mentors were always thought to possess innate or natural abilities. One thing holds true: mentors and the practice of mentoring adapt to the field of practice in which they are used.

Mentoring has been venerated as a unique relationship capable of producing a variety of benefits. Most often, mentors seem to be guides. They lead the mentee on a journey of discovery. Mentoring relationships are built on trust, and collaborative learning plays an important part in these relationships. The purpose of mentoring in

American Sign Language (ASL)–English interpreting is no different. Mentees will bring to the mentoring relationship their needs and vision for the destination in that particular time in their career. Each mentee has a different learning style influenced by their worldview, values, beliefs, and experiences. During the process of mentoring, mentees go through transformative learning, “a process of examining, questioning, validating, and revising [their] perspectives” (Cranton, 2006, p. 23), about their interpreting work.

The Master Mentor Program (MMP) was the focus of this research and was used to determine the extent to which the concepts and philosophies used by the graduates of the MMP provide superior outcomes compared to traditional approaches to mentoring.

Background of the Study

The MMP trains ASL–English interpreters and ASL–English interpreter educators to serve as mentors within their communities and at all skill levels. Through a total of 16 quarter hours and an online program, students are taught the concepts and practices of mentoring with the curriculum, focusing on the knowledge and skills necessary for effective mentoring. Mentors can provide support and direction to newly graduating and less experienced interpreters. MMP graduates earned an Interpreter Education Master Mentor graduate certificate at the end of their studies.

The original Mentor appears in *The Odyssey*: “Mentor was half male and female, mortal and immortal, an androgynous demigod, half here, half there. Wisdom personified” (Daloz, 1999, p. 20). The term *mentor* came from this mythological elucidating relationship, which parallels mentoring relationships today. One might say there is a certain joy in discovery when working in a mentoring relationship. Mentors

often elicit from their mentees a desire to be like them, to aspire to be where they are in their life or work.

Most definitely, mentoring relationships have influenced many novice ASL interpreters over the years whether informally or formally. As early as the 1990s, articles have been written for the national organization Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) and the Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT). Linda Siple (1991) wrote an article for *RID Views* titled The Functions of Mentoring, providing the interpreting practitioner an overview of mentoring interpreting students. Siple adapted the information from Kram's book, *Mentoring at Work*, written in 1985. In 1994, CIT's Educational Standards Committee disseminated a stimulus issue entitled Entry Level to the Profession, asking for responses for the proceedings (Davis et al., 1994). At that time, no position papers addressed this issue. Following are the guiding questions for the response paper:

1. What are minimal competencies for entry level into the profession?
2. Should Certificate/ AA/BA/MA program exit level skills equal professional entry level skills?
3. What jobs are considered entry level?
4. What level of skills should be defined beyond entry level?
5. What continued education is required to progress beyond entry level skills – Certificate? AA? BA? MA? (Davis et al., 1994, p. 50)

Later, Entry Level to the Profession was referred to as the *readiness to work gap*, and four responses were published in the Proceedings of the 10th National Convention, CIT (Davis et al.).

Looking back at the beginnings of interpreter training, the first collegiate programs were established in the mid-1970s. These programs were usually housed in speech communication or deaf education programs in universities or community colleges. Interpreter educators were experienced interpreters from the community with little or no advanced academic training (Roy, 2000). The programs started with one or two interpreter training courses and the curricula developed over time. In the late 1970s and 1980s, ASL was defined as a language. As linguists discovered and defined grammatical structure in ASL, a new focus on teaching interpreting emerged.

Interpreter education programs remained at the community college level with open-enrollment policies, thus creating a dilemma for the field. Programs could not require competency/fluency in ASL to enter the interpreter training programs, therefore, instructors spent most of the time teaching ASL rather than interpreting. Thus, the focus when entering the interpreting courses was placed on vocabulary and sentences and then finding conceptually accurate signs to convey the message. Students learned to convey the meaning, however, this contributed to the “faulty notion that words (or signs) in and of themselves have meanings that do not change over the course of an interpretation and can be transformed with only dictionary knowledge of a language” (Roy, 2000, p. 4).

In light of this, interpreting skills were taught specifically through successive approximation and then expected to interpret simultaneously from English or ASL from the onset of the training (Roy, 2000). Due to the lack of acquiring complex skills in stages, the goal was to improve students’ target language production to an approximated quality interpretation (Roy, 2000). At the same time, focus on ASL acquisition continued. With this in mind, the issue of entry level to the profession became an issue worth

discussing for interpreter educators. Those who responded to this issue focused on the questions posed and provided the field substantial input in developing parameters for interpreter training programs through clear and articulated standards for entry and exit criteria.

One noteworthy approach to the gap through these responses was mentoring. Although mentoring by no means resolves the issue of the readiness to work gap, it significantly provides students with a bridge from academia to the profession with the guidance of an experienced interpreter. The purpose of mentoring in the field of ASL–English interpreting goes beyond the readiness to work gap. Mentees seek mentors for various reasons. Novice interpreters may look to mentoring for skills development, while others may seek mentoring for specific skill sets for a specialization such as conference, legal, or theatrical interpreting. Working towards passing a state screening or national certification would be another reason an interpreter would seek a mentoring relationship.

Mentoring, in some fashion, came before the readiness to work gap. However, around this same time, mentoring became a hot topic in the field of ASL–English interpreting. Throughout the 1990s, articles were written about mentoring students, and several programs were established. As with other professions, existing empirical studies often point towards the inconsistencies related to the concept and practices of mentoring (Winans, 2007). This is evident in programs due to professional settings, the purpose for mentoring, and implementation. In addition, although mentoring is viewed as important in other professions and the field of ASL–English interpreting, participants in the mentoring relationship—mentor and mentee alike—are not prepared for their roles in the

process. The inconsistencies related to the concept and practices of mentoring brought forth the need to educate mentors in the field of ASL–English interpreting.

Led by Elizabeth Winston, Coordinator of the MMP at the University of Colorado, Boulder, across the United States, interpreters and educators alike contributed a great deal of effort and vision in laying the groundwork for the MMP. It was built on the insights of these people through their knowledge, work, and their teaching and interpreting experiences in the profession of ASL–English interpreting and interpreting education. Winston explained, “the value of our curriculum development experience was to clarify a philosophy and pedagogy for developing mentors who will be able to make a substantial and self-perpetuating contribution to improving the quality of service provided to deaf people” (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.). Creating a good foundation of mentorship in our field for others across the country to build upon was one hope of the MMP. As Winston stated in her overview of the curriculum, “there is a great opportunity to find and incorporate new scholarship, new materials, and new participants into the curriculum . . . tailoring it to the needs of the particular regions and communities of deaf people across the country” (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online).

Statement of the Problem

Traditionally, lives are directly influenced by mentoring relationships. The question remains: What are the requisite skills and proficiencies for successfully serving as a mentor? When making a decision to become a mentor, it is important that the mentor has a clear understanding of the definitions of mentorship, knowledge, and skills to mentor, characteristics of mentors and mentees, mentorship management, and approaches

to mentoring in interpreter education in the United States. It would be unrealistic to declare the MMP philosophies and approaches adequate to the development and preparation of mentors until the concepts have been proven in establishing mentoring relationships. Research helps us to evaluate our approaches in the field, as well as to add “knowledge means that educators undertake research in order to contribute to existing information about issues” (Creswell, 2005, p. 3). Research lends itself to establishing effective practices based on the field of ASL–English interpreting, where effective practices, borrowed from other professions, have been used since our profession’s conception to present. The National Consortium of Interpreter Educator Centers (NCIEC) is a great resource for the field of ASL–English interpreting in research and documentation of best and effective practices in the past 5 years. Empirical research on MMP practices and outcomes will contribute to the documentation of more information on mentoring in general.

Purpose of the Study

An analysis of the efficacy of the MMP, using its uniquely adapted philosophies and varied approaches in preparing mentors for the field of ASL–English interpreting, was the purpose of this study. This study examined graduates’ perceptions of how effective the philosophies and practices of the MMP are in their work as Master Mentors.

Rationale

The first mentors in the field of ASL–English interpreters were deaf community members. The deaf community is made up of people who are deaf and hard of hearing who use ASL and are committed to the culture of the deaf community. Throughout history, men and women who became the first interpreters were children of deaf parents,

clergy, and friends of people who were deaf. The deaf community nurtured their interpreting skills and, at some point, would deem them ready to interpret for them. The first interpreter training programs were established in the mid-1970s. The interpreter training programs consisted of one or two training classes and were taught by experienced interpreters who may or may not have had any academic training in interpreting themselves. With the advent of interpreter training programs—and, now, interpreter education programs based on theory and practice—mentoring interpreters in the field have shifted from the deaf community to experienced and/or qualified interpreters in the field.

Until 1993, the national organization RID did not have standard practice papers that articulated the consensus of the membership in outlining standard practices and positions on various interpreting roles and issues to help mentors. Most commonly, ASL–English Interpreters worked with mentors who used the mentor-centered approach, consistent with the teacher-centered approach discussed in adult education literature. The mentor was the “expert” and told the mentee where skills were lacking and often left the mentee with no resources to develop the needed interpreting skills.

Since the MMP’s conception, mentoring has taken on a new form in the field. Mentors who have completed the program use the mentee-centered approach based on theoretical concepts of constructivism and adult learning theory, which propose that learning comes from active participation and transforms personal knowledge into concepts students can understand and relate to through constructive conversation. A case study of the graduates from the MMP as they communicate about their perceptions of

how effective the philosophies and practices have been in their own work has provided evidence as to whether or to what extent the program is effective in training mentors.

Research Questions

The research questions posed in this study examined the development and preparation of mentors who are graduates from the MMP using the philosophies and practices in their work as mentors to ASL–English Interpreters. The overarching question of this study is as follows: How have the philosophies and approaches of the MMP developed and prepared graduates to become mentors to ASL–English interpreters? Following are the subquestions:

1. To what extent do graduates of the MMP use the philosophies and practices in their mentoring relationships?
2. How effective are the philosophies and practices of the MMP when applied to the work of mentors to ASL–English Interpreters?
3. What did graduates not recognize in their learning/education at the time they graduated that they now know about the program’s philosophies and practices?
4. To what extent do graduates who use the MMP philosophies and practices see changes in mentees skills development?
5. What philosophies, practices and/or approaches do graduates feel were lacking in their development and preparation to become Master Mentors and why?
6. How have the philosophies and approaches of the MMP changed behaviors and attitudes about mentoring relationships in the field of American Sign Language–English interpreting and education?

7. How do MMP participants differ from other mentors in terms of experience in the field, region, educational background, and workplace.

Nature of the Study

The five qualitative research methods most frequently used in research today are narrative, phenomenology, ethnography, case study, and grounded theory (Creswell, 2003). An ethnographic case study was the best fit for this study, as the case study design allows for an in-depth exploration of a bounded system. The MMP is a bounded system or program in which an in-depth examination of processes, activities, and events can be explored. Qualitative methodology uses a variety of data collection types allowing the researcher flexibility in structuring the procedures of collection to best suit the research questions. Using a semistructured, open-ended interview questionnaire given to graduates of the MMP who are now applying the philosophies and approaches to their work as mentors, the researcher discovered the level of effectiveness of the philosophies, theories, and practices of the MMP for those who become professional mentors.

The MMP was funded by a Department of Education grant (#H160C...) awarded to the University of Colorado, Boulder, where Project TIEM.Online developed the original curriculum, based on wide-spread input from interpreting professionals across the US and the world. The MMP, was delivered online through the University of Colorado for two years, and was then moved to Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, where it ended in 2005. The funding supported four cohorts of students from across the United States. Approximately 15 students participated in each of the four cohorts starting with Cohort I in 2001 and Cohort 4 graduating in 2005. The final mentoring project in each of the cohorts included an organized plan to deliver mentoring

support to recent graduate students from interpreter education programs, institute mentoring relationships with ASL–English interpreter practitioners (working as community interpreters and staff interpreters in a variety of settings and educational interpreters), or to establish a mentoring program in an agency or regional program in the students’ respective states. To complete these projects, students were required to mentor at least six mentees using the philosophies and practices of the MMP. Therefore, there were approximately 42 graduate Master Mentors who had experienced mentee-centered mentoring. A sample of this mentor population was used in this case study. Graduates were interviewed to get their perspectives on how effective the philosophies and practices are in their own work.

Significance of the Study

Qualitative ethnographic research designs allow one to understand the perspectives of participants who have participated in a shared event. In an attempt to show the merits of the MMP, an intrinsic case study of knowledge and skills gained from the program that prepares participants as mentors for the field of ASL–English interpreters was explored. The significance of the study to the field of ASL–English interpreting and education is that this research has the potential to codify or enhance the MMP model of effective practices in the development and preparation of mentors for ASL–English interpreters.

Definition of Terms

The terms used in this study are defined in the following narrative:

Effective practices. Effective practices are research-verified and research-based practices followed by exemplary institutions (NCIEC, n.d.). These are also defined as

techniques or methodologies that, through experiences and research, have proven to reliably lead to a desired result (NCIEC).

Interpreter education program. In the establishment of interpreter education programs, transitions towards language fluency in both ASL and English were noted in the 1980s, along with expectations of higher education (Roy, 2000).

Interpreter training program. Interpreter training programs were established in the mid-1970s. Students were taught sign language and after 2 years graduated “regardless of their general level of education, their abilities in English, or their exposure to deaf adults or children” (Roy, 2000, p. 3).

Mentee-centered approach. The mentee-centered approach to mentoring is based on theoretical concepts of constructivism and adult learning theory. Mentors allow more freedom of choice in the training of mentees by using self-assessment, self-direction, and active collaboration practices.

Mentor. For the purpose of this study, a mentor is a person within the field of ASL–English interpreting who guides the development of another person within the profession. In addition, the mentor has the ability to facilitate a learning relationship. The mentor may or may not be more experienced than the mentee, however, a learning relationship is established between the two (Gordon & Magler, 2007).

Mentor-centered approach. The mentor-centered approach to mentoring happens when knowledge is transferred from mentor to mentee, based on what the mentor deems appropriate for the mentee’s needs.

Mentoring. Mentoring is an agreed upon supportive and learning relationship between mentor and mentee, where the mentor guides the development of the mentee for the purpose of promoting professional and personal development (Fry, 2005).

Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf (RID). RID is a national membership organization representing the professionals who facilitate communication between people who are deaf or hard of hearing and people who can hear (RID, n.d.).

Standard practice. Standard practice is also known as a common practice used by educators or practitioners because it either works effectively for them or it has been passed down from other educators or practitioners to show how to address a particular role or issue. This does not mean that standard practice is always best or effective practice. RID states that standard practice papers articulate the consensus of the membership in outlining standard practices and positions on various interpreting roles and issues. These standard practice papers help guide ASL–English interpreters in their practice as professionals (NCIEC, n.d.).

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

1. The participants in the MMP, after graduating, work in their respective states and use the philosophies and approaches of the MMP in mentoring relationships.
2. Participants' glean from the MMP the philosophies and approaches what suits their style of mentoring and relationships.
3. Participants' implementation of the philosophies and approaches are constrained or shaped by the institutional context within which they practice mentoring.
4. Most participants will provide a rationale for the importance of attending the

MMP and will express themselves regarding whether, and in what ways, they feel the MMP has been beneficial to their professional work in mentoring.

Limitations

1. In sending surveys, not all graduates will respond. Those responding may be the ones who are more favorable to the MMP program, or those who are unhappy with the program. This makes it more difficult to generalize the findings.
2. The researcher is a graduate of the MMP and some bias may be evident along with participants' biases, which may limit the accuracy of the data.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter 2 contains the literature review, providing a brief history and standard practices of the field of ASL–English interpreting and education. Chapter 2 also reviews the theoretical background of mentoring adult learners and concepts of mentoring used as professional development and the perspectives of mentoring programs, their concepts, and notions on educating mentors. Chapter 3 contains a detailed description of ethnographic design case study methodology. Chapter 4 provides details on data collection and analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the merits of the findings and makes recommendations for further research on philosophies and approaches in developing and preparing mentors in the field of ASL–English interpreting.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Qualitative research designs use the literature review to document the need and importance for this study, in turn, this will allow the view of the MMP participants to “emerge without being constrained by the views of others from the literature” (Creswell, 2005, p. 79). More important than predicating the findings, found in quantitative research, are whether resulting findings from this study will support or modify existing ideas and practices advanced in the literature and will lend themselves towards effective practice in the MMP.

The Master Mentor Program Philosophies and Approaches

Laurent Daloz’s (1999) *Mentor, Guiding the Journey of Adult Learners* is the introductory text for the MMP. It focuses on adult learning or andragogy; participants start their journey to becoming Master Mentors by understanding how adults learn. Andragogy is a relatively new term, originating in Germany in 1833, and is associated with adults as learners (Forkum, 2008). At that time, education theorists used pedagogy, a term used for the art and science of teaching children. Knowles, however, published his work in the 1970s and concentrated on learning in adults from the work of Alexander Kapp, who introduced the term andragogy—the art and science of teaching adults (Forkum, 2008). Adult educators are likely to avoid static principles when working with adult learners. The interactive process of teaching where students interact with teachers

and other students, with materials both investigated or produced, along with the interaction of social and psychological forces that surround them explains why static principles are not nearly as important as identifying the tensions inherent within them. Brookfield (as cited in Wiley, 2005) gave us fundamental concerns when approaching each new teaching situation, which fit nicely with mentoring: acknowledging the experiences of the learner, establishing an adult teacher-learner relationship, and promoting autonomy and self-direction. Daloz held that we are all adult learners. Much of what we have learned has not been in the classroom but through the experiences lived through family and friends, work, problems resolved, and dilemmas faced.

Literature on mentoring programs has concurred that programs should be well organized, framed in adult learning theory; and knowledge of psychosocial aspects of mentoring relationships should also be examined (Hittmeier, 2007; Hollingsworth, 2008; Rider, 2007; Winans, 2007).

The MMP philosophies and approaches are heavily rooted in constructivism. Likewise, adult learning theory is at home in social constructivism. Understanding the bases of the concepts and approaches help educate and prepare students to become Master Mentors. Their practice influences the relationships they will have with future mentees. Basically, constructivism tells us that we build on what individuals already know; adult learning suggests that acknowledging the experiences of learners promotes autonomy and self-direction. Collaborative learning is the key to these foundations in the MMP.

Collaborative Learning

Brufee (1999), in his book *Collaborative Learning, Higher Education, Interdependence, and The Authority of Knowledge*, stated that collaborative learning and cooperative learning have similar goals even though their terms and methods and/or principles and assumptions differ. The main goal of each is to help “students to learn by working together on substantive issues” (Bruffee, p. 83). Both collaborative and cooperative learning are based on constructivism, in that learning comes from active participation and knowledge and is transformed by learners into concepts they can understand and relate to through constructive conversation. Therefore, the reaccluturation process that Brufee discussed where “students learn about the society they wish to join by developing the appropriate vocabulary of that society and by exploring that society’s culture and norms (e.g., that of mathematician, historian, journalist, etc.)” holds true in mentoring the process (Panitz, 1997, p. 2).

Collaboration is defined as a philosophy of interaction where participants are responsible for their learning and education, their interaction with other learners, and their contribution to constructing new information and knowledge (Panitz, 1997, p. 1). Whereas, cooperative learning is a structured interaction between learners in a group designed to produce a specific outcome, product, or goal (Panitz).

In the literature, the most significant difference in collaborative learning and cooperative learning is the notion of *foundational skills* versus *nonfoundational skills*. These two terms seem to clarify the differences. Cooperative learning is best associated with primary education using foundational knowledge, which represents our social justified beliefs. Primary or elementary grades focus on spelling and grammar, math,

history facts, and social skills lessons giving students a foundation or social integration. Bruffee (1999) described cooperative learning as designed to make sure that children and early adolescents become adequately socialized to a civil, cooperative environment, that they learn the variety of social skills required for working associative, that the groups they work with stay on track, and that every student contributes equitably to the work (p. 88).

Teachers become the authority in the cooperative classroom. Therefore, cooperative learning does not empower students. Teachers establish defined roles for students working in groups, the structure of the groups, the goals, and the proposed outcomes of the group work.

Collaborative learning differs in that it focuses on nonfoundational knowledge derived through reasoning and constructive conversations leading to active learning and inquiry process (Panitz, 1997). The premise for this notion lies with the idea that in a college or university, students should question foundational knowledge and authority helping them go through a transformational process to become self-actualized through personal, social, and organizational change. In collaborative learning, the group members share the authority and acceptance of responsibility for group actions. “The underlying premise of collaborative learning is based upon consensus building through cooperation by group members” (Panitz, p. 3). Collaborative learning empowers students in that the group works together to deliver the outcomes of the group task.

Collaborative learning is shared knowledge created and not transferred in a community of learners where teacher/facilitator and students become part of the educational process. Teachers/facilitators give up authority and students take

responsibility for their own learning. “Collaborative learning assumes that knowledge is social, rather than individual” (MacGregor, 1990, Novotny, Seifert, & Werner, 1991, as cited in Imel, 1991, p. 2); therefore, it takes a pragmatic view where the importance of critical thinking and problem solving, along with methods of inquiry by teachers and learners, create knowledge rather than to transfer it from teacher to learner. Anna Witter-Merithew (2001) stated that collaborative learning encourages learners to interact with one another for the purpose of sharing experiences and observations. This, in turn, fosters “student’s self-awareness, exploration, and a sense of themselves as the ‘knowers’ capable of discovering answers and solutions through critical thinking and analysis” (Witter-Merithew, p. 1).

Traditionally, the classroom is a place where the teacher disperses knowledge to the students. Bruffee (1999) discussed and encouraged interdependence through collaborative learning, which provides learners experience in how the real world of employment works. In using collaborative learning, a sense of trust must be established through the community of learners and with the facilitator giving the freedom to express opinions without recourse or ridicule, promoting a safe environment for learning. Forkum (2009) concurred, “collaborative learning encompasses active learning activities reacting to real-life scenarios and life learning” (p. 43). Applied to mentoring, collaboration between the mentor and mentee encompasses active learning where the mentor encourages the mentee to share his or her experiences and, in turn, guides him or her to discover answers and solutions through critical thinking and analysis. This is accomplished when the mentor honors the mentee as a whole person and starts where the mentee is in his or her knowledge and skills.

Zone of Proximal Development

Vygotsky provided another interesting approach to the practice of mentoring with the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and the idea of scaffolding. Interpreting skills can be developed with guidance and/or peer collaboration by supporting the student until concepts can be mastered then internalized. “Scaffolding was conceptualized as a process of providing higher levels of initial support for students as they entered the ZPD with the gradual dismantling of the support structure as students progressed towards independence” (Harland, 2003, p. 268). Each time a mentee enters the ZPD, a new scaffold is constructed and then dismantled as he or she reaches the next plateau. Challenges for mentors are to allow each mentee to reach his or her fullest potential within a particular context as each mentee is different.

Critical Thinking

In keeping with both constructivist and Vygotsky’s theories, guided self-analysis is an important part of the learning process where critical thinking and problem-solving are used. Mentees know their work and what they want to improve in their interpreting process better than the mentor does. As Michael Scriven and Richard Paul (2004) stated for the National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking Instruction, a well-cultivated critical thinker will think “open-mindedly within alternative systems of thought, recognizing and assessing, as need be, their assumptions, implications, and practical consequences” (p. 1). In addition, critical thinkers or mentees will communicate effectively with others in figuring out solutions to make interpretations more conceptual and clear for their consumers. These are important components of the collaborative nature of mentoring relationships.

Cultural Competence

Cultural competence starts with communication, as noted by author Geneva Gay (2000) in *Culturally Responsive Teaching, Theory, Research, and Practice*; communication is dynamic and interactive. When discussing the mentoring relationship, communication is a dynamic and interactive process that occurs between two people, which is built on trust. This Socratic communication between mentor and mentee can be complicated as there are many different purposes behind communication and many different layers to unfold. “Communication is also governed by the rules of the social and physical contexts in which it occurs” (Porter & Samover, 1991, as cited in Gay, p. 79). “Culture is the rule-governing system that defines the forms, functions, and content of communication” (Gay, p. 79).

Cultural diversity is a catch phrase in the educational setting. What does it really mean? In nontechnical language, it is how people differ from each other. We can look at people; identify things from the start such as gender, race, height and age; and distinguish some physical abilities. Visual attributes are much different from those things that are not quite so apparent or visual in a person such as worldview, knowledge, and experience.

Jan Nishimura (2005), a guest faculty presenter for the MMP, stated:

How can I become a mentor who is sensitive to people from other cultures? How can I focus on the people themselves? To summarize, it is a concept called cultural competence. Which means the ability to talk with people from different backgrounds and cultures and to get a sense of how we can fit together and be successful in our communication. (Parts 1 & 2)

She further stated that it is impossible to know and understand all cultures, however, it is possible to learn how to interact with different cultures in a positive way through developing one’s own cultural competencies.

To gain cultural competence, the MMP dedicates an entire section to Communication and Cultural Competence with an emphasis on self-analysis. “Culture or ethnicity plays a role in defining who we are as people and how we conduct our lives, multiple dimensions form that identity and influence our life ways” (Lynch & Hansen, 2004, p. 10). In many situations, it is easy to misinterpret other cultural nuances based on our own cultural values, norms, and experiences. Students in the MMP work as cross-cultural mediators with people who are deaf and hard of hearing and certainly can relate to the misunderstandings based on linguistic and cultural adjustments when working.

Why is it important to have cultural competencies when mentoring? Hunter (2007) identified cultural differences in helping behaviors, noting that those living in Western cultures are more independent with non-Western cultures defining themselves in terms of their social relationships. When looking at helping between friends versus between strangers or acquaintances, most people are more likely to help someone who identifies with their own culture. Culture, just like language, is acquired at a very early age. Lessons learned at an early age become an integral part of thinking and behavior. Perhaps due to the ability to be more flexible and with less information to manage, children are more able to learn new cultural patterns than adults are.

In self-analysis, we find that our values are responsible for our biases. “The importance individuals ascribe to cooperation versus competition, action versus passivity, youth versus age, family versus friends, or independence versus interdependence reflects cultural values” (Lynch & Hansen, 2004, p. 3). A good example of this is American culture and the concept of competition. Competition is intertwined in many aspects of

American life, and children from an early age are encouraged to compete. Therefore, competition in American life is highly prized; yet, for other cultures this is not true.

Many cultures—such as Native American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian Pacific, and Southeast Asian—view competition as self-serving. These cultures prefer to emphasize cooperation and teamwork. Likewise, interpretation of various situations is based on one's past experiences; therefore, interpreters and their interpretations are never culture-free. Old habits are hard to change from culturally programmed behaviors. When individuals are emotional or stressed, they often revert to previous behaviors. The emphasis is that cultural influences are such an integral part of lives and experiences that they are often invisible to others who at first sight have easily recognized cultural differences through appearance only. MMP recognizes the need for mentors to examine the values, beliefs, and patterns of behaviors from their own cultural identities in order to work effectively with people whose cultures differ from their own.

Learning Styles

In *Mentor: Guiding the Journey of Adult Learners*, Daloz (1999) provided the reader an overview of three different adult learning theories. Daloz's third chapter—*Maps of Transformation: How Adults Change and Develop*—explores three adult learning theories: Kegan, Levinson, and Perry. Perry's schema, when applied to ASL–English interpreting, helps mentors to understand the transformation of students concerning cultural competencies and ethic decision-making as it relates to professional ASL–English interpreting. The starting point in Perry's schema is with “dualism” (Daloz, p. 78) where students view the world as black or white, right or wrong. Depending on students' worldview, most have a dualistic view of concepts.

The next level of Perry's continuum is "multiplicity" (Daloz, 1999, p. 78). In this part of their journey, students realize that teachers/facilitators do not have all the answers and that sometimes there are more answers to a question or concept than one; and they accept that it is okay not to have all the answers. While going through the multiplicitic level of Perry's schema, the student starts to see that all knowledge and values can be measured or compared to other things and revert back to "dualism" (Daloz, p. 78) in special situations, often when learning new concepts. The student makes a personal "commitment" (p. 78) in establishing himself or herself in a world where nothing is permanently fixed and things change according to circumstances or context. This moves the student into the level of "contextual relativism" (p. 79) where he or she experiences and explores the commitment subjectively (Daloz). In the end, "the student experiences the affirmation of identity among multiple responsibilities and realizes commitment as an ongoing, unfolding activity through which he expresses his lifestyle" (Daloz, p. 79). Students should leave the interpreter education program with at least a perception of multiplicity. As they work in the field, contextual relativism will be integrated into their practice (Daloz).

Interpreting Process

In the field of ASL–English interpreting, one of the greatest challenges is providing both abstract knowledge of a theory of interpretation and a personal understanding of how to apply the theory in practice. Robert Lee (2005), a noted practitioner and educator in the field of ASL–English interpreting, stated, "Having taught interpreting in both workshop and university settings, I have been struck that many interpreters, novice or experienced, talk about the application of a theory of interpretation

but rarely put theory into practice outside a learning environment” (p. 138). Lee gave us the primary goal of teaching interpreting process as giving the students a sense of feeling of control and being able to take what they have learned from the classroom and use it on their own. Lee used the theoretical framework of Dennis Cokely’s *sociolinguistic model of the interpreting process* to help students discuss their own work and the work of their classmates. The ability to discuss their work using a common language creates a collaborative learning environment. Forestal and Wieseman (2006) emphasized that it is “critical that students/mentees are able to develop critical thinking skills through guided interaction for self-assessment” (p. 202). Using Socratic questions when setting up the collaborative learning experience will help stimulate students when challenged with questions. These are all components of the mentee-centered approach in mentoring ASL–English Interpreters.

Mentee-Centered Approach

The mentee-centered approach to mentoring is based on the theoretical concepts of constructivism and adult learning theory as stated throughout this literature review. Mentors allow more freedom of choice in the training of mentees by using self-assessment, self-direction, and active collaboration practices. Hollingsworth (2008) provided a different perspective in terminology, train/teach versus coaching, in his discussion on “Whitmore’s (1992) classic coaching text, *Coaching for Performance*” (p. 59). There is a difference between coaching and instructing in that coaching unlocks the person’s potential to maximize his or her own performance rather than teaching him or her. When exploring the definition of *coaching*, it has always been associated with athletics since the 1880s. Before that, the word *coach* was the horse-drawn vehicle that

moved people from where they were to where they wanted to be (Hollingsworth). From that point on, any time a person helped another person move from his or her current position to a place of higher performance, he or she was called a coach.

In the field of coaching, mentoring and coaching have distinct differences from the coaching perspective. Could this be semantics? Mentoring assumes that the mentee is best serviced by the expertise of another, who has proven his or her professionalism by successful practice. While coaching assumes that “power, expertise, and answers lie in the client [mentee] and that given the tools and space to explore options and obstacles, he or she will adopt an action plan born from within instead of adopted from without” (Hollingsworth, 2008, p. 65). In their book, *Co-Active Coaching: New Skills for Coaching People Toward Success in Work and Life*, Whitworth, Kimsey-House, and Sandahl (1998) referred to the co-active as the relationship formed in which the coach and client are active collaborators. Four cornerstones form the foundation of this new concept in coaching: “The client is naturally creative, resourceful and whole. Co-active coaching addresses the client’s whole life. The agenda comes from the client. The relationship is a designed alliance” (Whitworth et al., 2008, p. 3).

Although there may be fundamental differences in concepts as stated by the coaching field and of mentoring in the field of ASL–English interpreting, the notion of mentee-centered comes from a mentoring relationship based on the same principles of coaching using the fundamental principles of adult learning theory. In the mentee-centered relationship, trust is the key. Therefore, problem solving is inherent of this relationship, which proposes that mentees are naturally resourceful and come to the mentoring relationship with their agenda searching for answers for their needs.

Pragmatist philosopher John Dewey used problem-based learning as a way for students to learn (Guttek, 2004). Liberalism embraces social intelligence and critical thinking where students and teachers can be open to new ideas and methods of inquiry through asking questions, which challenges the traditional methods of the teacher-centered approach in teaching. Dewey developed a five-step rendition of the scientific method that he called the Complete Act of Thought to help this process of learning:

1. “Problematic situation” encountering something new and different.
2. “Define the problem” to figure out what is blocking the flow of experience, one must reflect and figure out what the problem is.
3. “Survey, investigate, and research it” drawing from past experience and see how the new experience is different or similar.
4. “Conjecturing possible alternative of action” possible ways of solving the problem, that is, if I do this that might occur.
5. “Choose the alternative” choose what we think might solve the problem, ‘Test by acting on it’ hopefully the action will solve the problem. (Guttek, p. 74)

Guttek (2004) reiterated teachers/mentors cannot maintain neutrality or objectivity in their roles, but must be a part of the students learning and discovery, making it more real and applicable. There is reciprocity in learning, therefore, the mentor and mentee learn from each other and mentors are directly involved in the problem-based learning and activities as part of the mentee’s learning.

The Socratic discourse of the mentee-centered mentoring relationship looks at the interpreting work through problem-solving to find alternative ways of approaching the interpretation or ethical decision. In addition, problem-solving takes on another meaning when it comes to self-assessment and looking at one’s own interpreting work.

Language and Interpreting Portfolios/Interpreting Assessments

The MMP promotes the use of language and interpreting portfolios, which have several purposes as tools for both mentors and mentees. First, how do people know what their work looks like if they have not seen it? The idea of documenting interpreting work through video or DVD media provides mentees a way to see their work—both effective interpreting and areas that need to improve. In addition, the mentor can use the portfolio while mentoring the mentee using his or her work in the Socratic discussions. The portfolio can also be used for self-assessment.

Interpreting Skills: English to ASL (1993) and *Interpreting Skills: ASL to English* (2002)—both written by Marty Taylor as part of her doctorate dissertation—have become one of the most valuable tools in the profession for assessing and self-assessing ASL–English interpreting work. The primary purpose of these books is to provide a standardized format for viewing and discussing work, supporting the collaborative learning approach. “The sequence is designed to move from skills required in portions of the interpretation (knowledge-lean skills [needed to understand the language of ASL]) to skills required throughout the interpretation (knowledge-rich skills [needed to understand how to interpret])” (Taylor, 1993, p. 7).

Eight major features are presented in the Taylor books. They are (a) finger spelling, (b) numbers, (c) vocabulary, (d) classifiers that indicate size and shape specifiers (SASSes), (e) structuring space, (f) grammar, (g) interpreting and (h) composure and appearance. “Within the Major Features a common format is used. Each Major Feature includes a list of skills. Each skill is preceded by a definition (e.g., 1.DEF) and followed by a list of related possible errors (e.g., 1.A, 1.B)” (Taylor, 1993, p. 8).

Mentees work with a videotaped working portfolio of their work. After watching the videotaped segment of their work with a mentor or peer, they are able to self-assess and discuss with confidence, through finding areas of their work that are effective and areas where they might need improvement with the use of the Taylor (1993, 2002) books. This scaffolds them to a higher level of understanding by knowing where they are with their work and where they should be using the standardized format. This activity takes on the components of problem-solving where mentees must evaluate the problem, identify what they know about the problem and what they don't know, share knowledge, and solve the problem. In addition to discussing and assessing the work in a portfolio, like other professions, portfolios can show milestones of mentees' progress in skills development, and the portfolios can be given to prospective employers.

Transformative Learning

Cranton (2006) argued that adult learning, in general, is seen as participatory and collaborative; however, it depends on how one views transformative theory. She went on to say that Belenky and Stanton emphasized conflicts being resolved through dialogue, conversation, storytelling, and perspective-sharing. Merzirow (as cited in Cranton, 2006) stated that within a comfortable group, or as it applies here, in a trust relationship with a mentor, discourse plays an important role in transformative learning. Yet, the bottom line is that transformative learning can happen without collaboration. "Transformative learning has to do with making meaning out of experiences and questions assumptions based on prior experience" (Cranton, p. 8).

There is a correlation between the meaning of andragogy—adults students who are self-directed and what their needs and vision of their educational destination will

be—and a cognitive structure—a schema or mental model found in constructivist theory. Transformative learning is a part of constructivist theory, and a basic theme in constructivist theory is that learning is an active process “in which learners construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current/past knowledge” (Kearsley, 2011). “Transformative learning is a process of examining, questioning, validating, and revising our perspectives” (Cranton, 2006, p. 23). Both processes fit nicely with learning language and culture as students can relate to concepts using current/past knowledge and in the process constructing new ideas and concepts.

In McCarthy’s (2000) book, *About Learning*, readers learn about the natural cycle of learning in the form of 4MAT. This cyclic movement starts with feeling (perceiving), reflecting (processing), thinking (perceiving), and ends with doing (processing). In reflecting on transformative learning, McCarthy explained that learners connect experiences to what they already know:

Sometimes experiences shock us, take us back, make us question our past knowing or reveal facets that were unexplored, or sometimes suspended or ignored, because we just couldn’t handle it. So we learn to balance the tension between what is known and experienced and the newness. (p. 123)

This is transformative learning, which incorporates adult learning psychological types, learning styles, multiple intelligences, and ethical considerations as it applies to the field of ASL-English interpreter education.

Roles/Characteristics of Mentors

“Who are you?” said the Caterpillar . . .

“I—I hardly know, Sir, just at present,” Alice replied rather shyly, “at least I know who I was when I got up this morning, but I think I must have changed several times since then.” (Carroll, 1960, p. 27)

William Bridges (2004) took us on his journey of understanding transitions. Mentees seek mentoring for various reasons. Often, they are in need of change. This notion of transition fits nicely with Daloz (1999) and his chapters on adult learning. Students participating in the MMP are adult learners. Those mentees who seek change are adult learners. For both, they are likely to be in a myriad of transitions such as personal, career, or identity—to name a few. What do these transitions look and feel like? Bridges gave us the notion that there is a natural process in going through and understanding transitions. In the mentoring relationship, mentees go through transitions, and the importance of knowing and understanding the process is helpful to the role of mentoring them.

In 1970, Williams Bridges (2004) was going through some difficult inner and outer changes. He actually gave up his teaching career due to these changes and became interested in the subject of transitions. After quitting his teaching job and moving his family to the country, he decided to give a seminar on Being in Transition. He thought, because he lived in the country, that the seminar would “attract mostly other exurbanites and that together we [they] could puzzle out this difficult transition” (Bridges, p. 7). Much to his surprise, he had what he called a mix richer than what he had expected. Both men and women attended; recently separated folks, divorced, newlyweds, and widows; several retired men; and a woman who had recently given birth to her first child. Although they claimed they did not have much in common, they found their situations challenged them to deal with the same basic experience. Three main similarities emerged from their experiences: “(1) an ending, (2) followed by a period of confusion and distress, (3) leading to a new beginning, for those who had come that far” (Bridges, p. 8).

Understanding the transition process itself—endings, the neutral zone (confusion and distress), and finishing with a new beginning—is valuable information for new mentors as adult learners/mentees face challenging changes or transitions in their lives. Mentees’ enthusiasm in coming to the mentoring relationship is an ending to some part of their work—perhaps a skill, a mindset, an ethical decision—as they know it. In the process, they will experience the neutral zone (i.e., a process of examining, questioning, validating, and revising our perspectives) and arrive on the other side with a new beginning. It takes a special person to take this journey of transition. Therefore, understanding the roles and characteristics of mentors are beneficial to MMP students.

Gordon and Magler (2007), both interpreter educators and Master Mentors, found that one does not have to be an expert in the field to mentor. This seems to be contrary to what others have written about mentoring. Hollingsworth (2008) stated that mentoring, “assumes the client is best served by the expertise of another” (p. 65). Winans (2007) regarded mentors as those tenured teachers who take novice teachers and teach them the ropes. “Mentoring begins when a person strategically affects the professional life of someone else by fostering insights, identifying needed knowledge, and expanding the other person’s horizons” which indicates the mentor as the expert (Ambrose, as cited in Rider, 2007, p. 13). Mentoring “is described as a developmental relationship where mentors, typically more experienced individuals, leverage their time, knowledge, and effort” (p. 13) to encourage personal growth, knowledge, and skills in their protégés (Fry, 2005).

As stated before, research has shown that not everyone has the skills, abilities, and temperament to become a successful mentor (Fry, 2005). As each profession tailors

mentoring to fit its needs, the definition of mentoring may be different. However, there is agreement in what roles mentors may take on during the relationship, along with specific characteristics one might need to be a successful mentor.

In researching different characteristics, Fry (2005) differentiated mentors from the general population. She measured personal value system, self-esteem, and altruistic outlooks. Values are unique behaviors and guide a person's perception of the world. Therefore, every decision made by a person is based on one's attitudes, beliefs, and values. Fry found that people's values are reflected when they seek to attain goals in their lives.

Fry (2005) looked at self-esteem as a characteristic of mentors and justly stated, if one does not have self-esteem, how can he or she lead others in developing self-esteem? Altruism plays a particular role in being a successful mentor as this person will exhibit unselfish concern for others and act in ways that will benefit others rather than self. In the world of business and the interpreting profession, too, the focus and pursuit of one's personal goals and objectives are motivated by self-interest. Entering the mentoring relationship means that the mentor becomes the guide into the business world, or in the case of mentoring novice interpreters, the mentor introduces mentees to the deaf and interpreting communities.

Hunter (2007) looked at models of motivation for prosocial behaviors when studying at mentoring. He focused on mentoring in the workplace and what motivates mentors to help others. He added empathy to altruism in mentoring. Seeing someone else in a situation and having actually experienced something similar may evoke empathy and the notion that one might help, guide, and/or advise on how to get through the situation.

Hicks (2007) stated that desirable mentors demonstrate prosocial personality variables such as empathy, altruism, and other helper traits. Hicks added other traits, such as flexibility, empathy, patience, supportiveness, encouraging, and open.

Hittmeier (2007) explored mentor traits through research on psychological types and mentoring competency. She proposed that mentors must be self-aware. Hittmeier looked towards understanding characteristics unique to each of the personality types, which provide insights on how they influence an individual's behavior. Hittmeier said that as a mentor, one should understand his or her own learning style and be cognizant of learning styles of those he or she is mentoring. She emphasized that mentoring is defined as a relationship, and each person has his or her own needs. The importance of this relationship is to satisfy the mentee's needs by honoring the mentee's freedom and uniqueness without surrendering their integrity and independence (Hittmeier).

Hunter (2007) examined social exchange as a character trait in mentoring where the motivation to help involves the helper considering the potential benefits versus the potential cost of helping. This interestingly relates to Fry's (2007) notion of altruistic outlook. In providing help to a worker, the helper must decide or weigh the cost in providing the help. If the helper helps the co-worker, the worker may gain the co-worker's admiration, praise, and a degree of loyalty (Hunter). At the same time, the worker may have to give up his or her focus and pursuit of personal goals and objectives motivated by self-interest or meeting deadlines or completing his or her own work to help the co-worker. Applying social exchange to mentoring entails both costs and benefits. Hunter elaborated that the mentor must look at the short-term and long-term benefits, finding the rewards more than the potential costs. One can think of the many benefits of

mentoring, which include the continuation of one's own philosophies, building a legacy, the information of an inner circle or group, support, friendships, potential contacts, and a variety of other positive benefits and gains that would be useful in the work environment (Hunter).

There are costs, too. The cost of dependency, energy invested in a relationship, the lost relationship at the end, and the potential that a novice would outshine the mentor are just a few of the costs in mentoring. At the same time, looking at long-term building of extended relationships, alliances that will weather time, shared learning, and legacy-building far outweigh the costs. Gordon and Magler (2007) added that effective mentors are supportive, patient, aware of roles and responsibilities, clear communicators and good listeners, effective guides, committed, empathetic, and respectful.

In agreement with Gordon and Magler, Hicks (2007) believed that effective mentors clarify expectations and know and affirm their protégés. There are many roles mentors may assume in the mentoring relationship. However, it depends on the needs of the mentee. Roles could include guide, advisor, drill sergeant, counselor, mediator, sponsor, teacher, friend, and cheerleader—among others. In *The Mentor's Companion*, Gordon and Magler (2005) proposed counselor as the riskiest role as a mentor: “the mentee's emotional health is not the responsibility of the mentor” (p. 24). Hicks, on the other hand, reported that “mentors are loyal and trusted counselors, but more importantly they are facilitative partners in an evolving learning relationship” (p. 18). “Kram (1985) theorized that mentors provide four not all inclusive psychosocial functions: Counseling, friendship, role modeling, and offering acceptance and confirmation to the protégé”

(Hicks, p. 17). During the early stages of mentoring, mentors must take every opportunity to support and encourage their mentees.

In the broader scope, mentors are not there to deal with mentees' emotional well-being, however, counseling is a function where mentees may explore personal concerns that may interfere with a positive sense of self (Hunter, 2007). Mentors should be open to provide career advice, give insights to problems and concerns the mentee may be facing, and/or provide the mentee with resources to address personal and emotional needs (Gordon & Magler, 2007).

The Master Mentor Program

In 2001, the MMP was initiated with the first cohort of students. Applicants to the program were working ASL–English interpreters with expertise in English and the process of interpreting from one language (source language) to another language (target language). In nonprofessionals' terms, the ASL–English interpreter facilitates communication between a person who cannot hear (deaf or hard of hearing) and a person who can hear in a variety of settings ,which may include educational, medical, mental health, legal, business, and personal. The MMP was delivered online, allowing students from across the United States to participate.

The first phase of study included learning the concepts and the practice of mentoring, ending with a final approved mentoring project in the last phase of the 16-month program. The mentoring project included an organized plan to deliver mentoring support to recently graduated students from interpreter education programs, ASL–English interpreter practitioners (working as community interpreters and staff interpreters in a

variety of settings and educational interpreters), or establish a mentoring program in an agency or regional program in the students' respective states.

Within a short time, the MMP showed “tremendous promise of educating mentors to work with interpreters in their local communities” (Master Mentor Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.). A number of things were recognized in what was called Mentoring as Skill Multiplication. Guiding adult learners towards self-discovery, self-assessment of their work, developing the ability to set target goals for themselves, and modeling techniques used by their mentors to others in the field, mentors became “capacity builders and skill multipliers” (Master Mentor Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.).

After surveying working interpreters and educators in 1999, it was found that the interpreting skills gap between institutionalized interpreter education and entering the field was growing larger (Master Mentor Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.). This meant that the skills they had were not adequate for the work they faced in the field. ASL–English interpreting, as a profession, is relatively new, with the founding of the national organization in the 1960s. Most interpreter education programs were located in 2-year community or county colleges offering Certificates of Completions. Later, programs became accredited and Associates in Applied Science Degrees were offered as they are today. For working interpreters, options for furthering their education were minimal. Educators were faced with the same challenges.

In the past 10 years, several 4-year colleges have established the Bachelor of Arts in Interpreting. The Master of Arts in Interpreting Pedagogy was launched in 2006 at Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts, and was the first of its kind in the United States. This degree offered preparation for interpreters who wanted to become

teachers of interpreting with a focus on teaching and active learning. The field of interpreting education is facing a challenge in educating qualified interpreters who are an integral part of the access needed by deaf and hearing-impaired Americans.

Other options were found in teaching ASL and degrees in linguistics, neither of which provide interpreter educators the knowledge and expertise they need in teaching theory and the process of interpreting. Those challenges brought great promise to the MMP's concept of mentorship in practice. Interpreters working with mentors, educated in the concepts and practice of mentoring, would help close the skills gap by enhancing skill levels and keeping up with effective practices in the field. In turn, it would alleviate the inevitable search for education, which may or may not meet needs for that particular time in their careers.

To realize the potential of the existing challenges, important choices were made in developing the MMP resulting in articulated mandates. The program would do the following:

1. Fully explore the potential of mentorship as a direct route to enhancing the skills of working interpreters. The program would take the opportunity to challenge the limiting idea that mentors are defined by the task of assessing the performance of interpreters for employment or certification purposes.
2. Make a distinct contribution to defining the skills involved in excellent interpretation by exploring a wide range of cultural and communicative competencies involved in human communication in general. These areas of skill and knowledge are not always considered to be part of an interpreter's education.
3. Contribute to the field of interpreter education by developing and testing pedagogy for producing skilled mentors.
4. Build respectful awareness among students and faculty of the range of cultural differences, in part by incorporating knowledge and materials developed by other groups working on diversity issues.

5. Provide students with access to top experts in the field and deliver an academic experience in which research and ideas originating all over the country could be shared, discussed, and disseminated.
6. Design a program that was inclusive in every way. It would solicit input from people with different geographic and cultural backgrounds, both hearing and deaf. It would also reproduce that inclusiveness as much as possible in the student body, in the corps of instructors, and in the materials and concepts presented in the courses. All material presented and collected would be accessible to both deaf and hearing students.
7. Offer courses that qualified for graduate credit. This would help to build the pool of interpreter educators working on graduate degrees who would build up the academic side of the profession, through their own research, publication, and teaching activities.
8. Position the MMP as the keystone element in the wider Teaching Interpreting Educators and Mentors (TIEM) curriculum. The four courses in this program would provide a development opportunity and would be a proving ground for a pedagogical model as key to future work on other aspects of interpreter education. Mentorship was seen as the application of specialized understanding of the needs of adult learners to foster the ongoing professional growth and self-development of these learners.
9. Create new channels through which experienced interpreters would pass on their skills and insight to others in the profession. Currently, there are very few channels by which this important capacity building can take place (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d., “Articulating a Mandate”).

As it turns out, these broad development guidelines closely match the needs articulated by the first cohort of students. Some students had been mentoring informally and wanted to enhance their knowledge and skills as professional mentors. For others, their states were requiring mentoring for new interpreters, which opened new opportunities as professionals if the appropriate academic training was acquired. Moving the field towards a greater understanding of cultural diversity through mentoring was thought by some as a viable way. Others wanted graduate credits to enhance their

opportunities as interpreter educators, community interpreters, and staff interpreters (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.).

Reiterating the notion that mentors and the practice of mentoring adapt to the field of practice in which they are used, the MMP faced challenges in developing an effective curriculum suited for members of the community of ASL–English interpreters. Faculty built the curriculum on the concept of learning as guided discovery, therefore, students proceeded to “take on risky processes of self-assessment, self-direction, and active collaboration with their peers” (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.). Later, through the students’ discoveries about their own work, those discoveries would be passed on to others in the field through mentoring relationships. Birthed from the concept of learning as guided discover, the model of mentee-centered relationships came to fruition.

The process of learning based on personal responsibility and peer collaboration is a challenge for most learners who have been raised in the U.S. educational system. Students would have to learn to trust themselves and others as reliable sources of information, in lieu of teachers as the authority. In establishing this andragogy (i.e., the teaching of dependent adult learners; Forkum, 2008), it allowed students to develop ideas and approaches that could be placed into practice. As students worked towards specific skill and knowledge-learning outcomes, they could explore new structures for student/instructor and student/student interaction. Structuring the program in an open-ended curriculum design process provided ongoing feedback as students tried new things and took risks by sharing insights collaboratively, by assessing each other’s work, and by practicing mentoring techniques on fellow students in order to learn. Although the online

delivery of the MMP program was formatted to be flexible in many ways, students do have specific timelines to meet, which include activities of mentoring each other in both content and skills enhancement and assignments.

In defining the syllabus and content of the curriculum, the best current understanding of the process and functions of mentoring were gleaned from a range of disciplines. In doing so, the “approach would lead students beyond received wisdom about activities of mentors in interpretation, to an intimate understanding of the private and personal tasks they need to undertake to grow as mentors, to become in fact Master Mentors” (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.). The ultimate gain from this program is to promote lifelong learning in others as Master Mentors.

The MMP courses are designed to encourage self-discovery. Additionally, the students use critical thinking to assess their own interpreting knowledge and skills. These assessments guide them in deciding their level of accomplishment in various tasks and activities.

Following are the courses that were ultimately decided upon to provide a mixture of knowledge, skills, and exploration of mentoring students’ needs:

Introduction to Mentoring

A general introduction of concepts in the field

The what and how of mentoring

Explore ideas and issues in cultural diversity and adult cognitive development

Address power dynamics and ethical decision making in students work

Learn how to structure and manage mentorship relationships

Portfolio preparation in both first and second language samples are developed

Mentoring II

Expand mentoring skills in assessment and feedback

Incorporate perspectives on diversity and understanding of adult learners' experiences

Peer mentoring first and second language skills

Vygotskyan approach to effective feedback through learning-focused interactions

Incorporate theoretical models of interpretation processes in assessing and mentoring interpretation skills

Introduce interpreting skills into the portfolio

Introduce the business skills involved in a mentoring practice

Develop and organize a fieldwork project for the final semester

Mentoring III: Practicum

Options: Two weeks on campus component of the course or working at a distance

Supervised mentoring activities

Students working from a distance, collaborated via asynchronous web interaction and video exchange with mentors and on-site students

Activities undertaken are clearly differentiated from quick "error correction" fixes

Students focus on identifying causes of meaning loss and work toward moving mentees to message equivalency

Mentoring IV: Fieldwork

Implementation of fieldwork projects

Students approach mentoring using the concepts and approaches from the previous three courses

Feedback is provided by the mentees the students are mentoring and the organization through which the fieldwork project is running
Aspects of the project include taking care of all business and specific activities to encourage skill growth in their mentees

Development of the mentoring portion of the portfolio

Online discussions are continued discussing students' insights and experiences, reports, and analysis of their own mentoring skills. (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.)

Looking back through the above curriculum, sequenced learning—or building on what students know—follows the phases of a mentoring relationship defined by the MMP. In the initiation phase, students have little sense of the skills they will be building when entering the program. In the cultivation stage, over time, students' skill sets are organized along with developing a broader understanding of themselves and their work. In the separation stage, students start applying their mentoring skill sets. In the redefinition stage, students, now as mentors, share their skills and knowledge with the larger community.

The MMP was developed and delivered online through the University of Colorado, Boulder and then moved to Northeastern University for its final two years. Both hearing and deaf interpreters and interpreter educators are encouraged to apply to the program. This online format provided access to working, community-based students. Online delivery provides students access to many of the matriarchs and patriarchs of the interpreting community as senior faculty for the program. Working through online media allows the MMP to prepare and send out a wide range of recourses. Visual materials, signed versions of lectures, and English translations are provided and posted to course materials.

Conclusion

In closing, the MMP has framed both philosophies and approaches within adult learning theory, which is a key to the success of working with adults in mentoring relationships. The literature has taken us on a journey through different programs with variations in approaches to mentoring, tailored to the mentoring relationship for that particular profession.

Lambright (1999) laments that the mentoring literature lacks precision and definition, this lack of clarity proves frustrating for scholars. On a positive note, Lambright recognizes that the lack of clarity indicates the richness and the depth of the mentoring relationship. (Hunter, 2007, p. 8)

The MMP postulates the integration of current practices in the field of mentoring to prepare and educate Master Mentors for the field of ASL–English interpreters. It is important to take this one step further to see if the MMP founders have been effective in their endeavors. An ethnographic case study of the graduates of the MMP as they communicate about their perceptions of how effective the philosophies and practices have been in their own work will provide evidence as to whether and to what extent the program is effective in training mentors.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

After an extensive literary search for mentoring programs that are organized, executed, and researched for outcomes, it was found that they are in short supply. Because this study was based on one program that was organized and repeated four times, researching the outcomes using a qualitative design approach seemed the best fit. Qualitative research is noted for its holistic view of the world, where reality is based on the perception of individuals, which change over time, and derived meaning is through context (Francis & Simon, 2001). Qualitative research seeks to interpret social phenomena by producing a rich, thick descriptive narrative to convey the findings. There are several approaches used when embarking on a qualitative study, which include ethnographies, grounded theory, case studies, and phenomenological and narrative research. A qualitative case study design was used for this research. “Case studies are used when asking the how and why, rather than what and how many” (Francis & Simon, p. 31).

The case study allowed the researcher to explore the depths of the MMP as it is bound in time and activities. This method invokes descriptive research based on a real-life situation. The design offered the researcher the opportunity to collect detailed information using data from four cohorts of students in the MMP. Inductive logic is used to discover the reality behind the data collected in a case study. When findings are presented, they are a multidimensional perspective of those who participated. Examining

the MMP offered an excellent way of gathering qualitative information and using such research to establish effective practices within the field of mentoring for ASL–English interpreters. The case study design seemed a good fit in addressing the research question.

Sample

This case study took an in-depth look at participants’ use of MMP’s philosophies and approaches, where graduates provided certain claims about their practice of mentoring, which was generalized and used as effective practices in the field of mentoring ASL–English interpreting and education.

The MMP is the first nationally recognized ASL–English interpreter mentor education program and is, thus, selected as an intrinsic case. The next step in applying the case study methodology was deciding how many participants would be included in the research. The MMP consisted of four cohorts of students from across the United States, two cohorts from the University of Colorado, Boulder and two cohorts from Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts. To obtain a list of graduates of the MMP, a letter of request was sent to Dr. Elizabeth Winston, Coordinator of the MMP.

Approximately, 10 students participated in each of the four cohorts. To complete the MMP, each student established a mentoring program in his or her state as a final project. The project entailed mentoring at least six mentees following the concepts of mentoring and philosophy of the mentee-centered approach. The target population was the 42 graduating mentors from the MMP using mentee-centered mentoring in their final project. Creswell (2005) indicated a probability sample as one of the most rigorous forms of sampling as the sample is representative of the population and the findings can be generalized to the population. In this case, the actual respondents will determine what

will be generalized to the population itself. Each of the graduates was invited to participate in this research through a letter of invitation which included an Informed Consent Form.

Instrument

A four-phase administration process was used as suggested in Creswell's (2003) book, *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. This process was completed by email. Graduates of the MMP were sent an email with a letter of invitation and informed consent attached. After the initial dissemination, some email addresses had to be checked if returned. A reminder to all perspective participants was sent 2 weeks later. When the informed consent was delivered, an email was sent to the participant with the links for both instruments. Once the instruments were completed, they were automatically submitted to Zoomerang for tallying.

Two instruments were used in this qualitative case study design:

1. A characteristic questionnaire was administered to those graduates who responded to the invitation to participate in the research (see Appendix A). The questionnaire included both closed and open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions asking demographical information provides the researcher with additional information as to their gender, age, if they are graduates of interpreter education programs, and national certification. Open-ended questions provide additional information about mentoring relationships they have experienced prior to the MMP. These questions ask if participants have had previous mentoring relationships as a mentor/mentee before enrolling in the MMP with examples of practice (mentor-centered or

mentee-centered) and outcomes of the experience along with their rationale for enrolling in the MMP.

2. A semistructured interview questionnaire (see Appendix B) was administered to participating graduates of the MMP to elicit views and opinions on their use of the MMP philosophies and approaches while mentoring. Case studies engage in a detailed description of the setting, followed by analysis of the data for themes.

The characteristic questionnaire and the semistructured interview questionnaire were developed by the researcher to ensure the questions would support the overarching research question and subquestions. To validate the characteristic questionnaire, a pilot test was completed by asking at least two graduates of the MMP to complete and review the questionnaire. Through written comments from those who completed and reviewed the questionnaire, the researcher revised or changed the questionnaire to address any concerns. Those who participated in the pilot test were not a part of the final sample of participants in the study.

Data Collection

A letter of invitation and informed consent form were sent to the graduates of the MMP asking them to participate in the research study. Participants were asked to contact the researcher by email within 7 days of the invitation letter if they were interested in participating. A copy of the Informed Consent Form was retained by the participants for their records.

Zoomerang online survey software tool allows users to create online surveys while providing reporting and advanced survey logic. As MMP graduates responded, two emails were sent directly to the respondents through Zoomerang messaging; one included

the characteristic questionnaire, and one contained the semistructured questionnaire. Participants were given 7 days to complete the online questionnaires and submit it to Zoomerang. The online questionnaire format allowed respondents to type under each question on the questionnaire. When the responses were submitted to Zoomerang, it was noted that only the characteristic questionnaire had been completed.

After the 7-day period had expired, those participants who did not respond received a reminder email providing an extension of 7 days to complete the online questionnaire. Noting both questionnaires were not being completed, in the third phase, an email was sent directly from the researcher with links to Zoomerang online the characteristic questionnaire and the semistructured questionnaire, thus adjusting dissemination to the participants with a more positive return.

Twelve graduates had responded to the characteristic questionnaires, and three graduates had responded to the semistructured questionnaire at the end of Phase 3. Due to the lack of the responses on both questionnaires, emails were sent to all of the MMP graduates, encouraging them to participate. This phase lasted a total of 3 months where reminder emails were sent every 2 weeks. When the totals reached 20 participants completing the characteristic questionnaire and 12 participants completing the semistructured questionnaire, it was decided to start the data analysis with what was collected. The characteristic questionnaire supported the questions in the semistructured questionnaire, which helped to complete the narrative with positive outcomes. A tally sheet was completed to keep track of participants, dates of all four phases of email delivery, and responses.

Data Analysis

There were several components involved in analyzing the data collected from the characteristic questionnaire and semistructured interview questionnaire instruments.

These steps follow:

1. Using the advanced survey logic on Zoomerang, the questionnaires received were numbered in the order they were received. Due to the content of the questionnaire, each question was answered sequentially and responses were related to the specific questions. The characteristic questionnaire and semistructured interview questionnaire instruments gleaned different information; therefore, the questionnaires were received separately. The characteristic questionnaire included demographic information and open-ended questions regarding the MMP graduates' background with prior mentoring relationships before entering the MMP, whether those prior mentoring relationships were mentor-centered or mentee-centered, and the outcomes of those relationships. In addition, respondents explained their rationale for entering the MMP. Likewise, the semistructured interview questionnaire was developed to elicit views and opinions on MMP graduates' use of the MMP philosophies and approaches while mentoring was arranged sequentially by question. This made grouping thoughts and themes easier.
2. The data, once organized and printed, were read. The characteristic questionnaire was used for general information about the MMP participants. The semistructured interview questionnaire provided the researcher with a general sense of the information obtained from the questioner. Notes were taken in the margins

identifying ideas, the tone of the ideas, and the depth and credibility of the information. General thoughts about the overall data were formulated at this stage of data analysis.

3. The coding process began. “Coding is the process of organizing the materials into ‘chunks’ before bringing meaning to those ‘chunks’” (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, as cited in Creswell, 2003, p. 192). The Zoomerang survey system was used for both questionnaires where the questions became the coding for the data, as each philosophy and approach was responded to by participants. Using this online electronic method, each question could be analyzed in a way to find codes that address topics, codes that may bring a surprise to the findings, and larger theoretical perspectives.
4. Through the coding process, descriptive themes emerged. These themes were, in fact, the questions from the survey and became the headings in the findings section of the study. The themes within the headings became the “story line.”
5. In this part of the analysis, the description and themes represented the qualitative narrative. The narrative shows the process of using the philosophies and approaches in the mentee-centered mentoring approach using subthemes, perspectives from participants and quotes, and discussion with interconnecting themes.
6. The final step in the data analysis process was to make meaning of the data collected. “Thus interpretation in qualitative research can take many forms, be adapted for different types of designs, and be flexible to convey personal, research-based, and action meanings” (Creswell, 2003, p. 195). Having a vested

interest in the results and application of this data to the field of ASL–English interpreting and education, the lessons learned could be the researcher’s personal interpretation “couched in the individual understanding that the inquirer brings to the study from her or his own culture, history, and experience” (Creswell, p. 195). At the same time, the comparison of findings with information gleaned from the literature added new information to the field in the form of empirical evidence of effective practice.

Validity and Reliability

Triangulation was used to validate the findings as accurate from the standpoint of the researcher, the participant, and reader. Through the process of corroborating evidence from different individuals attended different cohorts, themes were built and justified. In addition, the rich descriptive narrative given by participants has provided an element of shared experiences. Finally, being both researcher and a graduate of the MMP, having used both philosophies and approaches to teaching and mentoring others, could have been a bias within the research; in fact, it was an asset in creating an open and honest narrative.

Ethical Considerations

Issues emerge that call for good ethical decisions during the analysis and interpretation of qualitative research (Creswell, 2003). Ethical considerations towards participants are foremost in qualitative research. The MMP participants provided the researcher with their personal insights and views, in written form, of their experiences using the philosophies and approaches of the MMP. Participants must be assured of anonymity regardless of their views. To do this, participants were given an Informed

Consent Form to protect their rights and privacy. The objectives of the research were clearly stated in written form along with data collection and how the data would be used. Written interpretations and reports are available to participants at their request.

When reporting the data, the rights of the participant were considered. The researcher (a graduate of the MMP) did not share experiences with participants. There could have been privacy issues that could have arisen in using this type of collection strategy due to the technology used. Creswell (2003) stated that in survey research, “investigators disassociate names from responses during the coding and recording process” (p. 66). Therefore, emailed questionnaires were assigned pseudonyms (i.e., numbers) electronically through Zoomerang to protect the anonymity of the participants during the process of analyzing the data. When reporting the data participants were given pseudonymous names.

In research, there is always the “potential of suppressing, falsifying, or inventing findings to meet a researcher’s or an audience’s needs” (Creswell, 2003, p. 65). This research was conducted and reported openly and honestly with the intention of adding much needed research to the field of mentoring in the field of ASL–English interpreting. If needed, the researcher was able to seek the advice of the committee or of the university to ensure the ethical considerations were of utmost importance throughout the research.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a qualitative case study design provided the researcher with the best opportunity to represent a multidimensional perspective of those who participated in the MMP in sharing their experiences in using the philosophies and practices of the MMP in their work. The instrument was a characteristic questionnaire that included general

questions regarding the participants and their backgrounds in mentoring and a semistructured questionnaire, which elicited information regarding their use of the MMP philosophies and practices. A pilot test was administered to two MMP graduates to check for validity on both instruments before sending the initial invitation to participate. A four-phase process was used to administer the instruments. The case study design engaged in a detailed description of the MMP graduates' use of the MMP philosophies and practices followed by an analysis of the data for themes. The description and themes of view and opinions were represented in a qualitative narrative, which provided the field of ASL–English interpreter's solid research to establish effective practice in the field.

CHAPTER 4. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The previous chapter described the methodology of this study, data collection, data analysis, procedures, and data managements. This chapter examines the findings and the insights of the Master Mentor Program (MMP) graduates. An analysis of the efficacy of the MMP, using its uniquely adapted philosophies and varied approaches in preparing mentors for the field of American Sign Language (ASL)–English interpreting, was the purpose of this study. This study examined graduates’ perceptions of how relevant the philosophies and practices of the MMP are in their work as Master Mentors.

Following is the overreaching question that guided this study: How have graduates used the philosophies and approaches of the MMP to develop and prepare them to become mentors to ASL–English interpreters?

Following are the subquestions:

1. To what extent do graduates of the MMP use the philosophies and practices in their mentoring relationships?
2. How appropriate are the philosophies and practices of the MMP when applied to the work of mentors to ASL–English interpreters?
3. What have graduates learned about applying the program philosophies and approaches since their graduation from the MMP?
4. To what extent do graduates who use the MMP philosophies and practices see changes in mentees skills development?

5. What philosophies, practices, or approaches do graduates feel were lacking in their development and preparation to become a Master Mentor and why?
6. How have the philosophies and approaches of the MMP changed behaviors and attitudes about mentoring relationships in the field of ASL–English interpreting and education?

A total of 20 students from the MMP participated in the study which is approximately 48% of the total graduates of the program. Funded by a grant, the MMP offered 4 years of mentoring training to students from across the United States. The program was 1 year long, and prepared four groups/cohorts of students. The cohorts (or group of students) represented by the respondents were Cohort I with four respondents, II with six, III with three, and IV with six.

Table 1

Cohort Representation

Cohort	Number of mentor graduates
I	4
II	3
III	6
IV	6
Unidentified	1

Data were obtained by two surveys. A characteristic questionnaire was administered. The questionnaire included both closed- and open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions asking demographical information provides the research with additional information as to respondents' gender, age, if they are graduates of interpreter education programs, and national certification. Open-ended questions provide additional information about mentoring relationships they have experienced prior to the MMP, asking if participants have had previous mentoring relationships as a mentor/mentee before enrolling in the MMP with examples of practice (mentor-centered or mentee-centered) and outcomes of the experience, along with their rationale for enrolling in the MMP.

The characteristic questionnaire was followed by a semistructured interview questionnaire to elicit views and opinions on their effective use of the MMP philosophies and approaches while mentoring post-MMP. Both the characteristic and semistructured interview questionnaires were developed by the researcher to ensure the questions would support the overarching research question and subquestions.

Data Analysis: Characteristic Questionnaire

Demographics and Credentials

The characteristic questionnaire first posed closed-ended questions, asking mentor graduates their gender (Question 1), age (Question 2), which MMP cohort the respondent attended (Question 3), if they graduated from an interpreter education program (Question 4), years as an ASL–English Interpreter (Question 5), and what credentials they hold as an interpreter (Question 6).

The data from the characteristic questionnaire showed that 18 females and 2 males responded to the survey. This information corresponds with RID's *2010 Annual Report to Our Members* (RID, 2010) comparison of gender results. From the total 15,332 membership of RID, of the 10,682 members who reported, there were 1,400 (12.87%) male interpreters and 9,482 (87.13%) female interpreters (RID 2010 Annual Report, p. 59). The ages of the respondents ranged from 38 years to 63 years (see Table 2). One respondent did not identify with a cohort. All of the MMP cohorts were represented, however, not equally.

Eight or 40% of the respondents graduated from an Interpreter Education Program, while 60% or 12 did not (see Figure 1). The RID, at that time at what time?, did not require any training or education to become an interpreter. Most interpreters learned sign language from deaf relatives or deaf friends and began interpreting for them again—what is the time frame here—most interpreters in recent years haven't learned from family. As of 2010, RID required an Associate in Arts degree to sit for the national test and in 2012 will require a Bachelor of Arts degree to qualify for national certification. There are still no stipulations that one must have an interpreter education program to take the national test, even today.

All but two of the respondents held some type of interpreting credentials (see Table 2). Credentials represented were various state screenings, RID certifications, the National Association for the Deaf (NAD) certifications, all of which were awarded to competent community interpreters after completing a written and performance of skills assessment. The most recent certification used for national accreditation was a joint effort between RID and NAD—the National Interpreting Certificate (NIC)—which replaced the

previous RID Certificate of Interpretation (CI) and Certificate of Transliteration (CT) and NAD certifications: NAD I, II, III, IV, and V. Certified members of RID are grandfathered in when new certifications are established, thus the reason for the variety of certifications noted. Other certificates noted were IC (Interpreter Certificate) and TC (Transliteration Certificate); SC:L (Specialty Certificate in Legal Interpreting); SC:OTC (Specialty Certificate in Oral Transliteration); CSC (Comprehensive Skills Certificate). The Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) is awarded to competent ASL–English Interpreters who work in the academic setting of Pre-K to 12. Each state sets standards for competency in the educational settings Pre-K to 12. RID recognizes and EIPA if the candidate passes the performance and written assessments with a 4.0 or higher (scale of 1 to 5 are awarded).

The 20 respondents had been interpreting from 14 to over 40 + years (see Table 2). Two stated that they facilitated communication for 21 and 22 years. Neither of these graduates have credentials. The response of facilitating communication versus interpreting as to the respondents meaning is not clear.

Table 2

Age, Years of Interpreting, and Credentials of Respondents

Respondents	Age	Years of interpreting	State screening	RID	NAD	NIC	EIPA
1	46	16	Kansas 4/5	CI/CT			
2	40	20		CI/CT			
3	62	Over 40		RSC/CDI			
4	57	20+	X 5/5				

Respondents	Age	Years of interpreting	State screening	RID	NAD	NIC	EIPA
5	63	31		RSC			
6	39	17		Pre K -12			Elem/Sec
7	49	23		CI/CT		Adv.	
8	50	35		CSC,CI CT SC:L			
9	38	14	Ohio DOE	CI/CT, OTC EdK- 12			
10	38	12	X	CI/CT			
11	59	0 - facilitator	None	None	None	None	None
12	51	28		IC/TC, CI, CT, SC:L			
13	57	36					X
14	40	18		CI/CT	IV		4.1
15	57	33	X	CSC, CI/CT, SC:L,OTC IV		Master	PreK-12
16	59	22 - facilitator	None	None	None	None	None
17	38	14	Ohio DOE				PreK-12
18	50	25+	X	TC, CI CI/CT, SC:L	V	Master	
19	52	30		X			
20	51	Most of my life		CDI			

Note. National Interpreting Certificate (NIC), Certificate of Interpretation (CI), Certificate of Transliteration (CT), NAD certifications: NAD I, II, III, IV, and V, Interpreter Certificate (IC) and

Transliteration Certificate (TC), Comprehensive Skills Certificate CSC, Specialty Certificate in Legal Interpreting SC:L, Specialty Certificate in Oral Transliteration SC:OTC, Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA).

Mentoring Prior to the Master Mentor Program as Mentor

Mentoring experiences prior to the MMP were elicited from respondents from open-ended questions on the characteristic questionnaire. Respondents were asked if they were involved in mentoring relationships as a mentor (Question 7), why the mentee sought mentoring (Question 8), was mentee-centered or mentor-centered mentoring practiced (Question 9), did the respondent have any mentoring training prior to MMP (Question 10), and what were the outcomes as a result of the mentoring relationship (Question 11).

All of the mentor graduates had mentored prior to...mentoring relationships as a mentor prior to their enrollment in the program. This information showed that experienced interpreters in the field shared their knowledge and expertise in interpreting before they enrolled in a formal mentor training. The mentor graduates having been interpreting for anywhere from 12 to 40+ years and mentored both formally and informally throughout their careers. Some explained that their mentoring prior to the program was more “loose private teaching and not exactly mentoring as we learned it” or “untrained mentoring.”

In these mentoring relationships, mentees with whom they were working came to seek a mentor (Question 2) for the same reasons mentees would seek a mentoring relationship today. Mentees seek mentors for various reasons. As recent graduates from an interpreter education program, often mentoring is recommended to help them make the transition from academics to the work environment. Novice interpreters (recent

graduates, who are pre-certified) work on general skill sets or seek a mentoring relationship to work towards passing a state screening or national certification. In some cases, the respondent provided mentoring when “they [mentees] wanted to become an interpreter but there was no local interpreter training program” (Respondent Sharon).

At the time of their mentoring relationship as the mentor, nine of the respondents used a mentee-centered approach (Question 9) when working with the mentee as taught in the MMP prior to their enrollment to the program.

Table 3

Mentoring Approach (prior to MMMP)

Mentoring Approach	Respondents
Mentor-centered	Cathy, Leo, Sandy, Janet, Kate, Teri, David, Janine, and #Ashley
Mentor-centered	Lori, Sara, Alexa
Dual approach	Sharon, Monica, Stacey

The question of mentoring training prior to MMP (Question 10) was interesting in that nine respondents acquired training in various ways by attending workshops specific to mentoring and skills development. Lori was trained as a teacher, and Teri conveyed no training to become a mentor. Of the 20 respondents, only 10 answered the question as to whether they had acquired any training for mentoring prior to the MMP. With regards to mentoring approaches, Leo and Kate used Sandra Gish’s model of processing, which is Vygotsky-based, learner-centered teaching. One respondent reported that her

“background is in counseling with deaf and hard of hearing consumers and their families and problem solving so many of the principles I was taught in the field carried over to mentoring” (Sandy). Three of the respondents used a mentor-centered approach, and only one reported that she had no training other than teaching. A dual approach, explained by “mentee lead and mentor guided,” was used by three respondents prior to MMP; only one reported having attended a few workshops. Five respondents did not answer this question. With all respondents claiming mentoring relationships as mentors before MMP, it remains unknown as to how those five respondents approached the mentoring work.

Each of the respondents reported successful outcomes for their mentees from their mentoring relationships prior to the MMP (Question 11). Mentees left the relationships with enhanced skill sets; identified areas to work on and improve; passed qualifying tests, screenings, and certification; and reported positive experiences. Leo provided an interesting response in lieu of mentoring over 250+ mentees in his 40-year interpreting practice: “Outcomes were greater after I completed MMP as I had tools to work with.”

In summary, most of the mentor graduates had experienced mentoring relationships as a mentor prior to enrolling in the program. Many of them used the mentee-centered approach in their practice.

Mentoring Prior to the Master Mentor Program as Mentee

The following open-ended questions provide experiences mentor graduates had as mentees (Question 12) prior to their education in the MMP, their reason for seeking a mentor (Question 13), whether the mentor-centered approach or mentee-centered approach was used in the mentoring relationship, and what outcomes resulted in the mentoring relationship.

From 15 responses, 13 of the mentor graduates had mentoring relationships as mentees prior to their enrollment in the MMP. Twelve of the respondents had no formal interpreter training/education programs, so the likelihood they would seek mentoring would seem appropriate. Their experiences as mentees varied as did their experiences in mentoring. The majority of the mentoring relationships were informal. Though not stated explicitly as mentoring by either parties, some of the mentoring took place after assignments and the senior interpreter provided feedback to the novice interpreter, which still happens today. Respondent Janet stated her “primary mentors were members of the deaf community and selected interpreter colleagues.” Likewise, Monica’s response was similar, “My first mentor was a deaf community member who brought me into the interpreting field.” This relates to earlier findings that, prior to interpreter training programs, interpreters learned sign language from family members who were deaf or friends of the deaf community and started interpreting for them in the community. Those who did engage in mentoring relationships as mentees did so only once or twice or used a job or internship to glean skills from a more experienced interpreter in the setting.

ASL–English interpreters often work in isolation due to the nature of assignments. When asked why the respondent wanted to be mentored (Question 13), several did so in order to work with other interpreters who could critique their work. Stacey expressed, “I wanted to feel like what I was doing as an interpreter was correct and wanted guidance and reassurance that my skills were decent and that I was really rendering faithful messages and providing effective communication.” Many looked for mentors as a sounding board (David), support (Debbie, Janet, Emma, Stacey, and Shandel), to challenge themselves (Sharon, Teri, and Sara), acquire more tools (Kate, Janine, Ashley, and

Laura), and to continue to seek out language/cultural information and interpreting strategies (Lori, Jessica, and Janine). An interesting comment came from this particular question where the respondent looked for mentoring to “push the envelope in ways that a course can never do.”

When asked if their experiences as a mentee were mentee-centered or mentor-centered (Question 14), Kate, Teri, David, and Laura stated their mentoring experience was mentee-centered. Mentor-centered approaches were reported by Respondents Sharon, Debbie, Janet, Lori, Emma, Jessica, Sara, Stacey Shandel, and Ashley when mentored as a mentee. Janine reported both mentee-centered mentoring and mentor-centered mentoring were used in practice. Five respondents did not answer the question as to whether they had been mentored as a mentee previously. Upon reflection on this question, Sara stated, “75-80 percent of the time it was mentor-centered or a ‘teaching/coaching’ philosophy (especially with ‘mentors’ that were trained as teachers and those that were native ASL signers) and ‘learn by modeling’ behavior.” Stacey responded “not really” when asked about mentee-centered mentoring in practice when mentored. “It was more of a blatant critique of my skills, telling me what I was doing wrong and what I needed to do to fix it. List of observation notes and sign/concept corrections that we would discuss” (Stacey).

The outcomes of the mentoring relationships (Question 15) for the respondents were overall positive, leaving the mentee with improvement on skill sets, enhancement of skills, and understanding of individual process, passed certifications, and networking. In one experience, Stacey reported that the relationship “fizzled out” and, through her own experiences and growth in the field came the realization, that the mentor was incorrect in

the way she approached her practice. In another situation where a respondent left an unsatisfying mentoring relationship, Shandel stated the experience “drove me to seek out mentoring training for myself. I had an unpleasant mentoring experience and knew that there had to be something better that could be offered to interpreters seeking mentoring.”

When summarizing this part of the characteristic questionnaire where mentor graduates were asked if they were involved in mentoring relationships as a mentee prior to enrollment to the MMP, the responses seemed to set a different tone. Without placing a negative slant to these findings, it seems the respondents, after being mentored as mentees, wanted more from the mentoring they received and so sought something more to include in their own mentoring of others. A question might be asked: Did the experiences they had as mentees influence how they mentored before entering the MMP? Several of the respondents stated they were lifelong learners, thus the reason they had come to seek mentoring for their development in the field of ASL–English interpreting by expanding their education, gaining further credentials.

Previous Practice Versus Mentee-Centered Mentoring

Personal journeys: where people come from, where they arrive, and where they later continue are always interesting. Through the characteristic questionnaire, 20 mentor graduates shared their journeys from starting their careers as sign language interpreters, interpreter educators, and what some called facilitators to becoming mentees and mentors prior to the MMP. At this point, it is natural to ask what differences respondents have found in their previous practices and their post-MMP practices (Question 16).

Respondents agreed that within mentee-centered mentoring relationships, they found mentees took responsibility for their own learning and were allowed to make discoveries

in their work, both effective interpreting and areas where they needed to improve, providing a nonthreatening environment to grow. Whereas in mentor-centered mentoring, the mentor critiqued or provided feedback of what the mentee did wrong. Respondent Kate found “teacher-centered works for systems, but are certainly not individualized the way mentee-centered work can be. Mentee-centered respects the adult learner’s process and leads to unique results.” Additional comments with regards to Question 17 where respondents could expand on previous experiences in mentoring relationships, two mentor graduates felt mentee-centered mentoring to be frustrating for the mentees as they are seeking answers from the “expert.” While this may be true in all mentoring relationships—that mentees seek answers from the expert—Sandy realized it took time for the mentee “to buy into the concept,” as being told what to do was what they knew from previous experiences in mentoring relationships. Over time, the mentee realized the benefits of the mentee-centered approach. Using mentee-centered approaches “allowed me to grow in ways I didn’t expect at the onset of the relationship” was David’s response.

Why the MMP?

Question 18 asked the mentor graduates for their rationale for enrolling in the MMP. It would seem after many years in the field of ASL–English interpreting/educational interpreting, facilitating, and interpreter education the respondents would feel they knew enough. Yet, all 20 respondents stated in one way or another they wanted to become a more competent mentor. “I felt I wanted to pursue education about mentoring interpreters, since I had no formal interpreter education. The MMP seemed like a natural first step for someone who was working as a certified interpreter for almost 10 years” (Sharon). Leo sought “to become an effective mentor

with appropriate tools.” With the responsibility of being employed as an interpreter supervisor, Debbie “wanted to receive training on the best ways to encourage the interpreters to look at, evaluate, and improve their skills.” Sandy acknowledged, “Since my experiences were based on the few workshops on mentoring, I felt the MMP would provide me a strong foundation in theories of adult learning, mentoring, and transformation, as well as assessment tools.”

As a veteran in the field of interpreting at work, Janet wanted more guidance and knowledge on the latest information for interpreters. “I wanted to be a successful mentor to the newer interpreters entering the field. I’d already taken the Teaching ASL/Teaching Interpreting Certificate at CU, Boulder so knew Betsy Winston and she encouraged me to apply” (Janet). Prior to the MMP, Kate had a major project in mind and thought the MMP would be the perfect place to initiate the program. With an established mentoring program in Kate’s state, both Kate and the partner applied to the MMP together, so “we could improve our local programs.” Training for Lori would bring competency. Emma, after taking a mentoring program through an agency, knew there had to be something more to mentoring than what was learned. “I am a pro-active sort of person and I wanted to be part of that new paradigm” (Emma). More focus on mentoring training with credentials was Teri’s rationale for joining the MMP. Jessica wanted to mentor local interpreters, teachers, and students and for this reason joined the MMP. “I have always had a passion for mentoring and was thrilled to see a formal and in-depth offering of classes to help me in my journey so that I could help others in theirs” (Monica). Sara was in the initial Cohort I. “Actually I was approached and appointed to represent my region in the Pilot/Cohort I, which I consider a great honor to this day, 10 years later” (Sara).

She continued, “Other than that, I always loved learning, admired Dr. Betsy Winston and her vision for the MMP and thought, ‘Why not,’” (Sara).

I enrolled in the MMP because I wanted to help others achieve their goals while, at the same time, accomplishing some of my own. I love the field of interpreting and I wanted to have the credentials behind my name that would allow me the opportunity to help raise the standards of the profession. Additionally, it was the last year for the government subsidy tuition. I had seen the information for the MMP several years before I joined, but didn’t enroll because I wasn’t sure if I had what it would take to complete it successfully. I finally thought if I wanted to take advantage of the grant, that I would have to enroll (ready or not) or give up my own educational goals, and I didn’t want to do that, so I signed up. I have not regretted one bit. (Stacey)

David’s goal was to “become a better mentor and to develop a mentorship program.” To be able to mentor teachers and trainers was Alexa’s reason for joining the MMP. The MMP was the perfect place to achieve Alexa’s goal of formal training. “Skill improvement and courses that would lead to an advanced degree” was Janine’s response. Ashley concurred with other respondents with wanting to become a better mentor and was the reason for joining the MMP. Laura’s rationale for enrolling in the MMP was “We all can always use feedback and always aim for betterment of self, and can use some improvements. We must not stagnate.”

The MMP was a new paradigm for many interpreters and interpreter educators. It was an honor to be appointed as a representative for the respondents’ regions. In turn, to take the concepts and knowledge back to their respective states and teach others was paramount in the field. As lifelong learners, this was the likely thing to do.

Data Analysis: Semistructured Interview Questionnaire

The characteristic questionnaire was followed by a semistructured interview questionnaire to elicit views and opinions on mentor graduates' effective use of the MMP philosophies and approaches while mentoring. In order to elicit views and opinions, the questions asked about the philosophies and approaches that were nestled into the courses and ultimately decided upon to provide a mixture of knowledge, skills, and exploration of mentoring students' needs. Only 12 of the 20 respondents answered these questions.

How the MMP changed mentee graduates' views about mentoring was the first question asked in the semistructured interview questionnaire. Given the data collected from the characteristic questionnaire, it is not surprising that the five graduates expressed that, in general, going through the MMP did not change their view about mentoring. The majority of the mentor graduates had used a mentee-centered approach in the mentoring relationships they had prior to the MMP. The MMP gave them better structure while mentoring, reinforced the process they had already used (i.e., Vygotsky approach or mentee-centered), provided more insights to theory and learning styles, and enhanced their views on mentoring. Sharon stated,

Before I became involved in the Master Mentor Program, I had the old traditional ideas about mentoring—the mentor was the master and I, as the mentee, would go to the mentor to learn whatever (s) he felt I needed to learn. I have really appreciated the philosophy behind the Master Mentor Program and the fact that, as adults, we learn best those things that we want/need to learn. Hence their emphasis on the relationship being mentee-driven. I have seen this philosophy work with every mentoring situation I've participated in.

As compared to other programs, Sandy suggested, "This particular program seems to have a much more 'purist' (perhaps) even 'elitist' view of mentoring." It also took some time for this respondent to realize and understand that mentoring was not teaching. A

change from the traditional, watch and provide feedback to conversations about the work using the Vygotsky model “seems to be so much more effective for the mentee, puts the mentor/mentee on more equal footing, expedites learning and improvement in mentee” (Janet). According to Kate, it changed her view on what mentors and mentees are supposed to do. Kate stated that although some mentees had the experience where mentees did not like this style of mentoring and “just wanted the answers and didn’t want to do the work,” other mentees were “willing to do the work and take responsibility for their own learning”—and the latter did well. Several respondents stated that their views on mentoring were more positive, the information was enlightening, and they gained a historical perspective of mentoring and how adults learn.

Adult Learning Theory and Learning Styles

When using adult learning theories by Levinson, Kegan, and Perry, as found in Daloz, 1999, respondents were asked which adult learning theory suited their practice the best (Question 2). Kegan has been incorporated into six mentors’ practices, Perry was used by four, and Levinson was used by two.

Table 4

Adult Learning Theory

Adult learning theorist	Number of mentor graduates using the theory in practice
Levinson	2
Kegan	6
Perry	4

Overall, the respondents realized a better understanding of how adults learn differently and were able to successfully use the information to enhance their approaches in mentoring the mentee. The idea that adult learners are in control of their learning was another factor in using the theories, along with the notion that it creates a safe environment where mentees feel comfortable working on their goals. “Mentoring is not a one size fits all mentoring, and I need to assess and change how I work with each mentee,” was stated by Teri. Some respondents had to return to the different theory approaches and review them in order to respond to the question. Although they did not remember the theories by name, they realized how they had incorporated the knowledge of the theories into their practices. Lori’s view of concepts of adult learning was critical in that Lori learned to observe and assess the mentee and where the mentee was in his or her learning. This respondent used Kegan’s and Perry’s concepts in lieu of Levinson’s theory, which Lori found to be “more pragmatic and applicable to everyday learning in adults.” Mentor graduates concurred that concepts of adult learning theory guided their mentoring relationships.

Flexibility in the mentoring relationship came from understanding learning styles suggested Lori as “the approaches for mentoring can be better adapted towards the mentee’s learning styles, as well as learning needs.” Knowledge of learning styles (Question 4) provided different approaches for better support or effective guiding through the relationships (Debbie, Sandy, Janet, and Lori). In addition, it provided more knowledge of how mentees liked to learn and how they learned more effectively. In one case, it helped Emma’s “flexibility in shifting gears and going with the flow.” With regards to flexibility, Jessica agreed. In Lori’s opinion, “At times, it may be necessary to

work from a mentor-centered approach and gradually work towards a mentee-centered approach.” It seemed that for this respondent starting mentor-centered mentoring allowed the mentee to understand the mentee’s learning styles and then, as the mentor, she could use them to make adjustments. For Leo used some learning style theory, however for the most part relies on Meyers-Briggs, claiming a larger scope of the personality indices which provides more to work with when mentoring.

As for realizing integration of adult learning into their practice (Question 5), most mentor graduates (Leo, Debbie, Janet, Kate, and Monica) started using the concepts and theories when they studied them while in the MMP. Later, the theories became a natural process when working with mentees. Realization came to Sharon when the mentees started making huge improvements in the skills/abilities they wanted to see improve. Kate realized integration when mentoring several mentees at the same time. Through comparison of the mentees, Kate noted all of their needs were different as adult learners. This, in turn, brought more flexibility to the relationships as Kate worked with them as individuals. Teri had always integrated adult learning concepts into her mentoring practice, yet, she had no formal names as to what she was doing.

The benefit of using adult learning theory in mentoring practice was displayed in Question 6 when posed to the mentor graduates. Benefits were claimed by the mentor and for their mentees, as well. For Cathy, “A greater understanding of adult learning theory has caused me to be more sensitive to the needs of protégés in the mentoring relationship.” Respondents Sandy, Kate, Lori, and Emma, concurred. Measureable improvement and depth of improvement as a result of using adult learning theory was reported as a benefit by Sharon. Also noted by Sharon, “If the skill/ability the mentee

wants to improve actually becomes the focus of their work, they improve more quickly and more solidly than if they were working on something that someone told them needed improvement.” Leo recognized that when the learning was not centered in the mentor’s work, the mentor could be creative and attentive, not the task-master and homework creator. Adult learning theory provides all participants in the mentoring relationship what they need, resulting in benefits for both the mentor and the mentee stated Respondents Debbie and Monica. Not only can this mentor be more open to the needs of each student/mentee’s learning styles, it shows more acceptance of the student’s learning needs and where the student is coming from.

The use of theories can reap benefits in the mentoring relationship and set limitations. Question 7 asked the mentor graduates if there are any limitations to using adult learning theory. Finding adult learning useful in meta-analysis of the mentoring relationships and guiding the mentor within the relationship, at the same time, Cathy concluded, “If there is too much focus on the use of various theories, there can be a negative impact on the relationship.” Cathy did not share what this negative impact was on the relationship. Monica found limitations in that “no one exactly matches the stages theorists outline, so good listening skills and flexibility is important.” Sharon found limitations may be self-imposed by the mentee when not understanding how the mentoring relationship works or because the mentor is having difficulty pointing the mentee in the right direction. If the latter results in limitations for the mentee, Sharon suggested the mentee seek a different mentor. Limitations for Leo happened when mentees say they want to make changes in their work, yet are really looking for someone to blame for their lack of growth:

I don't take it personally, but it is frustrating to have a mentee who continually insists I do the work for them—and resists open and honest discussion. I am tempted to just become the teacher and feel frustrated with the person's lack of progress. It's not a limitation per se, but sticking to the idea of adult learning, I cannot do anything more than continue to reflect what I see and then walk away when necessary. (Leo)

Limitations would occur if the mentor looked at adult learning and perceived that one size fits all or if the mentor was not using or understanding adult learning theory (Kate and Lori).

Theories are frameworks, and there are many of them out there. By saying that I “apply adult learning theory” to my mentoring work, what I am really saying is that I apply the theories I know and am comfortable with; not that I have knowledge of all of the options out there. (Teri)

Collaborative Learning Concepts

Collaborative learning was a key element in the philosophies and approaches taught in the MMP. Collaborative learning encourages mentor and mentee to interact with one another for the purpose of sharing experiences and observations. When asked to explain their concept of collaborative learning in mentoring relationships (Question 8), the mentor graduates had several views and opinions. “Since the mentor is not necessarily considered an expert in the mentoring relationship, then both/all parties, in the MMP style mentoring work to learn about each other, the process and the content” (Cathy). Cathy concluded with the notion there is no one right answer, and each participant will come to his or her own understanding of the content. When involved in a mentoring relationship, s Sharon and Leo learned and benefited from the process as well.

Collaborative learning “is the sharing of ideas and the philosophy that neither of us has the only ‘right’ answer that really makes this work” (Sharon). Collaboration developed trust, skill development, and relationships between mentees as they became a support

system to each other, a source of feedback with the goal of meeting a common objective (Leo, Debbie, Sandy, Kate, Lori, and Monica). With this support system in place, the mentees were able to take risks and understand learning is an ongoing process that never ends. “We created very unique practice exercises, made our own resources and have developed a strong peer relationship as a result of the collaboration we have had together” (Leo). Equal partnership—“open and honest”—was another concept of collaborative learning that Kate embraced. Lori stated,

I love and apply collaborative learning. Collaborative learning is established through a structure set by the mentor which the group or mentor/mentee can collaborate together in discussing a “problem” or an issue. Using collaborative learning allows mentees/students to apply their knowledge and learn from each other. Others have different ways of knowing and how they understanding through their perspectives. The more that students can learn through collaborative learning, the richer they come away.

“Biofeedback, yes,” was Jessica’s explanation of collaboration.

Question 9 solicited responses regarding the benefits of using collaborative learning in mentoring. Respondents Cathy, Sharon, and Leo expressed, respectively, the learning process is shared within the relationship, creating trust, and reciprocity in knowledge and experiences. Trust and win/win situations result in the collaborative learning environments so stated by Kate, Lori, and Monica. Sharon explained that if one person in the relationship has struggled with an issue in the past and is able to share that experience with the other person in the relationship, who may be having the same issue, the latter person can relate and it may help that person. If that person cannot relate, he or she has gained another experience to draw upon in the future. Debbie found “connectedness” as a benefit of using collaborative learning. “It gets to the heart of what the individual seeks (less time wasted); empowers the mentee, allows the mentee to work

towards goals that are personalized. It's time consuming, but in the long run more effective" (Sandy). Kate looked at balance in the mentoring relationship as a benefit. Teri referred to her practice of, once having left the mentoring relationship, continuing to support each other in a peer relationship.

In most cases, benefits will outweigh the limitations to a given theory. Question 10 asked mentor graduates if there were any limitations in using their concept of collaborative learning. Establishing a common understanding of collaborative learning can be a limitation to some mentoring relationships, views held by both Respondents Cathy and Sharon, if participants in the relationship are having a hard time learning from others' experiences (Cathy), or if there are different expectations held by several of the members of a group. Debbie found limitations to collaborative learning when mentees feel they want sole attention or focus. Respondent Sandy stated the process of implementing collaborative learning is time consuming: "Sometimes, especially before one truly understands the difference between 'knowing' and 'owning,' both mentor/teacher/administration and mentees want (or think they want) 'the quick fix'—not realizing that it's little more than a band-aid or stop-gap" (Sandy). In group settings, it may be more difficult to maintain focus and to keep the momentum going, along with limiting progress or development when using collaborative learning (Respondents Kate, Lori, and Teri). Jessica found mentors who are critical of mentees could be a limitation. For Monica, collaborative learning could be a new concept to some, therefore "a fine tuning of their listening and active attending skills might be required."

Most of the respondents' concept of collaborative learning, whether mentoring individuals or groups, touched on similar ideas such as shared learning, trust

relationships, empowering the mentee, establishing personalized goals for the mentee, sharing experiences, support, equality, mentors are also learners, and shared success. The qualities noted in respondents' concept of collaborative learning in a mentoring relationship also become the benefits of collaborative learning. Limitations stemmed from those mentees—individual or an individual within the group—who do not understand the concept of collaborative learning or did not want to participate in this style of learning. Limitations in the use of collaborative learning could show in the time taken to share experiences, expectations (the quick fix), and developments.

Interpreting Process and Interpreting Process Model

Within the field of ASL–English interpreting, interpreting process models are used to teach students the theoretical process of moving from the source language (e.g., English) to the target language (e.g., ASL), making all of the necessary linguistic and cultural adjustments to create a dynamic equivalent between the two languages. Process models reviewed in the MMP were Cokely's (1992) sociolinguistic model, Colonomos' psycholinguistic pedagogical model (Boinis et al., 1996), and Gish's (1984) cognitive process management model, which many also consider a pedagogical model.

In Question 11, respondents were asked how they applied concepts of the interpreting process in their mentoring, and in Question 12, respondents were asked which model they use when mentoring and why. Respondents Cathy, Leo, Janet, and Kate found that graduates from an interpreter education program were already familiar with interpreting process and models, which made asking questions about processing easier. Those who did not graduate from an interpreter training program most frequently asked questions about processing. “That is a good opportunity to explore the various

process models with them and has led to a common vocabulary” (Cathy) when discussing the work. This respondent used Cokely’s sociolinguistic model (Cokely, 1992) when working with mentees, as it reflects the most explicit details of the process and was easiest for students to apply. Leo relied on Colonomos’ psycholinguistic model (Boinis et al., 1996) and Gish’s (1984) cognitive process management approach both in discussion and practice exercises while mentoring. This respondent found that mentees were usually familiar with both, and it provided common language to discuss the work where process breakdowns had occurred, and how to prep and debrief after work. Debbie used the applied concept of the top-down process in mentoring educational interpreters. Top-down processing is part of the EIPA philosophy as to how an interpretation should be delivered. Raters of the EIPA will look for why, how, what, why (i.e., what is the point), how (i.e., through discourse), and what is the content in the interpretation. “While mentoring, I use the EIPA results feedback. I focus on the individual areas for improvement” (Debbie). When working with mentees, Sandy tries to fit the needs of the mentee.

Sandy used “Gish, especially if you’re focusing on working with the text, whereas, Cokely works better if you are trying to assess mentee issues that center on repetitive production errors.” Janet surmised, along with others, that most interpreters are familiar with the Cokely and/or Colonomos models of interpreting process. “It is helpful to listen to what the mentee is experiencing and then look at either of these models to identify where in the process a breakdown might be (if applicable)” (Janet). For Kate, discussing the interpreting process highly depended on his or her experience with the process of interpreting—the more experience, the less interpreting process was applied to the mentoring, and the less experience, the more in-depth work on the process of

interpreting. The concepts of interpreting process in Lori's mentoring came from the explanation of how

mentoring would work by applying the different principles of collaborative learning and interpreting processes to guide the mentee to look at the work and what happened during the process of interpreting. This sets the premise of analyzing the work, not the person. Using the interpreting processes guides the framing of questioning to allow the mentee to look at the work at different angles. (Lori)

In selecting models to apply to mentoring, Lori used Colonomos (Boinis et al., 1996) and Gish (Gish, 1984), which proved more pragmatic and easier for assessments (breaking the process down into steps for further work) and skills developments. This respondent would like to see more use of Daniel Gile and his theories about interpreting and translating in spoken languages, which can be applied to interpreting. Teri started the mentoring relationship with dialog that "focuses on their work, what they like, what they don't like, and where in the interpreting process they struggle."

Most of the mentor graduates were familiar with interpreting process and process models and used them in their mentoring practices. They used a combination of Colonomos (Boinis et al., 1996) and Gish (1984) or Cokely (1992) to work with mentees' interpreting process, depending on where mentees were in their interpreting process skills development (i.e., Gish, 1984) approach for analysis of text and Cokely (1992) in working with repetitive production errors). Some agreed that most interpreters, with whom mentoring relationships are established, understand interpreting process and process models. This understanding provided a common language used when discussing their interpreting work. Mentors were able to discuss the interpreting models in more

depth to those mentees who did not attend an interpreter education program. All worked at tailoring their mentoring to the needs of the mentee.

Language-Interpreting Portfolios

During the MMP, every mentor graduate created a language-interpreting portfolio showing segments of their use of language using ASL and spoken English, along with their work interpreting both ASL to English and English to ASL. Question 13 asked mentor graduates how they have integrated language-interpreting portfolios into their mentoring. Seven of the 12 respondents (Cathy, Leo, Debbie, Janet, Teri, Jessica, and Monica) have not integrated language-interpreting portfolios into their mentoring practice. Sharon, Sandy, and Lori have integrated recorded samples/portfolios as a basis of analyzing their (the mentees) own work and “seeing” themselves. Emma encouraged mentees to develop portfolios for themselves, and Emma has developed a portfolio both for interpreting and mentoring.

I have yet to see any employer ask for them (Language-Interpreting Portfolios) or them to have any use beyond reflection—or the mentee looking back on how they have progressed. Until I sense there is any reason to have one for employment, I don’t plan to integrate them. (Leo)

Jessica has added language-interpreting portfolios to her list of tools distributed in workshops and trainings.

Marty Taylor Books: Uses by Mentors and Mentees

After mentees have recorded samples of their work, the recordings become the basis of analysis in the mentoring relationship. The Taylor (1993, 2002) books were introduced to the mentor graduates during the MMP. *Interpreting Skills: English to ASL* (Taylor, 1993) and *Interpreting Skills: ASL to English* (Taylor, 2002) were the bases of

Taylor's dissertation. Her research goal was to develop a diagnostic assessment instrument that would identify skills needed to render interpretations both in English to ASL and ASL to English.

Question 14 asked the respondents if the use of the Taylor books have helped them as a mentor in assessing mentees' work. All but two mentor graduates used Taylor books for assessment. Emma reported not having used the books and continued with an unfavorable opinion of the use of these mentoring tools: "In general, they had in the past made my work less than mentee-centered. They give a framework for labeling, but they are too 'error'/feedback-based for my current needs." Respondents Cathy, Sharon, Leo, Debbie, and Lori used the Taylor books as a tool for establishing a common vocabulary for assessing the work; in addition, "This ensures that mentor and protégé are using the same terms to describe the same areas of strength and areas needing improvement (Cathy)." Impartiality to the task of assessing work and keeping it less personal are credits in using the Taylor books (Sharon and Debbie). The mentee looks for patterns (i.e., repetitive strengths or areas needing improvement) in their work. Identifying those patterns through the use of the Taylor books allows mentees to evaluate their own work, leaving Sharon without any agenda, keeping it mentee-centered.

Leo used the Taylor books in teaching interpreters and mentoring: "I often have to show mentees and students how to use them . . . and to get them known as a reference book, not a text book." Both Respondents Debbie and Sandy viewed the books as useful for assessments due to the level of detail. s Kate and Teri labeled the Taylor books as great tools. Adding to this, Teri found them helpful, "especially when used for working on areas of improvement, as well as a tool for developing skill-building activities." Lori

provided a more comprehensive use of the Taylor books, which has been helpful to the mentoring practice:

These books provide a framework to look at the students/mentees' work with respect to her/his work and processes and provides a non-threatening approach to guide the mentee into assessing the work. Also, it provided a tool for the mentee to assess the work based on her/his learning needs and what they deem critical at that point, even though the mentor may see it differently. That shows where the mentee is and how the mentee may feel or view the work. This allows the mentee to set the pace and tone of the mentoring process while the mentor works with the learning styles and approaches to guide the mentee to set goals and ways to focus and improve on the specific areas.

While Question 14 looked at the Taylor book for mentors assessing mentees' work, Question 15 centered on mentees and how it has helped them assess their own work. Although several of the mentor graduates expressed mentees having some difficulties in first using the Taylor books, eventually, it became a nonjudgmental way to discuss the work together. Cathy, Debbie, and Leo reiterated, for mentees, the Taylor books establish the common language shared or as Debbie suggested, "language of the trade," when reviewing interpretations related to strengths and areas needing improvement. In the opinion of Sharon, Debbie, Lori, and Monica, the Taylor books help mentees to assess their work when comparing what they see in their work as effective or areas that need to improve with the detailed descriptions in the books. Sharon stated,

This happens without having someone tell them they are "doing this wrong" so it takes the need to feel defensive about their work out of the equation. It allows them to actually see some of the things they might struggle to accomplish written out in a clear, nonjudgmental explanation.

Sandy viewed the highly detailed Taylor books as a basis for what to look for in the mentees' interpretations and especially for those mentees who have not developed their own confidence. Janet was one of the mentor graduates who supported that the

books are a little overwhelming initially. Janet found that after mentees worked with the books, most of them felt the books had been beneficial in identifying and labeling areas they would like to work on in their interpretations. Kate provided a form based on the books for the mentees to work with when identifying skills they would like to develop. The form and books, along with a prerecorded stimulus, encourages mentees to look for both successful interpreting and areas needing improvement. “Often, mentees misperceive their areas of strength and weakness. Having a detailed list of possible errors helps keep language uniform and helps create goals” (Kate). Lori referred to the Taylor books as excellent in that they help to identify lean skills (needed for language) and rich skills (needed for interpreting). As mentees learn, understand, and develop the lean skills, they can move on to the rich skills of interpreting. “It has given them labels to criticize themselves with and had fed into their need for ‘feedback’” (Emma).

Overall, mentor graduates have used the Taylor books or are using them now in their mentoring practice. When discussing their views or opinions, respondents shared that the Taylor books for most mentees are difficult to use until they perceive the books as references—not texts. As mentees learn to use the Taylor books, they take responsibility for assessing their work in the areas where they have been successful in an interpretation or areas where they would like to improve interpreting skills. The books are used as an assessment tool for both mentors and mentees alike. The Taylor books provide mentors and mentees a common language to use when discussing their work. One respondent found the Taylor books a framework for labeling and considered them too error/feedback-based for his or her practice.

Demand Control Schema

Demand control schema (DCS) is used to teach mentees/students to think about challenges or *demands* they may encounter when working in any given setting while interpreting. What they personally bring to the setting to resolve those challenges is noted as *controls*. DCS is composed of four domains: (a) environmental (physical space and terms and jargon of the setting), (b) paralinguistic (style of discourse, pace, accents, etc.), (c) interpersonal (dynamics of those personalities involved), and (d) intrapersonal (feelings of the interpreter; i.e., personal safety, personal needs, skill level, apprehension), which the interpreter may encounter while working (Dean & Pollard, 2001). The decision-making process in interpreting is an intricate part of the mentoring relationship. Following are results to Question 16—whether or not mentor graduates had integrated their knowledge of DCS into their work as a mentor, into their own work as interpreter practitioners, and into their mentees.

Respondents Sharon, Leo, Sandy, Janet, Lori, Emma, and Teri agreed that integrating DCS into their overall work as mentors and practitioners and into the mentees' work has proven immensely valuable. Sharon stated,

I have used it as I've considered my processes in mentoring others, in my own work, as an interpreter, and as a tool for the mentee to be able to distance herself from her work and go back and evaluate the choices she made preassignment, during the assignment, and post assignment, to see if there were things she could have done differently.

Leo, Janet, Lori, and Emma similarly commented that using DCS allows mentees to analyze their own demands, prioritize, and develop goals to establish resources and means for decision making. Debbie reflected on her participation in the MMP: "I remember the cohort didn't do well with this during our course. I, as well as my mentees,

are attending a workshop this fall on the topic.” Sandy’s response was that DCS helps her target and prioritize issues. When working with mentees, DCS “allows them to understand/accept why some things are more problematic than others. It allows them to gain confidence and prepare themselves for the harder tasks” (Sandy). The DCS guides Lori “to frame questions that will guide the mentee into thinking and reflecting on what is being discussed.” Teri said, “When someone says ‘that job was sooooo hard,’ I open the conversation with some DCS concepts.” Jessica stated that it was not learned, which may mean that MMP introduced DCS after Cohort I or II.

Following the questions regarding the integration of DCS into their work as mentor, interpreting practitioner, and for the mentee, respondents were asked the benefits (Question 17) and limitations (Question 18) of using DCS with mentees. Mentor graduates’ responses were similar, yet, all had their own unique way of answering the question. Cathy’s view towards benefits of DCS is it aids mentees’ understanding of interpreting and interpreting process and what they can do and, at times, what they are not prepared to do. When looking at limitations, Cathy said, “DCS requires the development of the ability to do an analysis of the situation, language, and interpretation skills prior to application.” Without judgment and with the mentor working as a guide, DCS “allows the mentee to evaluate their own work and their own decision-making process from a safe distance” (Sharon). Sharon noted a disparity for some mentees, feeling unqualified to self-evaluate their work. Over time, mentees realize their ability to analyze their work. It becomes a process—evaluating work and not the mentee’s worth as an individual. Respondents Debbie, Sandy, Janet, and Lori concurred with Cathy and Sharon. In addition, by prioritizing and working on small pieces rather than undertaking

the whole, mentees gain confidence and are able to prepare themselves for the harder tasks. “It broadens their perspective beyond vocabulary—makes them think of the relationships, their own influence and how the physical space impacts the work” (Leo). Related to managing the work, Leo enjoyed the transformation from the feelings of helplessness in a given situations to knowing and understanding they have recourses to draw from.

The whole paralinguistic label is still really confusing for them . . . and there is not really as clean a way to discuss the language demands of the situation . . . it’s embedded in all other areas and that’s not easy for mentees to students to grasp. In addition, it can’t actually make them choose to take action—particularly when they tend to be young, inexperienced, and sense they can’t challenge any of the status quo. (Respondent Leo)

Debbie understood the benefits of DCS as taking in to the interpreting assignment/situation all of your personal experiences and knowledge. Within the given situation, you will encounter certain requirements/demands. “You have to find the balance to do the best job you can. Then after that situation, you have more knowledge to add to your bag” (Debbie). Janet, Kate, and Teri alluded to the idea that DCS provided a good framework and common language for mentor and mentee.

In agreement with Sharon, Debbie, and Lori, Respondent Janet stated a limitation is if the mentee is not familiar with DCS or familiar with the setting (i.e., legal). In a difficult situation, Janet will use DCS in a discussion regarding the work and review of all four domains—interpersonal, intrapersonal, paralinguistic, and environmental—of the DCS. Kate viewed limitations in using DCS: “Having the theoretical knowledge may not always be a benefit.” Lori viewed the benefits through mentees’ discovery of options in the decisions-making process: how each option has consequences, which produces more

demands, and how decisions and the consequences affect themselves and others either positively or negatively. Other benefits are “mentees move towards becoming autonomous in their decision-making processes, rather than dependent on a dualistic (rule-based, right or wrong) way of thinking or on authority” (Lori). Using discussion and guided self-analysis with the mentees may be successful for some; however, for other mentees it may become overwhelming “as it will not allow the mentee to offer different perspectives or avenues for learning needs” (Lori).

DCS was integrated into most of the mentor graduates’ work as mentor/interpreter practitioner and into the mentee’s work in various ways. Some referred to the DCS as a tool in analyzing interpreting situations preassignment, during the assignment, and postassignment. Although many of the respondents said they used DCS as a mentor, only one provided an example of how he or she integrated DCS into his or her work by framing questions, helping to guide mentees in their discoveries.

Overall, the benefits of using DCS in their work with mentees came from discussing the work in the context of making decisions, looking at the relationships within the assignment and how each individual may affect the process, and prioritizing and analyzing small pieces rather than the whole, which can be overwhelming. Limitations seem to stem from learning DCS and how to use it as a tool, which comes with time and experience, along with mentees’ initial desire for the mentor to tell them what is wrong versus mentees using critical thinking to make discoveries in their interpreting work.

Zone of Proximal Development and Scaffolding

The MMP introduced Vygotsky as a mentoring tool that introduced ZPD and scaffolding. Scaffolding is the support mentors give to mentees as they transition from what they know to what they have learned and how to incorporate that into their work, otherwise considered as ZPD. In Questions 19 and 20, mentor graduates were first asked if they had incorporated Vygotsky's scaffolding (i.e., ZPD) into their work as a mentor, followed by whether they had incorporated ZPD in their own work.

Every mentor graduate except Jessica has incorporated Vygotsky's scaffolding into their work as a mentor. While Cathy and Monica viewed scaffolding as a background function as the mentor and mentee work together to create a plan for skills, Respondents Cathy, Leo, Sandy, Janet and Monica used ZPD to help mentees understand the process of the mentoring relationship and were attentive to what steps are reasonable to address and what they might expect from the mentoring. In addition, mentees are asked to look at what they know (ZPD) before proceeding, which eases them into the scaffolding process. Sharon used scaffolding in activities that ensure continued development of skills rather than setting goals that are extreme and difficult to meet. "As they get closer to the level of achievement they are aiming for, I encourage them to find their own ways of continuing their work towards improvement" (Sharon). Sharon's modeling of Vygotsky's ZPD with mentees has proven successful in mentees using the same kinds of behaviors themselves:

I have set an assignment for myself and allow the mentee to be involved as I work through it. I believe it is the process of seeing the steps I need to take in order to be successful that helps the mentee realize that no one simply improves in a specific area because they have determined to do so. As they observe the thought

processes, struggles, and evaluations that happen in others, they are willing to engage in the same kinds of behavior themselves.

Debbie, who works with educational interpreters, responded, “Scaffolding is another area focused on for the EIPA. Kate discussed Vygotsky with mentees and has produced a manual for mentees explaining both Vygotsky’s ideas and scaffolding. Using the manual in discourse and discussions, Kate “thinks it is important for mentor/mentees to know where the mentee stands in terms of development. I usually use a graphic of the ZPD that illustrates to mentees the learning process.” Lori viewed that incorporating Vygotsky scaffolding into the mentoring work is fundamental to working as mentor and teacher: “Scaffolding provides a ‘holding’ position to allow the mentee to explore, talk, reflect, etc., without feeling the ‘free fall,’ which can be scary if there is no safety net—that ‘no zone’ during the process of making transitional thinking.” When responding to whether or not she had incorporated ZPD into her mentoring, she stated, “I know I have incorporated that, however there have been times I was not aware I was doing that.”

Apparent learning moments were used by Lori to engage in discussions regarding where the mentee would like to go from that point. Emma has “fully” incorporated scaffolding into mentoring. Emma’s “goal is to get to a place where scaffolding can effectively happen.” To Question 20, Emma replied, “Process mediation is my approach of choice. Therefore, attending to zone markers and seeking the ZPD is my goal each time in mentoring.” Teri believed ZPD is the foundation of the MMP.

Regarding these questions, in most responses, ZPD and scaffolding were both interwoven into the responses without clear explanation of each individually. One can only speculate, in using the Vygotsky approach while mentoring, must both ZPD and

scaffolding be incorporated into the mentoring practice for effective results? All but one respondent used Vygotsky in their mentoring.

Mentee-Centered Approach

The mentee-centered approach to mentoring is based on theoretical concepts of constructivism and adult learning theory. Mentors allow more freedom of choice in the training of mentees by using self-assessment, self-direction, and active collaboration practices. In the following questions, mentor graduates were asked if they were comfortable with the mentee-centered approach as used in the MMP (Question 21), if mentees are comfortable with the mentee-centered approach (Question 22), benefits of using this approach as a mentor (Question 23), limitations as mentor (Question 24), and benefits (Question 25) and limitations (Question 26) to mentees in using the mentee-centered approach.

Respondent Sandy is the only mentor graduate who said “no” to Question 21. This respondent’s rationale was “at times it feels too ‘adherent’ to its own philosophy. Both the mentee and mentor end up frustrated and then the whole bonding breaks down and you end up with bad feelings” (Sandy). When asked about mentees’ comfort in using the mentee-centered approach, again Sandy responded that mentees were not comfortable. However, Sandy admitted it may be a reflection of her own discomfort in using the approach. Respondents Cathy, Sharon, Leo, Debbie, Janet, and Kate found after completing the MMP that mentee-centered mentoring is used, and for all it is a comfortable fit in their practices. “It is their journey [the mentee’s] . . . they need to take the lead with some guidance to get them started” (Debbie). Kate added, “I don’t have a problem with focusing discussion, goals, and sessions back to the mentee and do not

usually try to interject my own personal desires/goals.” Emma was comfortable with the mentee-centered approach, however, “There were times when I felt that MMP lost sight of the approach and other times when they were right there with it.”

Question 22 brought responses of various degrees of comfort for the mentee-centered by mentees. Respondents Cathy, Sharon, Sandy, and Kate stated mentees are not comfortable with the mentee-centered approach. All alluded to changes in degrees of comfort: “I explain it in our first sessions . . . they start to understand” (Leo); mentee-centered mentoring “is still a new process and it takes time” (Janet); “if they are highly motivated” (Kate), they will like the approach; “depending on the mentee and considering their learning styles and learning experiences, most learn to embrace it” (Lori); it is an acclimation process (Emma); and a yes, from both Teri and Jessica. Monica found teacher-centered interpreter education programs made it difficult for mentees to use the mentee-centered approach when asked to explore their work and their feelings about the work on their own.

In addition to varying degrees of comfort, mentor graduates found other reasons where mentees did not like the mentee-centered approach which was the focus of the MMP (Question 24). Cathy cited mentees wanted questions answered explicitly in lieu of co-investigation due to a fear of being questioned about their work. The mentoring relationship would have suffered if the mentor adhered to the mentee-centered approach. Sharon found most mentees saw the mentee-centered approach as “radically different from the techniques used to help them learn in the past.” However, once the mentee-centered approach is explained and implemented, the mentee becomes comfortable (Respondents Leo, Janet, and Lori). Mentor graduates expressed the mentee-centered

approach gives mentees the power to make changes in their work, and once that concept is grasped, they make advances. Too, mentees find the ability to direct their own learning, engaging especially when they are guided by the mentor.

In Leo's opinion, it is not as comfortable when working with experienced interpreters for them to use the mentee-centered approach, and Leo found the work is more mentor-directed due to their goals or in working on specific skills sets. Viewing some mentees "not as committed" to the work as others can pose problems for the mentor in being more creative in the relationships (Debbie). Recalling Sandy's unfavorable response, frustration in using the mentee-centered approach will, at times, turn to anger from not getting the answers.

Respondents Kate, Lori, and Emma viewed mentees as having a tough time buying into the mentee-centered approach and still would like to be "told" what to do, "as that is what they learned to expect and may be confused or not confident in their own knowledge and self-reflections" (Lori). "Most of the mentees I have encountered are initially shocked by the entire question asking I do, and how little answers providing I do" (Kate). Those mentees who continue to want the answers given to them take much longer to transition to the mentee-centered approach and often seek other mentors who use a mentor-centered relationship.

Five of the mentor graduates (Respondents Cathy, Leo, Sandy, Kate, and Emma) found the benefit of learning from using a mentee-centered approach in their practice. Cathy wrote, "I am constantly learning and provided with different perspectives that I may not have explored previously." Cathy believed it makes her a better mentor and

interpreter. Viewing limitations, Cathy found it hard not to lead mentees to what they saw as a specific understanding or conclusion. Sharon stated,

The benefits I receive, as a mentor, comes from the satisfaction of watching someone who has been struggling with a specific skill and looking for the “right” answers to suddenly realize they have had the tools to provide their own “right” answer all along.

The benefits realized from the mentee-centered approach for Respondents Leo, Debbie, Lori, and Teri were summed up by Sharon: to see mentees feel they are contributing to and trusting their own learning. They found there is a sense of freedom as a benefit from the mentor-centered approach in mentoring. The work belongs to mentees along with the discoveries as the mentor guides them through what they want to work on and improve. “They challenge me, I have to be able to back up my statements, I end up chasing down information and resources as much as they do, so I always learn a lot” (Leo).

Time constraints placed on the mentoring relationship can become a limitation (Leo). Debbie found benefits from the excitement of seeing mentees take a self-directed turn after being afraid to, resulting in empowerment and doing better for themselves. Debbie believed that mentees have a true support system in the mentee-centered approach where the mentor is not forcing beliefs or thoughts on the mentee. Mentees who want the mentor to do all of the work and take all of the blame are limitations for Debbie. Sandy stated a limitation:

When the mentee becomes so frustrated that they become angry. If I “give in,” I am breaking with the MMP approach; if I don’t, the mentee may not be able to tolerate the frustration. Making “enemies” rather than “allies” is not effective.

Ownership is the mentee's and a benefit of the mentor-centered approach: "I am not responsible for their learning, for their improvement, their growth. I am there to guide and encourage, but they get to win the process and the success" (Janet).

Kate not only learns a tremendous amount about herself, but the mentee, too. Kate found through the mentee-centered approach, her question-answer skills have grown; Kate was "fairly confident" her mentoring skills have grown likewise. Sometimes, it takes more time for those mentees to understand the mentee-centered approach if they are not expressive or are unsure of their learning and skills development. This becomes a limitation for them (Kate): "It seems to sometimes waste time, when I could just tell them what they are doing wrong, rather than having them explore/discover it on their own as a product of the process."

In Lori and Teri's opinion, if there are any limitations at all it would be the time it takes for the mentee to adjust to the approach. The adjustment may be due to past learning experiences when a student comes from an interpreting program where a teacher-centered approach is used: "They don't know or understand that mentoring can be different than that" (Teri). Emma was always surprised by what she learns about new ways mentees discuss work and the interpreting process. Regarding the limitations, Emma faces, she stated, "Only the limitations my own rigidity imparts to the process." Monica wrote, "It takes some of the pressure off of me as being the sage or the one with all the answers." Monica agreed with Janet's limitation, where seeing the patterns in mentees' work must be contained until mentees make the discovery themselves.

When surveying mentor graduates as to what they thought were the benefits for mentees in using mentor-centered approach (Question 25), the benefits revolved around

autonomy and self-growth. The limitations (Question 26) revolved around nonautonomous behaviors, commitment, and responsibility.

Each of the respondents noted benefits for the mentees of empowerment, confidence, objectivity, learning, critical thinking, collaboration, support system, risk taking, having control, learning to trust, and discuss without judgment. Cathy found benefits for mentees in the opportunity to become “an expert and gain the skills necessary to use the skills in an organic way.”

Synonymous with other respondents is that mentees’ limitations come from mentor evaluation and feedback versus self-evaluation and responsibility for their own learning. In other words, limitations would be the mentees’ expectations of wanting the answers from the mentor, which does not fit with the mentee-centered approach. “Once they get past the ‘why won’t you just tell me’ part, they really, really learn—learn well” (Sandy). Lori shared,

The benefits are unbeatable as the mentee learns to trust their learning and to become relatively autonomous in their work. Also they learn to be confident in discussing their work without fear of being judged, put down, or mocked. They learn to look at their work from different perspectives and welcome new perspectives from others.

Respondent Monica saw the benefits for mentees in using the mentee-centered approach in that they acquire tools for self-diagnosis and exploration.

Cultural Competencies

Communication is a dynamic and interactive process that occurs in the mentoring relationship. Cultural competencies do not come from what distinguishes people on the outside but knowing people and what they know and think on the inside. Surveying the views and opinions of the importance of cultural competencies when establish a

mentoring relationship (Question 27), giving an example where understanding cultural competencies has enhanced the mentoring relationship (Question 28), and knowing the advantages of the mentor understanding cultural competencies for the mentee (Question 29) will be subsequently analyzed.

In regards to cultural competencies as discussed in the MMP, Cathy said the whole person is considered and, therefore, it deepens the relationship: “I think the protégé gains from my understanding of cultural competencies because I am better able to monitor my cultural filters and prevent them from having a negative impact on the relationship.” Each respondent following Cathy proclaimed the importance of cultural competency from huge and crucial to fairly and it depends. Although respondents had varying degrees with which they held cultural competencies as important, their examples were what stood out in the analysis of the data.

Sharon regarded cultural competencies as very important to the mentoring relationship: “Much of the way we see the world we live in is based on our own cultural background.” An example that enhances the mentoring relationship as related to cultural competency for Sharon has been through understanding her own culture and how it influences the ability to discuss issues. Sharon has become aware of different cultural responses where a mentee may be more direct or guarded during an evaluation process: “Being sensitive to the other person’s culture will allow me to temper my discussion accordingly.” The advantages for mentees relate to sensitivity to potential differences and allowing them to use their cultural framework and not to impose the mentor’s framework. Leo responded, “At least as important as personality [are] learning styles, awareness.” Leo stated cultural competencies have not been a huge thing for him as he works in a

homogeneous setting; however, “In some larger mentoring settings (where I hired mentors) exploring the native culture and deaf culture of the mentors has been a huge benefit for the interpreter mentees.”

Continuing to elicit views and opinions as to the advantages of you, as the mentor, understanding cultural competencies for the mentee, Leo stated, “Particularly with deaf culture—I feel I can help them start to understand why deaf people may be reacting in a certain way—and encourage the mentee’s own curiosity and exploration of the culture.” On importance, Debbie proclaimed, “Huge! You have to take into account where each person is coming from and how you will reach them.” Debbie provided the example of “working with someone who grew up in different culture than mine or the current one they are living in now.” When giving advantages, Debbie responded, “Provides the mentee with the right approach that will work for them. They will feel heard.” Cultural competencies are “critical to ANY effective communication and absolutely essential to building a relationship” (Sandy). At the same time, Sandy did not feel one must know everything about the culture of another within the relationship: “Learning and sharing can be a building point for the relationship. But we do need to be interculturally (and/or culturally) sensitive. We MUST be sensitive to each other’s reactions.” Sandy provided an example of cultures that do not readily accept other cultures’ point of view about given issues. In this case, being aware of “hot buttons” allows the mentor to find an approach that may be more acceptable. A pluralistic approach is an advantage to mentees (Sandy). Janet responded,

This is not something I had thought very deeply about until I took the MMP training. I appreciate the heightened awareness this gave me. Cultural

competencies are important, but because most mentees are of the same race and gender as me, I probably don't give it enough attention.

Janet gave two examples from mentoring relationships where understanding cultural competencies enhanced the relationship while working together. One was when he or she mentored older women with more interpreting experience than he or she. The mentee lived in a part of the country where traditionally the people responded with "yes, ma'am" and "no ma'am." The other mentee was of a different race than the mentor and worked in a rural setting. "All of these differences influenced how I interacted with these mentees" (Janet). Framing conversations and showing respect to the mentee were advantages Janet found in understanding cultural competencies. Kate viewed cultural competencies as "fairly important." If issues arose, Kate addresses them and throughout the relationship is respectful of differences. Kate did not have any specific examples; however, Kate provided advantages for mentees by his or her understanding of cultural competencies:

If I can understand different cultural needs that my mentees bring to the table, I can better provide the kind of service/mentoring that will benefit them the most. If I don't take the time to learn about cultural differences and if I am not proficient in understanding cultural differences, I could inadvertently set the mentee or myself up for failure. It is unproductive not to be competent culturally. Especially if mentoring someone of a different culture. I might even add gender to that. Men and women are very different in approach and learning even when they are from the same culture.

For Lori, cultural competency should be an "underlying principle" of the mentoring relationship. This has not used cultural competencies during mentoring sessions, however, when cultural competency topics are discussed they are addressed, if time allows. Lori stated that this does not mean that cultural competencies should be ignored but prevalent throughout the mentoring practice. Respect for diversity and a

desire to learn more about cultures within the deaf community are examples where understanding cultural competencies enhanced the mentoring relationship for this respondent.

The advantages are that they guide framing of questions and framing my perspectives of what the mentee is sharing. It frames the discussion and guides the path of the discussion into possible cultural conflicts and how the mentee may come up with resources and ways of handling these conflicts. (Lori)

Emma found the importance of understanding cultural competencies crucial in his or her practice. When providing examples, Emma stated, “In my work mentoring deaf interpreters, culture competencies have proven invaluable. Having the tool of curiosity and openness to different worldview and learning styles had helped in relation building.” This mentor graduate has mentored interpreters from other countries and reported the cultural competency work she did in the MMP proved a foundation for that work. Emma found the advantages for mentees in his or her knowledge of cultural competencies as “the mentee has someone they can communicate with in a meaningful way.” Monica said, “Knowing that some cultures self-depreciate or avoid eye contact with someone seen as a teacher helps the mentor.” The advantage for this respondent regarding mentees is the mentor and mentee work together.

In summary, all of the mentor graduates considered that having knowledge of cultural competencies is important to various degrees. Most of them provided examples in their mentoring relationships where understanding cultural competencies enhanced the relationship. Each found various advantages in using culturally competent practices for the mentees.

Socratic Questions

Socratic questions involved in the mentee-centered mentoring relationships were intended to help the mentee look at all aspects of the work and logically coming to discovering their best options through the discourse in resolving any issues in their work. Mentor graduates' next questions were what are the advantages (Question 31) and limitations (Question 32) of using Socratic questions in your mentoring relationships?

Respondents Cathy, Sharon, Leo, Debbie, Sandy, Kate, Lori, and Monica discovered Socratic questions aid the mentee into understanding, accepting, and using the discovery. Socratic questions ensure that all perspectives have been considered by the mentee. Sharon found,

Socratic questions allow the person involved to have their own points of view regarding specific issues, but then look for other solutions that may lead to a change in their perspectives. In other words, when a mentee looks at his work, he may be satisfied with it. A series of Socratic questions may be raised that could lead the mentee to reevaluate and reconsider his choices or methods of interpreting without putting him on the defensive. He can then come to another conclusion of his own, without the mentor having to simply state his earlier work was wrong.

These respondents found similar limitations to Socratic questions. Socratic questions require more time, which proves to be a limitation. "Also, they can be perceived as negating affirmations made by the mentee" (Cathy). Responding to the limitations, Sharon concluded, "One of the limitations might manifest itself when the mentee is not secure enough in himself to be able to objectively look for other ways to do the same job." When overused, the mentee may lose focus on the point of the question. If questions come too frequently, mentees may feel challenged or like they are being interrogated, added Lori and Monica. Sandy agreed, "Sometimes, it seems like

‘psychoanalysis for interpreters,’ especially if you end up probing self-confidence issues, linguist, or otherwise.”

Socratic questions for some mentor graduates can become its own parody and too much like therapy. Also, a mentee can use diversionary tactics to avoid real exploration. “At some point, there needs to be a cutoff and focus on work then back to questions” (Leo). Along the same lines of reasoning, Kate pointed out, “Having opposing viewpoints helps the mentee expand their thinking and can often help mentees draw conclusions that aren’t based on one-sided limited thinking.” Whereas, rationale Socratic questions “could offend the mentee if they feel attacked by the opposing question and without explanations, the mentee might not realize what is happening and shut down, and no learning can take place” (Kate). The advantages of using Socratic questions for Debbie is in the help it provides to mentees to think for themselves and allow them to guide the interaction. A limitation is when mentees dislike all the questioning and want the mentor to provide answers. To really find what is “going on” in the mentee’s head, Sandy suggested one must go beyond the yes/no questions.

In Lori’s perspective, Socratic questions “become a guided self-analysis approach for the mentee. They allow the mentee to go deeper and deeper into their process, work, and self-discovery when they are ready. These questions become the milestones as they mark the progress for the mentor.” Emma used Socratic questions in terms of the art of using dialogue and felt it is the only way to communicate and effectively listen to mentees.

Transitional Learning Experiences

Question 33 refers to how learners construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current/past knowledge (i.e., transitions). When using the philosophies and approaches of the MMP, what are some of the transitions you have experienced in your work with the mentees (i.e., ending, a period of confusion and distress, leading to, a new beginning)?

All respondents shared their unique experiences with mentees as their journey with different mentees progressed. Most respondents described mentees as leaving a comfort zone initially, to find in the end a new beginning of self-discovery with the ability to make decisions and deal with the consequences of those decisions with the guidance of the mentor. Emma wrote, “Everything is a transition. For me each mentoring relationship is like learning to dance with a new partner. Each relationship-building experience is unique.”

One of the most interesting transitions I have experienced happened with one mentee. This person approached me about her work as an interpreter, and as it turned out, she worked more on her own issues with self-confidence. As she became more comfortable with herself as a person, she was able to relax as she interpreted and allowed herself to do the job she had been able to do the whole time. It was fascinating to watch and simply be her sounding board as she worked through this process. Through this experience, I’ve learned that using the philosophies and approaches of the MMP are really beneficial when the mentee is truly allowed to direct the mentoring relations. (Sharon)

The transition lies in the “taking on a new perspective, letting go of or unlearning old habits or ways of thinking, fear of how others may react to their ‘new behavior,’ how to gain trust from others that the mentee is learning” (Lori).

Leo concurred with Respondents Sandy, Janet, and Lori regarding mentees’ passive approach in the beginning to find later “a sense of ‘it’s going to be all right’ from

the mentee” once he or she understood the mentoring relationship and the journey they would take together. Sandy found the most difficult part of transitions for many mentees is the period of confusion and distress. Continuing with the theme of mentees entering the relationship with the passive approach, Sandy stated, “A lot of mentees aren’t expecting to have to deal with that and end up resenting it, even with a heads-up.” Janet noticed that transitions in working with mentees are setting up structure of specific goals and the process of how to obtain these goals. Although she saw no difference in traditional mentoring, where specific goals are structured in the mentoring relationship, mentees have a difficult time “engaging in the conversations about the work” and the process of how to obtain these goals.

A different view was elicited from Kate who believed that the question is whether these are actual transitions or stagnations. Kate stated, “I think for me, getting the mentee to progress and not stagnate is sometimes the most difficult aspect of mentoring.” Transitions were viewed in various ways by mentor graduates as related to mentees’ journey in the relationships.

Business Practice

One section of learning in the MMP was setting business practices for mentoring. Business practices were then applied to the final project where mentor graduates designed and established a mentoring practice in their home environment. Question 34 asked if mentor graduates are using any of the business practices learned from the MMP and why. Some of these practices consisted of marketing tools such as business forms (i.e., developing invoices, letters to perspective mentees or agencies where mentoring might benefit their staff interpreters, documents [such as contracts], and miscellaneous forms

such as mentoring logs, goal setting, and activity materials). Other practices pertained to how mentees are accepted (Question 35), fees for services (Question 36) as noted in Table 5, and the length of time a mentoring relationship is established (Question 37).

Table 5

Fees for Service Charged by Respondents

Mentor	Fees for service/hour				
	No charge	\$35-40	\$45-50	\$55-75	Other—comments
1	NC				I believe it would be inappropriate to do so
2		\$35			
3				\$60-65	Plus mileage
4				\$60	Face-to-face fee. All other times is not paid
5		\$35			Varies
6		\$40			
7			\$35-50		Varies
8				\$50-75	A sliding scale. Depends on who is paying
9					A. A credit based course fee that kicks back a small amount to me. B. An hourly fee based upon the interpreters hourly fee to fall no lower than \$20/hour. Or reciprocation
10			\$50		
11				\$45-75	
12					Depends

Cathy used none of the business practices because she has not pursued marketing mentoring services; however, a co-interview process determines the terms of the relationship. The length of the mentoring relationship is decided after meeting several times and establishing the needs. Sharon has worked with both formal and informal mentoring and found formal mentor to be more suitable. Formal mentoring relationships seem to be a better way of making the mentoring relationship accountable by the mentee. “So, having a ‘contract’ spelling out the dates and times of meeting together gives the mentee a sense of deadlines to meet, so the work between meetings actually gets done” (Sharon).

An initial meeting is the first step for Sharon, and the determining factor is the mentee’s willingness to work with the mentee-centered approach in the mentoring relationship. Sharon reported those mentees who make this decision usually do well in the mentoring relationship. For those who do not take responsibility for their work, the relationship is ended. The mentoring relationship is set for a tentative 6 weeks and its length of time is determined by mentees’ progress in meeting their goals. Leo has been interpreting for over 20 years and his business practice was well established before entering the MMP. However, Leo used some of the information to set rates, invoice, and promote himself. Leo accepted mentees based on the following factors:

A) Do I have time to give—I don’t want to make a half-commitment. B) Do they have the time—do they have an understanding that this work takes time. C) Do I have a history with the district, agency, entity they are coming to me from? If I do, I know what I’m dealing with in terms of their history, their work environment, their colleagues, etc. . . . that makes my job easier. D) Where are we going to meet—will I have to spend time in transport? E) Are they willing to pay a fee—or can we work out compensation that is comfortable for us both? Those are the main things.

In answering the questions as to how long the mentoring relationship will last, the answer was “some are dictated” (Leo). Leo works with mentees who are mandated by state laws, prescribing 2 years of mentoring for new educational interpreters in the K-12 academic setting or until they pass the certification.

In a research project for the National Consortium for Interpreter Education Center (NCIEC, *Identifying Effective Practices*, 2007) Leo found a minimum 8-week commitment is necessary and used this for most mentoring work. However, if the mentoring is specific, that dictates the time. Debbie works with a state organization where she provides instruction, mentees are scheduled, and she is compensated. Leo indicated the use of some of the business forms from MMP for personal use. The assignment of mentees is through the agency, therefore, there is no decision as to whether they will work together. Leo travels to mentees’ location and works with them on average 2 hours a session. The business practice of the MMP enhanced and reinforced what Sandy has done prior to the MMP.

Sandy’s schedule and the needs of mentees define whether she will establish a mentoring relationship. With regard to her practice, “I am stronger with culture and linguistics, less so on actual interpreting process since I am not a practicing interpreter.” When establishing the length of the relationship, Sandy stated, “Based on what they want from the relationship and whether or not I think I can contribute . . . usually scheduled short term at first and then recurring if the relationship ‘clicks.’” In retrospect, Janet stated, “Business practice was a brief section in Cohort I,” therefore she had no input. As with other mentor graduates, a conversation about the needs of the mentee, along with the mentoring process and personality fits, precedes the mentoring agreement. When

establishing a time frame for the work, “Initially, it is usually no less than 3 months, then we evaluate” (Janet). Kate continued to use the forms and documents created during the MMP. “Having forms/documents that look and sound professional in design helps foster a more productive mentoring relationship and helps both me and the mentee to take it seriously” (Kate).

Kate used a contract to initiate the mentoring relationship when deciding whether or not to take a mentee: “There is no one thing that makes me say yes or no, but a variety of things that are taken into account.” Looking at the time involved the mentee’s present level of education and willingness to invest in the relationship, along with whether the mentoring will be paid or not are some of the things considered. In establishing how long Kate will work with a mentee, “We create an initial plan that details expectations such as time and money and commitment expectations.” Lori responded, “It is difficult to work with an organization on a bigger scale so I haven’t really used business practices.” With Lori, there is not one specific thing that initiates the mentoring relationship with the mentee. Time is a factor, along with the mentee’s background, education, needs, and previous relationships with the mentee when deciding whether to take the mentee. “For me, I feel that a six-eight-session program is best as that gives the mentee more freedom, as well as the mentor to decide if there should be another set of sessions, 4-6 weeks” (Lori).

Teri shared, “I am still working within the mentoring program I developed as my MMP project. The business practices are the same, but they are still not effective practices in the long run. Mentoring is still 60% giving back to the community.” This mentor graduate will meet with the prospective mentee, visit to get a feel for their

compatibility, and then engage in one session before making the final decision as to whether or not start the mentoring relationship. Generally, the respondent sets the first goal as six sessions and then continues from there.

Teri continues to use the same forms, checklists, and organizing systems learned while in the MMP and accepts new mentees only if time allows. Teri added, “I mentor and run a mentoring program through a state agency. As a group, my department developed guides for our program and those are what I following in terms of the duration of working with one mentee.” Monica did not answer Question 34 and spoke to “timing” with regards to taking a mentee or not. In establishing the length of time working with the mentee, Monica said, “The length of time prescribed by the source requesting mentoring or if private practice what works for the two of us.”

The section of instruction on business practices as learned in the MMP was either still used by some in private practice and agency-related mentoring or not used at all, due to working for organizations where business practices were already established. Some used the same exact forms and documents from their final project, and some used them to enhance and refine their previous documents.

Overall, the decision of whether or not to accept a prospective mentee weighed heavily on time. Other factors were mentee’s level of education, acceptance of the mentoring process, willingness to do the work and take responsibility, and whether there were personality fits. The length of a mentoring relationship was between 6 and 8 weeks with an evaluation at the end of the set time to determine if more time was needed. For some respondents who worked with agencies, lengths of mentorships were predetermined. Fees for services varied with each mentor graduate.

The Master Mentor Program

The final questions from the semistructured interview questionnaire were specific to the MMP as to what the mentor graduates have learned regarding mentoring (Question 38), preparation to become a mentor (Question 39), things that may have been lacking in the program (Question 40), the importance of credentialing (Question 41), sharing the knowledge (Question 42), and how philosophies and approaches of the MMP may have affected interpreter education programs (Question 43) in general.

All of the mentor graduates had different opinions or views of what they have learned about mentoring since they graduated from the MMP from learning specific concepts to realizing the philosophies and approaches did not suite their style of mentoring. Cathy suggested “that we (the graduates of the MMP) have not done enough to detail the benefits of the program and so there had been no benefit to having completed the training professional.” Others stated how important mentoring is in our field and how much it is needed. Several respondents voiced the opinion that there are still those in the field of mentoring who rely on the old concepts of mentoring or have misconceptions of what mentoring really is. Sharon has “learned that once they can get their minds wrapped around the concept of the mentee-driven relationship, they usually improve in areas they had not even originally considered. It’s been great!” Leo found a, “A pure Vygotsky/Colonomos only-asking-questions approach does not work for me [him]....” Leo found that working in specific areas as a mentor—such as Video Relay Service (VRS) mentoring, which focuses on very specific skill sets and benchmarks—leaves her ambivalent as to whether this is mentoring or not. Debbie realized better listening skills as she has worked with mentees. As a lifelong learner, Debbie continues to pursue

professional development opportunities to stay updated on all new philosophies and practices which, in turn, provide good role modeling to her mentees. After attending the MMP, Sandy decided she liked the program more than expected: “It grows on you.” The idea of the mentee and mentor collaboratively working together was a highlight of learning for Janet. An additional appreciation from the program was the tools of mentoring that were learned and how to use them. Learning how to ask questions and how to provide answers does not compare to learning that

My own learning never stops, and just like with interpreting skill, my mentoring skills will forever be changing and hopefully improving. I’ve learned that mentoring is not always easy and sometimes is hard to stay on task when the mentee is not driven by self-motivation. (Kate)

Lori later found mentoring as a viable profession with its own foundational theories and approaches that can be applied to teaching and everyday relationships with others.

Monica learned, “Experience is the best teacher.”

When asked about the positive or negative impact on the mentor graduates due to their participation in the MMP (Question 39), 10 respondents agreed their learning has made a positive impact on their practice. When discussing the impact, respondents found relationships that worked many useful tools (Respondents Debbie, Sandy, and Emma), freedom from the expectation of knowing all of the answers (Sharon), credibility and professional connections (Leo). For others, preparation to become a Master Mentor provided them with new job opportunities (Respondents Kate and Teri), a desire to continue their education (Lori), and establish mentoring programs.

Only two respondents found issues regarding their preparation as a Master Mentor, related to personal feelings about how the MMP handled their concerns at the

time of the program. Sandy found the second semester of the program a nightmare, “I eventually realized that “mentoring” was being modeled...” and wished, at the time, someone would have made this more explicit.

The MMP, as described in Chapter 2, developed and was fine tuned for subsequent cohorts. When asked to share practices or approaches respondents felt were lacking in their preparation (Question 41) most respondents agreed that the MMP was more comprehensive than lacking. Kate would have liked more “hands-on” training before leaving the program. “I felt I had great theory and knowledge, but application was lacking somewhat” (Kate). Several of the mentor graduates expressed lack of empathy from instructors and administrators towards the learners in program. Just as the mentees have a difficult time in the beginning with the mentee-centered approach, this was a paradigm shift for some MMP participants. Emma suggested a lack of “practicing what MMP preaches in their own training approach.” Monica similarly opined, “Cultural/Student centered learning/sensitivity on the part of the instructors.”

More than anything, mentor graduates found their practice evoked changes in mentees (Question 42) through the positive experience they had during the mentoring relationship. Some expressed the changes varied from mentee to mentee. Both Respondents Sharon and Kate saw the change in the empowerment of mentees with their positive regard for their successful work as they are building a good interpreting foundation, opposed to dwelling on what they were lacking. “I believe I model contentious learning, positive regard, and the value of commitment to the work in my practice and I see that present in my mentees,” stated Leo. Janet found the change in that “The mentee owns the process and is therefore so much more invested in the process.”

The majority of the mentor graduates left the MMP and shared their experience and knowledge by providing mentoring training to others (Question 43). When providing the details of sharing their experiences and knowledge, Respondents Leo, Janet, Lori, and Teri have provided mentor training in the forms of workshops or ongoing support systems for mentors either within their state of residency or across the nation. Respondents Sharon and Kate work within their states to provide mentor training for school systems, and Kate has created mentoring manuals for both mentor and mentee for school systems to use. A few of the mentoring graduates continue to mentor in one-on-one mentoring relationships. Sandy answered this question with yes and no:

I certainly haven't been this frank about the program with very many people because I DO appreciate the value in what I learned. But it does have an elitist feel that shuts people out. I'm sad about that. As for sharing knowledge, well of course, each time I have a mentee, I share knowledge to help frame the experience. How could anyone not?

When asked about the importance of training and credentialing for mentors (Question 44), most of the mentor graduates concurred that it is very important. They agreed, for most professionals, training and credentialing validate the practice of the mentor. Cathy suggested, "With credentials, mentees can be assured of the value of the service being provided. However there is not enough understanding of the value of trained mentors." During the program, when discussing the depths of their learning, some of the participants compared the MMP mentoring approach to "psychotherapy for interpreters" (Sandy). Sandy proposed this was not to be offensive, but a "compliment and a caution" to those who were working with mentees. When mentoring, Sandy felt mentors do more than just fix linguistic errors, they work with the whole person. This may include more than just the interpreting work only. "We DO have the potential to

have a strong impact on another person. Without at least SOME level of expertise, we could do more harm than good” (Sandy). Kate agreed,

Without the proper training/experience and credentials mentors could be doing a disservice to the mentee. As was my first experience with being a mentee. If the mentor would have been well versed and had training, my time with her could have been more effective.

In other terms, mentor graduates postulated the power of the mentoring relationship should not be taken lightly. “Training as a mentor is not a weekend endeavor and requires constant maintenance. Mentoring without training and supervision is like practicing medicine without a license, and is equally dangerous” (Emma). While the other mentor graduates supported credentialing, Leo did not agree with formal credentialing systems. At the least, mentors should have some training in adult learning and mentoring approaches, along with training in linguistics or interpreting process models and Leo found experience is not a factor to be a good mentor. To this mentor graduate, it is imperative that a mentor have resources and meets the needs of the mentee.

Although Cathy expressed the philosophies and approaches of the MMP having no significant impact on changed behaviors and attitudes about mentoring relationships in the field of ASL–English interpreting and education (Question 45), the majority of the other respondents have seen a myriad of changes throughout the field and within interpreter education. Standardizing the practice of mentoring within the field has been one advantage of the philosophies and approaches from the MMP. The long-held belief that mentors controlled the relationship has started changing towards the collaborative effort by both mentor and mentee to accomplish goals. Kate expressed,

We have more certified and better skilled interpreters in the area than ever before, where I live/work because many attended trainings or programs that were created

as a result of my attending the MMP. One person can help to create change, and I think that the MMP has allowed me to do this in my own community both directly and indirectly.

For others, the MMP philosophies and approaches have changed their attitude regarding ASL–English interpreting and education and increased awareness of the need of knowledge of adult learning and teaching and mentoring approaches while working with students. “We will all approach this field through our own filters of culture and education, and we will need to be the ones responsible for changing, improving, and sharing our progress with others” (Sharon). Sharon added,

I believe that the program has disseminated Vygotskian approaches to the learning process in positive ways; has led to a recognition that mentoring is an essential component of interpreter professional development; and had fostered dialogue among interpreters in a broad and nation-wide.

In summary, the MMP has made an impact on the mentor graduates with regards to their thoughts on what they have learned in their preparation through the MMP to become a mentor, their views on credentialing, and how they share what they learned and its influence on the field, in general. Chapter 5 follows with a summary and discussion of the results, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER 5. RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview of the Study

The efficacy and usefulness of the Master Mentor Program's (MMP) unique philosophies and varied approaches in preparing mentors for the field of ASL–English interpreting was the purpose of this study. The Master Mentor Program was established as a result of a desire to provide effective practices for mentoring in the profession.

In 2001, the MMP was initiated with the first cohort of students at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Applicants to the program were working interpreters with expertise in English and the process of interpreting from ASL to English and English to ASL. The MMP was delivered online, allowing students from across the United States to participate. The first phase of study included the concepts and the practice of mentoring, ending with a final approved mentoring project in the last phase of the 16-month program. The mentoring project included an organized plan to deliver mentoring support to agencies or regional programs in the students' respective states.

This study was an examination of this one program that was organized and delivered to students participating in four different cohorts. Qualitative research is noted for its holistic view of the world, where reality is based on the perception of individuals, which change over time, and derived meaning is through context (Francis & Simon, 2001). Qualitative research seeks to interpret social phenomena by producing a rich, thick descriptive narrative to convey the findings. "Case studies are used when asking the how

and why, rather than what and how many” (Francis & Simon, p. 31). Using the qualitative case study design allowed the researcher to explore the depths of the MMP as it is bound in time and activities. This method invokes descriptive research based on real-life situations. Detailed information collected from participants of the four cohorts of students in the MMP represents the multidimensional perspective of those who participated as to the effective use of the philosophies and approaches in the graduates mentoring practice.

In defining the syllabus and content of the curriculum, the best current understanding of the process and functions of mentoring were gleaned from a range of disciplines by the designers of the program. In doing so, the “approach would lead students beyond received wisdom about activities of mentors in interpretation, to an intimate understanding of the private and personal tasks they need to undertake to grow as mentors, to become in fact Master Mentors” (Master Mentor Program Curriculum, Project TIEM. Online, n.d.). The philosophies and approaches included in the content of the curriculum were based on the philosophy of “constructivism” in which individualism is not embraced and learning is considered a social concept. The philosophies and approaches include: adult learning theory, learning styles, collaborative learning, Vygotsky’s ZDP and mentee-centered learning, critical thinking, cultural competence, processes of interpreting, language and interpreting portfolios and interpreting assessments, transformational learning, and the roles and characteristics of mentors. This research adds validity to the philosophies and approaches that made up the content of the curriculum and adds to the body of researched knowledge of what is effective practice for mentoring in the profession of ASL–English Interpreting.

Results

The overarching question of this study is as follows: How have the philosophies and approaches of the MMP developed and prepared graduates to become mentors to ASL–English interpreters? Following are the subquestions:

1. To what extent do graduates of the MMP use the philosophies and practices in their mentoring relationships?
2. How effective are the philosophies and practices of the MMP when applied to the work of mentors to ASL–English Interpreters?
3. What did graduates not recognize in their learning/education at the time they graduated that they now know about the program’s philosophies and practices?
4. To what extent do graduates who use the MMP philosophies and practices see changes in mentees skills development?
5. What philosophies, practices and/or approaches do graduates feel were lacking in their development and preparation to become Master Mentors and why?
6. How have the philosophies and approaches of the MMP changed behaviors and attitudes about mentoring relationships in the field of American Sign Language–English interpreting and education?
7. How do MMP participants differ from other mentors in terms of experience in the field, region, educational background, and workplace?

As a result of the graduate’s participation in the MMP, and in answer to subquestion #1, many of the philosophies and approaches are used in their mentoring relationships. The MMP based its philosophies and approaches on constructivism,

taking the pragmatic view of the importance of collaborative learning, critical thinking, and problem solving as well as methods of inquiry by mentors and learners to create knowledge. When reviewing the responses of the participants, their willingness to go the extra mile for workshops and training seemed to reflect that their personal philosophies were also grounded in constructivism. The mentor graduates came to the MMP for a stronger foundation in mentoring based on theory, which they could apply to their field of ASL–English interpreting.

Adult learning principles, including the concept of learning styles, is one of the philosophies embraced by the MMP and the mentor graduates and subsequently answers subquestion #1. Brookfield (as cited in Wiley, 2005), gave fundamental advice when approaching each new teaching situation that fit nicely with mentoring: acknowledging the experiences of the learner, establishing an adult teacher-learner relationship, and promoting autonomy and self-direction.

After studying adult theorists, mentor graduates realized a better understanding of how adults learn, providing them with a theoretical foundation to establish relationships with their mentees (speaks to subquestions #1, extent of use, #2, appropriateness, and #3, learned to apply). In *The Psychology of Executive Coaching*, Peltier (2009) designated a full chapter on the importance of the knowledge of developmental psychology and adult development in coaching.

A developmental point of view allows a coach to sidestep judgment and think about how a person's behavior makes sense in a psychological framework, rather than a punitive or pathological way. We are all on a path of personal evolution and growth, and we are all at different points on different scales. (p. 56)

Many of the mentor graduates discussed the notion of encouraging their mentees to take control of or responsibility for their learning (subquestion #3), which coincides with promoting autonomy and self-direction by Brookfield (as cited in Wiley, 2005). When entering their mentoring relationship, seeking a true understanding of how this particular mentee would learn best was the next step in creating a good relationship. Mentor graduates could actually see the progress of various mentees (subquestion #4, mentees skills development) through filters of the mentees' learning styles and, in most cases, the mentees learning styles were different. Following the mentees' learning style provided the mentor graduates with opportunities to be not only attentive to the mentees needs but more creative and flexible with approaches in guiding the mentees to discoveries.

The mentee-centered mentoring relationship was the most challenging of the philosophies and approaches for the mentor graduates when used in practice. Some had difficulty learning this approach in the MMP. In response to what extent, subquestion #1, the mentee-centered approach was used throughout most of the mentor graduates mentoring relationships. What they learned, in response to subquestion #2 and #3, was the mentee-centered approach was appropriate, and found, based on the theoretical concepts of constructivism and adult learning theory, mentors allow more freedom of choice in their work with mentees by using self-assessment, self-direction, and active collaboration in their practices. In some cases, it was reported by mentor graduates, that mentees tend to hold fast to the old school mentoring, assuming the mentee is best serviced by the expertise of another who has proven his or her professionalism by successful practice. In other words, as many of the mentor graduates proclaimed, mentees wanted quick fixes, or the mentors to tell them what to do and when.

People in general are more comfortable when they are in a state of feeling consistent, according to cognitive dissonance theory (Peltier, 2009). At times, mentor graduates professed that the mentees' progress was hindered by this mindset or the relationship ended because the mentee could not make the transition from mentor-centered to mentee-centered. In addition, mentor graduates found mentees were unsure of their own learning and skills and it took time for them to make the transition to the mentee-centered approach. This, again, relates to cognitive dissonance, as "we are comfortable when our thought, feeling, and behaviors are aligned, and we are uncomfortable when they are in dissonance" (Peltier). Mentor graduates noted this dissonance happened when mentee 'expectations of mentoring were based on one concept and in practice it was not.

Many of the mentor graduates, post-MMP, found (subquestion #3, learned about applying) what worked best was by starting the mentoring relationship initially using a mentor-centered approach, and changing to using the mentee-centered approach later. Gradually, mentors would move towards the mentee-centered approach as they better understood the mentees' learning style and goals were documented. This approach can contribute to mentee's skills development (subquestion #4) as that uncomfortable feeling of dissonance was usually resolved by changing a behavior or "more typically changing what we tell ourselves about the situation" (Peltier, 2009, p.179). Most of the mentor graduates found the importance of using concrete business practices when establishing the relationship by first discussing goals, process (mentee-centered), and the use of a contract defining meetings and fees assisted most in developing a relationship that produced better outcomes in the end, leaving mentee and mentor satisfied with the results

of the relationship (subquestion #1, extent of use, #2, appropriateness, #3 learned by applying). Theune (2010) discussed this very thought about her own work with an executive coach;

[Thomas Leonard]helped her [Theune] to set specific and measurable goals, plan a course of action and take steps to achieve those goals in a timely manner, make critical decisions, and more fully use her natural strengths, express her values, and satisfy her need for career advancement. (p. 3)

Woven into the responses of the mentor graduates was evidence that collaborative learning was used as well (subquestion #1, extent of use). In her research on instructional strategies, Forkum (2009) found students born after 1982 and going into college in 2000 wanted a sense of destination in their learning. Even though they wanted some structure, they wanted to be a part of the learning process and to provide input in what is learned, how it is learned, and when it is learned (Forkum, 2008). The mentor graduates approached the mentoring relationship providing the mentees with this same sense of destination. The mentoring relationship encompassed active learning through Socratic questioning, reacting to real-life scenarios through their experiences interpreting, and sharing in the mentoring relationship, to encourage learning.

The idea of the zone of proximal development, ZPD and scaffolding was adopted by the mentor graduates and found to be substantial tools (subquestion #1, extent of use, #2, learn to apply). “Scaffolding was conceptualized as a process of providing higher levels of initial support for students as they entered the ZPD with the gradual dismantling of the support structure as students progressed towards independence” (Harland, 2003, p. 268). Several of the mentor graduates indicated that, depending on the ultimate goal of the mentee, taking or allowing for small steps of accomplishments was more successful

than setting goals so high that they were impossible to achieve (subquestion #3, learned to apply). Harland (2003) discussed scaffolding as a process of levels of support given to students as they learn new things. In the same sense, levels of support are given to mentees as they enter the ZPD; then the mentor gradually dismantles the support structures as they progress towards new knowledge or skill sets.

During this process, mentor graduates recognize transformational learning in mentees as a result of the MMP philosophies and approaches. Theune (2010) stated, “Transformative adult learning theory suggests that the learner may be transformed by replacing an existing point of view or mind set with one that is more developed or mature” (p. 2). An example of transformative learning was the approach some mentor graduates used by starting with the mentor-centered approach until mentees replaced an existing point of view or mindset that they needed the answers to the mentee-centered approach as the mentees developed confidence through the relationship to make their own discoveries.

When discussing concepts of critical thinking, Brookfield and Merriam (2005) suggest that central to developing critical thinkers is the mentee’s agreement to be involved. This was a key point throughout the responses, and central to the mentee-centered approach. To ask individuals to analyze their existing point of view or mindset may intimidate them and build resistance against the process of discovery. Brookfield and Merriam encouraged critical helpers to “try to awaken, prompt, nurture, and encourage this process without making people feel threatened or patronized” (p. 9). The mentee-centered approach encourages what Brookfield and Merriam (2005) referred to as characteristics of critical helpers. Throughout the responses of the mentor graduates,

recognition of similar qualities such as encouragement, sensitivity towards the mentee, working together through brainstorming, analysis and developing a plan, and making sure the mentee felt supported and not alone, were integrated into practice (subquestion #1 extent used, #2, appropriateness, #3, learned to apply). Critical thinking is a part of the process of self discovery and when mentor graduates applied the characteristics in different ways mentees were able to find a sense of accomplishment, self-direction, decision making, critical thinking, and satisfaction came to them and their work as interpreters (subquestion #4).

Other philosophies and approaches were also incorporated into the mentor graduates' practices. Cultural competencies were an underlying basis to the mentor graduates' practices, which leads to mentoring of the whole person (subquestion #1, extent use, #2, appropriateness). Activities using the common languages of the interpreting process models—demand control theory and the Taylor (1993, 2002) books in assessing work together— were important and appropriate to most of the mentor graduates. Language-Interpreting Portfolios was one philosophy that was not highly used (subquestions #1) in the Master Mentors practices. In response to the portfolios appropriateness (subquestions #2), although Master Mentors did not integrate them into their practices, they did encourage mentees to develop portfolios for themselves (subquestion #4).

Looking at the philosophies, practices, or approaches of the Master Mentor program, subquestion #5 asked if the graduates felt there was anything lacking in their preparation and development. Most participants viewed the MMP as more comprehensive than lacking. A two of the participants were ambivalent about the

delivery of the MMP, wanting more technology incorporated into the program, along with more hands on experiences, however, those mentor graduates do find the philosophies and approaches effective in their practices today.

It was established by most mentor graduates that the philosophies and approaches of the MMP have changed behaviors and attitudes about mentoring relationships within the field, as well as the ASL–English interpreting education programs (subquestion #6, behaviors and attitudes). The data reflected many positive attributes to the field in general through the philosophies and approaches taught at the MMP. The program helped to standardize what mentors know and how they approach the mentoring relationship. An increased awareness with regards to knowledge of adult learning, teaching methods, learning styles, cultural competencies and mentoring approaches in interpreter education programs were positively noted by mentor graduates across the United States. The MMP has led to recognition that mentoring is an essential part of professional development. In addition, the program has provided mentors with more tools to expand on their own work as professional interpreters and mentors.

A significant thread throughout the data was that all of the philosophies and approaches worked together for successful outcomes in the mentoring relationship. Cultural competencies led to understanding adult learning and learning styles, become tools for the mentor graduate to use to promote critical thinking, critical thinking promoted a mentee-centered approach, and mentor graduates reported transformative learning happened as mentees took responsibility for their work.

A relevant factor emerged from the data which inadvertently relates to practice in mentoring. The quintessence of mentoring as learned from the MMP demonstrates

standard practices imbedded in mentoring and coaching literature. Mentoring today has gone beyond the experienced sharing what they know with the inexperienced. Yes, there are traces of consulting and counseling (Whitworth et al., 1998) in what is done as mentors in the field of ASL–English interpreting. Master Mentor graduates suggested both training and credentialing for mentors should be addressed in the near future.

Conclusions

The overarching question of this study is as follows: How have the philosophies and approaches of the MMP developed and prepared graduates to become mentors to ASL–English interpreters? Overall, the mentor graduates found satisfaction working with the mentee-centered approach, both mentee and mentor learned from the experience, and the outcomes of this approach gleaned empowerment for the mentee, along with self-confidence and growth, so noted by the mentor graduates.

When examining the relevance of the philosophies and approaches of the MMP in their work as Master Mentors, the research showed explicit relevance. The mentor graduates, as Master Mentors, did apply the philosophies and approaches in their mentoring relationships and most of them proclaimed a positive impact to their practice. Each of the Master Mentor participants uses the philosophies and approaches in various ways, with creativity and purposefulness, while working with mentees and their unique learning styles. The practices of the Master Mentors, using the philosophies and approaches of the MMP, have evoked changes in the mentees as reported by the mentors. Graduates stated that mentees recognized their own knowledge as opposed to what they were lacking and found self-discovery, self-awareness, empowerment, and feeling a sense of accomplishment when reaching their goals—all of which led to self-confidence.

Looking back at the intent of the MMP, designed first to teach the concepts and practice of mentoring—the MMP through the insights and thoughts of these Master Mentors proved effective. The participants of the MMP’s final approved mentoring project in the last phase of the 16-month program resulted in the delivery of mentoring support to agencies or regional programs in the students’ respective states. Upon graduating, in several states, the Master Mentors established mentoring programs related to educational interpreting, wrote books and manuals based on the philosophies and approaches of the MMP to help mentors and mentees, and continued freelance mentoring practices working with individuals.

Recommendations for Replication of This Study

When developing the research process, the researcher’s goal was for success and smooth transitions through the timelines in order to collect data. To make the research more effective for the researcher and the participants, certain factors should remain the same and others should be adjusted to satisfy the above goal.

In this particular research, data were obtained by two surveys. A characteristic questionnaire was administered using closed-ended questions asking demographical information. The characteristic questionnaire was followed by a semistructured interview questionnaire to elicit views and opinions on subjects’ effective use of the MMP philosophies and approaches while mentoring post-MMP. During the proposal process, no one questioned the two surveys and their content. There were 42 participants in the MMP with four cohorts. Twenty participants responded to the characteristic questionnaire and 12 participants responded to the semistructured interview questionnaire. Due to lack of response to the semistructured interview questionnaire, the

surveys were disseminated from June to August 2010 every 2 weeks in one electronic document, as a reminder that both surveys needed to be completed. During that time frame, only a few surveys were then completed—not enough to complete the research. Once again, from October to December 2010, the 2-week reminders were sent to the 42 participants of the MMP. In January 2011, there were only a total of 12 respondents. Fortunately, the data collected from the characteristic survey supported the semistructured survey, providing enough data to complete the research successfully.

In the future, the surveys should be combined. Due to the nature of the research and the driving question of the study being the efficacy of the philosophies and approaches of the MMP and their use by mentor graduates, each of the philosophies and approaches had to be addressed, making the surveys laborious for some potential respondents. In retrospect, some of the questions on the characteristic survey could have been woven into the semistructured questionnaire, culminating in similar results. Another approach to this type of research would be personal interviews with the participants.

Even though an effort was made to cover all of the philosophies and approaches, mentoring portfolios were inadvertently excluded from the questions on the survey about Language-Interpreting Portfolios. Mentoring portfolios were an important part of the participants final project and could have gleaned valuable information about how participants were progressing.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study focused on the graduates of the Master Mentor Program and their effective use of the philosophies and approaches in their mentoring practices. Mentoring as taught by the MMP is new in the field of American Sign Language Interpreting and

Interpreter education. Further research as to its efficacy in other settings may help the field to better understand the need for professionalism and effective practices by practitioners.

Suggestions for future research include the following:

1. Research using mentees who received mentoring from the Master Mentors' final project may garner further insights as to the efficacy of the MMP's philosophies and approaches post mentoring.
2. A research study could be conducted on mentoring as taught by the Master Mentor program as a form of transformative adult learning, using Master Mentors or mentees who received mentoring from the Master Mentors' final project as the participants.
3. Finally, a comparison research study could be conducted based on goals and outcomes of those professionals who seek professional mentoring verse the goals and outcomes of the professional who do not seek mentoring.

Summation of the Study

This study suggests standard practices in mentoring and effective practice in mentoring in the field of ASL–English interpreting. The results of this study will encourage interpreters and interpreter educators to look towards professionalism in mentoring practices and to seek higher education, if needed. This study suggests credentialing for professional mentors through the national organization, Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf, may be a benefit to those receiving mentoring. In addition, the study reinforces the notion that mentoring does provide mentees with encouragements,

self-determination, and self-esteem when taking responsibility for their learning through the mentee-centered process. The study, revealing the successful use of the MMP's philosophies and approaches in mentoring, provides a model for other mentoring/coaching programs in academic settings.

REFERENCES

- Boinis, S., Gajewski Mickelson, P., Gordon, P., Krouse, L., & Swabey, L. (1996). *The interpreting process: Introduction and skills practice*. Minnesota RID Educational Interpreter Grant Project.
- Bridges, W. (2004). *Transitions: Making sense of life's changes*. Cambridge, MA: DaCapo Press.
- Brookfield, S. D., & Merriam, S. B. (Eds.). (2005). *Critical thinking in adult education*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Carroll, L. (1960). *Alice's adventures in wonderland*. New York: Signet Books.
- Cokely, D. (1992). *A sociolinguistic model of the interpreting process: ASL & English*. Silver Springs, MD: Linstock Press.
- Cranton, P. (2006). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Education research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Daloz, L. A., 1999. *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, J., Fried, T., Herbst, C., McCafferey, E., Toothman, C., & Schneider Clark, T. (1994). Mentorship: A true course in collaboration. The RITC Region IX Mentorship Program. *Proceedings of the Tenth National Convention of Conference of Interpreter Trainers*. Stillwater, OK: National Clearing House of Rehabilitation Training Materials.
- Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q. (2001). Application of demand control theory to sign language interpreters: Implications for stress and interpreter training. *Journal of Deaf Students and Deaf Education*, 6(1), 1-14.

- Forestal, E., & Wiesman, L. (2006). Effective practices for establishing mentoring programs. *Proceedings of the 16th National Conference of Interpreter Trainers*, San Diego, CA.
- Forkum, S. D. (2009, January). The millennial milieu: A study of instructional strategies. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DAI-A 69/07. (UMI No. 3316342)
- Francis, J. B., & Simon, M. K. (2001). *The dissertation and research cookbook: From soup to nuts* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendal/Hunt.
- Fry, A. D. (2005, November). Understanding the power of mentorship: An analysis of mentor psychological characteristics. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DAI-B (66/-5). (UMI No. 3174521)
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gile, D. (1995). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gish, S. (1984). Goal-to-detail and detail-to-goal. In M. L. McIntire (Ed.), *New dimensions in interpreter education: Task analysis—Theory and applications. Proceedings of the Fifth National Convention, Conference of Interpreter Trainers*. USA: Conference of Interpreter Trainers.
- Gordon, P., & Magler, M. (2007). *The mentor's companion*. Alexandria, VA: RID Press.
- Guttek, G. (2004). *Philosophical and ideological voices in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Harland, T. (2003). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development and problem-based learning: Linking a theoretical concept with practice through action research. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(2), 263-272.
- Hicks, J. M. (2007, September). A phenomenological study of the protégé's perceptions of the mentor's character traits. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DAI-B (68/03). (UMI No. 3258297)
- Hittmeier, M. H. (2007, June). A preliminary look at the relationship between psychological type and mentor competency. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DAI-B (67/12). (UMI 3244340)
- Hollingsworth, J.N. (2008, June). Christian leadership coaching: Implications of post-graduate pastoral residencies for the mentoring curriculum at the McAfee Scholl

- of Theology. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DBI-A (69/03). (UMI No. 3304643)
- Hunter, D. A. (2007, April). Why do mentors mentor?: A study of motivations in workplace mentoring. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DBI-B (68/10). (UMI No. 3286886)
- Imel, S. (1991). *Collaborative learning in adult education*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED334469)
- Kearsley, G. (today's date). The Theory Into Practice Database. Retrieved from <http://tip.psychology.org>
- Lee, R. (2005). From theory to practice: Making the interpreting process come alive in the classroom. In C. B. Roy (Ed.), *Advances in teaching sign language interpreters* (pp. 138-150). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University.
- Lynch, E., & Hansen, M. (2004). *Developing cross-cultural competence: A guide for working with children and their families*. Portland OR: Brooks.
- Master Mentor Program Curriculum. (n.d.). *Curriculum overview*. Retrieved from Project TIEM Online: http://www.tiemcenter.org/tiem.online/mm_curriculum_overview.html
- McCarthy, B. (2000). *About learning* (2nd ed.) Wauconda, IL: About Learning.
- National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers. (n.d.) *Effective Practice*. Retrieved June 5, 2009 from <http://www.nciec.org>
- Nishimura, J. (2005). Presentation Parts 1 & 2 (K. Bennett, Trans.). In *Master Mentor Certificate Program*. Boston: Northeastern University.
- Panitz, T. (1997). *Collaborative versus cooperative learning—A comparison of the two concepts which will help us understand underlying nature of interactive learning*. Retrieved July 23, 2006, from <http://home.capecod.net/~tpanitz/tedsarticles/coopdefinition.htm>
- Peltier, B. (2009). *The psychology of executive coaching*. New York: Routledge-Taylor & Francis Group.
- Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf. (2010). *2010 Annual Report to our Members* Retrieved September 20, 2008, from <http://www.rid.org>

- Rider, A. (2007, September). A phenomenological study exploring being mentored as a social dimension of transformational learning among adult learners. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DBI-B (68/03. (UMI No. 3258758)
- Roy, C. (2000). *Innovative practices for teaching sign language interpreters*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University.
- Scriven, M., & Paul, R. (2004). *Defining critical thinking*. National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking Instruction. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from <http://www.criticalthinking.org/aboutCT/definingCT.shtml>
- Siple, L. (1991, July-August). The functions of mentoring. *RID Views*.
- Taylor, M. (1993). *Interpreting skills: English to ASL*. Alberta, Canada: Interpreting Consolidated.
- Taylor, M. (2002). *Interpreting skills: ASL to English*. Alberta, Canada: Interpreting Consolidated.
- Theune, D. P. (2010, August). Women being coached to advance their careers to positions of power and influence: A narrative Inquiry. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DBI-A (72/02). (UMI No. 3434311)
- Whitworth, L., Kimsey-House, H., & Sandahl, P. (1998). *Co-Active coaching: New skills for coaching people toward success in work and life*. Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black.
- Wiley (Eds.). (2005). *Theory and methods of educating adults*. New York: Wiley.
- Winans, D. J. (2007, February). *Adult education principles in a teacher mentoring program: A grounded theory*. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, DAI-A (68/08). (UMI No. 3275025)
- Witter-Merithew, A. (2001). *Feedback: A conversation about "the work" between learners and colleagues*. Denver, CO: Distance Opportunities for Interpreter Training (DO IT) Center.

APPENDIX A. MENTOR CHARACTERISTIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Complete the following questions to the best of your ability.

Demographic information:

1) Female: _____ 2) Male: _____ 3) Age: _____

4. Which cohort were you enrolled in at the Master Mentor Program? _____

5. Are you a graduate of an Interpreter Education Program? YES _____ NO _____

6. How many years have you been an American Sign Language—English
Interpreter? _____

7. What credentials do you hold as an interpreter? (i.e., State Screening, RID, NIC, EIPA)

Mentoring Relationships:

8. Were you involved in mentoring relationships previous to the MMP where you
mentored were the mentor? YES _____ NO _____ How many? _____

9. Why did the mentee seek mentoring? _____

10. Did you practice mentee-centered mentoring or mentor-centered mentoring?

11. Did you have any training before mentoring prior to the MMP? _____
Explain: _____

12. What outcomes resulted in the mentoring relationship? _____

13. Were you involved in mentoring relationships before the Master Mentor Program and where you were the mentee? YES _____NO _____ Where _____

_____ How often? _____

14. Why did you seek mentoring? _____

15. Did the mentor practice mentee-centered mentoring or mentor-centered mentoring?

16. What outcomes resulted in the mentoring relationship? _____

17. How does participation in mentee-centered mentoring differ from prior practice?

18. Other comments regarding previous experiences in mentoring relationships: _____

19. What was your rationale for enrolling in the MMP? _____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire

APPENDIX B. SEMISTRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete this questionnaire and return within seven day of receipt. There are no limitations as to how long your answers are.

What does mentoring mean to you?

How has the Master Mentor Program changed your views about mentoring?

Adult Learning Theory

1. Which adult learning theory is best suited to your practice? (Levinson, Kegan, Perry)
2. How did the concepts of adult learning help your mentoring relationships?
3. How does the knowledge of learning styles help you when mentoring?
4. When did you first realize that you had integrated adult learning into your practice?
5. What are the benefits of using adult learning theory in your mentoring?
6. Are there any limitations to using adult learning theory?

Collaborative Learning

1. Explain your concept of collaborative learning in mentoring relationships.
Individuals/groups
2. What are the benefits of using collaborative learning in your mentoring?
3. What are the limitations?

Interpreting Process/Language-Interpreting Portfolio/Interpreting Assessment

1. How have you applied concepts of the interpreting process in your mentoring?
2. What process model do you use when working as a mentor? Why?

3. How have you integrated Language-Interpreting Portfolios into your mentoring?
4. How have the use of the Marty Taylor (1993, 2002) books helped you as a mentor in assessing mentees' work?
5. How has the use of the Marty Taylor's (1993, 2002) books helped mentees assess their work?

Demand Control Schema

1. How have you integrated Demand Control Schema into your work as a mentor?
For yourself? For your mentee?
2. What are the benefits in using Demand Control Schema when working with mentees?
3. What are the limitations?

Vygotsky

1. How have you incorporated Vygotsky's scaffolding into your work as a mentor?
2. How have you incorporated Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) into your work as a mentor?

Mentee-centered approach

1. Are you comfortable with the mentee-centered approach as used in the Master Mentor Program?
2. Are mentees comfortable with the mentee-centered approach as used in the MMP?
3. When using the mentee-centered approach, what are the benefits to you as a mentor?

4. What are the limitations when using the mentee-centered approach to you as a mentor?
5. When using the mentee-centered approach, what are the benefits to the mentee?
6. What are the limitations when using the mentee-centered approach to the mentee?

Cultural Competencies

1. How important are cultural competencies when establishing a mentoring relationship?
2. Provide an example where understanding cultural competencies has enhanced the mentoring relationship.
3. What are the advantages of understanding cultural competencies for you as the mentor?
4. What are the advantages of you, as the mentor, understanding cultural competencies for the mentee?

The Art of Questioning

1. What are the advantages of using Socratic questions in your mentoring relationship?
2. What are the limitations of using Socratic questions in your mentoring relationship?

Transitions

1. When using the philosophies and approaches of the MMP what are some of the transitions you have experienced in your work with the mentees?—that is, better understanding, skill development, confidence.

Business Practice

2. Since your graduation, what business practices learned from the MMP are you still using? Why?
3. How do you decide whether you will take a mentee or not?
4. What is your fee for services?
5. How do you establish how long you will work with the mentee?

Closing questions:

1. What have you learned about mentoring since you have graduated from the MMP?
2. Has your preparation to become a Master Mentor had a positive or negative impact on your practice? Explain
3. Explain any issues you have had regarding your preparation as a Master Mentor. Have they been resolved?
4. What practices or approaches do you feel were lacking in your preparation?
5. How does your practice evoke changes in the mentee?
6. Have you shared your experiences and knowledge by providing mentoring training to others since your graduation? Provide details.
7. What is the importance, in your perspective, that all mentors should have training and credentials? Explain
8. How have the philosophies and approaches of the MMP changed behaviors and attitudes about mentoring relationships in the field of American Sign Language–English interpreting and education? Explain

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!