The framework presented here for integrating three important dimensions within youth mentoring match interactions serves as an organizer for the subsequent chapters.

1

Youth mentoring with a balanced focus, shared purpose, and collaborative interactions

Michael J. Karcher, Michael J. Nakkula

THIS VOLUME BRINGS TOGETHER findings from studies of community- and school-based mentoring that help to explain how particular aspects of mentor-mentee meetings and match structure contribute to youth mentoring outcomes. The importance of investigating structure, specifically the characteristics of mentoring relationship processes and practices, was cogently articulated by Tolan et al. in a meta-analysis of mentoring for delinquent youth:

> These analyses suggest general support for mentoring for intervention related to delinquency and closely associated outcomes. However . . . the information obtainable about the "inside" of these interventions termed mentoring is limited. Thus, the conclusions to be drawn must remain very sketchy about what it is that makes mentoring effective. . . . Thus, while consistent with prior findings, there seems to be little additional certainty of the nature of mentoring and information to guide further development, sound training and management of the programming, and adequate tracking of effects to activities, staffing, and other features.[1]

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, NO. 126, SUMMER 2010 © WILEY PERIODICALS, INC.
Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com) • DOI: 10.1002/yd.347

The articles that follow, along with much of the youth mentoring literature more broadly, illustrate that effective youth mentoring, across all contexts, is fundamentally rooted in the quality of the relationship, the nature of the interactions that occur within it, and the developmental, cultural, and gender-specific affordances the relationship provides for mentees. Evidence is growing that the age of the youth, the location of the match, the intentions of the mentor and expectations of the mentee, and the gender of each partner influence the nature of the interactions that occur in the match.

The context also may interact with youth characteristics to influence the structure of the mentoring interactions. Workplace apprenticeships and explicitly academic mentoring programs in colleges (see the article by Larose and colleagues in this volume) are more likely to attract older youth who seek such goal-focused interactions, whereas the same interactions with children in school-based mentoring may be off-putting to students who do not want to spend mentoring time focused on sharpening their skills. Indeed, the degree of time spent in goal-directed activities in school-based matches seems to increase with age; this may explain the smaller and sometimes negative effects of school-based mentoring with high school–aged students.[2] Yet similarly goal-directed, skill-building activities in workplace or academic mentoring programs seem central to their success.[3]

The interaction between context and developmental needs reveals the utility of a more balanced or nuanced language for characterizing both the nature of specific interactions and the patterns of interaction that together reflect the type or style of relationship that results. Clearer terminology for communicating the nature of mentoring relationships may be helpful for mentor training and program development, and it is essential for conducting research that examines the relationship between what happens in the match and the outcomes from specific types of relationships.

The goal of relating what happens in the match with youth mentoring outcomes is not new. It was in fact the center of a lively discussion in 2002 when the first *New Directions for Youth Develop-*

ment volume on youth mentoring was published.[4] At that time, the consensus seemed to be that the mentoring context defined the answer. In workplace mentoring with teens, a goal-directed structure was deemed essential[5] and resulted in larger impacts.[6] In community settings, relational and casual interactions were found to be the key ingredients of change.[7] Subsequent work has proposed methods for studying whether goal-oriented or relationship-focused activities prove to be more effective in mentoring,[8] and some have explored how relationship dimensions manifest into different relationship styles that vary as a function of the degree of structure mentors provide.[9] Nevertheless, many questions remain.

Youth mentoring interactions and relationship styles

Two constructs originally proposed by Morrow and Styles and by Hamilton and Hamilton[10] for characterizing match interactions are foundational to the theoretically evolving activities in mentoring (TEAM) framework described in this article.[11] Their terms—*developmental* and *instrumental*, respectively—have held considerable staying power in mentoring research and in training provided to program staff and mentors. This may be because their rich descriptions of seemingly opposing styles are (we and others[12] suggest) in fact complementary. Indeed, it is precisely because both styles reveal the essential elements of successful youth mentoring relationships that they are at the center of the framework described here.

Unfortunately, these terms and others related to them have been used inconsistently in the mentoring literature, either because in later use people have overemphasized one element of these styles or left out another, rendering later characterizations confusing and ill defined. One such term commonly found in the literature is *prescriptive* mentoring.[13] *Prescriptive* has sometimes been used interchangeably with *instrumental* by those who neglect to recognize that the instrumental approach that Hamilton and Hamilton proposed is quite youth centered and includes an

important relational component. Our goal is to apply a framework that differentiates concepts like these for future research and practice.

If we look closely at the manner in which the terms *developmental* and *instrumental* were introduced to the literature, we find they share three elements. Each relationship style (1) includes both relational and goal-directed activities (that is, both styles are a hybrid of these relational and goal-directed interactions),[14] (2) places an emphasis on whether relational or goal-directed interactions are considered primary and predominate the early period in the relationship, and (3) underscores that these relationships are youth centered or collaborative in that the youth's voice, interests, and opinion are always respected, encouraged, and supported in making decisions regarding activities.

Youth mentoring interactions

Prior characterizations of youth mentoring also have failed to differentiate mentoring interactions from relationship styles. Relationship styles are more than either relational or goal-oriented interactions alone, although such interactions are essential elements of both developmental and instrumental styles. Here, *interactions* are defined as the specific activities and discussions that occur when the mentor and mentee do things together or are in communication. These are discrete events and reflect the focus and purpose of what happens during the mentoring meeting. We emphasize these two types of interactions—those that are primarily relationship focused and those that are primarily goal directed—because it is these specific moment-to-moment interactions that give rise over time to relationship styles of one type or another. Both are defined further in Exhibit 1.1.

In contrast to finite and specific relationship interactions, a relationship style is a pattern of interactions that evolves across the course of the relationship during a defined period of time. The time period may be one hour or one month, or it may be the entire span of the relationship (say, one year), from its inception until the present or until its conclusion. Relationship styles also reflect the

Exhibit 1.1. Focus of interactions: The focus of what happens during mentoring meetings

Goal directed	Within a goal-directed focus, explicitly goal-oriented outcomes are the priority, such as improved school performance, improving behavior, and better peer relationships. Mentoring for the sake of relational development and support is not the goal here; rather, it is a means to the achievement of a specific goal, outcome, skill, or other tangible end, which may be its own end or may be viewed as a way of promoting character and competencies that indirectly strengthen the youth's emotional well-being (self-esteem, connectedness, and resilience, for example).
Relational	In relationally focused interactions, building and sustaining the relationship is the core focus. The emphasis stays on relational development even though recreational activities or skill-building activities such as schoolwork might be employed. When such structured activities are included, they are done consciously by the mentor in an effort to facilitate what the mentee needs to do or achieve. Even in interactions that entail goal achievement, skill development, and activity completion, however, the focus remains on strengthening the relationship development as the primary means of promoting the youth's emotional well-being (self-esteem, connectedness, and resilience, for example).

manner in which interactions are negotiated. Some relationship styles reflect relatively consistent patterns of interacting and negotiation over time. In others, the progression of interactions varies over time.

Developmental versus instrumental relationship styles

Each of the two relationship styles we emphasize—developmental and instrumental (see Exhibit 1.2)—reflects a specific progression of both relational and goal-oriented interactions over time, and they do so through collaboratively made decisions. These styles have been most frequently credited in the literature as being associated with the longest, strongest, and most successful matches.

These two relationship styles are in many ways mirror reflections of each other. We define the developmental relationship

Exhibit 1.2. Relationship styles: The pattern of interaction focus, purpose, and authorship over time

Developmental style	The developmental style (or pattern of interactions) includes both relational and goal-directed interactions, and typically they unfold in that order, as Morrow and Styles observed.[a] That is, they describe developmental relationships as including goal-directed interactions after a period of relationship development based largely on a foundation of relational interactions.
Instrumental style	The instrumental style (or pattern of interactions) is predominantly built on a foundation of goal-directed interactions. However, like the developmental style, the instrumental style is a hybrid of goal-directed and relational interactions, wherein the relational interactions typically follow periods of predominantly goal-directed interactions.[b] Therefore, *instrumental* should not be used synonymously with *goal directed*; instead, it refers to a pattern of interactions guided by a goal and the goal is mutually agreed on. The strength of relationship increases over time as a result of collaborative negotiations and mutual agreements about the focus of their interactions, the purpose of their goals (for example, conventional or playful), and the manner in which they choose to address these goals.

[a]Morrow and Styles. (1995).

[b]Hamilton and Hamilton (1992).

style as one in which the mentor-mentee activities, interactions, and discussions are initially more heavily focused on relationship building and therefore tend to be more present oriented, fun, and playful. Yet over time, this relationship style allows and supports the incorporation of more goal-directed, future-oriented, achievement-focused, and serious activities or conversation topics (that is, interactions). The purpose thus shifts over time from being more playful to more conventional (reflecting skills, trades, or achievements most highly valued by adults in society).[15] Yet the interactions are consistently decided on collaboratively, with neither the

youth nor the mentor fully dictating what the match will do or focus on.[16]

The instrumental style is the temporal opposite of the developmental style. An instrumental relationship begins with an agreed-on purpose or specific outcome, such as learning a skill, mastering a trade, or achieving a goal. However, this purpose, which is more often conventional at the start of the relationship, tends to shift over time. Subsequent to the initially goal-directed interactions, the instrumental style allows and supports the introduction of more personal, relational, in-the-moment, and playful interactions. Yet throughout the relationship, there is a mutual respect for the input and perspectives of both the mentor and mentee, out of which both collaboration and friendship emerge.

What is apparent and important is that relationship styles are not characterized solely by any one type of interaction but rather by the types of interaction focus and purpose that are emphasized at different points in the match, as well as the manner in which these interactions get negotiated. This is why it is inaccurate from this perspective to use *relational* and *developmental* synonymously or *goal directed* and *instrumental* interchangeably. The relationship style is a quality of interacting, a pattern of interactions, that develops over time and reflects the degree of youth centeredness characteristic of those interactions. Most interactions have a relational or a goal-directed focus, reflect a playful or a serious goal-oriented purpose, and result from unilaterally imposed, reciprocally determined, or collaboratively generated negotiations. It is the impression or pattern revealed by a series of such interactions over time that reveals the relationship style.

Focus, purpose, and negotiation styles: Toward a framework for training mentors

In the remainder of this article, we describe a framework that may help those in the field understand, use, and study developmental and instrumental relationship styles in a more complete and

systematic fashion.[17] This framework may help program staff better train future mentors and researchers better study mentoring interactions and relationship styles.

The framework we present has three core dimensions—focus, purpose, and authorship—that together provide a useful heuristic for characterizing effective and ineffective mentoring styles.[18] The first dimension is *focus*, which we characterize as the target and structure of a specific interaction (discussion or activity) or set of interactions. We place interactions with a goal-oriented, more highly directive focus on one end of the continuum and interactions with a relational and less directive focus on the other end of the focus continuum (that is, the focus dimension is vertical; see Table 1.1).

The two other dimensions of this framework designate an interaction's purpose and authorship. Both what and whose purpose any mentor-mentee interaction serves and how it is negotiated, selected, or authored are key to what makes developmental and instrumental styles effective. In Table 1.1, the purpose continuum is presented horizontally (conventional on left, playful on right). The activity negotiation process, or authorship, is characterized by three columns (from left to right): program- or mentor-selected, collaboratively selected, and mentee-selected interactions. Each dimension—the interaction's focus, purpose, and authorship—is addressed separately below.

Focus: The target of the interaction and structure imposed to reach it

Focus best captures the continuum from relational to goal-directed interactions. The term *focus* reflects both the degree of goal-directedness and goal-oriented structure *and* the specific goals or intended outcomes of the interaction. The focus of an interaction is the target of attention, or that which is being influenced by the interactions. The focus may be internal to the child or relationship (for example, the child's emotional-well being or one's experience of the relationship) or an observable goal or skill-related outcome. We define a *goal-oriented interaction* focus as aimed at effecting an external, observable, demonstrable outcome such as mastery of a

Table 1.1. The theoretically evolving activities in mentoring (TEAM) framework: A typology of mentoring relationship interaction focus, purpose, and authorship

Purpose	Authorship			Purpose
Serves conventional (adult) purpose	**Unilateral: "Me" (mentor) focused**	**Collaborative: "We" focus (collaboration)**	**Unilateral: "Me" (mentee) focused**	**Serves playful (or youthful) purpose**
	Focus Minimally goal directed, highly relational, or both			
Adult-led spontaneous (nonrelational)	1. Preacher as in mentor-driven, but goal is vague. Mentor talks about whatever seems important at the time. Mentee is disengaged (usually a nonrelational approach)	2. Laissez-faire[a] mentor or acquaintance[b] as in doing whatever both can agree on in the moment. This is a nonrelational and unstructured relationship "about nothing"	3. Jocular mentor as in unstructured and overly playful (e.g., mentee has fun, play is spontaneous), but mentor can feel insignificant, peripheral (nonrelational approach)	Youth-led spontaneous (nonrelational)
Adult-oriented preventive and developmental activities or discussions (relational focus)	4. Role model takes a youth development focus on prevention (e.g., indirectly addresses conventional concerns such as school, work); the focus is the mentee (self-in-the-future) and on their relationship as the primary means to achieve growth	5. Developmental[c] mentor as initially relational interaction focus yet very collaborative (includes talk about interests, relationships, experiences; play, casual activities). "We" authorship supports the incorporation of more goal-oriented interactions later on	6. Playmate or friend[b] as in playful, supportive, relational interactions focused on youth's interests (e.g., may learn skills indirectly); focus is the mentee's self-in-the-present as enhanced through the relationship	Youth-oriented preventive and developmental activities or discussions (relational focus)
Conventional skill development purpose relevant to adult/societal goals, interests, or beliefs about what the mentee needs to prepare for future (primarily goal-oriented focus)	**7.** Tutor[b] with a focus on goal-directed interactions that are conventional. Focus on developing skills for adult world (such as reading or writing) or goal directed and future oriented (coaching of job skills); often didactic	8. Instrumental[d] mentor as collaborative, goal-oriented focus on character and competence; shared purpose in the goal they choose or agree to focus on; the interactions are goal directed at first but become increasingly relational over time	9. Teammate as being goal directed and playful (e.g., older and wiser peer) to help teammate (mentee) develop the skills needed to play well or may focus in the mentee's present concerns (e.g., peers, personal relationships)	Playful skill development purpose relevant to the youths' goals or interests, or emphasizes outcomes in the present (primarily goal-oriented focus)
Remedial/ intervention-oriented: Serves adults' goals (goal oriented)	10. Prescriptive[c] mentor as heavy handed (often insensitive), bombastic, directed at problems and adult identified goals	11. Apprenticeship highly instructive (directive), minimally relational but has some youth buy-in through shared purpose	12. Coach as active, fun, but very directive and minimally relational. Focus on youth's goals, such as improved skills	Remedial/ intervention-oriented: Serves youths' goals (goal oriented)
	Focus Highly goal directed, minimally relational, or both			

[a]Langhout, Rhodes, and Osborne (2004).
[b]Keller and Pryce, this volume.
[c]Morrow and Styles (1995).
[d]Hamilton and Hamilton (1992).

skill or some other kind of achievement. Conversely, a relational interaction focus is on facilitating, strengthening, or building the relationship and on processes internal to the child, such as connectedness, self-esteem, or hopefulness, that are fostered through a deepening of the mentor-mentee relationship.

Focus also reflects the degree of directivity, such that interactions can be spontaneous and relatively unstructured or more

directed and structured. Typically goal-oriented interactions are more structured, and relational interactions are less structured, but this is not always the case.

The focus continuum can be used to characterize the two interaction constructs, relational and goal directed, as well as the two main relationship styles, instrumental and developmental. Based on work by Morrow and Styles and Hamilton and Hamilton, a developmental relationship prioritizes at the start of the match the mentoring relationship and the mentee's social and emotional development broadly, whereas an instrumental relationship places primary focus at the start of the match on the achievement of a specific purpose, such as the development of specific skills.[19] However, the dimension of focus alone is insufficient to fully capture the richness of the developmental and instrumental relationship styles.

Purpose: Whose agenda is served by an interaction?

The second dimension researchers and practitioners commonly address is the underlying purpose the interaction serves. The primary stakeholders, proponents, or beneficiaries of a given interaction may be adults in society (or the youth in the future) *or* the youth more generally (and more immediately). Viewed from another vantage, the dimension of purpose (adult/future versus child/present) captures whether the purpose of the interaction, either the activity or discussion, is conventional (in Jessor and Jessor's terms[20]) or playful. In assessing the purpose dimension, we are not determining who (mentor or mentee) selected the specific activity (that is captured as authorship which is described in the following section), but rather whose agenda (that of adults generally or of youth generally) the interaction most serves, or whose needs it meets ultimately.

Most mentoring interactions can be viewed as having primarily a conventional or playful purpose. If the purpose is conventional, its outcome is future oriented, typically addressing or promoting the conventions of adult society, such as interactions that are oriented toward the youth's getting a job, going to college, gradu-

ating from high school, or learning skills important in the world of work. If the purpose is playful, it is more present oriented and more aligned with the immediate developmental inclinations of youth for fun interactions. Playful purposes are more youthful in that they attend to the priorities of youth (rather than those of adults). Although Jessor and Jessor call this focus "unconventional" (as contrasted with "conventional"), we feel this term is unnecessarily dismissive of the youths' needs generally and of youths' need for play more specifically.[21] Indeed, it could be said that the conventions of the youth world tend to be organized around playfulness. The difference between playing in the present and achieving in the future also may be seen as the difference between being and becoming. This is why the conventional purpose often co-occurs with goal-directed focus and the playful purpose often co-occurs with the relational focus. It is worth noting, of course, that each purpose, just like each focus, can help facilitate the mentee's emotional growth and well-being.

Sometimes an interaction is not clearly characterized as either conventional or playful; often this occurs when the purpose is overshadowed by the manner in which the interaction is negotiated. For example, when participants demonstrate caring for one another or engage in efforts to learn about one another (which can seem neither singly conventional nor playful), what stands out is the collaborative or reciprocal nature of the interchanges. Sometimes the "how" of their interaction—the manner in which the relationship is being authored—predominates, making focus and purpose less relevant characteristics, such as when each shares information about themselves or actively listens to elicit the knowledge about one another needed to achieve mutuality and effectively collaborate in the future.

Authorship: How interactions are negotiated

The third dimension of the framework is the nature of the negotiations that determine what happens in the mentoring relationship from moment to moment (see Exhibit 1.3). Authorship is important because until the degree to which a mentee is invested

Exhibit 1.3. Types of negotiations: The manner in which mentors and mentees decide what to do

Unilateral (one-sided)	In a unilaterally negotiated interaction, only one of the two parties feels that his or her needs were met through what was done, discussed, or focused on. The mentor may insist the match set goals or do a particular project, while the mentee complies despite having no interest in the activity. Similarly, the mentee may insist on playing games, interacting with peers, or talking about a topic of little interest to the mentor or that the mentor feels is not consistent with the role of a mentor.
Collaborative (mutual) .	In a collaborative negotiation, the unique perspectives of both the mentor and mentee are brought to bear on decisions made about what to do, what to focus on, or how to do something. Collaborative negotiations of activities and interaction topics are mutually generated and result in decisions satisfying to both parties. Optimally, collaborative decisions about what to do or talk about reflect the unique perspectives (that is, needs, experiences, talents, and interests) of both mentor and mentee, such that the same decisions would not have emerged had those two unique people not been present and considered each other's unique characteristics. For example, the same outcome would not result from a similar negotiation with a peer, teacher, or parent. For this reason, the outcome typically does not reflect what either would have independently chosen to do because the result of the negotiation was created by the confluence of their two unique perspectives.
Reciprocal[a]	Reciprocal interactions reflect two-way exchanges in which both parties' perspectives are honored such that each gets what he or she wants, albeit not exactly how or when it might have been wanted. Mentors and mentees might take turns or engage in some give-and-take that allows both to feel that their separate needs are met to some degree.

[a]This is not shown in Table 1.1.

in a given interaction is known, the perceived usefulness of the interaction's focus and purpose remains unclear. Understanding whether a program, mentor, or mentee introduced an activity or discussion topic is a good starting place for assessing the degree of youth buy-in. However, we feel that ultimately, who proposed the activity is less important than the process of negotiating what hap-

pens in the match; we believe that how interactions are authored typically determines both mentors' and mentees' degree of buy-in. In fact, hallmark indicators of buy-in by both participants are those moments of sharing, caring, and listening that enable the creation of their shared experience.

Selman and Schultz describe collaboration as a negotiation in which the nature of a joint activity reflects both partners' unique contribution to the selection (or creation) of the activity. Collaborative approaches create a sense of "we-ness," or shared experience, that can play a transformative role in therapeutic relationships and natural relationships.[22] We believe that unilateral (one-sided) and collaborative (mutually beneficial) interactions with the same focus (target and structure) can result in very different program outcomes (see Table 1.1).

Not pictured in Table 1.1 are reciprocal negotiations, in which each person's separate interests are met through a process of cooperation or turn taking. While this is a common negotiation style among youth, the mentoring literature says little about such interactions. In contrast, the literature consistently reveals the negative effects of unilateral negotiations and the positive effects of collaborative negotiations (see Karcher, Herrera, and Hansen, this volume). This is why it is important to take an interpersonal negotiation perspective to fully understand how mentors work with mentees to determine the purpose of their interactions. For this reason, we view collaboratively generated interactions as essential to fully describing developmental and instrumental styles.

How the framework explains two effective mentoring relationship styles

Having laid out the TEAM framework, we return to the original studies from which the terms *developmental* and *instrumental* emerged in order to reveal how this framework provides a useful way to characterize these two styles. We do this to underscore the importance of distinguishing between mentoring interactions and

relationship styles and to illustrate the role of focus, purpose, and authorship in making this distinction. We provide the original definitions of these terms to underscore the importance of youth centeredness—the degree of collaboration between mentor and mentee—in the original definitions of these terms.

Developmental style

Morrow and Styles conducted a study of matches in the Big Brothers Big Sisters program, and their results revealed a portrait of successful mentoring relationships that they described as developmental:

> These relationships were given the label "developmental" because the adult partner in the match focused on providing youth with a comfort zone in which to address a broad range of developmental tasks—such as building emotional well-being, developing social skills, or gaining straightforward exposure to a range of recreational and cultural activities. Developmental volunteers responded flexibly to their youth, adjusting to any preconceived notions as to the reality, circumstances and needs of their younger partner. Furthermore, these volunteers intentionally incorporated youth into decision-making about the relationship, allowing them to help choose activities and have a voice in determining whether and when the adult would provide advice and guidance.[23]

As Morrow and Styles describe it, the developmental style typically begins with interactions that are more relational in focus. This early focus on the relationship is deemed important because the relationship is viewed as a conduit through which the mentor influences the mentee's skills, internal characteristics, and emotional well-being. However, it would be inaccurate to suggest that the developmental style is only relationship focused (purely relational approaches to mentoring appear to have considerable limitations) because in this approach, the mentor is consistently youth focused and collaborative.[24]

Instrumental style

The instrumental style also is not only goal directed but essentially collaborative. Steve Hamilton and Mary Hamilton's research on

mentoring has focused on adolescents, and primarily on the process of workplace mentoring and apprenticeships.[25] Their research into reasons why some matches tended to meet less frequently than they should have revealed that "understanding [the mentors'] purposes was a critical predictor of the regularity of meetings." They found that mentors who saw their primary purpose as developing a relationship with their mentees were least likely to meet regularly, whereas "the mentors who seemed best able to overcome the frustrations of their task were those who combined the aims of developing competence and developing character."[26] It is for this reason that they later suggested that mentoring for high-school-aged youth is more appealing to the youth and more effective when "it occurs in the context of joint goal-directed (instrumental) activity" and when "the relationship develops around shared goals and actions more than purely social interaction."[27] Thus, instrumental relationships are not only goal directed but have a clearly defined shared goal and purpose at their core.

This reveals an important point about the types of interactions that may work best with older versus younger youth. Hamilton and Hamilton suggest that instrumental mentoring may be more optimal and developmentally appropriate for high school students than for younger mentees. It is worth noting that in the work by Morrow and Styles and in most studies of the Big Brothers Big Sisters program, the mentees are children and younger adolescents.[28] Notice that descriptions of these two mentoring styles emphasize meeting specific developmental needs.

Another commonality in the developmental and instrumental styles is the change in focus over time. For example, Morrow and Styles suggest that developmental relationships tend to take on a more goal-directed focus later in the relationship:

> After relatively extended and pacific periods primarily devoted to relationship-building—that is, to establishing trust and partnership, and enjoying activities—the majority of youth in developmental relationships began to demonstrate a pattern of independent help-seeking in which they voluntarily divulged such difficulties as poor grades or family strife. . . . Once their relationships were crystallized, nearly three-quarters of the

developmental volunteers were successful in involving youth in conversations or activities that targeted such key areas of youth development as academic performance and classroom behavior.[29]

Similarly, Hamilton and Hamilton reported that successful instrumental mentoring relationships "will have stronger positive impacts on youth when they endure over extended periods of time, are reciprocal, involve deepening emotional ties . . . and provide a balance of challenge and support."[30] Given this prior research, we do not see the two approaches or styles—developmental and instrumental—as dichotomous or independent; rather, we view them as interdependent. They differ mostly in terms of whether the relationship starts off more relational or goal-directed.

How the framework explains two ineffective mentoring relationship styles

We suggest that a pattern of mentoring interactions that either lacks any articulated goals or focuses exclusively on goals and skill development can result in quite ineffective mentoring. These approaches are revealed in the top and bottom rows of Table 1.1: in both rows, there are examples of "mentors" whose approach fosters minimal focus on the relationship and virtually no collaboration.

Laissez-faire relationship style

Jean Rhodes (personal communication, 2007) described the "low key" relationship that she and colleagues had previously identified[31] as a "laissez-faire" match. This laissez-faire mentoring relationship style reflects mentoring without a rudder. Although positioned in the center of Table 1.1, this relationship is not collaborative. Rather, its position in the center cell emphasizes that neither the mentor's nor the mentee's purpose is addressed. Neither mentor nor mentee considers, discusses, or reflects on the purpose of an activity other than that it is pleasurable in the moment. These

interactions are unstructured, nondirective, and nonrelational; they have no clear goal; and they seem to emerge organically in response to contextual factors (for example, a ball is available, and so they play). It relies too much on the immediate experience and does not attend to the relationship in the moment or view strengthening it as an end in itself.

Like what Keller and Pryce (this volume) call acquaintances, these relationships are neither relational nor goal directed, which makes them impersonal, aimless matches that lack the normal tension and affective commitment of partners that is essential to healthy, growing relationships. The focus lacks attention to the child's need for purposeful and goal-directed interactions, and neither person considers how their interactions help facilitate the relationship or the mentee's social or emotional well-being. Such directionless matches can drain the mentor's sense of efficacy and undermine the mentee's interest in the mentor.

Prescriptive style

Looking at the other end of the framework in Table 1.1, it also is easy to understand why prescriptive is the opposite of developmental.[32] In the prescriptive style, the focus is almost singularly goal or change oriented, and it is highly structured. It typically emphasizes remediating the child's faults or problems (highly conventional, to the point, at times, of being punishing) and is not at all youth-centric (it reflects the mentor's unilateral authorship). Prescriptive styles are heavy-handed and one-sided, and the youth may feel like a pawn to the mentor's achieving his or her own goals or meeting his or her own needs.

Using the framework to explain structured yet effective natural mentoring relationships

The framework also reveals why two common natural mentoring styles, the apprenticeship and coaching mentoring styles, may be so effective. Both are highly structured and goal oriented (like the

prescriptive approach), but by being either collaborative in their negotiation approach (apprenticeship) or sufficiently playful in their purpose (coaches), these styles may provide unique and important relationship experiences that are welcomed by many youth. It is worth noting these particular natural mentoring styles to underscore and illustrate that under some conditions, these highly goal-oriented styles can be quite effective, despite a minimal presence of relational interactions.

Conclusion

A variety of structures and approaches can be used to capitalize on the power of mentoring relationships to influence, even in modest ways, the lives of vulnerable youth. We hope we have successfully used this framework to provide both a clearer definition of the developmental and instrumental styles, as well as greater differentiation of these from other terms, in a way that will be helpful to program staff and researchers alike in their work. Information about specific intervention elements and processes such as these is necessary to describe effective mentoring at the level of specificity that Tolan et al. suggest is necessary to qualify youth mentoring as a bona-fide intervention.[33] Although program staff need to hold true to a vision of the relationship as the core change catalyst, they also may need to consider ways to encourage goal-oriented interactions and foster instrumental mentoring styles to maximize the potential of youth mentoring. We hope our elaboration of the theoretically evolving activities in the mentoring framework will help to inform the next generation of research, theory, and practice innovations necessary to realizing the full potential of this highly varied resource for youth called mentoring.

Notes

1. Tolan, P., Henry, D. H., Schoeny, M., & Bass, A. (2008). *Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems.* Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, University of Illinois at Chicago. P. 21.

2. Karcher, M. J. (2007). *The importance of match activities on mentoring relationships.* National teleconference conducted by the Mentoring Resource Center. Retrieved March 3, 2007, from http://www.edmentoring.org/seminar2.html. Karcher, M. J. (2008). The study of mentoring in the learning environment (SMILE): A randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of school-based mentoring. *Prevention Science*, *9*, 99–113.

3. Hamilton, M. A., & Hamilton, S. F. (2005). Work and service-learning. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 348–363). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

4. Rhodes, J. E. (Ed.). (2002a). A critical view of youth mentoring. In G. G. Noam (Series Ed.), *New Directions for Youth Development*, No. 93. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

5. Hamilton & Hamilton. (2005). Darling, N. (2005). Mentoring adolescents. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 177–190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

7. Rhodes, J. E. (2002b). *Stand by me: The risks and rewards of mentoring today's youth.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Morrow, K. V., & Styles, M. B. (1995). *Building relationships with youth in program settings: A study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

8. Karcher, M. J., Kuperminc, G. P., Portwood, S. G., Sipe, C. L., & Taylor, A. S. (2006). Mentoring programs: A framework to inform program development, research, and evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*(6), 709–725.

9. Langhout, R. D., Rhodes, J. E., & Osborne, L. N. (2004). An exploratory study of youth mentoring in an urban context: Adolescents' perceptions of relationship styles. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *33*(4), 293–306.

10. Morrow & Styles. (1995). Hamilton, S. F., & Hamilton, M. A. (1992). Mentoring programs: Promise and paradox. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *73*, 546–550.

11. Karcher, M. J. (2010). *The Cross-age Mentoring Program (CAMP) for children with adolescent mentors: Program manual.* Portland, OR: Education Northwest.

12. Keller, T. E. (2005). The stages and development of mentoring relationships. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 82–99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

13. Morrow & Styles. (1995).

14. Keller. (2005).

15. Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. L. (1977). *Problem behavior and psychological development: A longitudinal study of youth.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

16. Selman, R. L., & Schultz, L. H. (1990). *Making a friend in youth: Developmental theory and pair therapy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

17. Karcher. (2010).

18. Karcher. (2010).

19. Hamilton and Hamilton. (2005); Morrow & Styles. (1995).

20. Jessor & Jessor. (1977).

21. Jessor & Jessor. (1977).
22. Selman & Schultz. (1990); Nakkula, M., & Selman, R. (1991). How people "treat" each other: Pair therapy as a context for the development of interpersonal ethics. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (Vol. 3, pp. 179–211). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
23. Morrow & Styles. (1995). P. 19.
24. Morrow & Styles. (1995).
25. Hamilton & Hamilton. (2005); Morrow & Styles. (1995).
26. Hamilton & Hamilton. (1992). P. 548.
27. Hamilton & Hamilton. (2005). Pp. 352–353.
28. Morrow & Styles. (1995). Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., Feldman, A. F., McMaken, J., & Jucovy, L. (2007). *Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring impact study.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
29. Morrow & Styles. (1995). P. 20.
30. Hamilton & Hamilton. (2005). Pp. 352–353.
31. Langhout, Rhodes, & Osborne. (2004).
32. Morrow & Styles. (1995).
33. Tolan et al. (2008).

MICHAEL J. KARCHER *is a professor of education and human development at the University of Texas at San Antonio.*

MICHAEL J. NAKKULA *is a practice professor and chair of the division of Applied Psychology and Human Development at the University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education.*