7-1-2006

A Qualitative Examination of Graduate Advising Relationships: The Advisor Perspective

Sarah Knox
Marquette University, sarah.knox@marquette.edu

Lewis Z. Schlosser
Seton Hall University

Nathan Pruitt
Marquette University, nathan.pruitt@marquette.edu

Clara E. Hill
University of Maryland

A Qualitative Examination of Graduate Advising Relationships: The Advisor Perspective

Sarah Knox
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI

Lewis Z. Schlosser
Seton Hall University
South Orange, NJ

Nathan T. Pruitt
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI

Clara E. Hill
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

Nineteen counseling psychology faculty members were interviewed regarding their advising relationships with doctoral students. Advisors informally learned to advise from their experiences with their advisor and their advisees and defined their role as supporting and advocating for advisees as they navigated their doctoral program. Advisors identified personal satisfaction as a benefit and time demands as a cost of advising. Good advising relationships were facilitated by advisees' positive personal or professional characteristics, mutual respect, open communication, similarity in career path between

advisor and advisee, and lack of conflict. Difficult relationships were affected by advisees' negative personal or professional characteristics, lack of respect, research struggles, communication problems, advisors feeling ineffective working with advisees, disruption or rupture of the relationship, and conflict avoidance. Implications for research and training are discussed.

Advising relationships are vitally important in shaping students' experiences of counseling psychology doctoral programs (Gelso, 1979, 1993, 1997; Gelso & Lent, 2000; Magoon & Holland, 1984; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, in press; Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, & Hill, 2003). Although the advising relationship is certainly not unique to counseling psychology, it is nevertheless a central part of the training in which all are involved at some point in their career, whether as student or faculty. In addition, given our profession's focus on relationships and developmental perspectives, such an examination falls well within counseling psychology's interests and parameters.

The duties of the advisor, whom we defined as the faculty member who bears the greatest responsibility for helping guide the advisee through her or his doctoral program, are multifold. These responsibilities broadly include facilitating advisees' progress through graduate school as well as helping advisees with research requirements (e.g., thesis, dissertation), evolution as a practitioner, career guidance, and professional development.

We begin, though, by clarifying a few relevant terms. Although advising does share features with mentoring, these two constructs differ in ways quite meaningful to the current study. Mentoring connotes a positive relationship in which a protégé acquires professional skills (Cronan-Hillix, Gensheimer, Cronan-Hillix, & Davidson, 1986; Russell & Adams, 1997); advising refers to a relationship that may be positive or negative, within which guidance related to professional skill development may or may not be provided (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). In the current study, then, *advising* is the more appropriate term because such relationships may be either positive or negative.

In the extant literature, mentoring has received more attention (e.g., Hollingsworth & Fassinger, 2002; Russell & Adams, 1997), both within and beyond counseling psychology, than has advising. This literature reflects quite a diversity of settings, however—including business and industry, academia, and community mental health institutions. Relatedly, according to Green and Bauer (1995),

mentoring is contextually bound and, as a result, will take different forms in different settings. Our review of the mentoring literature, then, includes only those investigations that have addressed mentoring in academia, for such a focus ensures the greatest consistency with the current study's emphasis on counseling psychology advising relationships.

Smith and Davidson (1992), for example, examined the effects of mentoring among African American graduate students. They found that only one third of the respondents reported having a mentor, whether from their university or from community professionals and that 41% of these mentors were African American. In addition, the presence of a mentor significantly predicted students' professional development (i.e., teaching, research, grantsmanship). In another study, Green and Bauer (1995) longitudinally investigated the relationship between doctoral student potential for mentoring (i.e., attitudes and objective abilities) and mentoring actually provided by the faculty advisor. They found, intriguingly, that the students perceived as most capable (i.e., higher verbal aptitude, stronger commitment to program) elicited more mentoring from their advisors than did their less capable peers.

In the first published empirical study of graduate advising relationships in counseling psychology, Schlosser and Gelso (2001) developed a paper-andpencil, self-report measure of the working alliance between advisors and advisees (i.e., the Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version), measuring this alliance from the advisee's perspective. The advisory working alliance was defined in this study as "that portion of the [advising] relationship that reflects the connection between advisor and advisee that is made during work toward common goals" (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, p. 158). The authors noted, however, that the advisory alliance was not considered as encompassing all aspects of the advising relationship but only those aspects that are a result of collaboration toward agreed-on goals. Major findings included positive correlations between the advisory alliance and students' research self-efficacy, attitudes toward research, and perceptions of the advisor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy. The advisors' perspective on the advisory working alliance, however, was not examined in this research.

In a second study, Schlosser et al. (2003) qualitatively investigated advisees' perceptions of the advising relationship and

found marked differences between relationships that advisees described as satisfactory and those they described as unsatisfactory. More specifically, advisees who were satisfied with their advising relationship reported that they frequently met with their advisor, focused on general program requirements as well as research and career guidance, were encouraged to participate in conferences and were introduced to important people in the field, and felt very comfortable discussing professional concerns with their advisor. They also reported a range of benefits and no costs of this relationship and indicated that not only was conflict addressed openly but that such discussions strengthened the advising relationship. In contrast, advisees who were unsatisfied with their advising relationship reported only infrequent meetings with their advisors, stated that career guidance and research were often not a part of their advising relationship, nor were they encouraged to attend conferences and introduced to important people in the field. They did not feel as comfortable discussing professional concerns with their advisors, did not report many of the gains identified by their satisfied counterparts, and also indicated that their advisors' inaccessibility forced them to go elsewhere for the advising they sought but did not receive. For the unsatisfied advisees, conflict was avoided in the advising relationship and the relationship tended to worsen over time. Although both of these studies (i.e., Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; Schlosser et al., 2003) add to our understanding of the advising relationship, they focused solely on the perspectives of advisees and thus provide an incomplete picture, for we have yet to hear the voice of advisors.

We sought, then, to explore the advising relationship from advisors' perspectives (e.g., how advisors define the roles of advisor and advisee, the costs and benefits of advising, and one specific example of a good and one of a difficult advising relationship) whose experience of these relationships may differ in meaningful ways from those of advisees. For example, advisors inherently possess more power than do advisees, a dynamic that may affect their relationships. In addition, advisors' relationships with their own graduate advisors may influence their approach to advising. Finally, whereas advisees normally have only one advisor, advisors usually have multiple advisees, and thus, their experience of the advising relationship may indeed be quite different from that of their students. Our hope was that such an investigation would complement, and allow comparison

with, the work of Schlosser et al. (2003). We also hoped that the findings of this study would shed light on the factors that advisors believe contribute to good versus difficult advising relationships and thereby might increase advisors' satisfaction with this important role of their professional lives. In addition, such understanding may also enable advisors to enhance the advising they provide their students.

Because of the sparse empirical research on the advising relationship in counseling psychology, we believed that a qualitative approach would be an effective means of investigating advisors' experiences without restricting their responses. Such methodologies are well suited to the investigation of as-yet relatively unexplored areas. Furthermore, we felt that such an approach (i.e., using words as data) would foster potentially richer descriptions of advising relationships than would be afforded by a methodology whose data consisted of numbers.

Thus, we used consensual qualitative research (CQR), a methodology developed by Hill, Thompson, and Williams (1997) and recently updated (Hill, Knox, Thompson, Williams, Hess, & Ladany, in press). In CQR, a comparatively small number of cases is explored intensively to acquire a keen understanding of a particular phenomenon, data analysis occurs via a consensual group process, and findings emerge inductively from the data. Throughout the data analysis process, an auditor checks the emerging consensus judgments to ensure that they are based solidly on the data and are as free of researcher bias as possible. We chose CQR over other qualitative approaches because of two important strengths. First, CQR uses several judges in addition to at least one auditor, thereby decreasing the likelihood that any one researcher's views will disproportionately affect the data analysis. Second, the CQR interview is both consistent and flexible: Although all participants are asked the same basic questions, the interviewer is also free to pursue areas in more depth based on participants' responses.

Method

Participants

Advisors. Nineteen advisors (11 men, 8 women; 2 African American, 12 White, 3 Latina/o, and 2 Other) in APA-accredited counseling psychology doctoral programs participated in this study. They ranged in age from 33 to 69 years ($M = 46.44$; $SD = 9.45$);

reported specializations of counseling psychology (*n* = 18) and combined clinical, counseling, and school psychology (*n* = 1); and indicated that their terminal degrees were PhD (*n* = 18) and EdD (*n* = 1). These participants had been advising counseling psychology doctoral students for an average of 14.95 years (*SD* = 8.36), had advised an average of 25 counseling psychology doctoral students (*SD* = 14.12) during that time, and currently advised an average of 7 (*SD* = 2.68) doctoral students. Finally, when asked about the degree of emphasis advisors placed on each of the following areas in their advising relationships, participants indicated that practice received an average of 17% (*SD* = 12.15), research an average of 55% (*SD* = 20.37), teaching an average of 18% (*SD* = 11.46), and other (e.g., professional development) an average of 10% of their emphasis (*SD* = 10.45). Most of the advisees whom participants discussed were female and of traditional graduate school age (i.e., 20s to 30s), approximately half of whom were White and half were advisees of color.

Interviewers and judges. Three counseling psychologist researchers (i.e., a 41-year-old White woman, a 30-year-old White man, and a 26-yearold White man) conducted the telephone interviews and were the judges on the primary research team. One interviewer or judge was an assistant professor and two were counseling psychology doctoral students at the time of the study. A professor of counseling psychology (i.e., a 53-year-old White woman) served as auditor. All were authors of the study, and three had prior experience doing other CQR investigations.

Prior to collecting data, all of the authors discussed any biases they may have related to the study by answering the protocol questions based on their own experience as advisees or advisors. In terms of their advisors' approach, the doctoral students (both of whom described their advising relationship as positive) felt that their advisors approached the advising relationship by tailoring it to their needs, as well as by providing them with their primary guidance and mentoring in their graduate program. The relationship focused on a wide range of topics (e.g., research, teaching, practicum, professional development, relevant personal concerns); and whether they had chosen or been assigned to their advisor, the doctoral students felt that the ability to change advisors was very important. Positive advising relationships were described as consisting of a balance of support and challenge,

shared interests and personality features, evolution of the relationship over time, advisor accessibility, and open management of conflict. The doctoral students hypothesized that negative advising relationships would be characterized by a poor connection between advisor and advisee and by advisors who were inaccessible, rigid, and unempathic.

With respect to the authors who were faculty members and themselves advisors, one of the faculty reported that she met with advisees both individually and in groups (the other met with advisees only individually), and although both focused on research, they also attended to how advisees were doing in the program. The faculty stated that their advisees were matched with them according to research interests and that although doctoral students may change advisors at a later point, most stayed with their initial advisor. The faculty described positive relationships as involving bright students who were responsible and eager to work and who were pleasant to advise (e.g., good sense of humor, positive outlook, take appropriate initiative), whereas negative relationships were characterized by advisees who were uninvested in their graduate training and who crossed boundaries.

Measures

Demographic form. The demographic form asked for basic information about the participants: age, sex, race or ethnicity, terminal degree (i.e., EdD, PhD, PsyD), area of specialization (i.e., clinical psychology, counseling psychology, educational psychology), years of experience advising counseling psychology doctoral students, total number of counseling psychology doctoral students advised, current number of counseling psychology doctoral students advised, emphases in these advising relationships (i.e., practice, research, teaching, and other), and demographic information about their current advisees (i.e., age, race or ethnicity, sex). The form also asked participants to give their name and contact information so that researchers could arrange for the first interview.

Interview protocol. Our semistructured interview protocol (i.e., all participants were asked a standard set of questions, and interviewers routinely pursued new or additional areas that arose from participants' responses; see the Appendix) began by asking participants some questions about their counseling psychology advising relationships as a whole (e.g., role of advisor and advisee,

how they learned to be an advisor, benefits and costs of advising counseling psychology doctoral students). The next section of the interview focused on two distinct advising relationships, the first an example of an advising relationship that the participant felt was positive and the second an example of an advising relationship that the participant felt was negative or ambivalent. For each of these two examples, we gathered some basic information about the advisee (e.g., age, sex), asked what contributed to the relationship quality, and how the advisor and advisee negotiated conflict. The interview closed with questions regarding the effect of the interview on the participant and why the participant chose to take part in the study. Because of space limitations, data yielded by other questions are not reported here.

The follow-up interview adhered to no distinct or set protocol but instead gave the researcher an opportunity to ask further questions he or she may have had after the first interview and also provided the participant an opportunity to add to or amend any information given in the first interview. Furthermore, the follow-up allowed both researcher and participant to discuss what, if any, additional thoughts had been evoked by the initial interview. The data gathered from this interview tended to be brief comments or reflections regarding participants' approach to advising; participants offered no substantial revisions to data gathered in their first interview. Data from both interviews were considered together in the data analysis.

Procedures for Collecting Data

Recruiting advisors. A list was generated of all faculty at APA-accredited counseling psychology doctoral programs, excluding those known personally by the primary team. From this initial list of 454 individuals, 227 (one half of 454, in the hope that this would yield a sample of sufficient size) persons were randomly selected and mailed a recruitment postcard announcing the study and informing them that they would be receiving a complete packet in approximately 1 week. The packet contained a cover letter describing the study, including assurances of confidentiality via the use of code numbers and requirements for participation (i.e., faculty at an APA-accredited counseling psychology doctoral program who were themselves counseling psychologists [i.e., EdD or PhD in counseling psychology]

and had been advising counseling psychology doctoral students for at least 5 years), a consent form, a demographic form, the interview protocol, and a postcard participants could return under separate cover to request a copy of the study's results. From the mailing, 19 individuals completed and returned their consent and demographic forms, indicating their willingness to participate in the study. They were then contacted by one of the primary researchers and a time for the initial telephone interview established. No additional follow-up contact was attempted with those who did not respond. Eleven (of the 227) individuals responded that they did not meet the participation criteria (e.g., had not been advising counseling psychology doctoral students for at least 5 years, did not have an EdD or PhD in counseling psychology), 4 others responded that they did not wish to participate (e.g., because of other time commitments), and 1 postcard was returned as undeliverable, yielding a response rate of 8.80%.

Interviewing. The protocol was piloted on two nonparticipant volunteers who met the criteria for participation; comments on the protocol were also obtained from two additional individuals who did not complete a pilot interview. We revised the protocol (e.g., clarification of question wording, deletion of redundant questions) based on all of this feedback. Each of the primary team members then completed both the initial and follow-up telephone interviews with six or seven advisors. At the end of each interview, the researcher made brief notes on the interview, noting the length of the interview and the degree of rapport developed with the participant. At the conclusion of the 30- to 60-minute first interview, the follow-up interview was scheduled for approximately 2 weeks later. At the end of the 5- to 20-minute follow-up interview, the researcher asked the advisors if they were willing to receive and comment on a draft of the final results. The second interview closed with a short debriefing paragraph.

Transcripts. The interviews were transcribed verbatim (except for minimal encouragers, silences, and stutters) for all participants. Any identifying information was deleted from the transcripts, and each participant was assigned a code number to protect confidentiality.

Draft of final results. Participants who so requested (*n* = 15) were sent a draft of the final results of the study for their comments. We asked them to consider the degree to which their own experiences had been reflected in the group results depicted in the draft. Additionally, they were asked to verify that their and their advisees'

confidentiality had been maintained in any examples contained in the results. Five participants responded and suggested no changes.

Procedures for Analyzing Data

The data were analyzed according to CQR methods (Hill et al., 1997; Hill et al., in press). Fundamental in this qualitative methodology is arriving at consensus about data classification and meaning. Consensus is obtained via team members discussing their individual understandings and then agreeing on a final interpretation that all find satisfactory. At least some initial disagreement is anticipated and is later followed by agreement (i.e., consensus) on the meaning of the data.

Coding of domains. A start list (Miles & Huberman, 1994) of domains (i.e., topic areas) was first developed by the primary team by grouping the interview questions. The domains were revised by reviewing the transcripts, and considerable modifications were made throughout the process to reflect the emerging data. The final domains appear in Tables 1 and 2. Using the final transcripts, the three judges independently assigned each meaning unit (i.e., a complete thought, varying from a short phrase to several sentences) from each transcript into one or more domains. Next, the judges discussed the assignment of meaning units into domains until they reached consensus.

Coding of core ideas. For those interviews completed by each judge, he or she read all of the data within each domain and then wrote what he or she considered to be the core ideas that captured the content of the data more concisely. All three judges then discussed each core idea until they achieved consensus about both content and wording. The auditor examined the resulting consensus version for each case and assessed the accuracy of the domain coding as well as the wording of the core ideas. The judges reviewed the auditor's comments and again arrived at consensus for the domain coding and the wording of the core ideas.

Cross-analysis. The initial cross analysis was performed, consistent with CQR methodology, on 17 of the 19 cases (see further). First, responsibility for completing an initial cross-analysis on the domains was evenly divided between the primary team judges (i.e., each judge had responsibility for approximately one third of the domains). Using the core ideas from all cases for each specific domain, the judge responsible for that domain inductively created categories

that fit these core ideas best. All judges on the primary team next reached consensus regarding the conceptual labels (titles) of the categories and the core ideas that were placed in each category. The team members then reexamined the consensus versions of all cases to determine whether they contained evidence not yet coded for any of the categories. Categories and domains were thus revised until the judges agreed that the data had been well represented. The auditor then reviewed the cross-analysis. Any suggestions made by the auditor were discussed by the primary team and integrated if agreed on by consensus judgment, resulting in a revised cross-analysis. The auditor then checked this revised cross-analysis.

Stability check. After the initial cross-analysis was completed, the remaining two cases (dropped in the initial cross-analysis; see earlier) were added to determine whether the category designations of *general*, *typical*, *variant*, and *rare* (see further) changed, and also to assess whether the team felt that new categories were needed to accommodate the cases. The remaining cases did not alter the results meaningfully (e.g., no new categories were necessary), and thus, the findings were considered stable.

Results

The standard three categories used in CQR (e.g., general categories occur in all cases, typical categories occur in at least half but not all of the cases, and variant categories occur in at least two but fewer than half of the cases) created too blunt a system for presenting the findings based on these 19 cases, which is a relatively large sample for a CQR study (i.e., samples usually consist of 8 to 15 participants). Thus, we decided to create a four-category system (see further). We felt, for example, that a finding that emerged in 90% or more of the cases was indeed a general result across the vast majority of the sample. In the present study, then, categories were considered general if they applied to at least 17 (or approximately 90%) of the 19 cases, typical if they applied to between 10 and 16 cases (i.e., at least 50% but less than 90%), variant if they applied to between 4 and 9 cases (i.e., at least 20% but less than 50%), and rare if they applied to only 2 or 3 cases. Core ideas that fit for only 1 case were placed into the *other* category for that domain, as is consistent with CQR methodology.

First, we present the results that emerged when advisors described several overall features of their advising relationships (i.e., features unrelated to a particular advisee; see section titled "Advisors' Description of their Advising Relationships Overall;" see Table 1). These findings provide the necessary context and foundation on which readers may understand the subsequent results. However, because they were not the primary focus of the present study, we have chosen to present here only an overview of these results and direct readers to Table 1 for the more detailed findings. Next, we compare the findings that emerged when advisors discussed a good and a difficult (i.e., negative or ambivalent) advising relationship (i.e., section titled "Advisors' Discussion of Specific Advising Relationships;" see Table 2). To highlight the strongest findings, we draw comparisons only between those categories that varied by at least two frequency levels (e.g., general in good, variant or rare in difficult; rare in good, typical or general in difficult).

Advisors' Description of their Advising Relationships Overall

Advisors generally described their role as one of supporting and advocating for advisees as they navigated and completed their doctoral program (e.g., leading advisees through the administrative labyrinth). This role also typically involved serving as a mentor (e.g., providing a professional role model), addressing advisees' professional goals and plans, and tailoring the advising relationship to meet advisees' specific needs (e.g., meet advisees where they are). The advisee's role, according to these advisors, typically required responsibility, initiative, and follow through (e.g., "Be on top of progress, take initiative"), as well as open and honest communication (e.g., "[I] expect honesty and [a] straightforward approach"). The participants generally reported learning to be advisors from the advising and mentoring relationships they experienced as students (e.g., "From [my] own advisor and graduate professors"), and also typically from their own on-the-job experiences as advisors (e.g., "From experiences and mistakes as [an] advisor"). As benefits of advising, advisors generally remarked on personal satisfaction (e.g., "Joy of working with students who are interested in learning, discovering, and exploring new areas") and typically noted some modest external incentives (e.g., "A little bit of extra pay if you have

lots of students"). When speaking of the costs of advising, they typically stated that advising consumed a lot of time (e.g., "Biggest cost is time").

Advisors' Discussion of Specific Advising Relationships
What Contributed to Relationship Quality

Advisee's personal and professional characteristics. Differences between good and difficult advising relationships emerged with respect to advisors' descriptions of their advisees' personal and professional characteristics. All advisors in good advising relationships spoke of their advisees' positive traits. As examples of such characteristics, advisors described their advisees as motivated, goal-directed, genuine, fun, bright, respectful, reliable, hardworking, and passionate about their career. One advisor, for example, described her advisee as ideal in terms of being able to use the advisor's strengths without being dependent; a second advisor found his advisee to be dedicated, reliable, able to produce high quality work, possessing a great sense of humor, and willing to go the extra mile; and a third advisor said that her advisee "took on tasks with relish," acted as a professional from the start, and was one of the brightest advisees with whom this advisor had ever worked. In difficult advising relationships, however, such positive traits were only variantly reported and included remarks such as an advisee's being "up-to-date" on her profession and another as having good social skills.

Negative personal or professional characteristics were only identified by advisors describing their advisees in difficult relationships and here emerged as a general category. For example, advisors indicated that their advisees were anxious, presumptuous, rigid, lazy, self-centered, irresponsible, avoidant, dependent, had poor work habits, and lacked clear boundaries. As illustration, one advisor described her advisee as one of the weakest students she had seen graduate from her program and felt that the advisee's incompetence was quite time-consuming; another advisor stated that she had to "pull teeth" to get her advisee to do anything; and a third advisor reported that his advisee was "sloppy" in the classroom and did merely perfunctory work. Thus, as might be expected, positive personal and professional characteristics were more frequently reported in good than in difficult advising relationships, and negative such traits were reported only in difficult relationships.

Respect between advisor and advisee. Here again, differences emerged between advisors' descriptions of good versus difficult advising relationships. Advisors in good advising relationships variantly stated that mutual respect between advisor and advisee contributed to the relationship quality. For instance, one advisor remarked that she and her advisee had deep respect for each other, another indicated that their personalities just "clicked," and a third stated that he felt a "real mutuality" in terms of advisor and advisee liking and respecting each other. In the difficult relationships, however, advisors variantly reported a lack of respect from their advisees. One advisor, as an example, stated that he felt disrespected and let down by his advisee because the latter did not take the advisor's counsel. Another advisor felt that her male advisee was resistant to her input, felt that she had nothing to offer him, and did not value women. A third advisor felt disrespected when she was among the last to learn that her advisee, with whom she had worked for years, wanted to change advisors. Here, then, we found that mutual respect between advisor and advisee contributed to good relationships, and lack of respect likewise contributed to difficult relationships.

Communication between advisor and advisee. Differences between good and difficult advising relationships emerged with respect to communication as well. Good relationships were variantly characterized by open communication, as depicted by the advisor who reported that she and her advisee felt safe enough with each other to talk about and work through any instances in which they were upset with each other and also by the advisor who indicated that he and his advisee were able to address challenging situations and thus strengthen the relationship. On the other hand, difficult advising relationships were variantly characterized by communication problems. For example, one advisor reported that despite her repeated requests for him to do so, her advisee refused to keep her informed regarding the actions he was taking on his dissertation, actions that in fact misrepresented the advisor's recommendations. A second advisor stated that giving feedback to his advisee was "just awful" because they then had to spend hours trying to negotiate what the feedback meant. A third advisor reported a series of troublesome communications, including her advisee's angry response when he was told that he had been correctly paid for summer work and was not owed any more money. The advisor, in fact, stated that she felt that at

some point in their relationship, she "gave the wrong answer" to her advisee, which made the advisee no longer see her as an ally. Open communication, then, was present in good relationships, whereas communication problems appeared in difficult relationships.

Career path of advisor and advisee. Good and difficult advising relationships were also distinguished by the effect of advisors' and advisees' career paths on the relationship. Only in good advising relationships did advisors report that a similarity in career path between advisor and advisee typically had a positive effect. One advisor, for instance, reported that this similarity was part of a "gelling process" that fostered mutual respect, and another stated that because her advisee was interested in academe, she and the advisee were "on the same page." Similarities in career path, then, contributed positively only to good advising relationships.

Difficulties related to research. Only in difficult advising relationships did advisees' struggles with research contribute, here typically, to the quality of these relationships. One advisor labeled the dissertation process with her advisee as "tortuous" because of the extensive revisions needed on numerous drafts, and the advisor's feeling that she was writing her advisee's dissertation. Another advisor expressed concern that his advisee may have plagiarized his thesis, which left "a bad taste" in the advisor's mouth. This same advisee told his advisor that he was not interested in research, and viewed it merely as a "stepping stone" on his way to practice. A third advisor was "annoyed" and "embarrassed" that his advisee's proposal was not approved by his dissertation committee, which the advisor attributed to the advisee's lack of preparation and poor communication with his committee.

Advisor felt ineffective working with advisee. Here again, only advisors describing difficult relationships reported that the quality of the relationship was variantly affected by their feeling ineffective working with their advisees. One advisor described his direct confrontation of problematic issues with his advisee as running his head "into a brick wall," for example, and another reported that feedback discussions with her advisee were awful and left the advisor with a headache, her "stomach in knots," and no clue as to what went wrong. A third advisor felt ineffective in addressing her advisee's intense anxiety and panic, anxiety that impaired the advisee's ability to complete research requirements.

Disruption in advisee's initial advising relationship, after which advisor took on advisee. Also variantly contributing to the relationship quality only in difficult advising relationships were the means through which the advisor and advisee came to work together: After the advisee's initial advising relationship was disrupted, the current advisor (i.e., the participant) took on the advisee. Whether the advisee's initial advisor left the university, became ill, or the advisee and initial advisor decided not to continue working together, the current advisor took on this advisee, perhaps because no one else would do so, because the advisor felt it was her or his turn to "take on a difficult situation," or because the advisor was admittedly a "soft touch" and did not easily say no to students. As an example, one advisor reported that he took on an advisee because "nobody else on the faculty wanted to advise" this student. A second advisor acknowledged that because another faculty member was no longer at the university, she accepted as an advisee someone she would perhaps not have even recommended be admitted to the program. Finally, a third advisor stated that she accepted as an advisee a student whose first choice as an advisor refused to take the student because that faculty member felt the student was immature and unprepared for a doctoral program; furthermore, that faculty member was concerned about his own countertransference with this student.

Specific incident ruptured advising relationship. Finally, only when discussing difficult advising relationships did participants variantly report that the quality of their advising relationship was affected by a specific incident that ruptured the relationship. For instance, one advisor described an incident in which her advisee edited the letter of recommendation the advisor wrote in support of the advisee's internship applications. When the advisor indicated to her advisee that she felt this behavior presumptuous, the advisee "responded with a barrage of passive-aggressive emails." In a second example, an advisor reported that after her advisee failed one part of her comprehensive exams, the advisee no longer wanted to associate with the program or university anymore because she felt betrayed. A third advisor recalled that her advisee wanted to involve other people on campus in his dissertation because of their relationship with the advisor, but in doing so, misrepresented his research plans. When these other individuals called the advisor to ask what was going on and whether the advisor had approved of what the advisee was doing

(she had not), the student did not understand why these persons would consult with the advisor. The advisor spoke with her advisee about this behavior, but 2 weeks after the discussion, the advisee repeated the behavior.

Summary. The quality of advising relationships, then, was affected by a number of factors. Good advising relationships benefited from advisees' positive personal and professional characteristics, as well as mutual respect, open communication, and similarities in career path between advisor and advisee. Difficult relationships, in contrast, were affected by advisees' negative personal and professional characteristics, lack of respect, and poor communication. Additionally, these latter relationships also suffered because of advisees' research difficulties, advisors feeling ineffective working with these advisees, their somewhat reluctant acceptance of these students as advisees, and specific incidents that ruptured the relationship.

Conflict Or Power Negotiations Between Advisor And Advisee

When occurred, was addressed. In both good and difficult advising relationships, when conflict occurred, it typically was addressed. One advisor describing a good relationship, for example, stated that when she felt that "something weird was going on with her advisee," she "did not wait very long" to address it promptly and directly. Another advisor in a positive relationship echoed this approach, indicating that when his advisee wanted to move too quickly through some tasks, the advisor would slow down the advisee by ensuring that the advisee went through the proper channels. One advisor in a difficult relationship indicated that both she and her advisee tended to be very direct, so they were able to discuss any conflict that arose between them, and a second such advisor indicated that he would "sit back and watch advisee dynamics" to get a sense of his advisee's interpersonal style and would then confront the advisee when necessary. A third advisor in a difficult relationship reported that he was furious after his advisee backed out of leading a project from which another student was to complete her thesis; the advisor eventually let his advisee know how upset he was about the advisee's behavior.

None perceived. Only in good advising relationships did advisors variantly report that there was no conflict or need for power negotiations. One advisor, for instance, indicated that the lack of

conflict was, in fact, noteworthy, because the advisor had to say hard things to his advisee; despite these challenging conversations, conflict never developed and the advisor never had to "play his power card."

Addressed conflict via discussion of boundaries. With regard to how they negotiated conflict or power, only advisors in difficult advising relationships variantly reported doing so via attention to relationship boundaries. One advisor, for instance, reported that she confronted her advisee directly about how his treatment of her as a woman faculty member made her feel; a second advisor put limits on the number of times her advisee could call her at home; a third advisor had to reinforce to her advisee the roles and responsibilities of being a research assistant; and a fourth advisor acknowledged that his advisee "had to eat humble pie" because of the advisor's need to enforce a tight deadline to ensure that his advisee followed through on what was expected.

Conflict avoided. Also emerging only in difficult advising relationships, advisors variantly reported that they avoided conflict, as represented by the advisor who acknowledged that she never embraced the opportunity to address her disappointment in a markedly weak paper her advisee wrote. A second such advisor admitted that he dealt with advisee conflict by "patient resentment" on the part of the advisor and "passive resistance" on the part of the advisee; another advisor, who stated that he did not discuss conflicts with his advisee but chose to keep things "business-like," instead "prayed for" his advisee's graduation as an end to their conflict.

Summary. These results suggest that the presence of conflict itself did not distinguish between good and difficult advising relationships; rather, the negotiation of conflict or power between advisors and advisees appeared to be a more salient differentiating feature between these types of relationships. Although most advisors in both good and difficult relationships tended to address conflict when it occurred, only those in difficult relationships reported doing so by reinforcing boundaries. A number of advisors in good advising relationships perceived no conflict between themselves and their advisees, whereas a number of advisors in difficult advising relationships indicated that they avoided addressing conflict with their advisees.

Discussion

This study sought to examine counseling psychology advising relationships from advisors' perspectives, an interaction that remains relatively unexplored at this point in time. Our hope was that the results would illuminate those features considered by advisors to be important influences on relationship process and quality. In so doing, we also hoped that such understanding might lead to even more effective advising of our graduate students.

Advisors' Descriptions of Their Advising Relationships Overall

These advisors asserted a strong desire to facilitate their advisees' successful completion of their doctoral degree, a desire fed more by internal than external rewards, and one that demanded quite a bit of time from advisors. In helping them navigate the program; serving as supporter, advocator, and role model; and attending to advisees' professional goals and needs, the advisors were clearly invested in their advisees' development, and confirmed the multifaceted role of advising (Gelso, 1979, 1993, 1997; Gelso & Lent, 2000; Magoon & Holland, 1984; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, in press; Schlosser et al., 2003).

Interestingly, however, they fulfilled this role having had no formal training, and instead learned to be advisors through the advising relationships they experienced as graduate students and from on-the-job experiences as faculty members. Given the importance placed on the advising relationship (Gelso, 1979, 1993, 1997; Gelso & Lent, 2000; Magoon & Holland, 1984; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, in press; Schlosser et al., 2003), we are curious about the lack of formal training in this area. Certainly, potential advisors learn much simply by experiencing and observing their own advisors and other graduate faculty; similarly, as new advisors they likely consult with colleagues and also learn from their own experiences. We wonder, though, whether more formal attention to training advisors may be prudent. Perhaps new assistant professors could be mentored by more seasoned advisors as the former begin their advising responsibilities. In addition, given that the developmental and transitional challenges of new graduates have recently received attention at APA convention activities, perhaps some of this attention could be specifically targeted

toward new advisors so that they may learn from those more experienced in this important role.

Advisors' Discussion of a Specific Advising Relationship

With respect to the quality of the advising relationship, and as would be expected, advisors described their good advising relationships as having more positive than negative elements and also as possessing more positive elements than their difficult advising relationships. In addition, the latter type of relationship was characterized by distinct areas of difficulty (i.e., research, advisors feeling ineffective, disruption or rupture in the prior or current advising relationship) that did not appear at all in good advising relationships. Thus, a combination of interpersonal (e.g., personal traits, respect, communication) and instructional (e.g., professional traits, career path, research) factors emerged with regard to what contributed to the relationship quality. This combination of factors parallels previous research on advising (e.g., Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, in press; Schlosser et al., 2003) and research training (e.g., Kahn & Gelso, 1997). The consistency of such findings suggests that these factors may be crucial in all aspects of graduate psychology training, yet this is a question that warrants further empirical attention.

Looking now more specifically at those problematic elements that appeared only in difficult advising relationships, research emerged as the most prevalent area of difficulty. Advisors, whose position in academic institutions likely demands that they be productive researchers, spoke of marked problems in this area regarding advisees, ranging from a tortuous dissertation process to fears of plagiarism. Working with advisees who experience difficulties with research may be particularly frustrating for advisors, who are apt to place high value on research competence and productivity (these participants reported that more than half of the emphasis in their advising relationships was on research) and who may well feel ineffective when their advisees struggle in this area. Such a finding seems to parallel the work of Green and Bauer (1995), who reported that mentoring was more likely to be available to more, versus less, capable students.

Ruptures in the advisor-advisee relationship also emerged as a contributor only to difficult relationships. In some cases, our participants somewhat reluctantly took on advisees who were no

longer working with their original advisors; in other cases, advisor and advisee experienced a breach in their relationship. Neither condition seems ripe for nurturing a good advising relationship.

Similarly, it was also only in the difficult relationships that advisors acknowledged that they avoided addressing conflict. Here, then, we wonder what contributed to advisors' avoidance of conflict in their difficult advising relationships and what the outcome might have been had they addressed the rupture. Advisors have more power in this relationship than do their advisees. Thus, when conflict arises, advisees may be keenly aware of this power differential, may fear program and career suicide if they raise it, and may then wait for advisors to broach the topic (Schlosser et al., 2003). Despite their greater relative power, did advisors fear that addressing conflict would further deteriorate an already fragile relationship or that the conflict could not be successfully resolved? Given our present litigious society, as well, perhaps advisors chose not to address conflict for fear of sparking student complaints or legal proceedings. Or perhaps they had already invested so much time and energy in the relationship that they had little left to give (recall the advisor who "prayed for" his advisee's graduation to end their conflict)? Perhaps, as suggested by Johnson and Huwe (2002), such reluctance to address conflict reflects advisors' self-defeating responses to dysfunction in the relationship, including paralysis and distancing. Or were they afraid that if they perceived the source of the conflict as residing in the advisee's personality dynamics, addressing such conflict would open up territory perhaps more appropriate for therapy than for advising?

With regard to this last possibility, recent research on counseling supervision may shed some light. Specifically, Hoffman, Hill, Holmes, and Frietas (in press) found that feedback difficult to give to trainees was sometimes about clinical concerns (e.g., discomfort with a client's problem) but was equally likely to be about professional concerns (e.g., trainee exhibiting questionable judgment) or problems in the supervision relationship (e.g., trainee repeatedly canceling supervision). Supervisors' difficulty delivering these latter two types of feedback may parallel our findings about advisors' avoidance of conflict: When the source of the conflict is perceived as a fundamental part of the trainee's or advisee's personality, the supervisor or advisor may be reluctant to address the difficulty.

Relatedly, what coping strategies do advisors employ to survive difficult advising relationships? Neither all therapy relationships, nor all advising relationships, are positive. How, then, may the advisor manage a difficult relationship, behave professionally and kindly toward someone he or she would prefer not to advise and do so without acting out in some way or abusing her or his power? Similarly, how does an advisor successfully advise someone he or she simply does not like? A perfunctory approach to advising may save the advisor from angst but may be devastating to an advisee who now sees the advisor as yet another person who dislikes her or him.

Comparing Advisees' and Advisors' Perceptions of the Advising Relationship

In their examination of advisees' perceptions, Schlosser et al. (2003) found that satisfied and unsatisfied advisees differed regarding several aspects of the advising relationship, including the ability to choose their advisors (i.e., satisfied advisees typically chose their advisor, whereas all unsatisfied advisees had been assigned to their advisor), the frequency of meetings with their advisor (i.e., most satisfied advisees met frequently with their advisor; all unsatisfied advisees reported infrequent such meetings), the benefits and costs associated with their advising relationship (i.e., more benefits than costs were cited for satisfied advisees, more costs than benefits for unsatisfied advisees), and management of conflict in the advising relationship (i.e., satisfied advisees openly addressed and worked through conflict; unsatisfied advisees indicated that conflict was avoided). In the present study, our results differentiated positive and difficult advising relationships based on advisees' personal and professional characteristics, the degree of respect between advisor and advisee, communication between advisor and advisee, and management of conflict in the advising relationship. In addition, our research found a number of factors that contributed only to difficult advising relationships, including advisees struggling with research, advisors feeling ineffective working with their advisees, and the presence of a rupture in the advising relationship.

In both studies, then, a combination of interpersonal (e.g., rapport and respect in the relationship) and instructional (e.g., facilitation of advisee's progress through the graduate program) factors contributed to the relationship quality. Such a combination

parallels Bordin's (1983) tripartite model of the supervisory working alliance (i.e., with the emotional bond being captured by the "interpersonal" factors and the agreement on the goals and tasks being subsumed in the "instructional" factors). Thus, from both advisees' and advisors' perspectives, relational as well as task-oriented components may be vital to a good advising relationship.

One even more specific feature shared by both investigations was the emergence of conflict management as a defining feature of the advising relationship. Recall that in Schlosser et al. (2003), satisfied advisees reported that conflict was addressed in the advising relationship, in contrast to unsatisfied advisees' report that conflict was avoided. In the current study, advisors of both good and difficult advising relationships tended to address conflict when it occurred but only in difficult relationships did they report an avoidance of conflict. Openly addressing conflict, then, appears to be an important variable for both advisees and advisors, and avoidance of such conflict may be associated with poorer advising relationships.

In looking at how the studies differed, it appears that certain factors may be more important for students than for advisors. Students inherently hold less power than advisors in the advising relationship; thus, it seems logical that advisees valued the ability to choose (an exercise of some degree of power) their advisor and thereby select someone with whom they can work comfortably and successfully. Conversely, advisors appeared less concerned with how students arrived in their office but were more interested in what these students did once they had arrived (e.g., being respectful toward and communicating openly with the advisor, being a productive researcher). The power to choose apparently mattered to advisees, whereas professionalism and productivity held weight for advisors.

Summary

In sum, advisors appeared to enjoy tremendously their positive advising relationships, recalling these advisees with great fondness. In such relationships, advisor and advisee shared a good rapport, dealt openly and respectfully in their communication and handling of conflict, and worked together to facilitate the advisee's progress as a doctoral student. In contrast, advisors found it trying, indeed, to work with their difficult relationship advisees and at times simply waited for the relationship to end. Such relationships were characterized as

having, at best, tenuous rapport; problematic communication patterns, including the avoidance of addressing conflict; lack of mutual respect; and as eliciting in advisors feelings of ineffectiveness in working with these advisees. Furthermore, the advisees in difficult relationships struggled with research, likely a fundamental part of advisors' professional lives. These positive and negative aspects of advising relationships fit into the previously mentioned interpersonal and instructional categories, rendering them important factors for consideration in psychology graduate training.

Limitations

This study is limited by artifacts of sampling and methodology. With regard to sampling, the results are based on the experiences of 19 seasoned advisors from APA-accredited counseling psychology doctoral programs who responded to an invitation to participate in phone interviews regarding their advising relationships with their counseling psychology doctoral advisees. We cannot, therefore, generalize these results to all advisors in counseling psychology, to advisors in other psychology doctoral programs, nor to other nonpsychology doctoral programs. Although the response rate was consistent with that of other CQR studies (e.g., Hill, Nutt-Williams, Heaton, Thompson, & Rhodes, 1996, had a response rate of 4%; Knox, Hess, Williams, & Hill, 2003, had a response rate of 6%), future researchers may wish to contact potential participants personally (i.e., phone call) in an effort to increase their response rate, for doing so has yielded higher such rates (e.g., Fuertes, Mueller, Chauhan, Walker, & Ladany, 2002, had a response rate of 30%; Knox, Hess, Petersen, & Hill, 1997, had a response rate of 62%). Finally, although the current sample was relatively balanced with respect to sex, White advisors outnumbered those from other racial or ethnic groups, and the researchers themselves were also White. Thus, we are unsure as to how these findings may apply to advisors from non-White backgrounds.

Methodologically, in our effort to complement the earlier work of Schlosser et al. (2003), who focused on advisees, we admittedly have only the advisors' perspectives here. We also acknowledge that in comparison to the interviewees, the interviewers were less experienced as advisors and, thus, may have hesitated to probe some areas more deeply. However, because two of the interviewers were

neither faculty nor advisors, it is also possible that interviewees were more open with them because they felt less competition or comparison pressure (e.g., interviewees were not speaking with someone who held a similar role and therefore might judge the interviewees' fulfillment of that role). In addition, we sent potential participants a copy of the interview protocol so that they could provide fully informed consent and could think about their advising experiences if they chose to participate in the study. Awareness of the interview questions, while possibly facilitating richer responses, may have allowed participants to render their comments more socially desirable than would have been the case without having seen the protocol (Hill et al., 1997). Finally, we did not ask participants about the context within which they advised their counseling psychology doctoral students (e.g., value placed on advising, normative advising relationships, advisor accountability for advisee training, handling of mismatches between advisors and advisees, expectations of advisors within participants' programs, effect of cultural differences between advisors and advisees on advising, effect of faculty rank on advising, degree of choice advisors have to terminate an advising relationship) and thus do not know the possible impact of such contextual factors on our participants' data.

Implications

The findings raise several ideas for further consideration. First, these advisors reportedly had received no formal training for this role and instead had learned through their own experiences as advisees and advisors. Is training in advising necessary? Would such training improve advising relationships and the advising process, or is this role one that can be adequately learned through observation and lived experience? Further research in this area might help us answer such questions.

How, also, should advisors and advisees be matched? The good relationships here benefited from a similarity in career path; however, difficult relationships did not appear to be harmed by differences in career paths. We are well aware that most counseling psychology doctoral students do not intend to pursue careers in academia. Thus, if programs were to match advisees with faculty who share their intended career path, with whom would the majority of our students, who seek clinical positions, work?

Last, we encourage other researchers to examine contextual factors that were not considered in the current study. How, for example, do cultural differences (e.g., age, ethnicity, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation) between advisors and advisees affect the advising relationship? As an exploratory study in an area as yet relatively unexamined, we did not explicitly ask participants about the effects, if any, of culture. Interestingly, and perhaps relatedly, participants' responses to the interview questions likewise did not mention culture. We remain curious, then, as to the possible influence of culture on advising relationships. Furthermore, how do advising relationships differ from program to program, and how do such differences affect the advising relationships that students and faculty experience? These are but a few of the many questions worthy of further investigation, so that advisors may increase their understanding about how to work most effectively with their advisees.

References

Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *11*, 27-34.

Cronan-Hillix, T., Gensheimer, L. K., Cronan-Hillix, W. A., & Davidson, W. S. (1986). Students' views of mentors in psychology graduate training. *Teaching of Psychology*, *13*, 123-127.

Fuertes, J. N., Mueller, L. N., Chauhan, R. V., Walker, J. A., & Ladany, N. (2002). An investigation of European American therapists' approach to counseling African American clients. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *30*, 763-788.

Gelso, C. J. (1979). Research in counseling: Methodological and professional issues. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *8*, 7-35.

Gelso, C. J. (1993). On the making of a scientist-practitioner: A theory of research training in professional psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *24*, 468-476.

Gelso, C. J. (1997). The making of a scientist in applied psychology: An attribute by treatment conception. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *25*, 307-320.

Gelso, C. J., & Lent, R. W. (2000). Scientific training and scholarly productivity: The person, the training environment, and their interaction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 109-139), New York: John Wiley.

Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisers: Relationships with doctoral student potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 537-561.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (in press). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.

Hill, C. E., Nutt-Williams, E., Heaton, K. J., Thompson, B. J., & Rhodes, R. H. (1996). Therapist retrospective recall of impasses in long-term psychotherapy: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *43*, 207-217.

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *25*, 517-572.

Hoffman, M. A., Hill, C. E., Holmes, S. E., & Frietas, G. (in press). Supervisor perspective on the process and outcome of giving easy, difficult or no feedback to supervisees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.

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

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

Kahn, J. H., & Gelso, C. J. (1997). Factor structure of the Research Training Environment Scale Revised: Implications for research training in applied psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *25*, 22-37.

Knox, S., Hess, S. A., Petersen, D. A., & Hill, C. E. (1997). A qualitative analysis of client perceptions of the effects of helpful therapist self-disclosure in long-term therapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *44*, 274-283.

Knox, S., Hess, S. A., Williams, E. N., & Hill, C. E. (2003). Here's a little something for you: How therapists respond to clients gifts. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *50*, 199-210.

Magoon, T. M., & Holland, J. L. (1984). Research training and supervision. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 682-715). New York: John Wiley.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Russell, J. E. A., & Adams, D. M. (Eds.). (1997). Mentoring [Special Issue]. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *51* (1).

Schlosser, L. Z., & Gelso, C. J. (in press). The Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Advisor Version: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.

Schlosser, L. Z., & Gelso, C. J. (2001). Measuring the working alliance in advisor-advisee relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*, 157-167.

Schlosser, L. Z., Knox, S., Moskovitz, A. R., & Hill, C. E. (2003). A qualitative examination of graduate advising relationships: The advisee perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *50*, 178-188.

Smith, E. P., & Davidson, W. S. (1992). Mentoring and the development of African-American graduate students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *33*, 531-539.

Appendix

Table 1: Advisors' Descriptions of their Advising Relationships Overall

Domain	Category	Frequency	Illustrative Core Idea
1. Definition of role—Advisor	Help advisee	General	"Lead advisee through administrative labyrinth"
	Support or advocate for advisee	General	"Here for the service of the student"
	Role model or mentor	Typical	"Provide professional role model"
	Attend to professional goals or career plans of advisees	Typical	"Help advisees meet career goals"
	Tailor AR to advisees' needs	Typical	"Meet advisees where they are"
2. Definition of role—Advisee	Be response, take initiative, and follow through	Typical	"Be on top of progress, take initiative"
	Communicate openly and honestly	Typical	"Expect honesty and straightforward approach"
	Be engaged or involved; good program or profession citizen	Variant	"Be connected to profession outside of class"
3. How learned to be advisor	From previous advising or mentoring relationships	General	"From own advisor and graduate professors"
	From on-the-job experience as faculty member	Typical	"From experiences and mistakes as advisor"
4. Benefits of advising	Personal satisfaction	General	"Joy of working with students who are interesting in learning, discovering, and exploring new areas"
	Modest external incentives	Typical	"Advising load considered part of faculty responsibilities, and is reflected in annual merit raises"

Table 1 (continued)

Domain	Category	Frequency	Illustrative Core Idea
	Collaboration with students help advisor's research	Variant	"Presentations and publications with students translate into dollars for advisor in the long run"
	Grateful advisees	Rare	"Enjoy receiving 'thank you' notes from advisees"
	Helps advisor stay current	Rare	"Learns about new areas from students"
	Advisor wants to give back	Rare	"Was mentored in grad school and wants to pass that on"
5. Costs of advising	Time consuming	Typical	"Biggest cost is time"
	Decreased research productivity	Variant	"Advising students probably costs two to three articles a year"
	Hard to juggle multiple demands	Variant	"At busy times of year, advisor feels 'constant press' of multiple roles"
	Emotional costs	Variant	"Can become costly and disruptive when dealing with an impaired advice"
	Drains energy	Variant	"Advisees can wear advisor out"
	No institutional rewards, incentives, or credit	Variant	"Lack of rewards raises question of institution's perception of advisement"

NOTE: General = 17 to 19 cases; typical = 10 to 16 cases; variant = 4 to 9 cases; rare = 2 to 3 cases.

Table 2: Advisors' Discussion of Specific Advising Relationships (AR)

Domain or Category	Frequency	
	Good AR	Difficult AR
1. What contributed to relationship quality		
A) Advisee's personal or professional characteristics		
i. Positive characteristics	General	Variant
ii. Negative characteristics	—	General
B) Respect between advisor and advisee		
i. Mutual respect	Variant	—
ii. Advisee did not respect advisor	—	Variant
C) Communication between advisor and advisee		
i. Open communication	Variant	—
ii. Communication problems	—	Variant
D) Career path of advisor and advisee		
i. Similar career path had positive effect	Typical	—
ii. Different career path had no effect	Variant	Typical
E) Difficulties related to research	—	Typical
F) Advisor felt ineffective working with advisee	—	Variant

Table 2 (continued)

Domain or Category	Frequency	
	Good AR	Difficult AR
G) Disruption in advisee's initial AR, after which advisor took on advisee	—	Variant
H) Specific incident ruptured AR	—	Variant
I) Infrequent contact	—	Rare
2. Conflict or power negotiations between advisor and advisee		
A) When occurred, was addressed	Typical	Typical
B) None perceived	Variant	—
C) Addressed conflict via discussion of boundaries	—	Variant
D) Conflict avoided	—	Variant

NOTE: General = 17 to 19 cases; typical = 10 to 16 cases; variant = 4 to 9 cases; rare = 2 to 3 cases. Results in **bold** indicate those that differ by at least two frequency levels (e.g., general in good, variant or rare in difficult; rare in good, or typical or general in difficult).

Appendix

Interview Protocol

Initial Interview Protocol

Thank you for your interest in our study of the advisor's perspective on the advising relationship in counseling psychology doctoral programs. We believe that the relationship between advisors and advisees is extremely important, and are grateful for your gift of time to this project. For the purposes of this interview, we ask you to focus on your advising experiences with counseling psychology PhD students. As you do so, please focus on those advisees with whom you have/had more than an administrative relationship . . . in other words, advisees for whom you have/had major responsibility in their

progression through their graduate program. Please be assured, as well, that your responses will be kept confidential.

Your Advisee Relationships

1. We'd like to begin by asking some general questions about your advising relationships.

   - What is your approach to advising?

   - How do you define your role as advisor (e.g., what do you see are your responsibilities, what are your advisees' responsibilities, etc.)?

   - How did you learn to be an advisor?

2. How do you work with advisees at different stages of their graduate career?

   - Please describe how you might work with a student just entering your doctoral program.

   - Please describe how you might work with a student in the middle of her/his doctoral work.

   - Please describe how you might work with a student nearing the end of her/his doctoral work.

3. Please describe how advisors and students are paired in your program.

   - If you have the opportunity to select your advisees, what are the factors important to you in this decision? How does your having a choice affect the relationship?

   - If you are assigned advisees, how do you feel about not having a choice in this process? How does your not having a choice affect the relationship?

4. What types of boundaries do you set, whether explicitly or implicitly, with your advisees (e.g., personal friendships with advisees, contact with advisees outside the academic institution, etc.)?

5. What incentives, supports, or rewards exist for you regarding advising?

- Internal
- External (i.e., institutional)
6. What costs or disadvantages exist for you regarding advising?
  - Internal
  - External (i.e., institutional)

Critical Incident Questions

Now we'd like you to discuss some specific advising relationships that you have/have had with counseling psychology doctoral advisees, one example of what you consider to be a positive advising relationship, and another example of what you consider to be a negative advising relationship. If you have had no negative advising relationships, please discuss a relationship you would consider to be ambivalent. Please be assured that we will make no attempt to identify your advisees, and the resulting manuscript will likewise maintain confidentiality.

1. Please describe a specific example of an advising relationship you consider to be/have been good. Please tell me about this advisee.
   - Information about advisee (i.e., age; sex; whether current or past advisee; if past, when did advisee graduate?)
   - How did you and your advisee come to work together (e.g., matched, selected, other)?
   - What did this relationship focus on (e.g., research, practice, teaching)?
   - What made this relationship positive?
   - How did you and this advisee negotiate conflict or power struggles?
   - To the best of your knowledge, is/was this advisee's career path the same as yours (i.e., academic position)? To what extent does/did this similarity/ difference affect your relationship with this advisee?
   - Please describe some of the specific features of this advising relationship:
     - frequency of meetings
     - modality of meetings (i.e., individual, group)
     - appointment versus open-door policy

- If this advisee has graduated, what type of relationship do you now have with him or her?
- How did you select this student to discuss for this critical incident?

7. Please describe a specific example of an advising relationship you consider to be/have been negative. If you have had no negative advising relationships, please discuss a relationship you would consider to be ambivalent. Please tell me about this advisee.

  - Information about advisee (i.e., age; sex; whether current or past advisee; if past, when did advisee graduate?) How did you and your advisee come to work together (e.g., matched, selected, other)?

  - What did this relationship focus on (e.g., research, practice, teaching)?

  - What made this relationship negative (or ambivalent)?

  - How did you and this advisee negotiate conflict or power struggles?

  - To the best of your knowledge, is/was this advisee's career path the same as yours (i.e., academic position)? To what extent does/did this similarity/ difference affect your relationship with this advisee?

  - Please describe some of the specific features of this advising relationship:

    - frequency of meetings

    - modality of meetings (i.e., individual, group)

    - appointment versus open-door policy

  - If this advisee has graduated, what type of relationship do you now have with him or her?

  - How did you select this student to discuss for this critical incident?

Closing Questions

3. What was it like for you to do this interview?

4. Why did you choose to participate in this study?

5. Any final thoughts?

Set Time For Follow-Up Interview