

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Resilience in the Youth Mentoring Context

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a

Master of Science

In

Psychology

at Massey University, Manawatū

New Zealand

Elise O'Shea

2024

Abstract

Youth mentoring is a social intervention tool used throughout the world, as well as within Aotearoa New Zealand. Studying the impacts of youth mentoring is a useful endeavour to better understand how it can be used to improve personal outcomes of the young people. Central to effective youth mentoring is the establishment of a caring relationship between a young person (mentee) and a more mature person (mentor) with the goal of assisting the positive socialisation and development of the young person. Such relationships are established to provide a safe space for young people to receive guidance and support in multiple areas of their life, including those related to school situations, domestic relations, social circles, mental health, and personal development. The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of how mentors foster resilience in their mentees from the perspective of the mentors. Working with Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand (BBBSNZ), three case studies were conducted, comprising of material from individual interviews and insights from a focus group. These conversations generated accounts of what it is like to mentor a young person and the various factors and considerations surrounding fostering resilience in them. These cases provided diverse and overlapping perspectives on resilience, what fostering resilience can look like, the other factors that influence mentoring relationships. Three cases offer insights into how these mentors adapt to their mentee's needs, and how they fostered resilience in their own, unique ways. Key findings from this study relate to how mentoring offers such a personalised service to each child, and how this influences how resilience is fostered by their mentors. I consider the implications of key findings from across the three cases and relevant literature for how BBBSNZ can continue to support the mentoring of young people.

Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by acknowledging that this project would not have been possible without the cooperation and support of Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand. Thank you to Matt Button and Dean Chapman who provided me with information and materials, as well as connected me to participants. Your passion for helping young people has been a constant source of inspiration and a huge motivation for this study. Thank you to my participants, for sharing your stories and taking the time to make this project happen. Your insights and thoughts were incredibly valuable to me.

I am deeply grateful to my supervisor, Professor Darrin Hodgetts, for seeing the potential in my thesis idea and helping me build it into what it is today. You have been a steady support throughout the process and I have valued all of your wisdom and experience. Thank you for sharing that with me and encouraging me along this journey.

I would also like to thank my wonderful community, Cam: the man who has loved me and cheered me along every step, Rosa: my beautiful friend who has held me together with her passion and support, Sam, Zak, and Justin: the boys who listened every time I rambled about my work and offered words of support and validation. I cannot fully express my gratitude to this group and all the other people within it for their constant friendship and encouragement. Thank you for everything.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Youth Mentoring.....	2
Resilience.....	7
The Relationship between Youth Mentoring and Resilience.....	9
Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand (BBBSNZ).....	11
Research Aims, Questions, and Outcomes.....	12
Thesis Outline.....	13
Chapter 2: Method.....	16
Research Setting and Participant Recruitment.....	16
Narrative Theory.....	18
Case-Based Orientation.....	21
The Three Cases.....	24
Interview and Focus Group Engagements.....	25
Analysis Process.....	30
Ethical Considerations.....	32
Chapter 3: Buddy.....	34
Why Mentoring?.....	35
Problem-Solving and Encouragement.....	40
Royal New Zealand Air Force.....	44
New Activities and Networks.....	48
Chapter Discussion.....	51
Chapter 4: Rocket.....	54
Mentoring Expectations versus Reality.....	55
Coping and Support.....	59
Adapting to Change.....	64
The Role of Parents.....	66
Chapter Discussion.....	69
Chapter 5: Harrison.....	73
Harrison’s Perspective on Resilience.....	74

Building a Healthy Relationship	79
Building Critical Thinking in the Real World.....	85
Chapter Discussion.....	88
Chapter 6: Discussion	91
The Mentors’ Understanding of Mentoring and Resilience.....	92
How Mentors Foster Resilience	98
BBBSNZ and Organisational Influence on Participating Mentors	101
Recommendations	105
Concluding Statement	109
References.....	111
Appendix A.....	130
Appendix B	133
Appendix C	135
Appendix D.....	139
Appendix E	139

Chapter 1: Introduction

Youth mentoring is a common social intervention utilised to help young people who face various challenges in life, often associated with lower socioeconomic status, struggling with academic performance, or navigating social contexts. The goal of such mentoring is to pair a young person with an older adult to cultivate a bonded, caring relationships (Szabo, et al., 2019). Within these relationships, the mentor works alongside the mentee to address the specific needs of the youth, covering areas of skill development relating to social, educational, personal, or emotional dimensions of youth development (DuBois et al., 2011). This thesis addresses the topic of youth mentoring and how it can foster resilience in mentees from the perspective of the mentors.

The positive impacts of these relationships have been well documented throughout academic literature, finding them to be a successful prevention strategy to reduce the likelihood of youth engaging in harmful or illegal behaviours, such as drug misuse, alcohol consumption, or committing crimes, including assault (Tierney, 1995; Landefeld, 2009; Grossman & Tierney, 1995). Previous research also suggests that youth mentoring increases the likelihood of the youth engaging in positive behaviours, such as increasing school attendance and academic performance by improving personal attitudes, as well as positively affecting peer and family relationships. Even from an economic perspective, mentoring programs can offer a cost-efficient intervention to partially mitigate the financial toll a disadvantaged early life can have for young people and the community (Moodie & Fisher, 2009).

When youth are supported in navigating various relational complexities, assisted in building resilience, and mentored towards pro-social ends, they can experience significant positive changes in life and future aspirations (Osterling & Hines, 2006). Arora & Rangnekar (2014) found that mentoring that specifically focused on the psychosocial aspect of a youth's life was a significant predictor of resilience in the mentee. The authors propose that this positive outcome is the result of the beneficial relationship that is built between the mentor and mentee.

Although studies have found a positive relationship between youth mentoring and resilience, little has been done to reveal the underlying mechanics of how this occurs. Little is known about the factors affecting this relationship. Therefore, it is difficult to implement any actionable plans from previous, predominantly quantitative studies conducted in the field of

social or community psychology (Dzoba, 2014). One way this can be done is by learning more about the skills and strategies utilised by mentors in their relationships with mentees that they experience as fostering resilience. Evidence suggests that mentors can instil resilience-building qualities in mentees, but how do they achieve this? Answering this question is important because effective approaches should be identified and taught elsewhere to improve the quality and safety of the mentoring intervention for improving resilience (Rhodes & Lowe, 2008).

The purpose of this study is to work alongside a mentoring organisation in New Zealand, Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand (BBBSNZ), to understand how mentors understand and work to foster resilience in their young mentees. By taking an organisational case-based approach that is built on insights from organizational training materials and the accounts of three participating mentors, I am able to provide context-dependent insights regarding mentoring efforts and the cultivation of resilience in young mentees (Flyvberg, 2006).

This chapter introduces youth mentoring, explaining how the practice is defined. I review the findings of previous research into youth mentoring. From there, I will conceptualise resilience as a central topic for this thesis, recognising that resilience is a complex phenomenon associated with various theoretical perspectives and definitions. My review of resilience theories and empirical research into resilience among young people contributes to a working conceptualisation of resilience that is adopted in this research. After considering key aspects of the relationship between youth mentoring and resilience, I will also discuss the organisation that this study focuses on, namely Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand (BBBSNZ). This chapter ends with an explanation of this study's research aim and questions, as well as a preview of all subsequent chapters or thesis outline.

Youth Mentoring

There is no universally accepted definition for mentoring as various relationships and practices relate to group mentoring (Huizing, 2012), workplace mentoring (Arora & Rangnekar, 2014), school mentoring (Dutton et al., 2018), and youth mentoring (DuBois et al., 2002). A lack of clarity around a shared definition across these practice spaces is likely, in part, the result of the diversity of mentoring relationships, the various purposes that mentoring serves, the larger social conditions of different mentoring practices, and the

differing philosophies of mentoring interventions in different contexts and organisations (Keller, 2007).

Bozeman and Feeney (2007, p. 731) provide a working definition of mentoring that informs my study:

Mentoring: a process for the informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or social development; mentoring entails informal, usually face-to-face and during a sustained period of time, between one who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or expertise (the mentor) and a person who is perceived to have less (protégé).

There are a few interesting points about this definition. For example, the use of the word ‘informal’ seems to rule out formal mentoring programs. However, this is not the intention of Bozeman & Feeney (2007) who refer to the importance of such organisations and how their definition is focused more on mentoring relationships between mentors and mentees. These authors see formal mentoring programs as creating the environment for such mentoring relationships to develop. Bozeman and Feeney (2007) also highlight key conceptual issues to keep in mind if one should develop their basic definition further. Firstly, any definition should utilise ordinary language and not become so complicated as to make it unrecognisable in lived reality. Secondly, the purpose of the definition should be capable of providing distinction for mentoring and separating it from related social phenomena, such as teaching or coaching. Finally, whatever definition is used should be helpful for advancing research.

It did not take long for me to realise that while Bozeman and Feeney’s (2007) general definition of mentoring is useful, in some respects it is too narrow to properly capture the specific dynamics of youth mentoring. Youth mentoring has additional components unique to the context that this definition does not include. Therefore, one must build upon this definition to provide a clearer conceptualisation of youth mentoring.

In terms of youth mentoring more specifically, Keller (2007) proposes that it “...is characterised by a personal relationship in which a caring individual provides consistent companionship, support, and guidance aimed at developing the competence and character of a child or adolescent.” (p. 23). Keller (2007) goes on to say that youth mentoring is based on the intuitive understanding that young people understand themselves and their worlds through relationships with significant adults. Though youth mentoring may vary in many ways across

different groups and situations, there are some commonalities that can be used to refine our understanding for the purposes of the present study. For example, Eby et al. (2010) identify three common generalities. Firstly, mentoring is about relationship formation and maintenance, even if the enactment of each relationship differs and is shaped in response to the specific needs of mentors and mentees, and the wider social circumstances within which they interact. Secondly, mentoring relationships involve the acquisition of knowledge. This aspect is also noted by Bozeman & Feeney (2007), where they say, “At its most elemental, mentoring is about the transmission of knowledge.” (p. 724). Thirdly, the support provided by the mentor has a lot of bearing on their relationship with the mentee.

To address the first point made by Eby et al. (2010), I am informed by Karcher et al.’s (2006) framework for understanding mentoring relationships which also focuses on three dimensions of the relationship: context, structure, and goals. Context refers to the location of the meetings, as well as any external circumstances that influence the relationship. Structure refers to the nature of the mentor-mentee relationship, whether that be one-on-one, peer, or adult-with-child. Lastly, the goals of the relationship determine the activities, which can range from task- or skill-development to more developmental or social skills. Returning to Bozeman and Feeney’s (2007) conceptual considerations for defining mentoring, these three dimensions provide boundaries for what constitutes youth mentoring in the context of this study, differentiating it from other forms of youth mentoring, such as school-based or group mentoring.

With all of this in mind, the definition for youth mentoring that will be used in this thesis is provided by Keller (2007), with additional insights from Bozeman & Feeney’s (2007), and commonalities noted by Karcher et al. (2006):

Youth mentoring is a personal, informal relationship between an older, mature, caring individual and a young person that addresses the young person’s needs through consistent support, guidance, and the transference of knowledge that is relevant to the young person in the development of their character and competence. Mentoring is usually face-to-face, one-on-one and for a sustained amount of time. The relationship is unique based on context, structure, and goals.

This and related definitions have been foundational to research into youth mentoring in disciplines such as psychology and social work for some time now (Bozeman & Feeney, 2007). Research points to positive impacts for mentees in that mentoring can promote the

wellbeing of youth and helping them find positive life trajectories, particularly for young people from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds (DuBois et al., 2002). As previously mentioned, mentoring has also been found to be a cost-efficient response to many of the psychological support needs of young people living in situations of disadvantage (Moodie & Fisher, 2013).

The specific benefits of mentoring relationships have been well documented by many studies and reveal how mentoring positively impacts a youth's life in different ways. For example, Brown (2004) found that mentoring could help build self-confidence and optimism in mentees. Ye et al. (2016) also argue that mentoring promotes self-efficacy and hope (key resilience factors that will be discussed later), along with reducing emotional distress. This is often done through the skills mentees are taught by their mentors about coping, stress-management, and problem-solving (Fried et al., 2018; Kuperminc et al., 2020). These life skills help the mentee overcome difficulties or disadvantages (Ceja, 2013). Day (2006) found that mentoring teaches social skills, provides reinforcement, and introduces mentee to diverse social interactions. They also provide advice and help mentees develop a positive self-image. Mentoring could be a powerful medium to influence better decision making in youth (Dzoba, 2014), as seen in the reduction of negative or harmful behaviours and the increase of positive and healthy behaviours (Cavell et al., 2009; Griffin et al., 2009). Mentoring makes a positive difference in the academic context of a mentee, encouraging greater school connectedness and improved academic performance (Cavell et al., 2009; Kuperminc et al., 2020).

Much of the literature on mentoring focuses on evaluating formal mentoring programs, such as Big Brothers Big Sisters (DuBois et al., 2011) usually either through longitudinal studies of participants in these programmes (Newburn & Shiner, 2006), meta-analyses of these longitudinal studies (DuBois et al., 2011; Raposa et al., 2019), or case studies (Dutton et al., 2017; Dutton et al., 2018). In their meta-analysis, DuBois et al. (2011) found support for the efficacy of such mentoring programs for improving outcomes across behavioural, social, emotional, and academic domains in a young person's life. Another meta-analysis conducted by Raposa et al. (2019) also found support for the efficacy of mentoring programs, while also highlighting the need for quality and rigour in mentoring practices. In their case studies that focused on mentoring relationships, Dutton et al. (2017) found that the qualities of a positive mentoring relationship can be taught, and that gaining multiple perspectives about the relationship provides a nuanced understanding of these relationships (Dutton et al., 2018). Newburn & Shiner's (2006) longitudinal study found that

mentoring programmes were particularly successful in increasing young people's involvement in education, work, and training.

Whilst offering valuable insights into mentoring trends and impacts, previous research has focused predominantly on the experiences and outcomes of the youth being mentored. Though more recent studies have begun to incorporate the perspective of mentors and supervisors (Dutton et al., 2017; Dutton et al., 2018; Fried et al., 2018). More research into mentor intentions and practices can contribute to a more complete understanding of mentoring relationships and their benefits, and limitations (Dutton et al., 2018). It is probable that the answers to how these relationships work well and what factors underly success can be found in the experiences, knowledge and insights of mentors who build these relationships with young people.

The evidence of the positive impacts of youth mentoring abounds, as do recommendations about practice and research. However, I struggled to find evidence of how these recommendations and findings were being put into practice in mentoring training and ongoing development. As Aspfors & Fransson (2015) point out, while knowledge about the benefits of mentoring is readily available, very little is known about how mentors are trained (Bullough, 2012), their knowledge and needs within the relationship (Hobson et al., 2009), or how their knowledge and skills develop throughout the mentoring relationship. This makes it difficult to know how all these general recommendations about mentoring actually apply to the mentoring training experience. Cordingly (2008) adds further complication to this issue by pointing out that, even when there are general recommendations and policies about mentoring, outcomes will be variable. This is because mentors still play an active role in learning from any training or policies and adapting lessons learned to the dynamic and interactive setting that is their mentoring relationships.

The highly contextual and dynamic nature of mentoring relationships has been identified as one reason why it is difficult to translate research into actionable plans for mentoring organisations (Dzoba, 2014). However, it is still possible to identify effective approaches, strategies, and skills and provide this information in a more direct and relevant way to mentoring organisations to allow them to apply this knowledge to their training in a way that suits their unique needs and focuses (Rhodes & Lowe, 2008). This can be achieved through collaborative, grounded research with organisations and their mentors that has a specific focus on providing relevant and helpful insights to the organisation.

Resilience

Resilience is a common topic of interest in psychology (Van Breda, 2018), being seen by many leaders and researchers as an important trait to foster in people across a range of contexts, such as work (Arora & Rangnekar, 2014), social situations (Yates et al., 2015), academic performance (Wittrup et al., 2019), and everyday life (Wu et al., 2013). These studies raise issues around what does ‘resilience’ mean? What are the links between theories of resilience, research and practice? In order to study resilience, there needs to be a clear understanding of the construct that informs this thesis and how this may differ from other understandings of resilience. This section provides a clear definition of what resilience means in this study.

Fundamentally, resilience is about adaptive responses to adversity (Lou et al., 2018). There are various ways to describe this adversity, with stress, challenges, and risks being common words used to invoke adversity. However, disturbance (Carlson et al., 2012; Masten, 2014), trauma (Greene et al., 2004; Werner, 2000; Windle, 2011) and emotionality (Newman & Blackburn, 2002) are also commonly used terms to consider as ways of understanding what a resilient response is addressing. At-risk youth face adversities throughout their everyday lives, both in big and small ways. These can include living in poor conditions, struggling to keep up at school, having issues making social connections and friends, and feeling stressed by external factors in their lives. There are then various ways to describe how the individual reacts to adversity in a resilient manner. These include learning, thriving, resisting, anticipating, overcoming, recovering (Werner, 2000), adapting (Ungar, 2008), coping (Olsson et al., 2015), and managing. Such lists speak to the complexities of resilience responses.

Resilience is often conceptualised as either a trait, process, presence of promotive and protective factors, or outcome (Southwick et al., 2014). These are all valid understandings of resilience, but each lead to different approaches to researching resilience. For example, if a researcher approaches resilience as a process, they may explore how people and groups conceptualise their adversity, how they access resources, and how their support systems respond (Lou et al., 2018). If researching resilience as a trait, researchers may look at internal promotive factors, including pre-existing personality types, or beliefs and attitudes (Cahill et al., 2014). If understanding resilience as an outcome, researcher may be interested in how

environmental and social factors influenced the individual's capability to be resilient, or how the individual differs from the expected norm given their experiences (Masten, 2018). Identifying what orientation towards resilience is being drawn upon helps narrow down the various factors and complexities of resilience for a particular research project.

A key consideration in defining resilience is the context in which a person presents resilience and the typically negative life event or situation to which they have to respond. This is reflected in how many studies draw on phrases such as 'in the face of' (Wu et al., 2013; Windle, 2011; Naglerie et al., 2012; Smith & Carlson, 1997; Cahill et al. 2014; Ozbay et al., 2007; Ali et al., 2010), 'following' (Wagnild & Collins. 2009; Joyce et al., 2018) and 'despite' (Werner, 2000; Egeland et al., 1993; Newman & Blackburn, 2002; Lou et al., 2018; Zolkoski & Bullock, 2012) when conceptualising resilience. The underlying assumption is that they disrupt the individual's life in a negative manner, with lasting negative effects that threaten their ability to function in some capacity if a person is less resilient than they need to be, given the circumstances (Masten, 2014; Egeland et al., 1993).

Accounts of the end results of resilient responses are much more consistent in the literature, with most sources understanding resilience to be associated with a successful life (Olsson et al., 2015; Zolkoski & Bullock, 2012), which features some degree of psychological, physical and relational well-being (Lou et al., 2018; Zimmerman et al., 2013). What makes this end state or outcome notable as a resilient outcome is that this can occur after people experience adversities that have typically been correlated with negative life outcomes and pathologies.

In this research I draw insights from various definitions of resilience as these relate to the accounts of research participants. This is because each case study (see Chapter Two for details) highlights the particular conceptualisation that the mentor has and relates this to relevant literature. All these case studies are about individual relationships within the wider context of the mentoring organisation, providing the need to unpack how mentors in the organisation conceptualise resilience, and how this relates to the organisation's understanding of resilience. This organisational perspective was gained through a 40-minute video on fostering resilience provided by BBBSNZ and reading through their website. Because the organisation conceptualises resilience as something that can be taught to young people, they see resilience as the presence of promotive and protective factors that help young people bounce back from adverse experiences and situations. The organisation also conceptualises

mentoring as an opportunity to build these factors into the young person's life as much as possible. These factors can be internal, which blends with the understanding of resilience as a trait. However, I also incorporate the perspectives of the mentors, seeking their understandings of resilience that shape their personal practices as well. Central to my study are the aims is to better understand how the mentoring organisation and mentors conceptualise resilience and to compare this with the academic understandings to build a full picture of what resilience looks like on the ground in this organisation.

Following the conceptual understanding of resilience as the presence of promotive and protective factors in a young person's life that enable them to cope with adversity, I looked for common factors associated in the literature with resilience. I found that there are numerous factors associated with the level of resilience to be expected within a young person, with the two most noted factors being social connections and personal outlooks or what are often termed attitudes (Newman & Blackburn, 2002; Cahill et al., 2014; Yates et al., 2015; Van Breda, 2018). Other notable factors included external resources (Greene et al., 2004; Ungar, 2008; Egeland et al., 1993), multilevel attachments/relationships (Van Bred, 2018; Southwick et al., 2014; Zolkoski & Bullock, 2012), and problem-solving skills (Werner, 1995; McMahon, 2007; Ellis et al., 2017; Lou et al., 2018). The long list of protective factors reveals some of the complexities of resilience and how it can be affected by many different experiences, resources, and environments. While this does make resilience as an outcome difficult to study, it also presents multiple areas for the development of better understandings of how to promote resilience as a process of adaptation.

The Relationship between Youth Mentoring and Resilience

As eluded to above, research suggests that mentoring can be a significant predictor of resilience (Arora & Rangnekar, 2014). Researchers have identified several reasons for why this positive relationship is evident in different populations (Arora & Rangnekar, 2014; Day, 2006; Dzoba, 2014; Southwick et al., 2007). For example, from the perspective of social cognitive theory, which emphasises how people learn by observing others (Arora & Rangnekar, 2014), Dzoba (2014) highlights the ability of mentoring to influence young people to make better decisions. Mentoring has also been found to offer young people opportunities to model beneficial worldviews and ways of interacting with others that can have positive impacts on their future decision making and lifepaths. The introduction of

warm and nurturing relationships is also associated with buffering against depression and anxiety (Southwick et al., 2007). Day (2006) argues that mentoring promotes resilience by providing the young person with nurturance, empathy, stability, and a sense of belonging, perseverance, and resilience (Ledbetter, 2003; Mucci, 2009; Rabe, 2018).

One way in which mentoring builds these factors is through the social support offered to mentees (Low et al., 2019; Hass & Graydon, 2008), which has been found to be different from professional support (Stein, 2008). Mentors tend to place more emphasis on offering warm and positive social support to their mentees, which has been found to promote resilience (Vance, 2002). Mentoring can provide social connections, external resources, and multilevel attachments for the mentee.

The ability of mentoring to reduce distress is also important. By reducing the level of distress in a mentee's life, mentors can contribute to mentees feeling more hopeful about their futures. One way mentoring lessens distress is through coaching young people to reduce relationship problems (Zimmerman et al., 2005). Southwick et al. (2007) posit that mentoring relationships may act as moderator in the relationship between depression and relationship problems, serving as a buffer to young people developing depression, which is supported by the findings of Hurd & Zimmerman (2010). Cavell et al. (2009) found that mentoring programmes improve the relationships mentees have with their parental figures and peers.

Despite positive findings from various studies of links between mentoring and resilience related outcomes for young people, the relationship between mentoring and resilience is not a straightforward. Simply engaging in a mentoring programme is not enough to expect to see positive results in mentees. It has been established for some time that one key factor that influences these outcomes is the depth of relationship quality (Benard, 2002). Leugers (2018) found that a positive mentoring experience is what correlates strongly with resilience. Developing a sense of relatedness was also a key outcome of mentoring in the study by Altshuler (2013). Sulimani-Aidan & Tayri-Schwartz (2021) suggested that a sense of belonging possibly mediates the association between mentoring and resilience. Effective mentors are caring (Beltman & MacCallum, 2006) and provide a sense of safety, dedication, and nurturance for their mentees (Day, 2006). They are also strategic and purposeful, developing individual competencies in the mentee to improve resilience (Beltman & MacCallum, 2006). For example, Wittrup et al. (2019) found that only relationships

characterised by heightened relational closeness were associated with greater academic engagement.

Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand (BBBSNZ)

For the purposes of the present study, there is a specific focus on mentoring relationships that develop as a result of engagements with Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand mentoring organisation. This research comprised a case-based approach (See Chapter Two) and a partnership with the Manawatū branch of Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand (BBBSNZ). This service is part of the international organisation of Big Brothers Big Sisters. BBBSNZ oversees a national network of 13 branches across Aotearoa New Zealand. These branches do not work in isolation, but instead share resources, knowledge, whanaungatanga, and manakitanga to improve the efficiency of each branch and enhance capability (BBBSNZ, 2022). The formal mentoring service has been operating for 25 years in New Zealand, with the first mentoring match made back in November 1996.

BBBSNZ recruit mentors (who must be older than 18 years) to work alongside mentees (typically between the ages of 6 and 18 years) for at least one hour a week for at least one year. The organisation offers both community-based and school-based mentoring to increase the accessibility of the services. The community-based mentoring offered by this organisation occurs after school or on the weekend. According to Grossman & Tierney (1998), this means a focus on vulnerable youth, where the mentor and mentee (structure) meet in community settings 2-3 times a month for 3-4 hours (context) for at least a year to develop the mentee's social and personal skills (goals). Herrera et al. (2000) add that when mentoring is community-based, there is an engagement with social activities, parental involvement, and a focus on influencing social behaviours.

Before they are paired with a mentee, volunteer mentors must complete rigorous screening processes and several hours of training. The purpose of this training is to ensure that the mentor is well educated on the expectations, values, and goals. They continue to be supported throughout their mentoring experience to ensure a positive and high-quality relationship with their mentee that promotes the well-being of the mentee through a caring relationship that provides hope and stability. Staff from BBBSNZ stay involved throughout the mentorship to ensure that the relationship is safe and strong by providing ongoing support

and accountability. The mentors and mentees are encouraged to meet somewhere free and public for their mentoring sessions, such as the library, the park, or playground.

The organisational mission of BBBSNZ is to “enable life-changing mentoring relationships to ignite the power and potential of young people/taiohi” (BBBSNZ, 2022, p.5). They have four key values (BBBSNZ, 2022, p.5) that guide their practices:

- Whakamanatanga, which they practice by "raising the standards and creating improvements through resources and training."
- Manaakitanga, which recognises the "importance of caring for another person, doing the right thing for them, and ensuring their well-being."
- Kotahitanga, which refers to "connection, collaboration, unity, and bringing together as one."
- Whanaungatanga, which recognises the "importance of relationships and networks with current, future, and past generations through belonging, participation, community, and depth of relationships."

BBBSNZ use their own Programme Outcome Evaluation (POE) tool to evaluate the effectiveness of their relationships for the outcomes of the youth. By utilising this tool, BBBSNZ found improvements in confidence, competence, academic performance, emotional expression, and feelings of care (BBBSNZ, 2022). Other important statistics about the relationships include that the average length of a match through BBBSNZ is 869 days, well above the recommended minimum of a year, with an average retention rate of 75% (BBBSNZ, 2022).

Research Aims, Questions, and Outcomes

This project has been co-designed with BBBSNZ to enable an open exploration with participating mentors of their lived experiences of fostering resilience in young people through mentoring relationships. A key purpose is to translate the information provided by this research into actionable information for the organisation. Once the empirical materials have been analysed and developed into a thesis, the findings will be summarised and presented to the organisation and participating mentors. The knowledge gained will be used in conjunction with the relevant empirical literature to create a set of recommendations or a

policy brief for the organisation that will enhance their capability and performance. These recommendations will be presented in the form of a policy brief for the BBBSNZ.

This project aims to provide insights into the practical realities of fostering resilience in a mentoring environment within the participating organisation that may be of use to similar mentoring programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand. BBBSNZ has been offering formal mentoring opportunities to the young people of Aotearoa New Zealand for 25 years and this project is an opportunity to conduct research in collaboration with them and use the findings to help the organisation. Giving voice to the mentors and their understandings can help shape training material and organisational objectives to provide an effective service to young people. As previously mentioned, there is strong evidence that mentoring is helpful in a young person's life, but more needs to be known about the factors that create a positive mentoring experience (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009). Therefore, the results of this thesis would be beneficial for the wider community as it strengthens and improves an organisation that is valuable to society.

The core aim of this project is to contribute further depth of present understandings of how mentors (from a particular branch in Palmerston North) understand their efforts to support the development of resilience in young mentees. This study is informed by the following research questions:

- How do mentors understand their role in terms of building resilience with their mentees?
- How do mentors understand resilience?
- How does the mentoring organisation influence mentor understandings and practices for cultivating resilience with young people?

Thesis Outline

In this chapter, I have provided a backdrop of conceptual and academic information about the topics of this current study. I have discussed what youth mentoring is and the associated benefits that have been identified. Specifically, presented is a review of academic discussions regarding what mentoring relationships. I have also explored the concept of resilience, including definitional nuances, important factors of resilience, and how such a broad concept is understood within the context of this study. Provided is not an exhaustive

review of the literature. I have focused on key highlights from the literature on the complexity of resilience of relevance to the present study. I introduced the organisation that provides the context for this study and briefly referred to how this project was developed alongside the leadership of the organisation, including being informed by their conceptualisation of resilience, their goals for mentorship, and how mentoring relationships develop within their context. Further details on the design process and focus of the study is provided in Chapter Two.

The following Chapter Two covers the methodology utilised in this study with three case studies of mentors who have been working alongside their present mentees for at least a year. I provide a detailed account of the philosophical assumptions of this study and discuss the narrative approach to gaining insights from the participants and making sense of their mentoring stories. I then provide an overview of the central tenets and values of a case-based study and how the development of these cases were constructed. The analysis process is also explained. Ethical and cultural issues are identified and how they were addressed is discussed.

Chapter Three introduces the first of the three cases and explores Buddy and his relationship with his little brother. I explain how Buddy understands and fosters resilience in his little brother. My interpretation of the case is informed by literature on problem-solving skills and the positive impacts of networks on resilience. A key focus of this case is on how Buddy incorporates his experience as a serviceman in the Air Force within his approach to mentoring, and how this influences how Buddy understands resilience and coaches his little brother to respond effectively to and bounce back from struggles in life. This case reveals how resilience is fostered through everyday activities and trying new things by providing his little brother with opportunities and a safe space.

Chapter Four presents Rocket, who is one of the newest mentors, having only been mentoring her little sister for a year. This case reveals interesting insights into how a mentor can be situated or fits within the wider networks of a child's life and the importance of family resilience for young people. I explore the assumptions Rocket held about mentoring before she began and how these beliefs impact the mentoring relationship and shape the goals a mentor may hold. Consideration is given to social discourse surrounding mentoring and public assistance regarding raising children and how this impacts the resilience of families

and children involved in mentoring organisations such as Big Brothers Big Sisters. Again, I attend to how this mentor understanding her role in building the resilience of the child.

Chapter Five focuses on Harrison, who has been mentoring his little brother for four years now. This case focuses on the intense challenges some young people face in relation to school friends, family dynamics, and social media environments. How Harrison navigates these challenges with his little brother provides insights regarding how he works to foster resilience and why mentoring is such an important strategy and resource for vulnerable young people. This case reveals how a mentor can foster resilience by being supportive and caring for the mentee. Harrison's active listening style and thoughtful, holistic approach to mentoring his little brother has created a safe and open space for his little brother to ask questions about life and learn from Harrison's responses.

Chapter Six concludes the thesis with a discussion about the key findings and insights gained from the three cases in relation to previous research. More specifically, I will relate my findings to recommendations already raised by academic reviews and studies to create a discussion about how mentoring interventions offered by the organisation might be refined. I consider how my findings build upon the current knowledge about fostering resilience through mentoring and discuss the importance of applying these findings to both the literature on youth mentoring and to mentoring training procedures.

Chapter 2: Method

This chapter outlines the research approach I utilised to investigate the participants' accounts of how they foster resilience within their mentoring relationships with young people, and what implications this might have for Big Brothers Big Sisters in Palmerston North. The chapter begins with a return to BBBSNZ with a focus on how the present study was developed and conducted alongside this organisation. This leads to a discussion of why co-design and ongoing collaboration are important elements for research within organisational settings (Suarez-Balcazar, et al., 2005). Following this, I consider narrative theory as the guiding theoretical framework of this research. I adopted a storied case-based orientation to producing insights from practicing mentors that can benefit the organisation's efforts to cultivate resilience among young people. Next, each of the three cases are introduced in reference to the distinct characteristics of each mentor. I then discuss the analysis process, outlining how I developed the main storyline or focus for each case. This includes my advocacy for the utility of my adopting the perspective of the bricoleur in this research into the experience of mentors and their accounts of how they foster resilience in young people. I conclude the chapter with a discussion of the pertinent ethical issues for this study.

Research Setting and Participant Recruitment

Chapter One introduced BBBSNZ and its organisational intent. In this chapter, I outline how the present research was developed and conducted alongside BBBSNZ. Different studies will approach collaborative relationships in different ways that reflect local circumstances, interests, and opportunities (Cornish et al., 2023). There are no strict rules to follow in developing community relationships through research, but principles such as reciprocity and acting in mutual interest are foundational. Although this thesis does not meet the definition of Participative Action Research (PAR), I was guided by the relational principles of PAR outlined by Cornish et al. (2023), even though my thesis may not be substantive enough to fully engage with all the various reflexive cycles of PAR. According to Cornish et al. (2023), PAR is driven by an interest of generating knowledge in dialogue with people with direct experience of the research topic and acting upon this knowledge to assist efforts to improve related situations. This often involves working with communities who have lived experiences of the issue for researchers to learn more about the situation and what might be done to help it. The engagements with a community or organisation in this process extends from co-design discussions with stakeholders (as I will discuss below in relation to

the current study) to ethnographic participative projects that can span years or decades. Regardless of the intensity of engagement, central are efforts to work with communities or organisations to ensure the relevance of the research focus and appropriateness of any knowledge production practices for collaborative efforts to improve the situation. This participative orientation respects the authority of direct experiences, meaning that I recognised the mentors and the organisation leaders as experts in their experiences. I also worked with these people to develop suggestions that could enhance the mentors' experiences of the organisation, while also showing respect for the hard work the organisation has already done to provide such a service to the community.

More specifically, I initially approached the Practice Manager of BBBSNZ, Matt Button, to discuss the possibility of doing a thesis project in collaboration with the local branch. Through discussions with my supervisor, we agreed that, for this project to be of practical help to the organisation, it was important to discuss possible thesis topics with the organisation to learn what they would like to have researched and let the organisation lead this decision. Therefore, the initial discussion with Matt was about the organisation, its history, key service goals, and what aspects of mentoring that he would like to have explored more. Matt has also completed his master's degree, so our interactions were helped greatly in terms of my developing a clearer thesis focus. It was soon agreed that studying resilience would benefit the organisation because they have a strong focus on resilience in their mentoring training. Matt also provided the resources that assisted the organisation in developing the training materials to give me a clear idea about the underlying assumptions about resilience that the organisation holds. These materials have been incorporated into this thesis.

Matt Button then put me in touch with Dean Chapman, the local branch manager for the Manawatu. We then discussed the study and how we could work together. Dean was happy to send out an email to all the mentors in the area with a description of the study, the information sheet, and my contact details. He also forwarded any responses that had replied to him. Dean also invited me to the branch's annual general meeting (AGM), which was a great opportunity to see how this project would best assist the organisation and to learn more about the organisation. This AGM provided insights about the branch's concerns and current topics of debate, which helped me develop contextual and relevant information to assist them in these areas.

To recruit participants, an email was sent out by Dean to all local mentors about the study, describing its purpose and what involvement would look like. The study's information sheet (see Appendix B) was attached to the email and all interested mentors were able to contact me with any further questions. From this email, three mentors agreed to meet with me for an interview and a subsequent focus group. All these mentors met my participant criteria of being a mentor within the BBBSNZ organisation and having been a mentor for at least a year.

This study began with a purpose negotiated with a partnering organisation, a population, and certain participant characteristics in mind. Therefore, it was important to approach accessing a group of participants in a way that would ensure that the participant group consisted of individuals who would best serve the purpose of the study and provide information and insight that would be helpful (Etikan et al., 2016). The recruitment specification of at least one year's experience as a mentor was to ensure that the participants had developed their mentoring relationships, had some understanding of their mentoring styles, and could reflect on how they have put the training they received from the organisation into practice. It was also agreed that insights from their stories of mentoring would be fed back into the organisation to help the leaders listed above to refine how the organisation understands mentoring and trains mentors to promote resilience in young people.

Narrative Theory

This thesis is based on a narrative theoretical framework, central to which is the characterization of human beings as storied beings who make sense of themselves and events in their lives through various storytelling processes (Kirkman, 2002). The narratives human beings construct about themselves and their relationships with groups, their place in the world and the places of others, offer rich sources of contextual information for understanding human experiences and actions (Hodgetts et al., 2020). It is also through storytelling or narration that people are thought to organise their experiences of the world, both individually and collectively (Moen, 2006). People often do this by drawing on various existing story structures and tropes from within society and articulating these in ways that enable them to share their experiences with others, including for the purposes of research.

Central to this theoretical orientation is the assertion that as storied beings, people exist and grow psychologically within collective meaning systems (narrative structures) that influence their personal thoughts and actions and allow us to understand one another. Likewise, the stories we all produce to understand ourselves and others in the world can lead to refinements in collective ways of knowing and making sense of the world we share. This entangled association between the personal and the social is often referred to as the dialectics of meaning making (Hodgetts et al., 2020).

The narrative approach I adopt in this research reminds us of how our circumstances, socialisation, and values are all intrinsically entangled within our sense of self, understandings of the world, and the stories we produce in our own minds and in interactions with others (Riessman, 1984; Moen, 2006). In this way, narrative scholars tend to reject the “discovery” model of epistemology that understands social realities as set, given or objectively discoverable independent of human subjectivities (Bell, 2003). Social realities are approached as storied realities, with features common to groups of people as well as unique elements to each of us as storied and storying beings (Riessman, 1993).

Though perhaps risking oversimplification, narrative research can be understood as encompassing inquiries directed at existing human narratives in artefacts such as official documents and inquiries that produce narrative accounts through direct interactions with human participants using methods such as interviews and focus groups (Butina, 2015). Regardless, narrative inquiry explores human storying or sense making, how people and organisations come to know and tell others about particular experiences and situations, the implications of meanings people assign to themselves and others, and the particular stories they construct, hear and share (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Moen, 2006). Studies informed by narrative theory, such as mine, aim to learn more about how people make sense of events in their lives, such as their efforts to mentor young people. Correspondingly, I seek to document the meanings participants draw upon and reproduce to understand their mentoring experiences (Hart, 2002).

According to Moen (2006), there are three underpinning claims for narrative inquiry. Firstly, humans beings organise their experiences into stories, as discussed above. Secondly, how these stories are expressed depends on many factors, both within the person and within the larger context within which their story is constructed. This claim should be carefully considered when analysing stories and communicating findings within a narrative research

approach. A key task is to relate personal stories or accounts back into the shared narratives from which many aspects of personal accounts are constructed. Thirdly, narratives always contain a level of ‘multi-voicedness’ due to the social nature of storying or narrativity. This claim requires narrative researchers to consider the broader tropes and shared resources that people embed in their own accounts. Also of note is how we as researchers are adding another voice to the stories we study and are producing our own narratives about participant stories in the form of theses such as this one.

Correspondingly, I approached the three participants in this research as storying beings who are situated within broader social processes that influence the narratives they voice. This stance led me to analyse the mentors’ accounts with a view to consider different levels or scales of narrativity and to explore how broader social narratives and shared understandings of resilience and mentoring are drawn upon by the mentors as they construct their own understandings and stories. Additionally, I am aware that this thesis is also shaped across various levels of narration and in ways of which I am not fully conscious. Murray’s (2000) work on levels of narrative analysis was influential on my work in this regard. According to Murray, there are four interrelated levels of narrative analysis: personal, interpersonal, positional, and interpositional, and the challenge for a narrative inquirer is to articulate the connections between these different levels.

For further clarity, the personal level refers to how narratives are portrayed as constructions of the lived experience of the narrator. The interpositional level refers to narratives as co-created through dialogue, such as through the interviews and focus group conducted with participants during this thesis. The positional level refers to a consideration of the different social positions held by interlocutors in such discussions. The societal level refers to socially shared stories that are characteristic of certain communities or societies.

As Murray (2003, p.343) points out, “we live in a world that is mediated to us through stories that are spoken, written, and acted” at these levels of narration. There is a dialectical interplay between a storyteller and their world that emerges across these levels. While tellers’ stories do construct and organise experiences of everyday life, they also use socially embedded language and broader narrative structures to create these stories that in turn can inform the reproduction and renewal of broader collectivist narrative forms. As such, a narrative orientation provides a way for scholars to understand the influence of society and context on individual lives and how people come to understand and represent experiences

within broader narrative aspects of collective consciousness (Rappaport, 2000). In other words, the stories human beings tell themselves and others are rooted in societal level narratives that are experienced and performed within social settings. These processes of personal and collective narration are constantly re-produced, re-newed and re-constructed through social interactions as we collectively construct social reality (Bruner, 1984).

Butina (2015) also identifies three defining features of narrative research that have also influenced the present study. First, the research involves gaining access to and recording narratives from mentors at both the small group and personal levels (see account of the focus groups and individual interviews below). Second, there is a focus on developing a sense of collaboration between the researcher and the research participants. Moen (2006) adds that this places emphasis on the importance on providing time and space to develop rapport with the research participants and creating a sense of non-judgemental attitudes and equity within the research setting. Third, narrative research also exposes the researcher to the identities of the research participants through the stories they tell. That is, in narrating their experiences, people often also narrative themselves as particular characters in the unfolding events.

Further details about the specific ways narrative theory guides the methodological decisions made throughout this thesis is provided in the sections about the interview, focus group, and analysis processes. An important facet of my application of narrative theory is that a case-based research design enables me to look at the accounts of each participant in more depth than if I had tried to draw together the accounts of a larger group of mentors into a single composite analysis or story of their stories. Each mentor's particular perspective was also explored to tease out the nuances of their stories about mentoring to foster resilience. Also, by looking at the three case stories, it became clearer what differs and remains the same across mentoring experiences, providing a depth of contextual understanding to the overall discussion about fostering resilience in a mentoring relationship.

Case-Based Orientation

Case-based research offers an orientation to depth in specificity that is well suited for investigating social phenomena, often at the micro level in real-world settings (Swanborn, 2010; Yin, 2014). Case constructions are often used to create knowledge that is nuanced, context specific, and practical in orientation (Radley & Chamberlain, 2012). The focused depth of understanding that cases provide is often crucial for identifying what might be

helpful in addressing the needs of stakeholders. Relatedly, a key strength of such research is its utility in grounding a particular issue in the experiences of relevant persons within particular settings (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012). In the present research, a case-based orientation allowed me to understand the experience of mentoring from the perspective of the mentors as cases within the organisational context of BBBSNZ. In constructing the present thesis, I sought to develop a narrative about fostering resilience through the production of cases based on the stories provided by participating mentors. These cases were also compared and contrasted to reveal the similarities and differences that can be used to inform the broader efforts of BBBSNZ to cultivate resilience within young people (Stake, 2006).

The nuanced understanding gained from cases can be helpful in building effective strategies for enhancing the practices of mentors and the participating organisation. Here I am invoking the modest action aspect of this thesis within which a key aim is to understand mentoring as a means of cultivating resilience in young people in order to inform the practices of the participating mentoring organisation (Bargal, 2008). Correspondingly, cases can be focused on different scales from a person (mentor), particular group (mentors), to organisations (BBBSNZ), communities, regions and countries. The aim is to develop insights directly related to the case situation (Abbot, 1992), with a view to applying insights to improving the situation (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012). In this study there are two case levels (three mentor cases and the organisation as a local case) whereby the findings from the mentors are used to enhance the development of mentor training and practice within the organisation.

To understand the benefits of case-based research such as this, it is helpful to consider Swanborn's (2010) explanation of the different levels at which actors in a case operate. This study examines the micro-level, which involves mentors and their interpersonal relationships. I have constructed each case from the perspective of these mentors and the stories they shared during personal interviews and a focus group discussion whereby they all came together to share their stories and learn from one another. These stories were also produced within the meso-level of the mentoring organisation and the macro-level of the communities and social environments these mentors encounter in their own lives and the lives of their mentees. This contextualist focus is in keeping with my narrative orientation and allows me to explore the meso-level and macro-level story elements that impact how the mentors foster resilience. By investigating these links, especially at the meso-level of the organisation, I aim to identify particular opportunities within the organisation for enhancing training and support at the

micro-level for mentors and to contribute in a small way to their work fostering resilience among young people.

Case-based researchers also tend to strive to not reproduce top down or evaluative relationships between themselves and the research participants that are common in research drawing inspiration from the natural sciences (Small, 2009). Instead, cases are used as a means of developing joint explorations of a topic such as mentoring by spending time engaging and sharing in dialogue with participants in and around the contexts through which they conduct their everyday lives and mentoring practices (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012). For example, procedurally, I met with participants and spent time prior to the formal interview process just chatting and establishing some sense of connection and shared endeavour. At the completion of the interview, I met with them collectively for a focus group discussion within which we could continue our conversations and dig deeper into key points that had emerged from the interviews. Establishing rapport and building a sense of familiarity and openness took priority at the beginning of each interaction and was a key consideration throughout our interactions. I also took the time to listen to their stories and to better understand their points of view. Although admittedly fleeting, these interactions brought me close enough to them that we could explore key issues openly together.

Cases can also offer rich insights into how systems and organisational structures manifest in the practices of social actors, such as mentors, and offer opportunities to develop and apply new or established theories through worked examples and case comparisons (Radley & Chamberlain, 2012). Through knowledge translation across cases from particular populations, opportunities emerge for what has been termed ‘analytical transferability’ (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012, p. 381). This term refers to the process of analysing the relevant contextual factors of cases in relation to previous cases and other forms of empirical evidence to establish general trends or findings across cases (Small, 2009). This case comparative process allows abstractions from findings and recommendations to inform applications in different situations (Greenwood & Levin, 1998). Whilst cases are not generalizable in a ‘statistical span’ sense from samples to relative populations, cases are generalizable in a ‘virtual span’ sense from the exemplar to similar exemplars and situations for comparative and explanatory purposes (Radley & Chamberlain, 2012, p. 392). As Flyvberg (2001) notes we would not have had the scientific advances we have experienced over recent centuries without such comparative use of cases.

The Three Cases

This thesis is anchored in three cases, which are analysed comparatively (Small, 2009) in terms of participants overlapping and different orientations to mentoring and the storying of how they understand and work to cultivate resilience in young people. One way of understanding how these cases differ and yet still contribute to the larger narration of mentoring resilience is to consider the subject and object of the cases. This idea of the subject and object of a case was developed by Thomas and Myers (2015), building on the early work of Wieviorka (1992). Wieviorka proposes that the subject of a case is the case itself (here, the mentor) and the object is the ‘theoretical, scientific basis’ of the case (here, my focus on the storying of the mentoring of resilience). As Wieviorka (1992, p. 160) explains, “It does not suffice to observe a social phenomenon, historical event, or set of behaviours to declare them to be ‘cases’. If you want to talk about a ‘case’, you also need the means of interpreting it or placing it in a context”. So, in this study, each of mentors are the subject of the case, while their experience fostering resilience is the object. This object, fostering resilience, places the cases within a certain context that is the same across the cases, providing the opportunity for comparison and discussion.

Empirical materials for developing the three cases were collated through a personal interview with each participant and a focus group with all three mentors. Each of these mentors provided detailed and reflexive accounts of their mentoring experiences and understanding of resilience, creating a wealth of information to be analysed and constructed into the three cases. Though three may seem like a small sample, these cases each provide a particular perspective of mentoring that revealed something different and interesting about fostering resilience through mentoring. By having only three cases, I was able to work in a more iterative manner and to delve into these perspectives and do justice to the knowledge shared by each mentor and share the complexities and nuances of each mentor’s mentoring relationships and experiences (Flyvberg, 2006).

In order to present a case with coherence and a clear focus, I had to sit with each participant’s story until I found the particular angle for each case. Sometimes this was a simple process, with the focus becoming apparent in the interview process. Other times, it took more reflection and consideration before the underlying focal issues emerged and I could articulate them. Correspondingly, despite noted overlaps, I developed each case from a

different angle and to complement one another in my telling of a more complete account of participant efforts to promote resilience among their mentees. Buddy's case focuses more on building networks and incorporating life experiences. Rocket's case provides insights into family resilience and underlying assumptions about mentoring. Harrison's case discusses the different roles and functions of a mentoring relationship. Combined, these cases offer a bigger picture of what fostering resilience through mentoring looks like, revealing the complexities of this process, as well as the common encounters and thought processes of mentors. Below, I provide a brief overview of each of the cases, with pseudonyms used to ensure anonymity of both the mentors and their mentees.

Buddy has been mentoring his little brother for seven years now and is preparing for his little brother to graduate the program once he turns eighteen. Buddy works for the Royal New Zealand Air Force, while also enjoying various hobbies, such as acting, theatre production, fishing, and BMX. He has seen his little brother develop from a child into a young adult, overcoming challenges throughout this time. Buddy takes on an active, solution-focused support role for his little brother.

Harrison has been mentoring his little brother for four years, during which time he has also had to learn how to juggle new responsibilities, with his first child born a year ago. Even though Harrison and his little brother come from very different backgrounds, they've created a safe and supportive relationship where his little brother can question things going on around him and learn to make different decisions.

Rocket is the newest mentor in this study, having been mentoring her little sister for just over a year. Having raised her son, she is finding having a little sister to be both rewarding and eye-opening. Being part of the programme has given her a new perspective about what mentoring is and what it can offer both the young person and the mentor. She's learned a lot about the strength of a good family background and has found her place in her little sister's life as an external support.

Interview and Focus Group Engagements

In terms of further details on participant recruitment, once I had been given the names and contact details of potential participants through their response to the recruitment email sent out by Dean, I reached out to each potential participant and arranged a time and place to meet, to complete the informed consent process and conduct the initial interview. The

purpose of the first interview was to gain more personalised stories from each mentor about their experiences fostering resilience and learn more about their background and personal insights. These interviews provided more nuanced and personal accounts of the mentor's perceptions and practices in response to the particular needs of their mentee(s). The interviews allowed me to dive deeper into the personal experiences of each mentor to better understand what they do and what they each find helpful (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012).

The narrative orientation to the first interviews was guided by the recommendations of Savin-Baden & Van Niekirk (2007) and Jovchelovitch & Bauer (2000). While I did have a set of questions that I had prepared with my supervisor in front of me (see Appendix D), these were primarily to remind me of key topics I hoped to address in the interview and possible questions to ask to prompt further stories should the conversation begin to lag. Therefore, these interviews did adopt a semi-structured approach (Jacob & Furgerson, 2012) that was informed by the preliminary findings from the focus group and relevant literature, which does go against the unstructured nature of a narrative interview (Jovchelovitch & Bauer, 2000). However, the goal was still to allow the participants to tell their stories in their own words as a means for me to gain a contextual understanding of their experiences and efforts to support the resilience of mentees. These questions (see Appendix D) were framed to work as conversation starters to open up and focus the conversation. I also used them to encourage the mentors to also guide the discussion according to where they wanted to take the conversation.

Jovchelovitch & Bauer (2000) suggest five basic phases for such narrative interviews Preparation, Initiation, Main narration, Questioning, and Concluding talk. The preliminary literature review conducted before the study began and discussions with the organisation and my supervisor served as the preparation phase. The interviews provided me with some understanding of the different ways each mentor understood and fostered resilience in their mentees, as well as variances in their respective relationships with mentees. As the mentors expanded on their stories and experiences, I gained a better appreciation for key factors they reported facing when mentoring and how they each differed in their understanding of resilience. These insights prepared me for the focus group discussion in terms of understanding the different positions each participant brought to the group discussion and what topics might be interesting to explore further as a group.

Following the advice of Jovchelovitch & Bauer (2000), the initiation phase of the interview involved formulating the initial topic for narration and initiating the discussion. I explained the format of the interview to the participant, including my willingness to prompt and then listen with limited interruptions to their stories. I provided a brief overview what a narrative interview looks like, sharing why I wanted to conduct individual interviews, how long I expected the interview to last. Participants were also reminded of their rights, such as how these interviews would be anonymised via a pseudonym, that they could end the interview at any point, and could decline to answer any questions. From there, the topic of interest was shared with the participant, which Jovchelovitch and Bauer (2000) also recommend should be of personal and of social and communal importance, broad enough to allow participants to craft deep accounts of their experiences. I then asked permission to record the interview, letting participants know that this was to allow me to be present with them in the moment and would ensure that their answers were recorded as accurately as possible. Once this was understood and any questions answered, the recorder was turned on and we began the main narration phase.

I initiated the narration phase with a couple of questions about the mentor and their background in order to gain a fuller picture of their mentoring experience and to help them orientate themselves to the topic. During the main narration phase, the participant told their story, while I listened without interrupting and providing no comments other than those that communicate active listening or when asked to comment by the participant. I also took notes during this phase for later questioning, but only if it did not interfere with the participant's narration. I found that I needed to adapt my level of engagement for each mentor. Two mentors were happy to share their stories and follow the emerging threads of their own responses. The third participant preferred to answer questions succinctly and as accurately as they could and struggled to think of specific examples to expand their answers. Before speaking, I waited for a clear code, where the informant paused or signalled the end of the story. I then probed into particular aspects of their account for further details and to ensure that the participant was able to add any details or clarify any issues that seemed important but remained a little unclear. Only once the informant seemed to feel that they had communicated their experience did I move to the open questioning phase.

The open questioning phase offered an opportunity for me to gain new or additional information beyond the self-generated story each participant provided (Jovchelovitch & Bauer, 2000). The questions were designed to add further depth to the story and for me to

probe the participant further in terms of key events and relationships within their narratives. Jovchelovitch & Bauer (2000) recommend only asking “What happened then?” style questions and offering no opinion or questions, nor posing any contradictions or arguments, and I did not ask any “why” questions at this stage. I also worked to use the same terms as the participant in phrasing my probes.

Once the questioning phase was completed, the concluding talk phase of the interview began. This phase offered a chance for us to engage in “small talk”, which led to further elaborations on the participants story, including contextual information that proved useful during my analysis of the interview material. It was in this phase that I asked “Why?” questions. After the interviews concluded, I immediately summarised or write down the main points, focusing in particular on any additional content from the small talk phase, along with any personal insights, impressions, and compiled my notes taken during the interview.

The second engagement with all the mentors was via a 90-minute focus group discussion. The focus group comprised a guided conversation about participant experiences in fostering resilience among their mentees and their perceptions of the organisation’s training about resilience (see Appendix D for focus group protocol). The focus group provided a useful opportunity to learn more and develop a contextual understanding about how the mentors conceptualise resilience. I also wanted to draw out the key storylines and experiences participants had voiced during the interviews. My intention here was to see how participants dialogued about these experiences, what they understood as resilience and how they mobilised their knowledge and experiences in discussing mentoring relationships to foster resilience with young people with peers. The discussion offered a chance to explore how understandings of fostering resilience were co-constructed within mentor storying practices and the underlying contexts and meanings that these narratives developed (Lyndon, 2017). In other words, the focus group allowed for the participants to come together and to share their stories and in doing so co-construct a group narrative.

I had been provided with a training video specifically focusing on resilience by Button, which was used by the organisation. My initial plan had been to conduct a document analysis on this video and include this in the study. I had thought that the video provided a rich set of data to answer my research questions “How does the Manawatū branch of Big Brothers Big Sisters characterise resilience in the mentoring context of their operations?” and “How does the mentoring organisation influence their understandings and practices for

cultivating resilience with young people?” However, during the interviews with the participants, it became apparent that none of these mentors had seen this video during their training. Therefore, I showed the video to participants and used it to promote further discussion and to relate their understandings of resilience to those of the organisation. I also included quotes and insights from the video to further develop my engagements with each case.

An additional aspect of the focus group was the use of participant notes while they watched the resilience video. The purpose of the note taking process was to provide another means of recording thoughts and ideas as the video was playing that participants could either share with the group or discuss with me later. This process helped the mentors to cover all the topics they wanted to without forgetting about them as they continued to watch the video or as the other mentors raised discussion points. The notes were for the participant’s use only and was not collected by me at any point in the study. I wanted the participants to feel free to write or draw anything they wanted however they wanted to without any anxieties regarding how others might perceive their notes.

Briefly, the focus group discussion was structured around the resilience training video and the conversation prompts suggested by the video. There were three prompts from the video. Two were about the mentors’ thoughts and reactions on the six internal and six external factors of resilience that are discussed in the video. The other prompt was a visualisation exercise called “The Running Race of Life”. The mentors also discussed their mentoring experiences, particular instances with each other, and their experiences in the organisation, and with me. This allowed me to gather information to inform my answering the research question, “How does the mentoring organisation influence their (mentors’) understandings and practices for cultivating resilience with young people?”. Together, the participants were encouraged to co-create the story of their experiences of mentoring in relation to the video and the relationship between mentoring and the cultivation of resilience among young people as it made sense to them (Kirkman, 2002). Though the video approached resilience as the presence of promotive and protective factors (Southwick et al., 2014), it was also of interest to note how the mentors discussed resilience, and if they ever referred to resilience as an inherent trait of the young person, or as a process of reacting to their circumstances (Southwick et al., 2014).

Enacting the focus group in this way allowed me to understand how the mentors reacted to the organisation's training about resilience, opening a conversation about how the mentors view this video now, having spent time mentoring, and what insights or reactions they had considering these experiences. The conversation was also a chance to hear about the mentors' other sources of knowledge for fostering resilience and any barriers they had experienced when trying to foster resilience (Barbour, 2013).

Key insights from the discussion were dispersed throughout this thesis. Some comments were added to the general discussion at the end of the thesis to answer the research question, "How does the Manawatū branch of Big Brothers Big Sisters characterise resilience in the mentoring context of their operations?". This video is the only official document of BBBSNZ that directly relates to resilience and therefore is the foundational source of information in this discussion. Additionally, any comments or conversation inputs from mentors were added to their specific case study examinations to provide more details about each mentor's personal story of fostering resilience.

Briefly, the focus group turned into a helpful conversation about each mentor's thoughts about their own mentoring journey. The discussion also revealed the importance all mentors placed on parental involvement, how much the mentors valued meeting with each other and sharing insights, and how each mentor reacted to the video. These insights will be discussed in more depth in the policy brief provided to the organisation due to the highly actionable nature of the mentors' thoughts and suggestions. This focus group offered a valuable opportunity to move beyond each mentor's individual story and create a collaborative narrative about the organisation and mentoring.

Analysis Process

To analyse the content gained from my interactions with the participants, I used a thematic orientation to narrative inquiry that focuses on the content of the stories told by the mentors and the key issues or themes around which their stories were constructed (Riessman, 2008). The interviews and focus group content were analysed using the same process. There are four general steps to narrative thematic analysis: selection of subtexts and segments, definition of analytical categories or codes, sorting the material into these categories, and drawing interpretative conclusions (Riessman, 2008). This process of analysis was repeated for each mentor's interview and contributions to the focus group discussion to develop three

individual cases. The analytical categories or thematic codes used related to the emergent angle present within each case. When conducting this analysis, I used both the key thematic topics predetermined by the research questions, as well as emergent or inductive themes that emerged from the interactions. This allowed me to both answer the research questions while also providing opportunities for the different points made by participants to be represented in the study.

As the analysis progressed, all relevant sections from the transcripts for each participant were brought together or coded according to the categories or framework I had constructed deductively from the interview questions and focus group prompts and inductively from my notes and initial reading of the transcripts. For example, all comments or stories about fostering resilience were grouped together under several categories. Esin (2011) notes that though these subtexts are often treated as independent from the total narrative, contextual information should still be provided about these subtexts during the interpretation stage (Riley & Hawke, 2005). From there, additional key issues, tropes and perspectives were identified across the subtexts. Finally, the narrative content collected under each category was used to develop a sense of coherence and describe the meaning of the narrative text for each case.

Once I had categorised the participant accounts and read over the content of each category I began to shift to the interpretative level of analysis. This involved adopting a bricolage approach to the accounts, which is a flexible orientation towards piecing together insights from various sources to understand the phenomena under investigation (Kincheloe, 2005). Adopting a bricolage approach reflects the complexity of real-life, requiring flexibility and plurality for the emergent story and employing appropriate methods as each case took shape. This involved stepping out beyond the data to uncover the links between the specific, personal stories and more general levels of narrativity regarding mentoring and resilience. This shift was enacted by my drawing links between the mentor's stories and insights from the resilience video and from the academic literature on mentoring, resilience, and any other ideas or concepts that arose from the mentor's account. The bricolage approach reflects the development of my interpretation of the events and relationships each mentor storied in relation to my reading of existing literature on relevant concepts and definitions of mentoring and resilience (Hodgetts et al., 2020). I worked to place their stories within wider academic and practice related discussions. In many respects, the analysis process was anchored in my abductive reasoning and a series of interpretative shifts. Central was the positioning of the

situations and moments raised by the participants in relation to the organisation and various societal features that shape participant accounts, including narratives of mentoring and resilience (Delmar, 2010; Hodgetts et al., 2020). This shift in focus to dig down into, contextualise and interpret participant narratives was useful in revealing several intricacies of mentoring and how these reflect aspects of broader social relations and narratives in society that have become intertwined with the participants own stories.

Ethical Considerations

Once a research plan was formed and articulated into a proposal document, a low-risk ethics applications (See Appendix A) was submitted to the Massey University Human Ethics Committee on the 29th of May 2023. This project was lodged as a low-risk ethical application, with my supervisor, Professor Darrin Hodgetts providing his approval on the 30th of May 2023. The project was designated low risk because there was little tangible risk of harm or danger to the participants.

Below, I provide an outline of the ethical considerations taken in this research and how each of these ethical principles were applied. Each ethical principle is considered, how it was addressed in the research process is outlined, and any further strategies put in place to uphold the principles is discussed.

Mentors who expressed interest in the study were provided an information sheet (See Appendix B) that outlined the study's aims, methods, and expectations for participants. This sheet identified what participation in the study would entail, any risks associated with participating in the study, the benefits and goals of the study, and their rights as a participant. Once interested individuals had confirmed their desire to be part of the study, and had any questions and concerns addressed, a consent form (see Appendix C) was sent to participants to be read over and a time and location for their individual interviews was confirmed. They signed the consent form when they arrived for their interview before the interview process began.

There was a potential ethical issue with one or two participants dominating the focus group discussion and another participant being ignored or feeling unable to voice their opinions. In response, I made every effort to ensure that each participant felt that their opinion or insight was expressed to their satisfaction and that these views were respected and valued by the group. Any relevant insights gained through the study were used to inform the

staff training and service development of BBBSNZ, ensuring that the research was beneficial for all involved.

Before the research began, it was established that there were no special relationships between the researcher and the participants or the organisation. The relationship was purely based on achieving the goals of the study. However, I did acknowledge the small possibility of my knowing a participant due to the local nature of the study setting, though there was little chance of this affecting the quality of the study.

Chapter 3: Buddy

This chapter presents the case of how Buddy understands mentoring and his efforts to foster resilience in his little brother, Tom. Buddy has been mentoring for seven years, since his little brother was ten years old. Both live in Manawatu, where they engage in a range of activities together, from fishing to mountain biking to theatre and soccer. Buddy works for the Royal New Zealand Air Force (RNZAF), where, in addition to his other duties, he helps mentor younger service personnel. During the focus group, Buddy shared how he had been raised in a tight knit community, surrounded by neighbourhood friends, with both parents who each had good jobs. Since joining the Air Force, Buddy has moved around with different postings, with his eldest daughter being born in Christchurch, his second in Blenheim, and them settling in Palmerston North in 2004. Buddy is a self-confessed optimistic, hard-working individual, with a passion for supporting young people as they develop.

My analysis explores the key themes that emerged from the interview and focus group conversations regarding Buddy's experiences of mentoring. This includes how he approaches mentoring, his motivations for mentoring, how he conceptualises resilience and attempts to foster it in his little brother through teaching him problem-solving skills and independence. Also considered is how Buddy has encouraged his little brother to expand his outlook on life by engaging in new activities and hobbies. The unique way Buddy approaches resilience and how he adapts his response in different situations, such as in the Air Force versus in his mentoring relationships, sheds light on the different ways mentors can influence their mentees based on their background and understandings of mentoring and resilience. This is a recurring theme we will see throughout this thesis, in that each mentor offers a unique and different approach to fostering resilience. Each case adds to the bigger picture of what fostering resilience in mentoring looks like. Throughout each of these cases, I will expand upon each mentor's thoughts and insights with relevant academic literature insights to introduce key ideas within each mentor's story and relate academic findings to each mentor's experiences.

I begin the analysis below by bringing into focus why Buddy got into mentoring and how he sees himself in this role. His self-concept appears to have a notable impact on how he understands the purpose of their mentoring sessions, how he views his contributions to Tom's life, and how he goes about fostering resilience with Tom. I then discuss Buddy's particular

conceptualisation of resilience, where this comes from, and how he applies it not only to his mentoring relationship with his little brother, but also in his mentoring in the Air Force. From there, I explore how the Air Force has shaped Buddy's view of resilience and personal development in general. Finally, I finish by reflecting on how Buddy encourages Tom to try new activities and to handle or manage the frustrations that can come with new experiences that involve mastering particular skills. Buddy presents these practical learning opportunities as key moments for fostering resilience in Tom. This case concludes with a discussion on the emergent insights revealed through Buddy's storying of mentoring and resilience.

Why Mentoring?

This section explores the specific ways in which mentors approach their mentoring relationships based on their underlying motivations and understandings about themselves and mentoring. Buddy approaches his mentoring relationship from a very specific and unique standpoint, based on his own self-perception and occupational background. From this discussion, I will go on to consider Buddy's current mentoring situation and how he approaches mentoring, including what typical mentoring sessions look like for him and his little brother.

For researchers, the motives behind why people choose to mentor has been of interest for some time (Allen, 2003; Eby et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2009; Jansen et al., 2014). Social psychological theory has been of great benefit to developing a better understanding of this phenomenon. For example, mentoring has been discussed as a form of prosocial behaviour (Allen, 2003). Following this line of thought, there are two relevant cognitive phenomena related to prosocial behaviour to note here: other-oriented empathy and helpfulness (Penner et al., 2014). People with a high level of empathy tend to be more likely to have concern about and feel responsible for the wellbeing of others (Allan, 2003) and act upon this concern through prosocial behaviours such as mentoring or volunteering. Mentoring can be understood as a helping behaviour that relates to altruistic tendencies. It has been argued that people who have high levels of empathy and a desire to be helpful are more likely to engage in mentoring (Allan, 2003). From a social psychology perspective, Liu and Wang (2023) suggest that people who do not have such prosocial traits may be less likely to devote the time and effort necessary to donate a significant portion of their time, such as is required for mentoring. It can also be assumed that the motivation behind choosing to mentor influences

what functions or purposes are carried out in the mentoring relationship (Haggard et al., 2011), such as whether the relationship has more interpersonal or career goal focused.

To better understand Buddy's motivations for mentoring, I asked him why he got involved. He explained how he sees it as a way to give back:

So, the reason I got into it was, I guess, I had had some spare time - time tends to get tied up with other things - but it was more, pay it, pay it forward and help our young people, yeah, develop. And Big Brothers Big Sisters needed some support, needed male mentors, an, um, so I said, 'yeah'.

Buddy then went on to explain what he meant by giving back:

Yeah. So, a lot of people - and I'll use the example that you gave from your professor, he said, 'Don't be a seagull in life.' And that's really struck with me - stuck with me - for the last week and I'm just going, yeah, people do take, take, take and they don't give back. And I think that's part of my personality, very empathetic personality, to give something.

Just as a brief explanation to understand the context of Buddy's statement, the phrase "don't be a seagull" comes from Professor Drew's (2006) metaphor of a seagull that swoops into communities, takes whatever it wants from people, and leaves a mess behind. Eady & Rifenburg (2023) use this metaphor to promote more community-led research that builds up communities, rather than just taking from them. I have kept this metaphor and its message in mind throughout the design of this thesis and shared the metaphor with Buddy when explaining the purpose of the study. Buddy then applied this metaphor in day-to-day life by reflecting on how much people just take without giving back or contributing.

As Buddy explains, he sees himself as a very empathetic person, and that it is part of his personality to give something. This self-presentation is in keeping with key findings from classic research into mentoring. For example, Haggard et al. (2011) found that people who were motivated by a desire to help others were most likely to engage in both career mentoring and psychosocial mentoring. Levine Daniel et al. (2019) subsequently noted that mentoring relationships are often defined by the mentor's expectations and efforts. This means that these people offer both mentoring in terms of life goals and personal development as well as mentoring in terms of encouraging psychological progress and being a space for more personal, emotional conversations. In the classical 1985 mentoring model developed by

Kram, he notes that this type of mentoring, focusing on both types of function, is crucial for mentees' overall development.

This explanation of motive also fits well within the categories of mentor motives developed by Janssen et al. (2016) as “integrated regulation” (p. 271). According to Janssen et al. (2016), integrated regulation is a form of motivation where mentors see mentoring as behaving in alignment with their personal values or needs. They understand that mentoring is important in terms of social benefits, but they also feel that it aligns with their identities or personal narratives. For Buddy, mentoring was a good use of his spare time, but also, he felt the need to give back to the community based on his self-identification as an empathetic person and used mentoring to do so.

Motivations then influence expectations, although mentor expectations are also shaped by the training they receive from BBBSNZ before they begin their mentoring relationship. In his video on resilience, Button states that *“You're not there to fix and change a young person. You're not there to have that wide influence and change things that are out of your control.”* Making this clear to the mentors sets them up to focus on what they can control or influence, mainly, the mentee's attitude or approach to life. This expectation of mentoring outcomes lines up well with the findings of previous studies. In their meta-analysis of the outcomes of mentoring, Eby et al. (2008) found that mentoring outcomes are strongly related to the mentee's developing positive attitudes to life. As Buddy puts it, *I guess I'm just providing a different perspective. I mean, I can't replace Dad, Dad's Dad. But I think in these young people's lives, they need other mentors that they can just, maybe, talk about something to another person.*

As we will see below, Buddy encourages Tom to solve problems as they arise using the skills and resources available to him and provides him with opportunities to try new things and meet new people, which builds his personal development. But they have also had more personal conversations about struggles Tom has gone through, such as bullying at school, where Buddy coached Tom on choosing to talk about his problems rather than fighting his bullies:

Yeah, yeah, there was obviously some bullying and bits and pieces. So, we talked about coping mechanisms and stuff like that. So, you know, 'What would you do?' 'Oh, I'd just go, I'd just go and punch them!' 'So, what's the outcome of that?'

(chuckles) ... But I think that was that macho-ness. Yeah, because that's what boys do, you know? Yeah, that's what guys do. And I said 'No, they don't.' Talk about it.

Even though Buddy has such a practical, solution-focused approach to problems, he also understands the need to talk through the problem and communicated that to Tom. Buddy was able to step back from the immediate issue of bullying to see the bigger issue in Tom's perspective and how he was approaching the problem with a potentially harmful schema, namely that boys don't talk about stuff, they should just act. In this case, acting from this perspective involved violence. Buddy provided Tom with a different perspective, providing a space for Tom to talk through how he felt about the bullying.

As previously mentioned, Buddy is employed by the RNZAF. He also mentors within the Air Force and ties these experiences into how he approaches mentoring with young people to also help them develop resilience outside of the military. As Buddy puts it *"I guess I'm probably working on my own experiences and techniques from the resilient stuff that we've sort of done with the Air Force."*

Buddy went on to articulate how he places considerable importance on applying a strengths-based approach to mentoring that he has developed from his previous experiences of mentoring and the importance of providing a supportive relationship to mentees. Matt relates this orientation to the importance of mentors finding what they are effective at and developing their own style of engagement that reflects who they are as people:

I really encourage mentors to be good at something in their mentoring, and whether that's to be creative, to be encouraging, to be whatever it is, you know. And put your own slant on it, put yourself into the mentoring ... Not forcing them, but you know, just bring that part of yourself, the stuff that you're good at.

Correspondingly, Buddy's sessions with Tom are usually activity-based, mostly football because this is something that they both are interested in: *"He's mad about football. So, it's a lot of physical activity. I grew up with football anyway."* Buddy has also introduced Tom to some of the other hobbies and activities Buddy enjoys, in this case, fishing, mountain biking, and theatre:

Yep, I've introduced him to theatre, the backstage side of it. We've done a lot of theatre construction, sorry, set construction, packing and those type of things. And introduced him to fishing. Some freshwater fishing. So, the Manawatu is great for

that, yeah, yeah. ... We've gone for walks through the Manawatu gorge. I've taken him mountain biking. We've done a little bit of, uh, we cleaned his bike once and helped, sort of, repair it a bit.

As discussed below, the engagements in fun and shared activities also provide a good opportunity for resilience-building through affording Tom opportunities to gain new experiences and learn new skills. Their mentoring relationship creates a safe space for Tom to try new things and pursue activities that he enjoys. Once such safe activity spaces in which he and Tom feel comfortable and familiar with one another are established, more pointed conversations become more possible. Such activity-based conversations have been found to be central to how men communicate in caring ways with one another (Hodgetts & Rua, 2010). For Buddy, these mentoring sessions are not so much about forcing conversations or life lessons on his mentee, but more about providing a safe space where his little brother can just exist and do something outside of the house. Buddy shared feedback he had received from BBBSNZ about how Tom perceives this time and the activities they engage in:

Well, from the feedback I get from Big Brothers Big Sisters, they keep relating back to, 'Hey, look, he enjoys the time with you. It's completely different to the family life and his other groups and stuff like that.' ... 'It's just a good space, you two together.' It's just another realm, I guess, world, you could call it, that he can go to and still feel safe, do the things that he enjoys, yeah. And then move back into the general routine.

The mentoring relationship between Buddy and Tom has provided Tom with a safe space, one he enjoys being in. It offers him a chance to get out of his normal routine and spend time with someone who shows him other opportunities and perspectives. Buddy can be there for Tom, spending time with him as they enjoy shared hobbies and creating a space for Tom to share any problems or struggles if he wants to.

Apparent throughout the quotes and discussion of this chapter is Buddy's practical orientation towards mentoring. He often relates back to lessons Tom has learned through tackling practical issues together as they arise during their mentoring sessions. Having someone in your life who helps you tackle problems and achieve your goals has a significant impact on one's resilience by building self-esteem and self-efficacy, feeling a sense of belonging and purpose, and improving one's confidence (Dutton et al., 2012). When discussing his perspective on mentoring, Buddy related it to the ability of a mentor to teach mentees new perspectives:

Don't think you don't have anything to offer. We have a lot of life experience. And we may not have come across the same problems, but the way we go around solving our own problems, it might seem mundane to you at the moment, but that's quite big for a young person.

Mentoring is a chance for a young person to learn new perspectives by watching the example set by their mentor. This does not need to be something extraordinary that the mentor does, but as Buddy points out, it can simply be how the mentor approaches life and its challenges in a different way from how the mentor may have seen done before.

In this section, I have explored how Buddy got involved in mentoring and how his approach relates to key concepts from social cognitive psychology to help explain his motivates and attributes that have been associated with a willingness to engage the prosocial act of mentoring. I have also begun to unpack how Buddy's approach to mentoring influences the outcomes of the mentoring relationship with his little brother. How his experience in the Air Force has shaped his approach has also been introduced and will be discussed in more depth later in the chapter. In the following section, the ways in which Buddy understands and fosters resilience in Tom through their mentoring sessions will be discussed, specifically how he teaches his little brother problem-solving skills in everyday situations and provides encouragement to persevere.

Problem-Solving and Encouragement

This section documents how Buddy understands resilience in the context of his mentoring efforts. We will look at Buddy's understanding of resilience and how he fosters resilience through teaching his little brother problem-solving skills and giving him encouragement when Tom is trying new hobbies and activities. By basing the conversation on the understanding of resilience Buddy uses, I can gain insights about the specific ways he fosters resilience and where that approach comes from. When asked to define what he understood as 'resilience', this is what Buddy said:

Yeah, so resilience, I think, is working through a problem and being... proud of what you've done? No, it's not the right one... Yeah, yeah, working through a problem. And it can range from, I don't know, changing a wheel in the car to maybe a relationship problem or, uh, a learning problem

Problem-solving skills as invoked by Buddy have been established as a key protective factor in building resilience for a long time (Ellis et al., 2017; Lou et al., 2018; Rutter, 1989; Werner, 1995). Masten (2001) specifically defined resilience as the ability to overcome challenges and bounce back from adversity. Buddy also articulates this orientation throughout our interview that is grounded in engaging Tom in practical tasks from changing a wheel to coaching him on managing his way through relational difficulties. As will become apparent from this case, Buddy asserts that skills of resilience can be coached and learned practically through exposure to solving problems.

The focus group revealed that resilience is something that Buddy is intentionally trying to teach Tom in response to noticing the way his little brother tends to rely on others to solve issues for him. What Buddy is teaching his little brother is not only how to solve problems, but also how to face a problem and not avoid it when obstacles arise to frustrate his efforts to solve it. Again, he anchors his examples in their practical activities

When we were fishing, we had, um, a tangle. Yeah, and my eyesight's not that good, especially the close-in stuff. So, I had to get him to untangle it, and that was, yeah, that was pretty frustrating, for both of us. Yeah, I've had fishing tangles before, so it's not a biggie for me. But yeah, he did become quite frustrated. I said, 'That's alright. Let's take this in chunks. What do we need to do first?' And, I think, we broke it down into like 3 chunks and ended up pulling half the nylon off the spool and just cutting it. That's it. 'Well, that's effective, isn't it? We can still fish.' So, I guess, getting away from that task focus bit of 'Ugh, there's this massive tangle, I need to untangle it.' 'Yeah, sure. You can have a go at it, but if it's not really working, and the fish are running, yeah, just pull off as much as you can, snip it, put on a new hook. Go again.

This extract reflects the emphasis Buddy places on coaching Tom to engage problem solving in positive and pragmatic ways. This account also reflects an understanding of resilience as relating to not letting frustrations get a hold of you and learning how to break problems down into more manageable chunks. Buddy proposes that Tom learning to do so aids him in developing a flexible process to 'bouncing back' from frustrations (Ong et al., 2006; Masten, 2001). Through engaging in such material acts, Buddy attempts to teach his little brother to view and approach challenges in a more positive manner (Garmezy, 1991) that can also help foster feelings of self-esteem and success in overcoming problems. As Seligman (1995, p.33)

puts it, “feelings of self-esteem in particular, and happiness in general, develop as a side effect of mastering challenges... The feeling of self-esteem is a by-product of doing well.”

During the focus group, Buddy shared how teaching his little brother new skills of resilience is achieved by exposing Tom to new activities and experiences:

I've mentioned he's gotten into fishing. We went down and surprisingly caught a trout in the river! Gave us both a fright! Never catch anything. But now, yeah, he was with his grandparents over in Tauranga and there he wanted to go fishing with Granddad at the beach.

It is important for mentors to keep in mind the ripple effect of their time with mentees, where their interactions may have a spreading effect in being transferred into other domains of their mentee's life (Bukko et al., 2019). Because Buddy taught his little brother a new hobby and built Tom's confidence with fishing, he was able to go out with his family and enjoy that hobby with them as well with some success. Bukko et al. (2019) define this as the ripple effect of building capacity within a mentee and developing their social capital network. Buddy's approach to solving problems and building confidence in his little brother has had an impact on him and provided him with more opportunities to connect with the people around him.

Buddy seems to engage in a positive, solution-focused approach to problems, role modelling this optimistic approach to Tom. Buddy often sees obstacles as challenges he and Tom can solve together, believing that either they possess the skills necessary to overcome a problem, or that they can learn as they go (Korhonen, 2007). As Buddy states this often involves learning to break problems down into more manageable chunks:

We may not achieve, we may not solve the problem, but we've bitten off maybe 30-40% of it and it's made the problem a little bit less and maybe that is just enough for them to go, 'Ohh, it's not much of a problem now.

This approach is evidenced by Buddy's story about the fishing tangle, where he encouraged Tom to move beyond seeing the tangle as a source of frustration and instead consider what he needed to do. He broke it down into steps: untangle it a bit, snip off the most tangled part, and put on a new hook. It seems that Buddy is coaching Tom to move beyond focusing on the problem itself and instead think about how to solve it or at least work through it enough so that the problem isn't such a frustration or obstacle anymore.

Buddy has quite an optimistic, hopeful outlook towards his mentee and his efforts to help Tom's efforts to turn particular challenges into strengths. During the focus group, Buddy talked about what his little brother wants to do in the future and in doing so disclosed to the other mentors that Tom is challenged by a hearing impairment. Tom is almost eighteen and beginning to think about what he wants to do for a career. Buddy talked about how his little brother has a career in mind that Buddy thinks would be great for him. Buddy is optimistic that his little brother's hearing impairment does not need to impede his life and can see how his little brother is making decisions that work with his hearing impairment:

But he, because he's hearing impaired, he wants to do PE [Physical Education]. And I think that's perfect for a PE teacher because he can just sign to everyone, and they can do what he told them. He could be halfway across the gym and not have to say anything.

Though PE may seem an unusual choice for a person with a hearing impairment, Buddy views it as something that Tom wants to do and thus Buddy has already begun thinking about ways in which it could work, such as by signing to the children when he wants them to do something. As previously mentioned, Tom enjoys outdoor activities, especially soccer, and it is possible that his career goal reflects his interests. This quote exemplifies the optimistic and hopeful approach Buddy has towards Tom, where he encourages him to pursue his dreams and find solutions to any potential obstacles or challenges. Letting Tom share these goals and providing him with positive encouragement also helps build his little brother's self-esteem and confidence in his decision-making skills, further fostering his resilience (Alvord & Grados, 2005). He is also encouraging his little brother to be adaptable to his circumstances and find solutions.

In this section, we have learned more about how Buddy views resilience and how this translates to his time with his little brother. Teaching him problem-solving skills is the result of Buddy's understanding of resilience as primarily the result of successfully overcoming difficulties. The impacts of this approach are intended towards helping build Tom's confidence and self-efficacy through their engagements in various activities, the lessons from which Buddy hopes will transfer to other domains of Tom's life. In the following section, we will reflect on Buddy's insights from the RNZAF, and how his employment has influenced his approach to mentoring resilience.

Royal New Zealand Air Force

This section considers Buddy's employment with the RNZAF as a key influence on the way he approaches mentoring, particularly in relation to his focus on fostering problem-solving skills and resilience with Tom. Relatedly, I discuss more in depth Buddy's perspective about resilience that he has developed because of his employment. We will see how Buddy teaches critical thinking to his Air force students and reflects on how this perspective related to the training BBBSNZ provides their mentors.

Since Buddy emphasises problem-solving skills as a key factor for cultivating resilience, I was interested to learn where this focus came from. I was curious about what had led Buddy adopt this emphasis regarding resilience, and whether he felt it was a natural part of his subjectivity and empathic orientation that he associates with his decision to mentor. Or does this emphasis come from his work environment? His response revealed that both these factors, and emphasised that skill development was associated with teamwork and cooperation:

I guess, maybe getting into, you know, having problems yourself. So, I'll use work as an example. So, in the back of the helicopter, I sit in the back of the helicopter. Operate the winch, getting people in and out of the helicopter and stuff like that. And I'm responsible for, we're basically the pilot's eyes, anything right to the back of the helicopter, because they can't turn around and have a look. So, we're describing what is out there. We're painting that picture through words. So, an example would be that the helicopter needs to get down in below, into the trees and then under something to go and rescue someone. So, we paint the picture and provide a suggestion, 'Let's do this. Move the tail this way.' Those type of things ... And then you get in there and go, 'Ah, that didn't work. Hmm. How do we get out?' or 'Damn we can't move the tail that way. How do we get in and out?' So yeah, little things like that. So yeah, a lot of problem-solving. Or there's an emergency with the aircraft. And you just go, 'Hm, OK. Are we still flying? Yes, we're still flying. Cool. Let's keep flying, eh. This is great.' Yeah, that's a good thing. And yeah, get out and go and get it fixed. Or go back to base. So yeah, there's all of these little problems that come up and you just deal with them.

This account is about the resilience and adaptability that can come through dialogue and teamwork. One of Buddy's professed strengths is his way of seeing a problem in relation to

bigger issues and how he proposes that it is important to not get stressed and to remain calm as a means of working through an effective response. It is also evident that he tries to be ‘the calm head’ who is there to reassure others and to support them to not become overwhelmed by a problem. This mindset informs his mentoring practice as a reflection of lessons he has learned from his time in the Air Force.

As Buddy continues, he engages further with how his Air Force experience has given him a particular perspective that influences how he approaches his mentoring with his little brother to teach him how to render problems more manageable. Having been in dangerous situations during his time in the Air Force, Buddy has developed the perspective that most day-to-day challenges are completely manageable when compared to the challenges he has faced in the past. Buddy talks around these issues in relation to how the problems and obstacles that arise during mentoring seem much smaller when compared to challenges in active duty in that there is not threat of violence or enemy ‘coming over the hill’:

Yeah, no one's in danger. No one's coming over the hill with a gun and gonna shoot you. Nah, we're good. (chuckles) This is great. Yeah. Are you safe? Yeah. These people are safe. Cool. Yeah, it can freak a lot of people out just thinking about it. Yeah, you just go, 'Well.' You just gotta deal with it at the time.

Here, Buddy is putting emphasis on reassuring mentees that they are safe and so can be calm and relaxed enough to explore and grow. He helps them place the problem within a context where there is no danger or threatening circumstances, giving them the opportunity to take a moment and think calmly about how they want to solve the problem. Implicit to this quote is the idea that creating safe spaces for exploration are foundational to effective mentoring with young people. By staying calm, Buddy provides others with an opportunity to also calm down and work through the problem at a comfortable pace.

One of Buddy’s key methods for teaching problem-solving skills to his little brother is to not give Tom the solution, but rather reassure him by emphasising safety and encouraging him to approach problems as opportunities to learn and grow. Buddy’s approach is about nurturing Tom’s independence by advising him on how to approach problems constructively. This approach is supported by academic research by emphasising independent thinking and thoughtful decision making (Widuroyeki et al., 2023). During the focus group, Buddy was able to reflect more on his perspective of Tom’s growing independence and problem-solving abilities when he discussed the resilience factors mentioned in the training video:

I can see a few of those in my mentee. And again, over the time, helping him with especially the independence, yeah. His fall back to, 'Well, what are we gonna do today?' is "Oh, I'll ask mum... Even now, at 17. So yeah, he hasn't really developed - and that's one of the things out of my control. Yeah, "When's football?" "I don't know, ask Mum." "What time's the game?" "I don't know, ask Mum." ... Yeah, yeah. "Go and get ready!" type of thing. So yeah. Yeah, that was a really interesting thing.

In response to this statement from Buddy, Rocket (Case 2) suggested that perhaps Tom acts this way in turning to his mother because Tom knows his mother is protective of him due to his hearing impairment. Buddy agreed that this might be the case. *"I think he has been nurtured a little bit. Yeah, yeah, yeah, helicoptered."*

The term 'helicoptered' refers to a style of parenting called 'helicopter parenting'. This term was first used by Dr Haim Ginott in his book *Between Parent and Teenager*. It is understood to refer to a style of parenting that is characterised by high warmth, high control, and low empowerment (Nie et al., 2023). It is so named because such parents are seen as 'hovering over' their child, overseeing every aspect of their child's life. In their longitudinal study, Perry et al. (2018) found that helicopter parenting styles were associated with a decrease in self-regulatory skills in children. Perry et al. (2018) suggested that this style of parenting reduces a child's resilience by reducing their ability to handle challenges in life later. However, it should be noted here that this is a highly cultural construct, based on societal assumptions about what normal parenting and child development looks like. It is based on cultural values of autonomy and independence that may not be shared by Tom's parents. This is something Buddy can't control as a mentor.

So, Buddy uses his time with his little brother to help build his confidence in solving problems and learning to rely on himself a little more. This approach of offering support, not solutions, is one that Buddy takes when instructing and mentoring in the Air Force. Below Buddy outlines key points of crossover between his mentoring practice in both military and civilian contexts:

When I was instructing and teaching in the Air Force, when you've got your student, they've got their own problems when they're flying and ... you've already gone through the exercise lessons, so they know the information, but you were just asking the questions: 'So if this happened, what would you do?' And they go. 'Uhh, do this.' ... Why would you do that? And what made you say that when we did that?' 'Oh,

we did this and this and this.’ ‘OK, cool. Yeah. Have you thought about it through this angle? Yeah, tackling this problem.’ ‘Ohh no, I didn’t.’ ‘Cool. Did that make it easier? There you go.’ Yeah. Yeah. So little, little, little subtle things. Rather than telling them do this, do this, do this.

Evident here is how Buddy uses an open questioning technique to coach his mentees on how to think critically about trying situation and to reflect on their responses and how they may have responded more effectively. This approach is presented as a form of nudging mentees gently or little by little so that they can learn and apply critical thinking skills. Buddy repeatedly presents this mentoring strategy as preferable to mentees remaining overly reliant on him to find solutions for them.

Buddy also emphasised the need to impress on mentees the importance of them not giving up on the first try. They need to learn from their failings and try again where necessary by adopting different approaches to resolving problems:

And then also you can give them that support as well, ‘Hey, that’s alright.’, you know, and relate the story back to yourself and say, ‘Yep, I broke this or didn’t achieve this’ and stuff like that ‘And what I did is I went back and learned a little bit more, and then came back, nailed it’” ... “Don’t be afraid, for them, don’t be afraid to fail. Yeah, because that’s how you learn. You’re not gonna be good at something without failing.

Emphasis is placed in this account on the importance of accepting and learning from failures, as well as learning how to persevere until one is successful. Such accounts also reflect the emphasis Buddy placing on coaching resilience by showing his little brother how it is ok to fail and pick yourself up and try again to remedy the situation and to learn from it. And that is what is important to Buddy, that his little brother, and anyone else he mentors, learn skills of adaptation and perseverance.

In this section, we have considered how Buddy draws upon his own experiences into coaching his mentees in both the Air Force and his time with Tom to foster their resilience and independence. Buddy has had to both learn and teach problem-solving skills and independent thinking through his military job. He reporting trying to pass on this knowledge to Tom during their mentoring sessions. The practical scenarios in which Buddy learned resilience seems to also feed into how he coaches his little brother, relying on activities they engage in to foster a resilient response. In the following section, I discuss in more depth the new activities and hobbies Buddy has introduced Tom to over the course of their relationship,

as well as how he is expanding his little brother's network of opportunities and support. Central is an emphasis on providing Tom with experiences that can be challenging to him, and from which he can grow and learn to become more resilient.

New Activities and Networks

This section focuses on the new activities that Buddy has introduced his little brother to and how they have navigated the challenges that come with related frustrations that can emerge. New activities can bring with them frustrations for Tom and this is something Buddy and Tom can work through together. In recounting such activities Buddy emphasises how these new activities afford the pair opportunities to build Tom's self-efficacy and confidence, which further fosters his resilience (Parra et al., 2002). These activities can also be understood as opportunities to participate in meaningful decision-making and enhance Tom's sense of connectedness and belonging, which in turn positively impacts his wellbeing (Oliver et al., 2006). Wierenga (2003) found that young people have a greater sense of control when they are involved in decisions that affect them and are given opportunities to participate positively with others. My exploration of these issues leads to an exploration of how Buddy's mentoring has also helped cultivate a network of support for Tom through the pair's participation in various activities.

While we have already seen how Tom's confidence and self-efficacy has been fostered through the activities he and Buddy engage in, there have also been challenges and discouragements with some of these activities. How Buddy and his little brother navigate these is just as important as how they celebrate their achievements. Buddy presents their engagements in various activities as offering lessons for Tom on how to adapt to different situations and respond in positive ways. Buddy discussed how his little brother has been discouraged in his pursuit of acting and is learning to deal with frustrations in life by finding a 'work around' and enjoyment regardless of success:

Yeah. So he's a little bit frustrated. He's auditioned for shows, but he hasn't been successful in that. He's learned singing. He's got grade... What did he do, grade one? Grade two, I think, singing. And because of his hearing impairment, it's a different teaching technique, I guess, from his singing teacher. Yeah, because he hears things differently. Very muffled. Yeah. So, yeah, I guess that would be frustrating, but again there's work arounds and he's seems to be enjoying the singing.

Buddy encourages Tom to learn from smaller challenges and to work on enjoying himself and gaining the confidence and motivation to pursue something he is interested in despite the challenges associated with his hearing impairment and setbacks in landing acting parts. More broadly, young people who are encouraged to be good at something are more likely to be resilient (Katz, 1994). This is because this encouragement gives them a sense of what they are good at, which becomes a positive element of their identities. Brooks (1994) also lauds the role of encouragement in building resilience, explaining how emotional support and encouragement from a significant adult are crucial for promoting self-esteem and resilience. Encouragement “demonstrates the existence of people who accept and believe in them” (Brooks, 1994, p. 551)

Matt Button also discusses this motivation to learn and be curious in the resilience video as a factor of resilience. He refers to this as “having your eyes up”, seeing the world around you and having the motivation to try something you have never tried or perhaps your family has never done. Mentors can be a catalyst for this wider perspective by exposing their little brother or sister to new opportunities, and this can become a significant part of their overall development of resilience. As Buddy invokes his opening up opportunities for Tom to learn how to engage positively with life more generally through the metaphor of opening windows and doors:

And I guess it's like opening windows, or opening doors. Just a little door and you have a look, have a peek through it and go, 'Oh, that looks pretty cool through there. Yep, I'm gonna go through that door. Or meet someone else.'

The other way that Buddy builds resilience within his little brother is through the trusting relationship they have built together. By being a positive and supportive person in Tom's life, Buddy has also consciously increased Tom's network of people he can rely on. Relatedly, Werner (1995) found that resilient children often had a close relationship with at least one competent and emotionally stable person who was attuned to the child's needs. She also found that resilient boys had a male in their lives who served as a role model who could support them to become more emotionally expressive. As mentioned, Buddy does not focus on having deep conversations with his little brother just for the sake of it, and has focused on building trust with Tom through their engagements with various activities, from which open dialogue often springs. When asked if Tom had shared any experiences of frustration or

disappointment in relation to trying new hobbies, particularly in relation to theatre, where Tom must go through an audition process, Buddy stated:

Umm... No, he doesn't. He doesn't seem that discouraged. I think he is, on the inside, but, yeah, he doesn't, sort of, wear it outwardly. Yeah. Yeah. It's more from the parents, 'Ohh. You know, he might be a bit sad he missed out on this.' and I'll say, 'OK, cool.' Yeah, and I'll leave it to him to broach the subject. I'll ask him, 'How did it go?' and he'll say 'Ah, I didn't get in.' 'OK. Yeah, do you wanna...?' 'Nah' 'OK'. I'm not going to push it, so yeah.

Evident in this quote is the emphasis Buddy placed on building trust by being attuned to Tom's needs and leaving the door open for more depth of conversation or emotional expression regarding frustrations or stressors Tom may have, but not pushing Tom to open up emotionally until he is ready. Many of the activities that Buddy has exposed Tom to are continued by Tom even when Buddy is not around, including fishing and auditioning for shows. Buddy then checks in with Tom by asking 'how he has gone' with such activities and as a means of engaging Tom in conversations that are anchored in his real world experiences.

Buddy and his little brother have been together for some time now. Tom is the oldest mentee in the program and getting close to graduating. Buddy also reported positively that he can see that Tom is beginning to give back to the organisation now that he is a bit older as an expression of his increased openness to networking with other people:

Yeah, he would be the oldest and he's getting in there and meeting some of these kids. Yeah, he can talk to people easily, which is great. But yeah, even helping out, he helped out on, I think, Esplanade Day. I couldn't make it. So, he went along and cooked barbecue and did things. So, there's that generosity starting to come back. Yeah, it's pretty cool.

Zimmerman et al. (2013) refer to these kinds of helping out activities as prosocial involvements that can become central to mentees growing positively, gain a sense of belonging and community, and opportunities to pursue shared interests with others, and acquire personal and interpersonal skills in the process of participating in the organised activities (Lerner et al., 2005; Mahoney et al., 2005). These times that Buddy's little brother engages with BBBSNZ and volunteers his time to help the organisation and to meet with the younger brothers and sisters, he is building his individual cognitive and behavioural assets, as well as building connections to resources that foster his positive development (Zimmerman et

al., 2013). But as Buddy points out, it is also a demonstration of generosity and Tom's willingness to giving back to the community. Buddy's accounts of Tom's efforts suggest that Tom has developed resilient qualities and some resilience during their time together and with the organisation.

Chapter Discussion

This first case has focused on Buddy's storying of mentoring Tom and how their relationship has developed over the past seven years. Mentoring is invoked as an extension of Buddy's prosocial orientation towards life, as he teaches coping skills and a problem-solving to his little brother in an effort to cultivate Tom's resilience. In the first section, we saw why Buddy got involved with mentoring to give back to the community. This decision to contribute appears to be central to Buddy's sense of self that he associates with the decision to participate in the BBBSNZ mentoring program and apply the coaching skills that he has developed from his time in the military (Janssen et al., 2016). Buddy's involvement in the mentoring program in the RNZAF is also an extension of his values and how he ties his Air Force and youth mentoring experiences together. How Buddy has introduced his little brother to new activities and the positive impact of this was also considered, revealing the activity-focused nature of their sessions.

In the second section, we looked deeper into how Buddy conceptualises resilience and how this relates to his broader proactive and solutions focused outlook on life. Buddy is optimistic and his hopeful approach to problems was a key focus on this section as we saw how this influences his relationship with Tom and their time together (Bukko et al., 2019). This focus lead into the third section that explored Buddy's involvement in the RNZAF in terms of how he developed is positive and solutions focused approach to mentoring Tom that involves coaching him to solve problems for himself. We saw how the new activities and networks that Buddy has introduced Tom to opportunities to develop his own sense of efficacy and resilience in not only solving small problems, but also accessing and extending his network of support, whilst improving his self-reliance. We also noted how Tom is beginning to act out the values of generosity Buddy has exposed him to and is starting to give back to BBBSNZ.

In Buddy's case, it would seem that his employment influences his approach to mentoring. Such employment has taught him a grounded, realistic perspective of a problem

and Buddy has learned to persevere until the issues is resolved. He then passes on this knowledge to Tom through encouragement and guidance. From the perspective of the BBBS training, it can be understood that the role of a mentor is not to fix or change and young person's life, but rather to support them as they navigate life's challenges. As Buddy puts it, mentoring Tom is about providing "*another world that he can go to and feel safe.*" Buddy has a strengths-based approach to mentoring, where he encourages Tom in what he enjoys. He holds hope for him and his future. Having such a role in Tom's life affords Buddy the opportunity to help him achieve his goals and Buddy enjoys seeing him succeed. This relationship can foster resilience in numerous ways (Dutton et al., 2012). We will see that in Rocket's and Harrison's chapters as well, which both provide different insight into the position of a mentor in a young person's life and how they each interact with their mentors to foster resilience.

The most consistent resilience factor invoked by Buddy is problem-solving skills. Buddy approaches resilience as the ability to overcome problems, bounce back, and being proud of how you approach life. Through his story, the impacts of being confident in your ability to solve and overcome problems became apparent. Buddy imparts problem-solving skills to Tom by engaging him through various shared activities, some of which Tom has picked up and continues to engage with even when Buddy is not around. Tom branching out to engage in additional activities such as auditioning for acting roles and taking singing lessons suggest that he is gaining self-confidence from experiencing successes in solving problems for himself. Buddy proposes that Tom has increasing confidence to give things a go, solve problems as these arise and not let things not going his way get him down or discourage his efforts (Parra et al., 2002). When the concept of problem-solving is applied so holistically through mentoring, it can have significant positive impacts on a mentee's quality of life and sense of resilience (Werner, 1995).

Buddy's story also revealed the importance he places on mentors adapting to the needs and interests of mentees, which in this case relates to getting out of the house to engage in fun activities. Buddy positions himself as offering opportunities for Tom to have fun and experience success. He is there to encourage and support Tom to develop a positive outlook and life skills that support his self-efficacy and resilience. This case reveals how a mentor simply being there for a young person and taking the time to share little moments of learning with a mentee can contribute to the young person's overall positive development, revealing the ripple effect described by Bukko et al. (2019) as central to effective mentoring.

One recommendation about fostering resilience that arises from this chapter is that mentors should focus on their time with their little brother or sister as an opportunity to allow that young person to pursue their own interests and the mentor can be there to provide encouragement and support. Mentors may begin their relationship thinking that they have to come up with all these activities and ideas for their little brother or sister, which is something Rocket mentions experiencing when she began. However, Buddy's story reveals the value of allowing the mentee to engage in meaningful participation by being allowed to decide what they would like to do, thereby building their own confidence and independence within the relationship (Oliver et al., 2006). From these activities, there may arise further opportunities to build other aspects of resilience, such as problem-solving skills, generosity, sense of belonging, and other valuable resilience factors (Dutton et al., 2012).

Overall, this case has highlighted the everyday acts that occur in a mentoring relationship that foster resilience in the mentee. Simple activities such as fishing or soccer are still great opportunities to teach problem-solving skills and coping strategies. Buddy has quite a humble idea of his influence on his little brother, seeing these moments of encouragement as just a regular part of mentoring. It is possible that a lot of mentors are unaware of the difference they are making in their mentee's life or the scope of their influence on the outcomes of that young person's life. This chapter has shown how by simply bringing all their strengths and insights to the relationship, mentors can have a huge impact on the resilience of a young person (Bukko et al., 2019). In the following chapter, I will discuss Rocket's experiences of mentoring a young girl who has challenged all the assumptions she had about mentoring and what that relationship looks like.

Chapter 4: Rocket

This chapter presents a case that challenges many of the common assumptions made about mentoring by focusing on Rocket's journey as a relatively new Big Sister. Rocket has been mentoring her 12-year-old little sister, Sally, for a year now and has found this experience to be both eye-opening and fulfilling. This is her first match since joining BBBSNZ and her first time mentoring someone as young as Sally, though she has mentored adults and worked in a youth intervention program before. Sally lives in the small town of Feilding, near Palmerston North, and they enjoy various fun activities during their setting and sessions together. Rocket works in the army, where she has had experiences with mentoring various adults. As will become evident from the case below, mentoring a young child has turned out to be a completely different experience.

Rocket came from a modest beginning, referring during the focus group to the "below average public high school" she attended. She values the community in which she grew up, where everyone knew everyone and there was a strong sense of stability in the neighbourhood. She reflected on the benefit of that when, during the focus group, Harrison raised the point that an environment like that would provide a strong sense of belonging and anchorage. Rocket can see similarities in her Sally's childhood as well, where Sally has a strong, close family around her, which has led Rocket to re-adjust her expectations of what her role in Sally's life would be, as we will see below.

My analysis for this case explores the insights and observations shared by Rocket during her interview and engagement in the focus group. Of particular note is how her perceptions of mentoring have changed since she began, how she sees herself in her little sister's support network, and what she has learned about the role parents play in a child's mentoring experiences. Rocket's reflections on these topics provide rich information about the assumptions we make when evaluating mentoring outcomes and gives food for thought about the external influences that impact the resilience of a young person being mentored.

Mirroring to some extent the structure of case one, I begin by reflecting on Rocket's assumptions about what mentoring was going to be like before she began, and how her expectations reflect the understandings that many people, including researchers, hold about mentoring and the life circumstances surrounding young mentees. Rocket's own experiences, as well as the internalisation of typical social commentary, appear to play an influential role in shaping her preconceptions regarding mentoring. From there, Rocket's understanding of

resilience is considered, along with the factors she sees in her little sister's life as resilience-building. Sally has a strong family network and an enthusiastic orientation to life that seems to help her move easily through life in the sense of forming relations with others and navigating social situations. Finally, I delve deeper into the role of parents in mentoring by reflecting on Rocket's experiences, both in her personal life as well as her little sister's life. This is a topic often overlooked when considering the impact of mentoring on outcomes. However, it seems to be a key factor in Rocket's approach and how she presents Sally's resilience and coping skills development. The case study concludes with a discussion on the overall insights from Rocket's story and how these insights deepen our understanding of resilience and mentoring.

Mentoring Expectations versus Reality

This section discusses the assumptions Rocket presents about mentoring young people and what involvement in the mentoring programme with BBBSNZ would be like, both for herself as a mentor and the mentee. Assumptions about what mentoring will look like has been associated as either a predictor of success or the underlying force of failure (Spencer, 2007). This makes pre-assumptions an important consideration for understanding the efficacy of mentoring. As Searby (2009, p. 10) puts it, "Prior life experience, fears, cultural interpretations, myths, and core values are wrapped up in the personal packages adults bring into the mentoring relationship." All of these factors influence the kinds of assumptions a mentor will carry and apply to their mentoring relationship, especially at the start.

Rocket started mentoring with preconceptions about what she might achieve in helping a young person, which were quickly challenged once she met and got to know Sally and realised that she herself would also gain from the experience:

So, I got into it thinking I was doing like this amazing, you know, thing that I thought was important and important for somebody else and important for being part of the community and part of society. ... So, I did it for all of these, sort of, 'right reasons'. What I hadn't thought about at the time was how amazing it was gonna be for me as well.

What a mentor conceptualises as the value or role of mentoring can also influence their assumptions about what mentoring should look like. Rocket went on to discuss how she

values assisting in the development of people and how she believes external support is vital for this development:

I've got a passion about people, yeah, and about development and about all sorts of things like that ... I guess I value that people need somebody in their lives for different reasons at different stages of their lives ... Kids haven't chosen what life they've been born into. And what opportunities that do or don't come with that. So they just get what they get. So, and I also think that it's really valuable, you know, as kids go into teenage years that they have people inside their life that's outside of family, you know, cause even if they've got really close, older brothers or sisters, aunties, cousins, uncles, whatever that looks like, they're always involved in the whole family dynamics, the whole family political, the whole everything. You know, so it's important that kids have somebody in their life that's there for what they're there for.

As we will continue to see, Rocket understands mentoring as an opportunity for a young person to have someone separate from the family to support them. She doesn't assume a deficit within the family, but instead recognises the inherent dynamics of a family and how having someone outside of that can be beneficial for the young person.

Rocket has been able to realise that, while mentoring is a prosocial behaviour that contributes to society, it also has multiple benefits for the mentor themselves. As Ghosh & Reio (2013) point out, effective mentoring is collaborative and reciprocal, and it is not only the mentee who benefits. While Rocket voiced pro-social motivations for getting involved with mentoring in the first place, she has also developed personal benefits from it.

Rocket goes on to talk about the fun activities she does with her little sister and how much enjoyment she gets from their sessions together. They do all kinds of activities, usually with Rocket letting Sally make the decisions. Rocket talked about how active Sally is and mentioned how they can end up doing seven or eight activities during their sessions together.

And we do a lot of things. She's into everything and we'll do, like, in four hours, we might do eight things. It's crazy ... So, like last weekend, what happened? She came over, we did some quizzes on YouTube. We went out for pancakes. We went to the museum. We went to the park. We played some board games. Yeah. Yeah. So, normally it starts at my place. We've done some night ones because I've got a projector and we've done, like, outdoor movie nights and popcorn and stuff like that.

Being able to just enjoy her time with Sally and just do fun activities with her was not at all what Rocket had thought was going to be the situation after the training that focused on worse case scenarios:

Yeah, because there was a lot of conversations in the training about what, you know, as I said, what you can and can't do. What if you come across something that you don't think is right or is unhealthy? What if you get pressure put on to help out and do things that aren't part of what that should look like, you know, all of that. But I've had none of that. ... A lot of discussion on the training is really kind of the worst-case scenario. And yet I guess you need to be front loaded with what the worst picture might look like. Versus what, like, particularly mine looks like is none of what we learned about.

Here, we can see how the training information led Rocket to certain assumptions about what mentoring would like, most of which related to the likelihood of negative interactions or difficult scenarios. She was pleasantly surprised that her initial interactions with Sally were far more positive.

During the focus group, the mentors did agree that the problem orientation of the initial mentor training was important for the safety of the mentors and mentees. However, it did lead Rocket to initially approach mentoring with a defensive mindset that she then had to rethink when the situation proved very different and positive:

I guess, I was expecting it to be tougher than it was. But I guess that was some of my own preconceived ideas, you know, because we were learning the worst-case scenario of what we should do with this financial or family or violence or alcohol.

Rocket refers to how the initial training and her related negative assumptions lead her to approach the initial engagements with Sally more defensively than was perhaps warranted. More specifically, she goes on to talk about how she was initially wary of the young person's family and how they might make it difficult for her to build a relationship with them and Sally that could enable the mentoring to run smoothly and effectively.

There is also prior life experience that Rocket brought into her approach to mentoring that also influenced her initial orientation. Some of these preconceptions that Rocket had about mentoring came from her experiences in the army. She was once posted to a youth development program, where young people were sent by WINZ because of concerns about

their life trajectories. Many young people in the program did not necessarily want to be there and tried very hard to get kicked out. Rocket referred to this program as an ‘ambulance at the bottom of the cliff’, where so many of the young people were already in trouble or struggling and were not open to guidance or coaching:

Years and years and years ago, for example, I worked at one of our units which is called One You, which is a youth development unit and we... It was, for want of a better term, a bit of a six-week army boot camp style training for 17 to 24-year-olds, that are referred on from WINZ that are off the tracks ... But, you know, I've worked in that ambulance at the bottom of the cliff ... But you know, definitely learned some skills in that role. It's really tough to lead people and mentor people that have been court ordered to be there. Yes, you know, like when you're leading people in the workplace that have made an effort and applied for your organisation and have chosen to be there, it is a whole lot easier to lead them than the people who, like, 'You're going there because if you don't go there, you're losing your unemployment benefit.' You know, and from day one, they're just challenging the process to want to get out, you know. But you learn all sorts of things about yourself as a leader and about how you can deal with stuff, you know, and be a little bit calmer and less reactive and stuff like that.

Rocket saw her joining BBBSNZ as a mentor as a chance to help prevent young people from getting to this point by intervening early in their lives with effective mentoring: *And, it's quite nice, I saw this mentoring programme (BBBSNZ) as an ambulance at the top. You know, dealing with kids before they had to come to something like that.*

Above, Rocket makes an important age-related comparison between the reluctant mentees from ages 17-24 in the Army program and her work with younger children like Sally in the BBBSNZ program. The account suggests that Rocket holds the assumption that mentoring can prevent negative outcomes by influencing the life trajectory of a young person towards a more positive direction. Rocket appears to have entered the BBBSNZ mentoring programme with the assumption that the mentees had likely already begun to follow negative life paths in response to their adverse living conditions, which could lead them to be subject to harsher interventions later in life. However, these assumptions were challenged once Rocket encountered Sally. Instead, she met a confident, enthusiastic young girl with a loving family and a strong support network:

So, you know, what I imagined was quite different than what I've ended up doing. So you know, I, kind of, in the first bit, I was kind of like, 'Wow. What? What am I doing?' You know, there is this really good support network around there of a young child or young adult that is resilient and is amazing and social and involved in things. You know, it wasn't anything I thought it was.

It became clear very quickly that Rocket did not need to be so intervention-focused, but rather to be a friend to her little sister as another person for her to rely on and support her.

Emelo (2006) categorised assumptions as either prescriptive (what the individual thinks should happen) and causal (how the individual thinks things should work, and the conditions under which these things can change). Many of Rocket's initial assumption about her role as a mentor were prescriptive, such as when she thought she would be only giving in the relationship and had not thought about what she would gain from the relationship. Her causal assumption about the preventative role of mentoring was also challenged when she met a young girl with a bright future based on her personality and mindset.

What is so important about the assumptions noted above is how Rocket has consciously become aware of and willing to rethink them. Zachary (2000) and Emelo (2006) identify this as a process of 'assumption hunting' that involves a person becoming aware of assumptions, examining them, determining their validity, and where appropriate shifting one's perspective accordingly. Doing so can enhance the possibility of success in the mentoring relationships, especially when done early on in the relationship (Searby, 2009). Rocket has been able to adapt her ideas about what mentoring should like and what her specific situation is like in order to provide her little sister with the most relevant and helpful mentoring possible.

Coping and Support

This section explores Rocket's understanding of resilience. I offer an understanding of how her viewpoint about resilience offers additional insights into the link between a nuanced understanding of resilience and such mentor's approaches to the mentoring relationship. How such mentors understand resilience seems to reflect their own experiences from when they have felt resilient or what they have seen to be resilient behaviour in self and others. Rocket focuses on two key elements when presenting her account of resilience. These are (1) the ability to cope with life and (2) having a support network. This section begins by exploring

the first element before moving on to look at the family situation as the primary support network for Sally, which fosters her resilience.

As noted just above, Rocket talked about resilience as the ability to cope with life, which is similar to the common understanding of resilience found in the literature, often described as ‘bouncing back’ (Ungar, 2008). For Rocket, this is about acknowledging disruptions and trials in life, acknowledging your reactions, and the ability to actively work through challenges to achieve desired outcomes:

So, it's like the resilience is, like, how do you go. 'OK, I'm anxious about this change of what I'm doing. How do I deal with it? How do I get through it? I may still have it, but how do I get it to a level that I can, yeah, continue to function. How can I recognise that it is nice and normal and move on from that? And, like, what are those coping strategies? How do I deal with the anxiety if it's because something that's happened unexpectedly? How do I process it, acknowledge it and move through that? How do I work still holding those feelings? Or how do I get rid of them?'

Rocket emphasises the importance of developing the ability to be able to normalise emotions and feelings about challenges in life or testing situations without letting these interfere with one's general functioning or coping. For her, resilience is about processing problems in a healthy and constructive ways in order to move forward in life. Rocket's orientation here also echoes Buddy's sentiment about resilience being built on a person's problem-solving skills. This similarity could be due to both these participants working in the Defence Force, wherein they both face obstacles on a daily basis and see resilience as the ability to move forward despite of these challenges.

When asked about how she teaches or models this orientation towards problem solving resilience in life with Sally, Rocket quickly assured me that her little sister already shows so many of these aspects of resilience. Rocket proposes that she has not needed to help build these in Sally. She admires how her little sister copes with life at such a young age. Rocket goes on to talk about how her little sister is just taking things in her stride and enjoying the adventure of life:

But, you know, there's probably lots of things I apply that I don't recognise what I'm doing. But I do say, I've got an amazing little sister, with none of the challenges I thought I'd have, so there's a lot of things I haven't had to do because I haven't had to

do it with her because she's twelve and she's enthusiastic and excited and we've got no behavioural challenges or none of that stuff.

Rocket attributes Sally's resilience to her positive family situation, which moves us on to the second core element that Rocket associates with resilience; having a support network. Here, we take a slight detour from our focus on how mentors foster resilience to look at the resiliency factors present in Sally's family. Doing so provides an important backdrop to better understand Rocket's contribution in promoting the resilience of not only her little sister, but the whole family as well:

So, her mum's a social worker. So, you know, so her mum's got training and, like, her mum's really onto it, she's fantastic. She's got a really tight family group. ... So, there's a lot of family stuff that's super supportive. Yeah, they just deal with life, yeah.

Relevant here is the literature on family resilience, which shifts the focus away from individual traits that enable or foster resilience and toward the influence of positive relationships within the family and with external supports such as mentors (Black & Lobo, 2008). Research has identified multiple factors that contribute to the overall resiliency of a family. Relevant factors for this case study include optimism, family cohesion, flexibility, and an extended network of support (Black & Lobo, 2008).

Rocket's little sister comes from a blended family, with lots of aunties, uncles, and cousins who are active in the children's lives. Sally lives close to her grandparents and refers to her stepdad as her own father and now has Papa and Dad. One story Rocket shares highlights the presence of these resilience factors in her little sister's family:

Just in the last few months her stepdad's, I guess, ex-partner has moved down to Palmerston North with a stepbrother and a stepsister to her, and they've just moved bedrooms all around in the house. And she's like, 'I'm just, just like last weekend, I just, like, moved into my brother's room cos now my brother needs to share with my stepbrother when he stays for the weekends and that.' And she's like, 'Oh. It was really cool. We've cleaned out the room and I got a new duvet.' You know, so not feeling shoved out of her room and like family is family.

This extract speaks to the way this family can adapt to changing circumstances to ensure that the whole family is cared for and accommodated. According to Black & Lobo (2008), a healthy family is able to adjust and shift to accommodate for changes in the family's needs.

Rocket mentioned how Sally did not seem to be fazed at all by the recent changes, but rather took these in her stride and focused on the positive aspects, including her receiving a new duvet. This optimism is another sign of a resilient family, where possibilities are affirmed, and members of the family remain hopeful (Black & Lobo, 2008).

Also emerging from Rocket's account is her understanding of the importance of the strong sense of cohesion within Sally's family unit. All members are accommodated and taken care of. The development of new relationships are facilitated and appear to flow smoothly. Rocket's little sister feels safe and included in her family, no matter the changes, and this also appears to be central to her personal resilience (Rutter, 1987). Family cohesion enhances a family's belief that problems that arise are manageable, meaningful, and that they will achieve a healthy, or even improved, level of reorganisation and adjustment afterwards (McCubbin et al., 2002; Walsh, 1998).

Rocket also proposes that Sally also displays resilient qualities that are worth discussing here. Sally is characterized as a confident, energetic, positive girl with a strong social network of caring adults. When discussing temperamental characteristics of resilient children, Werner (1984) described them as characteristics that provoke a positive response from family members and strangers, such as pronounced autonomy and a strong social orientation (Zolkowski & Bullock, 2012). Zolkowski & Bullock also discuss positive emotions and exuberance as a strong indicator of a pro-social disposition and behaviour, which is also strongly related to resilient outcomes. Rocket's little sister demonstrates all of these characteristics according to Rocket, suggesting Sally already exhibits a high level of resiliency.

Rocket repeatedly referred to Sally as someone who "knows her own mind" and demonstrates a strong sense of self, which is related to positive self-esteem (Fathi-Ashtiani et al., 2007). This personal disposition is contextualized in relation to Sally having significant attachment figures in her life, such as her parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, siblings and so forth. Rocket characterizes her own efforts as one contribution to a larger familial effort to support Sally:

I had a really soft landing with mine [mentee]. Mine's from a fantastic family with lots of good family support and lots of good independence and her mum's a social worker and just recognises that it's important for kids to have somebody outside of the family. Because they've got a very big family that are very, very tight.

Resilience theory and research emphasises the importance of strengths-based approaches that purposefully focusing on the strengths and positive aspects of personhood that can be supported and fostered. This is seen as preferable to reducing exposure to risk or focusing on negative aspects of a person and their situation (Zimmerman et al., 2013). Rocket's little sister has many protective factors within her life to assist her in creating resilient outcomes and reactions to future adversity. In this relationship, Rocket can focus on providing Sally with any additional support and helping her continue to foster these resilient aspects of life as her circumstances change and she develops further.

This leads us to discuss what Rocket's role is within this network of a child who already has resilient qualities and comes from such a healthy, resilient family. When a person or family is already thriving, it can be tempting to see that unit as self-sufficient and question the need for an external mentor. However, research has found that such an external mentor often emerges as one of the key factors that help a family stay strong (Luthar et al., 2000). Supports, external to the immediate family, can serve as another source of information, respite, services, and information for young people (Seccombe, 2002). Rocket is this external support for Sally, offering another positive relationship, outside of the family, in which Sally can also feel supported and cared for:

What I imagined was quite different than what I've ended up doing. So, you know, I, kind of, in the first bit, I was kind of like, 'Wow. What? What am I doing?' You know, there is this really good support network around there of a young child or young adult that is resilient and is amazing and social and involved in things. You know, it wasn't anything I thought it was. And then it was like, 'Well, what am I doing? Where do I fit in this?' But actually it's, I guess, it's somebody out, like I said earlier, somebody outside of the family that I've got no engagement of... doing the right thing because I'm an auntie or a cousin or this or that. Like, I don't know all of the other dynamics. I only know what I hear.

This family dynamic was another related aspect of the mentoring relationship that Rocket was surprised about when she began mentoring. It can be quite difficult for a mentor to find their place in their mentee's life, especially when they can see that the role they thought they would have had been fulfilled. Rocket has been able to realise the value of her role as an external support for Sally. Rocket sees their relationship as a safe space outside of the family where Sally can be herself and discuss what is going on at home knowing the conversation

will be kept in confidence. Rocket's ability to develop and adapt to the situation is a key focus in the analysis below, where we will consider how this skill benefits this mentoring relationship.

Adapting to Change

In their research into what makes for a positive mentoring relationship, Drew & Spencer (2021) found that there was no specific approach to mentoring that worked best. Rather, the success of a mentoring match and the ability of the mentor to provide support seemed to rely on the mentor's ability to adapt their approach to the relationship in harmony with the specific circumstances of the match. Rocket has had to adapt much of her thinking and the approaches she has taken in the past to better suit her little sister's unique situation. As discussed, this match was not at all what Rocket was expecting in terms of Sally's needs and familial situation. Her ability to change her approach to better suit her little sister has helped greatly in making this a successful mentoring relationship, one that they both enjoy.

Rocket has taken her little sister's pace of activity in her stride, accepting her little sister and her way of spending time without any judgement or control. While this is something Rocket has done simply because of how her little sister is, this response orientation towards Sally also contributes to the quality of their relationship. Drew & Spencer (2021) go on to discuss that they found that a focus on having fun and sharing in the relationship seems to be correlated with the young person being open to receiving support from a mentor who ensures that the young person enjoys their time together. Thus, focusing on just enjoying their time together and engaging in shared activities improves the quality of that relationship for Rocket and Sally.

During the focus group, Rocket mentioned that the high-speed pace of their sessions together seems to be slowing down now, with her little sister seeming to shift towards not trying to cram in as many activities during the time they have together:

In fact, it's been funny, the last month or so, things have calmed down with our visits ... But we seem to have calmed down a little bit lately. We're just managing to do like three things, not twelve things.

Again, here we see an orientation toward the mentoring relationships whereby Rocket adapts to the changing dynamic and in response to Sally's lead. Being attuned to the mentee's needs

and changes in behaviour allows the mentor to adapt to this and be responsive to the young person's new preferences throughout the match (Drew & Spencer, 2021). Again, we see this benefit of being adaptable to change, as Rocket's little sister develops and changes over the course of their mentoring relationship. Rocket seems to understand that change is a normal part of life and is happy to accommodate her little sister as their relationship and time together changes. Even during the discussion about resilience factors in the focus group, Rocket also noted the dynamic nature of resilience:

Well, I think these (resilience factors) change, like, I mean, while they are who you are as a person, it does also change at different stages of your life depending on what you've got going on.

Referring back to Rocket's idea of what resilience is, she sees it as successful adaptation to changes in life. And here we can see how comfortable Rocket is with change and how she can understand how dynamic a resilient response can be depending on the situation and stage of life.

As Sally enters her teenager years, Rocket's outlook could well become a significant source of support as she navigates the different changes in her life, likely relating to school, social circles, and daily routines. This is something that Rocket is already beginning to think about:

She's fantastic, and she's a bit of a tomboy and she knows her own mind and none of that terrible 12/13/14 year old stuff is happening yet. But I suspect it will happen. Cos, yeah, we've all been teenagers and we're all a bit feral during that time. I've got a 24-year-old son, so it's been a long time since I've gone through it (group laughs).

Anticipation based on life experiences emerges here as a key aspect of Rocket's orientation to this mentoring relationship, in that she is already thinking about how to support Sally when she begins a new stage of life. This preparedness can greatly assist Sally in also adapting to change in a resilient manner. As Afifi (2018) argues, social relations could be the strongest source of influence on a person's ability to adapt positively to change.

Rocket is able to provide her little sister with not only a strong example of how to adapt and embrace change, but also as a support person for how Sally might work through life-stage changes. Relevant here is what Matt Button discusses in the resilience training video about the core, primary role of a mentor:

How can we nurture a young person? Well, it's really clear. We care. We nurture a young person by regularly, consistently turning up ... And that's the role of the mentor, to be like a stake in the ground next to a young person, providing that stability and a listening ear as they go through this particularly tumultuous time of life.

Rocket may not need to have as active a role in Sally's life than she had first anticipated, but simply being there for her, consistently and with stability, offers Rocket a chance to have a positive influence in her little sister's life. Below we will discuss the other source of support in Sally's life, her family, and how Rocket can and does operate within this support network.

The Role of Parents

This section discusses the interesting point raised by Rocket about the role parents play in their child's mentorship. Often, parents are forgotten in research about mentoring, where the focus is placed largely on the organisation, the mentors, and the mentees (Rhodes, 2002). Even research that does focus on parental involvement (e.g., Spencer et al., 2011; Keller, 2005) focuses more on such involvement once the mentoring relationship has begun. However, parents play a significant role in a child engaging with a mentoring organisation in the first place. This insight came from Rocket's reflection on Sally's situation and how her family already foster her resilience:

The parents need to make an effort to know about the programme, to want to be involved, to go to the interviews, to do all of that. Yeah, you know, so there's still a commitment of a parent that cares enough to have their child in it and also, I guess, is willing to admit that they recognise that maybe they need that as well, so there's a bit for not being as willing to ask for help.

As Spencer et al. (2011) point out, often parents are not mentioned in the literature about mentoring unless it is to speculate about how youth may seek mentors to compensate for a lack of parental guidance or to discuss how parents can negatively impact the mentoring relationship. This focus has led many researchers to discourage the involvement of parents in mentoring programmes (e.g., Miller, 2007; Styles & Morrow, 1992; Philip et al., 2004). However, parents are a major part of the larger context within which the mentoring relationship develops. Correspondingly, Dubois et al. (2002) found parental involvement to be one of the key program practices that are associated with positive youth outcomes. Keller

(2005) stated that parental involvement can either undermine or support the success of the mentoring intervention, and therefore included parents in their systemic model of mentoring. This stance is also supported more recently by Taylor & Porcellini (2013).

When it comes of community-based mentoring, there needs to be someone who recognises that the child should join the program and who puts in the work to make this happen. This person is already demonstrating resilience to the child by being able to recognise one's own limitations and reaching out for help. Studies have found that parents or guardians often have their children involved in a mentoring programme because they want their child to have an additional positive role model. Such role models can provide different experiences and opportunities than the ones the parents or other significant adults in the child's life can provide (Spencer et al., 2011). These are proactive parents and guardians who are thinking about their child and their resources and actively searching out ways to expand their horizons. This probably skews the type of children that enter the programme as well. As Rocket puts it:

Yeah, I guess there's a little bit too that says, like, the parents that have got their children involved in the programme, are the parents that care. And the ones that might need it the most, the parents probably don't care enough to get them in the program.

It seems that mentor training focuses on a particular demographic of children in their training scenarios. This also creates an expectation within the mentors about the type of children they will be mentoring. However, it is possible that this demographic of children do not receive the chance to be in the programme. This could be due to their circumstances and not having someone in their life who knows about the program and are willing to put in the effort to enrol the child into the programme.

Possibly also relevant here are issues of pride or shame. Society often insists that parents should be able to fulfil all their child's needs and to admit that they cannot do so could be a difficult step for some parents take. This is an issue that Rocket acknowledged and expanded upon during her interview:

Yeah. And to own that, you can't be or you - because you recognise they need it or because you can't, because of whatever circumstances. Yeah, you know, like for some parents, it would be almost like admitting to failure. Like 'I could not parent. I could

not cope parenting completely, of all the things I should' so, you know, it's a big step, I guess, for the parents.

Basualdo-Delmonico & Spencer (2016) provide a comprehensive discussion about this issue of shame and societal assumptions about reaching out for external, public assistance. They state that there are still undercurrents within mentoring of deficit-based views about families that reach out for help that ignore structural inequalities or fail to consider the multiple factors that would lead to a family requesting help. These authors refer to Handler & Hasenfeld's (1997) commentary on the issue, where they describe the pervasive societal assumption that individuals who seek public help are somehow violating the work ethic, placing them as morally deficient. Deutsch et al. (2013) have also argued that there are class-based prejudices and middle-class assumptions that need to be overcome in order to build effective community mentoring interventions.

Rocket was also able to relate this contradiction of assumptions versus her own experiences of the BBBSNZ program from knowing someone who has engaged in it as a little brother, which had also been one of the reasons she got into mentoring in the first place:

So, my partner's nephew is in the programme in Auckland and it's interesting because I know why they're in it. But I still weirdly didn't put two and two together with some preconceived ideas of what I thought it was gonna look like. So, his sister's a solo mum because unfortunately his dad passed away while she was pregnant ... And so, you know, I know why they were in the programme, and it was no socioeconomic, you know, negative sides. It was just purely life dealt my partner's sister and her son the raw end of the stick that she solo mum-ed, through no choice of her own. And that she recognised that her son would really benefit from having a regular male role model in his life.

This example portrays a parent caring about their child enough to seek out ways to fulfil his needs that she could not meet on her own. The loss of a partner led her to look proactively for a solution for her son, which she found in the form of the programme. There was no 'morally deficit' reason for her asking for help. She was working with circumstances she had no control over and was seeking to provide her son with more opportunities than either she or any other caring adults were able to provide.

During the focus group, a conversation about each mentor's background led Rocket to reflect on how her own parents' decisions and values had influenced her own life. For

example, Rocket's parents set down a strong example of emphasis being placed on hard work and resilience, an example of positive role modelling that Rocket picked up and carried throughout her life:

Yeah, like my parents both always worked. So I'd have had my butt kicked if I'd thought that, you know, that a lifestyle of social welfare was an acceptable behaviour in my family, you know. So, the generational stuff becomes that.

This conversation reveals how important a parent's influence is on a young person, acting as either an advantage or disadvantage depending on the example they set for their child. It also reflects how mentors can be characterized as additional aids to positive and proactive parenting for young people.

Chapter Discussion

In this chapter, I have discussed Rocket's involvement as a mentor in the BBBSNZ organisation. Rocket is the newest youth mentor in this study, having been mentoring for just over a year. Her coming out of her first year with the program has led Rocket to engage in a lot of self-reflection and to re-evaluate her assumptions about mentoring before she began. Overall, mentoring has been a positive experience for her. Rocket's story exhibits a lot of care and respect for Sally and her family. Her insights about mentoring assumptions and external influences in the mentoring relationship provide much to think about when considering evaluating mentoring outcomes.

In the first section above, Rocket shared her assumptions about what mentoring was going to be like. We considered how these assumptions were shaped by her involvement in a youth intervention programme in the Army, the training she received from BBBSNZ, and social narratives about the children and families that would engage in a mentoring organisation. These assumptions were quickly proven wrong for her, and she embraced this new information that helped her shift her perspective on what mentoring was and what her role should be.

In the second section, we discussed what Rocket understands to be resilience and the resilient qualities she already sees as evident in her little sister, both internally and in her environment. I considered the importance of family resilience and the specific factors that are evident in Sally's family that contribute to the family's resilience and therefore Sally's

security. This led to a reflection on how Rocket fits within this context as an additional source of support for her little sister. Mentors offer an external source of information, care, and support for a family and having such an external support is also contributing to Sally's resilience and the resilience of Sally's family.

In the third section, we focused in on how Rocket has adapted to a relationship so different from her expectations and how such adaptability is vital for a healthy and positive mentoring relationship. Rocket's little sister is about to go through some significant life changes. What emerges from Rocket's account is how she is anticipating this change and how she will need to be flexible in her response to supporting Sally.

The fourth section looked at the role of parents in a mentoring relationship. Parents are not often discussed in mentoring literature, often because the focus is on the mentor mentee dyad (Rhodes, 2002). However, Rocket's insights about the family revealed the importance of acknowledging a parent's role and working with the family to provide the best support for a young person. This analysis provided insights into what mentoring means to Rocket and how she can enhance the resilience her little sister already has with support from her family.

Rocket was very open about the assumptions she had about mentoring before she began. These may be assumptions that a lot of other mentors or people looking into becoming a mentor may share (Searby, 2009). Having these assumptions challenged can be either a positive or negative situation depending on the person (Searby, 2009). Some mentors may become discouraged when they realise that their ideas about mentoring and what their role will be are possibly erroneous. Some studies have found that such realisations can lead to an early termination of the relationship (Searby, 2009), which can be detrimental to both the organisation trying to create these connections, and to the child who is losing their mentor early in the process. Rocket was able to embrace this challenge and work on changing her perspective as she learned more about Sally's situation. This seems to have enabled her confidence about what her role is as a mentor in her relationship with Sally. The experience appears to have led to them being able to build a relationship that is as helpful and relevant to her little sister as possible.

From the sections above it should be evident that Rocket is aware of the importance of adaptability in mentoring relationships. Not only has she had to adapt her perspective regarding youth mentoring, but Rocket also adapted to keep up with her little sister's pace.

When I first interviewed Rocket, she talked about how energetic her little sister is and how they are constantly jumping from one activity to another. However, during the focus group, Rocket said that this had begun to slow down and her little sister was content doing only a few activities during their time together. In this way, Rocket has had to adapt her approach to their sessions to ensure she is accommodating her little sister's pace of activities. Her little sister is also about to move into a new stage of life, with new schools and schedules. Rocket is also thinking about this and preparing to adapt for that as well. For Rocket, being able to adapt appears to be a key factor of a successful mentoring relationship (Drew & Spencer, 2021). Rocket is also role modelling this flexibility to her little sister, thereby also contributing to Sally's adaptability and resilience (Distelberg & Taylor, 2015).

Repeating points raised by Rocket is the value of her little sister's family and the strong dynamic that appears to be supporting Sally's resilience. In contrast, there seems to be a pronounced emphasis in the mentoring literature towards ignoring the role of parents in external mentoring relationships (Miller, 2007; Philip et al., 2004; Spencer et al., 2011; Styles & Morrow, 1992;). However, Rocket's story demonstrates the value of proactive parents, both as the people who engaged with the mentoring organisation to provide their child with a mentor as well as providing ongoing support during the mentoring relationship. This includes liaising with the mentor to arrange sessions, communicating about what is going on in the child's life, and providing suggestions for activities. Rocket was able to reflect on her own life, where she could recognise that her parents played a key role in her values and life goals. Family is a key component of resilience (Van Breda, 2018) and it is possible to incorporate family elements into a mentoring relationship. Rocket also acknowledges that some parents or guardians may feel ashamed to ask for this kind of help. As we saw, there are various reasons for this feeling, mostly from societal discourses about the parent's responsibilities and the moral judgements within society about requiring external assistance (Basualdo-Delmonico & Spencer, 2016). This could mean that there are lots of children missing out on the opportunity to have a mentor. Perhaps this is a societal assumption that can be challenged in the future. However, there is also a need for more mentors in the Manawatu before this issue can be tackled, as I learned during the AGM Dean invited me to attend.

The discussion about the role of parents and their influence on their children being involved in the mentoring programme also raises the point about potential differences in expectations between the mentor and the parent. Spencer (2007) found that mentors reported feeling disappointed in their mentoring relationships when their expectations were not met.

Spencer (2007) proposed that mentors realising the parents only wanted another role model to widen their child's horizons, rather than a central positive adult, often contributed to mentor disappointment in the mentoring relationship. It was also associated with the mentor experiencing reduced feelings of perceived self-worth in the child's life. It is important that the expectations of parents and mentors are clearly communicated before a mentoring relationship begins.

Overall, this chapter has brought to light the qualities of a mentor who has been able to find their place in their little sister's life and been confident in that role in terms of supporting and fostering resilience. Sally has many resilient aspects in her life, both in terms of functional internal qualities (e.g., her confidence, exuberance, and curiosity), as well as external situational supports (her loving family). Rocket has been able to provide another valuable source of support and a safe space for Sally to be herself and learn from an older woman. Additionally, this case reveals how a mentor must undergo a lot of internal adaptation and growth in order to provide their mentee with the most positive mentoring experience possible. It also reveals how external influences impact the resilience of a young person and how a mentor can navigate that in a constructive way to either build on an already strong foundation, or work with the young person to challenge any negative influence and learn from them. In the following chapter, I focus on the case of Harrison and how he navigates such challenges with his little brother and how they have built a relationship of trust and support.

Chapter 5: Harrison

This chapter discusses Harrison, a mentor of four years to Ben, a young boy aged 12. Harrison joined the organisation after hearing an ad on the radio and wanting to get involved in something to help young people. He and his little brother were matched when his little brother was eight years old. During this time, Harrison's life has changed significantly, with his first child born a year ago. He and his wife are also raising his wife's cousin, who is about the same age as Ben. While this does make life busy for Harrison, he still finds ways to interact with his little brother, including bringing him along to events with his family.

Harrison's little brother has been diagnosed with ADHD, something he has been managing with prescription medication. This can sometimes be a challenge for both himself and his grandmother. However, Harrison has not found it to be a problem at all, finding ways to engage with his little brother that help him, such as high-energy outdoor activities or even going to the arcade to play games that are stimulating. Harrison knows to avoid activities that would require his little brother to sit still for too long, instead choosing to work with his ADHD rather than let it be a barrier or issue.

Harrison and his little brother come from very different backgrounds. His little brother lives in the middle of Palmerston North, while Harrison grew up in a small rural community. His little brother lives with his grandmother and her partner, as his parents live in Australia with very little contact. On the other hand, Harrison grew up with his parents until their divorce, and subsequently had a stepfather whom he greatly admired. His little brother faces constant messages about gangs, drugs, and police involvement, and Harrison admits that he experienced little of this when growing up at the same age. So, what makes this match work? What can Harrison offer his little brother in terms of fostering resilience? Perhaps, as we will explore below, this difference in backgrounds is one of their strengths. Harrison can be a voice in his little brother's life that is different from those in his immediate environment and offers support for this young person to develop his critical thinking skills.

My analysis explores Harrison's perspective on how his mentoring is impacting this young person's life. Harrison has shared many stories and thoughts about how they have navigated through some of the problems his little brother faces, such as peer relationships, day-to-day problems, understanding differences, and extending to financial education. Harrison's thoughtful responses to his little brother's questions and struggles offers insights into how a

mentor can influence a young person positively by challenging their assumptions and revealing other alternative solutions to problems.

Harrison's Perspective on Resilience

As we will see below, Harrison has quite a thoughtful and applied approach to his mentoring relationship with Ben. Harrison emphasises the importance of adapting his approach to the environment his little brother exists in and listens carefully so that he can offer appropriate and helpful advice. He takes a holistic approach to his mentoring, and his understanding of resilience reflects this contextualised orientation. Harrison does not focus on one specific aspect of resilience, but instead focuses on ensuring he has the skills and knowledge to support his mentee in responding effectively to challenges in life:

Being able to have, I guess, what would you say, like, the skills and the knowledge and the support to be able to handle life challenges. Yeah. So just, you know, everyone has challenges come in their life and some people, you know, get more than others. Definitely. But yeah, just being able to handle them as well, as good as you can, I guess that that would be what resilience means to me.

Harrison notes skills, knowledge, and support as all important aspects of his ability to support the resilience of his mentee. He understands resilience as the ability to get through whatever challenges life offers, regardless of how many issues life throw out. His account also highlights how a 'resilient outcome' can look different for each person, depending on their own situation, experiences of adversity, and how they choose to respond to challenges in life. Harrison's statement "being able to handle them as well, as good as you can" reflects how one person's resilient response will not look the same as someone else's due to the different assets and resources to which a person has access. Harrison sees his role as doing the best he can to support this young person in developing his own skills to handle or respond effectively to life's problems.

Below, we will see how Harrison is helping his little brother with different aspects of a resilient response in their mentoring relationship and what the outcomes are or could be according to the literature. Because Harrison sees his role as one of building his little brother's skills and knowledge, it is informative to learn about which of these aspects Harrison is focusing on with his little brother and why. Since his little brother is still relatively young, it is difficult to see much evidence of these skills and knowledge being put

to use. Correspondingly, I use findings from relevant literature to suggest potential ways this support could benefit his little brother in the future. Beginning with skills, Harrison discusses how he has seen improvements in his little brother's communication skills and how the pair have used real life scenarios to encourage his problem-solving skills.

Research also shows that communication skills are an integral part of resilience (Nowicki, 2008). The ability to express oneself and seek support all contribute to one's ability to bounce back from challenges and maintain a sense of well-being and connection. Being able to seek help from the people around you when you are going through something difficult can enable a young person to access solutions and advice that they might not have been able to discover on their own (Nowicki, 2008). It also builds a sense of belonging and connection during hard times, developing one's network of support (Van Breda, 2018). As Harrison puts it, his little brother has been able to practice this through their time together:

Yeah, I mean, so he's better at phrasing his questions, you know, if he needs to ask for help or something, he's better at doing that. He can phrase it in a way where it's, you know more, that the recipient will be more receptive to that.

Resilience is often strengthened when one feels like they have social support from the people around them (Rutter, 1987; Goodenow, 1993; Bandura, 1995). Harrison's little brother learning how to frame his struggles in ways that people can understand and help him is central to how Harrison works to cultivate his resilience and ability to access relevant help when he needs. Additionally, learning how to phrase his concerns into questions is also building Ben's emotional intelligence, teaching him how to articulate his feelings and communicate those in a healthy manner (Cherry et al., 2013). Having a mentor who is willing to listen and provide feedback is important for this mentee's development. Harrison sees himself as his little brother's friend, there to listen and support him, cultivating his communicative skills.

Harrison has also used some of the trickier situations he and his little brother have found themselves in to teach Ben additional problem-solving skills and perseverance:

So, we've gone on some bike rides. Yeah, and so those are fun. Once, when we had those floods last year, when the river had been flooded and it was all muddy. And we went down there to do a bike ride and it was just way muddier than we expected. And we went offroad and we got stuck and he was like, "Ah, it so muddy!" But, you know, with a bit of encouragement, we pushed on, got to the end. And we came back and

cleaned the bikes and everything. So yeah, so that was like, sort of, more, what I'd say, resilience in like a physical way, like knowing the limits of what he can do. And you know, like things aren't always that bad, if you just keep going, you'll come out all right.

How someone approaches a problem can differ from person-to-person. We have seen how Buddy approaches problems by encouraging Tom to face a challenge and break it down into manageable steps to overcome the problem in Chapter 3. In the present case, we can see a slightly different approach that suits the mentor and mentee. Since Harrison mentors someone much younger than Buddy's little brother, he takes a gentler approach to helping Ben work through problems. Harrison lets his little brother voice his frustrations with situations, but encourages him to keep going, not allowing the current moment to make him give up. Also, through the small act of working together to clean the bikes afterwards, Harrison is teaching his little brother to see a problem all the way through, including the aftermath of a difficult situation. Harrison's little brother was able to learn that he could get through the mud and the difficult terrain and focus on finishing what he had begun.

As Harrison puts it, this is building resilience through a physical situation. Knowing one's limits, but also not letting emotions or discouragement stop you from getting through is a key marker of resilience (Ellis et al., 2017). Resilience is the ability to adapt and see something hard through to the end with desired results, such as an enhanced understanding of one's capabilities and strengths (Ungar, 2008). Harrison turned what could have been a negative experience for his little brother into an achievement by being there to support and encourage him and help him afterwards. By being there, Harrison helped his little brother face the problem, solve it, and learn from it. Relatedly, perceived self-efficacy is a strong predictor of resilient outcomes (Parra et al., 2002; Ye et al., 2016; Dutton et al., 2018.). Persons with a strong sense of self-efficacy have been found to display confidence in their ability to solve problems (Nowicki, 2008). Rutter (1987) found that the enhancement of self-efficacy is a protective factor of resilience. Bandura et al. (1999) add that a high level of perceived self-efficacy can lead an individual to interpret successes as an indication of their capabilities, creating a positive feedback loop. By working together to solve problems, Harrison is promoting his little brother's sense of self-efficacy and therefore his overall resilience.

Alvord & Grados (2005) discuss the importance of self-control as a factor of resilience. Referring to Rubin et al.'s (1995) work, they discuss how the ability to exercise self-control as being at the core of multiple areas of successful functioning and adaptation. Harrison also emphasised the importance of sharing his knowledge and experience with his little brother, particularly with aspects of life such as handling money. This is something his little brother has shown a lot of interest in. Harrison was taught about money from his father, and he tries to pass on this knowledge to his little brother:

I teach him a little bit about, like, money, money policy. Like, so talking about like, you know, our mortgage and how we're paying it off and how debt works, you know. Just an overview, but he's pretty good at math, so he picks it up pretty well. Because I know that's going to be coming into the curriculum soon. But you know, it's not at the moment. So, I think that I was lucky that I was taught by my dad, you know, all those important things about, you know, trying to stay out of debt and, you know, yeah, those sorts of things. So, I try to pass that on.

Again, Harrison takes quite a practical or life skills orientation to his mentoring, using the situations that arise during their mentoring sessions to impart to his little brother practical knowledge about handling money and controlling one's spending impulses:

Like his grandmother might give him, like, \$20.00 for the outing or whatever, and he'd spend all of it. He still quite often spends all of it, but sometimes I can be like, "Do you want to save a little bit of that the next time?" Or something like that or "You wanna spend some of that to get, you know, a present for your grandmother?" Something like that. He quite likes going to TimeZone in the winter. And, you know, he gets the tickets on his card, you know, for every game he plays, and he'd always want to spend all of them, you know, spend all his tickets. And I'm like, "Well, if you do that, you're not gonna be able to save up for one of the nice prizes. You'll just get a bunch of lollies each week. And so, yeah, now he buys, like, maybe one chocolate bar or something. And he'll save the rest of the points, yeah. It's hard, you know, it comes down to impulse control, I guess. And things like that but, yeah, just trying to just give him that idea that just because you have something, doesn't mean you have to spend it.

By approaching his mentoring in this way, Harrison can shift his little brother's perspective about spending and saving over time through practical scenarios that relate to what his little

brother is facing. He may not need to know about mortgages and loans just yet, but learning wise financial habits during his childhood can set his little brother up to think wisely about these possible decisions of life further down the track. The way Harrison also draws attention to the idea of getting his grandmother a gift is also an opportunity for Ben to learn generosity, a resilient factor Matt Button discusses in his resilience training video:

So, you can imagine a picture here of a young person at the start line with their head down, looking at their feet, They're not able to see even that there is a race in front of them, Whereas those who have the ability to look up and look around are those who are more likely to be resilient. So, generosity is an example of that, because to be generous means that you have to be looking at the world around you and seeing what's there.

By teaching his little brother to think more deeply about the different ways he can spend his money, particularly in terms of being generous, Harrison is enabling Ben to learn how to look around him and beyond the immediate circumstances. This involve Ben learning to consider other factors or opportunities that are available to him and offer him a different outcome than what he would have naturally chosen.

Tiet et al. (2010) discuss how fostering resilience involves creating positive feedback loops, where resilience builds resilience, and early interventions often have bigger impacts on a young person's life. Tackling practical issues like money management early on can have a more influential role in Ben's life. These lessons Harrison has shared with his little brother have already made Ben think about what he wants to his future to look like:

Yeah. It's relatively future focused, I think ... Like, he wants to be either an accountant or a real estate agent. So yeah, I mean, that's pretty good. They're not glamorous professions, so he's probably thinking, you know, these are good, stable ways to make money.

Here, Harrison presents the importance of his mentee developing a respect for and understanding of money as an important element in cultivating resilience with Ben. Their conversations have turned organically to this young person voicing positive aspirations for future work in roles that involve managing money practically. This also invokes the hopeful nature of mentoring, where Harrison holds hope for his little brother's future. Matt Button puts it this way:

Hope is a great word that is so central to Big Brothers Big Sisters when we think of what we want for our young people. We have hope for them. We hold hope for them. We may get disappointed with things that happen in their lives. We may be deeply saddened by that, but we continue to hold out hope for them that they can do well. Not in a kind of blind hope, but a kind of, I guess, a belief in them, that they are worth it and that there is a chance that, you know, with the right kind of input into their lives, that they still can do well in life. So, we want young people to have that faith and hope in themselves.

Harrison is offering his little brother encouragement and advice that represents the hopeful perspective Harrison has for Ben and his life. As Matt says, this sends a message to that young person that they are worth it and that they can also have hope in themselves.

In this section, I have considered some of the skills and knowledge Harrison feels is important to passing on to his little brother and how this is helping foster resilience in his little brother's life. It also informs us of Harrison's practice-based understanding of resilience and how to cultivate it with young people. From this section we can begin to see how impactful Harrison's approach to mentoring can be in a young person's life, particularly when this mentor responds to events in Ben's life and uses the opportunities that arise during their interactions to help him develop skills and knowledge that can foster resilience. The following sections extend this focus on Harrison's practical approach to mentoring resilience to go deeper into the specific support Harrison provides his little brother. This includes building their relationship by cultivating mutual trust so that Harrison can support his little brother to navigate his surroundings.

Building a Healthy Relationship

There is not a lot of literature specifically addressing the relationship between interpersonal connection and resilience or collective notions of resilience (Hodgetts et al., 2020). In their work, Hodgetts et al. (2020) discuss the relational nature of resilience, and how one's ability to become resilient is enmeshed in the lives and actions of other. Mattis et al. (2009) note that pro-social behaviour and acts of giving, such as mentoring, cultivate resilience both within individuals and within the communities in which they are situated. From an ecological perspective, there are three factors that relate to one's ability to grow into a resilient person: opportunities, interpersonal support, and structured environments (Reed-Victor & Strong,

2002). Mentoring has afforded Ben each of these factors, with Harrison providing him with opportunities to engage in activities and interests, giving him support and encouragement, and presenting him with strong, consistent values that shape their environment of mentoring.

Scholars working on relationality more generally offer useful information about interpersonal communication and protective factors of resilience. This includes enhancing the ability of people to manage stress and promote positive adaptation and personal health. For example, Afifi (2018) argues that social relationships have a strong influence on an individual's stress trajectory due to the individual's embeddedness within larger relational systems. When those social relationships are positive and healthy, they can influence one's ability to positively handle stress and challenges. Harrison's account positions mentors as one such social relationship for a young person, influencing their ability to handle life's challenges. Matt Button touches on this in his resilience training video:

So close relationships is recognising that young people need a network of people around them to help them be resilient. The smaller the network, the more of a risk it is that when one of the relationships within that network breaks down, if you've only got one or two close relationships and one of them breaks down, you've only got one other person to go to. If you've got a bunch of people around you, then you're often going to have other people to go to so that network will support you at different times, different places in different situations - might have eyes for you at different places and times as well. And that provides you with kind of like a foundation of support that sits wherever you go.

Here, Matt is teaching the mentors to see themselves as part of the young person's social network, there to offer support and resilience. They can be those eyes for the young person, seeing them grow and struggle and assist them with their development. They can listen and offer advice when things are hard. Because these mentors are a separate entity to the rest of the young person's life, they are less likely to be affected by the breaking down of other networks and can remain constant and stable throughout those difficult periods.

For such a mentoring relationship to work, mentors and mentees must put in the effort to build trust and rapport with one another. This is especially important in the mentoring relationships that are created by Big Brothers Big Sisters, where the pair are complete strangers when they meet. The success or failure of a mentoring match often comes down to how the mentor approaches the relationship and the type of support they are able to offer the

mentee (Christenson et al., 2020; DuBois et al., 2002; Raposa et al., 2019; Spencer et al., 2018). A mentor needs to demonstrate their willingness to engage with their mentee, through the activities they plan, their honesty, and how they listen (Parra et al., 2002). When Harrison met his little brother, the latter was eight years old. Though Harrison would not have described Ben as shy when they first met, he has definitely noticed an increase in the comfort and confidence this young person has developed over their time together. In this section, I unpack some of the ways in which this has developed and how Harrison's approach to mentoring have influenced Ben's outlook on life and behaviour.

As noted above, Harrison describes his childhood as having occurred in the context of a loving family. He credits his mother for his development of empathy and a supportive outlook towards others. Her example to him has shaped how Harrison views his relationship with his little brother and how he wants to impact Ben's life:

I think I've got my empathy and kindness from her. Yeah, yeah. So, I mean, I guess, yeah, I guess that's the gift that she gave me. And yeah, and that that's one of the things I try and pass on to my little brother. I mean, he was already quite an empathetic boy when we first met. But just, yeah, just help develop that.

Harrison draws on similarities between positive parenting and the mentoring of young people (Masten & Palmer, 2019). He also emphasises the importance of kindness and empathy in the growth of young people. In a sense, how mentoring is invoked here is as a form of paying it forward or reciprocity for the positive parenting he received from his mother. It also reflects the assertion that women can grow positive young men who are in touch with their emotions and can act empathetically towards others in building positive relationships (Taylor & Conger, 2017). Spencer et al. (2020) found that mentors who demonstrate empathy toward their mentee are able to relate to what their mentees are going through and understand their perspectives. Having empathy and kindness for his little brother has translated into Harrison demonstrating active listening, which will we see in action below, when his little brother shares anything, understanding what he is going through, and offering support and encouragement to make the right decisions.

It also means that Harrison sees the best in Ben, and lets him know that, thereby supporting the development of self-esteem within this young person. This is done through their conversations and shared engagements in practical outdoor activities that, as noted above, can help develop self-confidence and tenacity:

Yeah, building his esteem, but also sort of teaching him how to interact with other people, you know, in, sort of, a competitive or semi competitive environment. How it's important, you know, whether you win or lose to, you know, be good about it. And that will encourage people to want to play with you again the next time, you know. Like, whether you're a sore loser or sore winner, people won't be as keen to play with you or, yeah, do whatever with you. So, that's more of a life skill, I guess, rather than resilience, but it's an important thing to learn.

Supportive or well-mannered competition can teach people how to overcome challenges by building their skills and knowledge as well as recognising the skills and performance of others (Secades et al., 2017). By not letting his little brother win every time, Harrison also exposes him to experiences of failure and opportunities to learn how to bounce back from disappointments in a good way. This is part of what Harrison is seeking to teach his little brother, how to be a good sport, whether he wins or loses, and how to bounce back from that disappointment and still persevere.

Interestingly, Harrison makes a distinction here between life skills and resilience that seems to reflect the idea that one develops skills that enable one to be more resilient. Life skills can be understood as important protective factors for avoiding or reducing maladaptive behaviours (Sagone & Indiana, 2017). Having perceived self-efficacy in life skills has been positively correlated with high levels of resilience. Sagone et al. (2020) found that adolescents with a perceived self-efficacy in life skills were more likely to deal with the consequences of their actions and adapt their behaviour to suit the situation. This includes being a good sportsman regardless of the results of the race, as Harrison is trying to teach Ben.

From the interview and focus group, it would appear that building rapport with his little brother has been incredibly valuable for Harrison. He himself has been able to understand his own upbringing a little more fully and in relation to how he as the adult can now also offer support and guidance to a younger person. He values honesty and always tries to give his little brother a truthful and sincere answer to his questions. In discussing this issue, Harrison also reveals his own understanding of his mentee as an intelligent, astute and engaged young person who benefits from and responds well to authentic interactions:

Because he's a pretty smart guy. Like if I tried to lie to him, I think he would have been able to tell ... like, I wouldn't want to lie to him anyway because that's not the relationship we have. But yeah, I think, he could tell if I was being insincere.

Harrison also recounts recognising how this foundation of mutual respect has had an impact on how his little brother values his opinion of the issues raised. He can see how his time with his little brother engaged in various activities is foundational to their relationship and mutual trust:

And just yeah, I think, just maybe building a rapport with him and us going out and doing fun things led him to respect my opinion in a way that, you know, I could say, "You know, I would never do that" you know, had more, carried more weight than a stranger saying that sort of thing.

This relationship might not have worked as well if Harrison had not taken the time to develop that level of trust with his little brother. As he said, his little brother is a 'smart kid', and has benefited by seeing how Harrison lived. He also invokes the idea that modelling pro-social behaviour through shared activities can bond persons and form the basis of trust and future collaborations (Hodgetts et al., 2020). It has led to Ben coming to trust and respect Harrison's experience and opinion. His little brother now freely asks Harrison questions on all kinds of topics, telling him about what is going on at school and at home, and actively seeking Harrison's advice on these matters.

Ben lives in a trying environment, which Harrison describes as requiring resilience: *"It's much more look after yourself, you know, always on the defensive environment."* Ben often brings aspects of his situation up with Harrison, asking for his opinion on particular events and relationships. Harrison has learned to navigate this in an honest, sincere manner, seeing himself as his little brother's friend, here when he has questions and to provide thoughtful and careful answers. *"I'm just there to be that, you know, be his friend and yeah, do fun things with him and answer any questions he's got."* As a mentor, Harrison understands that he cannot control the environment his little brother is growing up in, but he can offer support and guidance.

Harrison has also supported Ben with his ADHD, choosing to engage in more energy-focused activities that help his little brother get out some of that energy in a healthy and educational way. These include races in the park, bike rides, and arcade games. Harrison

strives to provide his little brother with high energy activities, even if this can be more difficult during the winter months:

But we, um, I try and do outdoor things, especially once we get into summer, that it's a lot easier to go and do outdoor things because it's just, you know, then I'm doing outdoor stuff as well and, yeah, it's just nice to get out of the house. Do something different.

Finding activities for his little brother to do can be a challenge, but Harrison remains optimistic and sees the value in showing his little brother all of these different ways he can spend his time, especially when his little brother tends to spend most of his time playing computer games. Harrison wants Ben to experience different activities, but is also patient with him and wants him to find the activities that work for him and his ADHD:

But I mean, I play video games, so I can't be a hypocrite and be like 'No, you shouldn't play computer games, you know, get off your PlayStation.' But, you know, it's about giving him another, wider depth of experience rather than just doing that. Yeah, so, I mean, we just keep trying new things and seeing what sticks. And it's coming into warmer weather slowly, so that's always nice.

A lot of the life lessons Harrison teaches his little brother are the result of Harrison taking the time to reflect on their interactions afterwards and connecting those experiences to larger concepts. Harrison's ability to step back from the here and now of each session and look for the bigger lessons has led to some meaningful conversations with his little brother about how he sees and responds to his lifeworld and the people around him. As Harrison explains, he takes moments within their sessions to make these connections and then shares them with his little brother when the opportunity presents itself:

I'll probably look at it at short term. Yeah, like just how will we get through this? And maybe, you know, maybe on the drive back home or whatever, it might click in my mind, and I, you know, might relate back to something else that someone else, you know, has talked to me about.

How a mentor approaches the relationship can be what makes or breaks the relationship (Drew & Spencer, 2021). An empathetic and attuned mentor offers their mentee attention, high levels of communication, and responsiveness to their emotions and concerns (Pryce, 2012). Above, we have seen how Harrison does this for his little brother, offering him a

relationship where he can feel safe, heard and supported. He can work on life skills with support from an adult he trusts. Ben has his own set of challenges in terms of managing ADHD and the environment he lives in, but he also has Harrison there to help him navigate these challenges.

The next section focuses in on the critical thinking Harrison is teaching Ben in relation to the messages he receives from the world around him. Again, a lot of these conversations would not have been possible if Harrison had not put in the work to build rapport with his little brother.

Building Critical Thinking in the Real World

In reflecting on the historical origins of the word ‘mentor’, Shea (2002) refers to Homer’s *Odyssey* where Odysseus leaves his son in the care of his friend, Mentor. From this story, the word mentor has come to mean friend, teacher, and wise person. This leads us to see mentoring as a nurturing, supportive, and protective relationship and process. And this is what we see Harrison offer his little brother. Harrison strives to protect Ben as much as possible from the challenges and pitfalls of the environment in which he lives and offers nurturing support and wisdom. As I document in this section, central to Harrison’s efforts is his encouraging Ben to think critically about his situation.

Critical thinking is the ability to analyse, evaluate, and make sound decisions based on evidence and reasoning. It is often a skill that needs to be taught or modelled to a person. Critical thinking is beginning to be recognised as the tool through which people can be mentored to nurture potentials (Behzadi & Noushadi, 2016). Noddings (2007) even considered the relationship between mentoring and critical thinking as a means of creating social change in the world. As Behzadi & Noushadi (2016) put it, mentors encouraging critical thinking equips mentees with three skills: communication, decision-making, and problem solving. We have already seen how Harrison is teaching Ben these skills. In this section I focus on the benefits critical thinking brings to Ben interpersonal relationships and self-reflections.

Harrison emphasises the need to teach his little brother to look holistically at challenging situations and not just the parts that people around him are emphasising. For example, Harrison discusses how his little brother hears a lot about gangs at school and from

social media sources, often from other children who think the lifestyle is cool or something they would like to be part of:

So, he was seeing a lot of gang media on social media and things like that. And some of his friends at school were, you know, their parents were members of gangs, things like that. So, it was just explaining to him that, you know what you see on social media, that's not what it actually is like ... I mean, what I said to him was, "You know, I would never be a member of a gang, because if you're in a gang, you have to hurt people." And I think, out of everything I said, that was what resonated with him the most because he hadn't really, sort of, seen it that way.

Harrison's little brother was only hearing about the positive aspects of gang life, such as the access to nice cars, money, and activities such as doing burnouts. He had not heard anyone explain to him the dangers and risks of being in a gang or thought about the implications of that path. Harrison was able to share his perspective on the issue in a way that his little brother had not heard before.

Harrison has a perspective that is new for his little brother and provides him with wisdom and advice that he might not hear from the people in his direct surroundings. This is how Harrison is able to impart critical thinking skills to his little brother, by opening him up to a world of opinions that he might not have encountered before, and by inviting him to think about issues in a deeper way.

Such conversations are not the only way Harrison has taught his little brother critical thinking. Harrison has also showed Ben how to think about the people around him, seeing them as complex people instead of understanding them only through a simplistic mindset. Harrison did so when his little brother shared with him thoughts his grandmother had about his cousin, who lives across the street from them:

Yeah, so his actual cousin, who lives next door is a bit of a boy racer. So, he keeps getting in trouble with the police with his car that's too loud and no WOF and things like that. And his grandmother will say to my mentee, you know, he's a bad influence, things like that.

Harrison's little brother asked him what he thought about that. Harrison went on to explain to him that people are much more complicated than just their present behaviour.

I said, 'Well, you can't put people in a box of 'they're good' and 'they're bad'. Usually, people, everyone's in a bit of both. I said to him like, you know, 'Does he go to work every day?' Yes, he does. 'Does he support his family?' Yes, he does. Like, 'Are all of those good things?' 'Yeah' You know, they'd be good things then. OK, 'So, what are some not good things that he does?' You know, obviously, 'Breaks the law. Drives cars that don't have warrants of fitness and are too loud and things like that.' And I said, 'So, do you understand from that, that you can admire someone but still see things about them that you don't like, things like that?'

Such interview extracts reflect how Harrison does not shy away from engaging with Ben difficult questions that Ben asks in relation to the complicated lifeworld that his little brother occupies. Harrison responds in ways that assist Ben to think critically about particular interactions and situations that might be perplexing to him. Harrison knows that his little brother looks up to his cousin, and so he points out the good things his cousin does, things worth admiring and possibly striving to emulate, while also separating that from the negative things. Arguably, by doing so, Harrison aids his little brother to not feel like he must pick a side between key people in his life, choosing to either only see his cousin as a bad influence or only see him as a perfect role model. Harrison encourages Ben to see the mistakes his cousin may be making and choose to learn from these, and to take from such situations valuable lessons about what success really looks like, and how he can choose success for himself.

Harrison also role models an active listening style, which is important when engaging in active critical thinking. He places emphasis on asking purposeful questions and provides effective feedback to his little brother. Alisson and Williams (2012) propose that this feature of a mentoring relationship is also key to an effective and helpful relationship. By in engaging in open questioning and listening, Harrison models these skills for his mentee, helping him learn how to think through situations and issues and hopefully make informed decisions for himself.

Harrison can explain to Ben how he can have similar interests as people who are in gangs or engaging in anti-social behaviour but choose not to pursue those interests in an unhealthy manner, relating back to their conversations about the gang lifestyle and the aspects of it that are attractive to Ben. As mentioned, his little brother is most excited about the car aspect of gangs. Harrison draws aspects of the gang and cousin conversations that Ben

has raised with him to communicate to Ben see that he does not have to accept a gang lifestyle or engage in illegal activities to realise his interests in cars:

Especially back when he was talking about the gangs, it was always their motorbikes and their cars that he is most interested in. Yeah. And he does like, you know, like, he likes cars. I'm not a car nut at all. But he likes cars, so. Just sort of, yeah, you know, he'll point out a car to me and I won't know what the car is. So, it's relating that back to him that, you know, you can be, you can be interested in cars and stuff, but you don't have to, you know, exhibit anti-social behaviour.

Harrison's little brother might not have heard this perspective from anyone else, having been encouraged to see gangs as the way to pursue his interests in cars, rather than seeing it as a potentially harmful pathway for himself and others. Helping Ben develop his critical thinking regarding such issue is central to Harrison's efforts to help his little brother to be able to think about situations in a rational way for himself, and to navigate his challenging environment in a resilient way.

Chapter Discussion

This case focuses on Harrison's experience mentoring his little brother, Ben. During this time, the pair have been able to share many experiences and activities that have fostered Ben's resilience in several ways. In this section, I summarise and discuss key points from this case as they relate to the broader topic of fostering resilience through mentoring. I will discuss various aspects of their relationship, including how Harrison is building Ben's self-worth and confidence. Also considered is how Harrison fosters a sense of self-efficacy in Ben and how he is helping build Ben's critical thinking skills through the conversations they have about issues in Ben's life. I conclude with a discussion about the importance of having such a mentor in Ben's life before we move on to the next chapter.

There are a few different ways in which Harrison is fostering Ben's sense of self-worth and confidence through their mentoring relationship. Mostly, it comes from Harrison's positive and hopeful perspective of Ben. Harrison's advice for Ben always has a hopeful and positive tone, suggesting that Harrison believes in Ben and his capabilities. For example, Harrison has begun talking to Ben about fiscal management because he believes Ben can learn those things and will find them useful in the future. This seems to have resulted in Ben beginning to think about his future in a positive way, as reflected in his aspirations to become

an accountant or a property broker. Harrison is also fostering Ben's confidence through the activities they engage in, supporting him in what he is good at and encouraging him that he can overcome any challenges, such as when they went for that difficult bike ride. Ben has also become more expressive about his feelings and needs, which is a possible reflection of him feeling confident that those feelings matter and will be heard by Harrison. Matt Button discusses this ability for a mentor to foster self-worth and confidence in his resilience training video:

One of the beauties of mentoring is just this profound message that mentors give a young person that they're worth it. You give them your time and you tell them by giving them time that they are worth it. And that's a beautiful message for young people to get hold of and you can see their confidence growing as a result of that.

Harrison is also building his little brother's perceived self-efficacy, which is a strong predictor of resilience (Pooley & Cohen, 2010). He does so through the activities they engage in, such as the outdoor activities. Using the difficult bike ride mentioned above, Harrison encouraged Ben to see that challenge through to the end, revealing that Ben was capable of overcoming that challenge. This affords Ben the opportunity to interpret this success as proof of his abilities, thus providing a feedback loop of positive feedback (Bandura et al., 1999). Ben is able to look back on that experience and know that he can overcome challenges in the future as well. As mentioned above, Harrison is also building different life skills into Ben's life, such as good sportsmanship, fiscal management, and critical thinking. All of these skills build one's perceived self-efficacy, therefore fostering resilience (Sagone et al., 2020). Another way Harrison is promoting Ben's self-efficacy is by enhancing his social network, which provides Ben with resources to be able to overcome challenges that he may have struggled with on his own (Van Breda, 2018).

Critical thinking is another area where Harrison is fostering resilience in Ben's life. Just as Ben has the opportunity to build his confidence and self-efficacy, he is also learning how to navigate difficult issues with a critical and thoughtful approach. Harrison models this approach to Ben through his active listening style and demonstrating to him the wider, more complex view of an issue. Harrison does not shy away from the difficult topics Ben brings to him, but rather has an honest and sincere approach of trying to help Ben navigate the situation in a healthy manner. They have been able to build such a relationship by fostering a relationship of mutual respect, trust, and rapport. Harrison is an empathetic and attuned

mentor, who models thoughtfulness and consideration to Ben and teaches him to look more holistically at an issue. This aspect of the relationships is partly due to Harrison's approach of taking the time to consider the immediate situation or issue and think about a deeper level of learning to share with Ben.

Werner (1993) discusses the importance of having a sense of belonging and attachment on positive effects in a young person's life, such as improved self-esteem and self-efficacy. But as Alvord & Grados (2005) warn, the availability of such positive social supports cannot be taken for granted or assumed. 'Social support is not a self-forming entity waiting around to buffer harried people against stressors' (Bandura et al., 1999, p. 259). In this case, engaging in the mentoring programme has afforded Ben the chance to have someone like Harrison in his life. This relationship was a purposeful decision made by the people in Ben's life to give him more social support that would be positive and helpful. Without this mentoring, Ben may not have heard perspectives like Harrison's and learned the lessons that Harrison is teaching him.

One recurring argument made in the literature is that natural mentoring, where the young person naturally identifies and forms a mentoring bond with someone already in their life, is preferable to organized mentoring programs regarding short-term or haphazard matches (Evans & Ave, 2000). This may be true, but the ability to find natural mentors may not be possible for many at-risk youths. Social networks are contagious, and it can be the case that most of the older people in a youth's life face the same challenges and cannot offer different opportunities and perspectives. For this reason, formal mentoring programs have utility as an opportunity for youth to meet someone different who can encourage them toward positive development and making different, more beneficial life decisions.

In the next chapter, we will reflect on the learning gained from each of these case studies presented in this thesis. We will see how each case presents similar underlying findings about resilience and youth mentoring, as well as how each puts forward their own insights into youth mentoring. Using these cases, the argument for utilising youth mentoring as a means of fostering resilience will be put forward.

Chapter 6: Discussion

Within this thesis, I have engaged with three case narratives regarding how participating mentors work with a little brother or sister through the BBBSNZ (Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand) programme. These cases reveal how mentors navigate their relationships and how they foster resilience within their mentee. There is expansive literature on the positive impacts of mentoring on resilient outcomes for young people (Cavell et al., 2009; Dzoba, 2014; Ye et al., 2016; Fried et al., 2018). The present study contributes to this literature by offering three case exemplars through which mentors share their personal stories regarding how they understand resilience and apply these understandings when working to foster resilience in their mentees. Each of these storied cases highlights diverse ways in which resilience can be fostered through mentoring, and the range of factors implicated in these processes, including family, environments, and the mentors' personal experiences (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009). While many mentoring evaluations tend to depend upon meta-analyses and longitudinal studies (Newburn & Shiner, 2006; Eby et al., 2008; DuBois et al., 2011; Faruggia et al., 2011), a case-based approach (Mattingly, 1991; Abbot, 1992; Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012; Stake, 2013) such as that adopted in this thesis provides further contextual nuance regarding mentor understandings and mentoring practices.

My aim with this study was to explore and understand the experiences of mentors in fostering resilience among young people from the perspective of three mentors in New Zealand. Each of the participants had been engaging with their mentees for at least a year and offered unique and specific narratives about how they fostered resilience through mentoring. I also set out to learn more about how the mentoring organisation, Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand, trains and assists their mentors in achieving resilient outcomes and how these mentors have put the concept of fostering resilience into practice. To do so, I interviewed three mentors from the Manawatū branch and drew upon academic literature, the organisation's resources about resilience, and the insights and stories shared by these mentors to construct the three case studies. This approach allowed me to engage in detail with each case and to compare similarities and differences in the participant narratives and factors that influence their practices.

In this chapter, I return to the research aims and questions presented in Chapter One and answer these questions as they relate to the three storied cases. Below, the key findings of

each case are presented comparatively. First, I discuss how these mentors conceptualise resilience, revealing the factors that influenced these perspectives, and how this sheds light on links between how a mentor understands resilience and how they foster resilience in their mentee. Second, I compare the many ways in which the different mentors strive to foster resilience in their mentees. Third, I highlight and expand upon insights from the cases as these relate to how mentoring can work to foster resilience among young people. As I discuss these key topics, I will relate key insights from the cases back to relevant academic literature as a means of considering the wider implications of this research. Finally, I consider how findings from this thesis can be used by Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand to assist their mentoring training and ongoing support for young people. Throughout this study, I embraced Drew's (2006) approach to community psychology, seeing my study as a means of assisting the organisation and ensuring that their approaches can be informed by the experiences of their mentors.

As a form of conceptual generalisation from these cases (Hodgetts et al., 2020), I will inform my final interpretation of the general lessons from across the three cases to previous theory and research in the area of mentoring resilience. Central is my use of recommendations made by the authors of previous research that may be pertinent to Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand. This incorporation of other academic voices positions this thesis and the experiences of the mentors within existing knowledge regarding youth mentoring. This is not a top down, prescriptive process, but rather a dialectical practice that enables me to position the present thesis in relation to existing knowledge and to inform the recommendations I make to the mentoring service from my thesis with insights from previous research.

The Mentors' Understanding of Mentoring and Resilience

One core research question for this thesis related to how the mentors each understood resilience and mentoring. From participant stories, it became clear that what these concepts mean to each mentor featured both similarities and differs. As Levine-Daniel et al. (2019) point out, mentoring relationships are often defined by mentor expectations and efforts, which suggests that different mentors can have unique perspectives on what mentoring means to them in the context of their mentoring relationships.

Below, I discuss each mentor's conceptualisation of mentoring and resilience in complimentary ways (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017). Individual accounts of each conceptualisation have been covered in the chapters about the mentors. This chapter affords an opportunity for bringing these perspectives together and compare these for similarities and differences. My aim here is to answer the research question in a way that maintains the individual, nuanced accounts of each mentor, while also providing insights about how resilience can be understood in the mentoring context. I will begin with a discussion about the mentors' understanding of mentoring before moving on to discuss their understanding of resilience. As discussed in Chapter 1, more insights into the underlying factors of successful mentoring relationships could be found in the experiences, knowledge, and insight of successful mentors (Dutton et al., 2018). In this thesis, each case discussed how the mentor understands mentoring and the underlying factors that influence these understandings.

At the beginning of this thesis (see Chapter 1), I discussed resilience and youth mentoring and provided a working definition of both based on academic sources. These discussions created the foundation for any comments or insights I had about resilience and youth mentoring. Creating or finding a definitive definition of either youth mentoring or resilience proved difficult due to nuances regarding context, culture, purpose, and philosophy (Keller, 2007). I used Bozeman and Feeney's (2007) definition of mentoring as a starting point, emphasizing the transmission of knowledge, social capital, and psychosocial support as a means by which resilience is fostered. At a fundamental level, resilience was positioned as adaptive responses to adversity (Lou et al., 2018), and this study was interested in how young people learn and develop these adaptive responses. I did not simply assume that these understandings from the academic literature would be fully shared or replicated by the mentors. There were overlaps, but each mentor had their own understandings and approaches to mentoring, which are discussed below.

Asking each mentor to explain what they understood to be resilience and effective youth mentoring at the beginning of our interviews proved to be helpful for several reasons. By asking them to conceptualise these key terms, I was able to open up our dialogue in relation to participant experiences and draw out their understandings in that context, as well as linking the accounts to my engagements with insights from relevant literature (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2012; Small, 2009). This open-ended strategy led to me understanding more about the underlying factors that influenced participant understandings and approaches to mentoring. For example, in relation to resilience, I was able to learn more about how Buddy's

employment in the RNZAF (Royal New Zealand Air Force) had influenced his perspective of resilience as primarily about problem-solving.

Both Buddy and Rocket raised their self-concepts as a key influence on their understanding of effective mentoring. Buddy discusses how he sees himself as an empathetic person who wants to give to others. This self-concept seems to have had an impact on how he understands the purpose of the mentoring relationship with Tom. Similarly, Rocket discusses how she values the development of people and finds satisfaction in assisting with this development. Harrison discusses how he was influenced by his mother to show empathy and compassion and how he tries to pass on these values to his little brother. Such self-concepts that orientate towards helping others have been found to influence how these and other mentors interpret the purpose and function of mentoring relationships. While Weiler et al. (2014) did not find a correlation between self-concept and mentoring strategies, they did note that the wide variability of self-concepts raised by their participants reflect the depth and diversity of mentors in general. However, there is an argument to be made that since voluntary mentoring is a prosocial behaviour requiring time and effort, it is plausible that people who choose to mentor already have prosocial values, such as the ones raised by the mentors here (Liu & Wang, 2023; Allen, 2003). For example, Haggard et al. (2011) found that there are correlations between certain types of self-concepts and the motivations behind becoming a mentor.

Across the three cases, an altruistic orientation to community engagement emerged as central to participant understandings of mentoring. For example, Buddy storied mentoring as a chance to give back to the community. Rocket saw it as a chance to support the community in general and as a great opportunity to support young people in particular. Harrison also raised empathy and compassion as core traits he recognised as influencing his approach to mentoring. These positive community values appear to influence how these mentors engage in mentoring, usually by developing a more holistic approach, encouraging both psychological progress as well as personal development in their mentees (Haggard et al., 2011).

Rocket's case also raised the point that personal assumptions can impact one's understanding of mentoring. These assumptions can come from sources such as personal values, self-concepts, personal histories, and social commentary on mentoring that populate broader societal level narratives (Murray, 2000). Relatedly, Spencer (2007) found that mentor

assumptions can either predict success or failure for a mentoring relationship, and that success depends on mentors being open to shifting their assumptions as relationships with mentees develop. For example, Rocket seemed to hold an assumption that mentoring is a tool for preventing negative outcomes for a young person by influencing their life trajectories. This assumption was anchored in her service experiences in the army. However, this assumption was challenged when she met Sally, who was not on a negative life path. This led Rocket to rethink her assumption, adapt her understanding of mentoring to take a more general support orientation to how she worked with Sally. The presence and influence of such assumptions and the willingness to reflect on and shift one's perspective regarding mentoring highlights the active role mentors play in their relationships that often are more successful when rendered flexible and responsive to mentee needs (Cordingly, 2008).

Another consistent topic, which was expressed in various ways by the three mentors, was that effective mentoring relationships feature supportive care. What this support looked like differed between the mentors, highlighting the way mentoring can look different in each relationship. Buddy supported and enacted care towards Tom by teaching him problem-solving skills and being an encouraging and safe space for him to ask questions about a range of life development issues. Harrison supported and cared for Ben by engaging in active listening and offering guidance. Rocket supported and cared for Sally by being an external figure outside of the family for her to engage in fun activities and have some one-on-one attention. Each of the mentors understood their role as a mentor to be primarily about supporting them and it seemed that a fostering of their mentees' resilience resulted as an extension of this support. All participants emphasised social connection and support in ways that reflect Keller's (2005) conceptualisation of mentoring. Keller's (2005) model of youth mentoring depicts the interconnected network of relationships in a child's life that all contribute to the outcome of the mentoring relationship. The model serves as a reminder of the way these networks and relationships can serve to either inhibit or reinforce the relationship.

All the mentors saw resilience as a means to foster mentee capabilities in coping and thriving in life. Buddy and Harrison both viewed mentoring such capabilities in their mentees as focusing on a challenge or a problem that they could consciously work at. They discussed challenges such as difficult terrain on bike rides, or flat tires. Buddy saw this challenge as anything from something small, like changing a car tire, to something more significant, like relationship problems. Such an approach echoes what Rutter (2012) discussed as the 'steeling

effect', referring to how vulnerabilities can be decreased through exposure and successful adaptation to adversities, thus fostering resilience. Harrison would add to this practice-based learning process by discussing how some people have more challenges in life than others and that it is important to learn to deal with what life presents you with. This orientation also speaks to the idea that resilience can be cultivated via mentees learning how to solve problems, with problem-solving skills being a well-known factor for resilience (Ellis et al., 2017; Lou et al., 2018; Rutter, 1989; Werner, 1995). On the other hand, Rocket viewed any change in life, both positive and negative, as an opportunity to choose an adaptive response. This perspective reflects the notion that any disruption, whether positive or negative, can require a resilient response since a disruption requires a person to adapt and can cause anxiety.

Each mentor differed on what exactly they understood as key factors that enhance mentee resilience when faced with adversity. Buddy understood resilience as the ability to work through and respond effectively to problems. Similarly, Harrison discussed skills, support, and knowledge as key aspects of a resilient response to problems. Rocket added another element to a resilient response that neither of the other mentors noted. That is, dealing with the emotions that may arise because of the disruption caused by life problems, including anxiety and feelings of inadequacy in response. Rocket discussed how a resilient response could include acknowledging any such negative feelings about the challenge, change and figuring out how to cope with those feelings or work through them as to respond effectively. However, all of these accounts reflect an understanding of resilience as a process (Southwick et al., 2014). All participants worked to support mentees in learning to be resilient persons by developing the skills to conceptualise their problems, access resources to enable effective responses, and gain support from the people around them. As a whole, this layered conceptualisation also reflects Cahill et al.'s (2014, p. 14) conceptualisation of resilience, which is conceptualised as: "The capacity to cope, learn and thrive in the face of change, challenge or adversity ... the ability to 'bounce back', recover or rebound from adversity, or as the ongoing and dynamic process of coping"

Each mentor differed somewhat in terms of the key elements they highlighted when conveying somewhat similar understandings of resilience as a process of effective adaptation and response to problems. The mentors' different responses seem to mirror that of literature (Werner, 2000; Olsson et al., 2015). For example, each mentor discussed different factors of resilience, but all mentioned social connections and personal outlook, which are the two most

noted factors in the literature. Mentors had similar perspectives, associating resilient with a successful life. All three agreed that the goal was to equip their mentees to be more effective in working through problems, adapting to challenging situations. Rocket saw a resilient outcome as a person being able to continue functioning well afterwards, or returning to a state of equilibrium. Her account resembled Olsson et al.'s (2015) conceptualisation of a resilient outcome as 'coping'. Buddy discussed the importance of a person feeling proud of how they worked through the problem, reflecting the positive feedback loop of self-efficacy building more self-efficacy. Werner (2000) refers to this type of outcome as 'thriving' or 'learning' from exercising resilience in the face of adversity.

If we were to combine all participant conceptualisations into one idea of resilience, it would be as follows: Resiliency is the ability to handle or work through challenges, problem, or change processes, or bounce back effectively. The chances of being able to cope and bounce back is related to mentees developing their personal skills of coping, knowledge of how to respond effectively to problems, and being supported in coping and developing adaptive strategies of problem response. Acknowledging, working through, and managing issues of self-doubt and associated emotions (e.g., anxiety) was acknowledged by all three participants as central to effective problem solving and meeting challenges effectively to return to a balanced state of functioning, with can feature feelings of pride and achievement. Throughout the three cases, we can see how each mentor emphasises the need to support their mentees to achieve a sense of resilience. Often, they do so through how participants engage in various activities together and how they respond to any emerging challenges.

Overall, examining the mentors' conceptualisations of resilience and mentoring has provided a grounded, lived understanding of how these participants have understood resilience and their roles as mentors. The way each participant has developed their own approach to mentoring without resilience-specific training from BBBSNZ is probably a recurring process that every mentor in the organisation has gone through. It may be beneficial for BBBSNZ to consider ways in which they can better equip their mentors for the uniqueness of their relationship and teach them about fostering resilience during initial training. Accounts such as the ones in this study could be used to evaluate and structure future training to better reflect the shared reality of these participants' experiences.

In this section, I have compared key elements of the three mentors' conceptualisation of youth mentoring and resilience. This comparative approach mirrors that of Bartlett and

Vavrus (2017) who suggest that comparison is done along various axes: horizontal, vertical, and historical. Bartlett and Vavrus (2017) discuss the process of case contrast utilised here as comparing along the horizontal axis, where we contrast one case with another while also tying in other external perspectives and insights across this comparison. This horizontal axis of comparison focuses on how similar phenomenon, in this case resilience and mentoring, unfold in distinct contexts which are both “socially produced (Massey, 2005) and complexly connected (Tsing, 2005).” (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017, p. 14). This discussion reveals how each mentor views these key concepts in shared and slightly unique ways. I found it helpful to keep each mentor’s conceptualisation separate within their individual cases and then bring these cases together comparatively. This chapter provides the opportunity to consider further the nuances of each person’s understanding and begin to think about the bigger picture of mentoring and its impact on the resilience of the mentees. Having comparatively discussed the different conceptualisations each mentor had about youth mentoring and resilience, the following section explores how each of the mentors understood their role in fostering the resilience of their mentees. This focus continues my exploration of the horizontal axis of comparison to deepen our understanding of how participating mentors foster resilience in their mentees. The different, yet complimentary approaches of each mentor mirror their shared, but divergent understandings of resilience discussed above. To recap, this parallel discussion highlights the way each person’s conceptualisation of resilience influences their approach to fostering it.

How Mentors Foster Resilience

The second question guiding this research related to how the mentors understood their role in terms of building resilience with their mentees. Asking participants to discuss their understanding of their role assisted in the development of mentee resilience brought further insights. These related to what participants saw as important for effective mentoring and how they each uniquely approached their mentoring relationships. Further, it also helped me avoid relying overly on my own assumptions (also informed by the literature I had read e.g. Rutter 1987; Werner, 2000; Windle, 2011) about how the mentors fostered resilience. Participant responses to this question also provided worked, practical exemplars about the diverse ways the mentors were assisting their mentee with difference aspects of resilience (Radley & Chamberlain, 2012). This question also revealed the scope of the mentor’s ability to foster

resilience, as they would often discuss what they were and were not able to do in their mentee's life (Eby et al., 2008; Drew & Spencer, 2021). Participant responses revealed additional factors influencing their mentee's resilience, such as family and environmental influences, that they were either working with or accepting that they would not be able to influence.

My aim in this section is to compare and discuss each mentor's account of how they foster resilience in their mentees. These accounts form the foundations of my attempt to develop an understanding of how participants thought their approaches and activities achieve resilient results with their mentees. As is evident from the three case chapters, each account of mentoring is different because each mentor and mentee combination is different, and these pairs often face different situations and issues. This section involves my taking a further step in the interpretative process I discussed in Chapter 2, where I go beyond each participant narrative to uncover the links between these mentors, further developing our understanding and interpretations of their participant stories (Kincheloe, 2005). I position these stories alongside each other to reveal the intricacies of mentoring as an adaptive social process for fostering resilience in young people (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017). The aim here is to use all three cases to develop a broad and contextual understanding of what fostering resilience looks like for these mentors.

Buddy shared how he focuses on the cultivation of problem-solving skills with his little brother. He uses real life situations they find themselves in, such as during fishing trips or when going for BMX rides, to help his little brother face a challenge and produce a solution to overcome the challenge. Buddy also provides opportunities for his little brother to engage in other activities such as theatre to expand his worldview and consider alternative life pathways. This is also a chance to build his network of people and opportunities, which has led to his little brother trying new things, like singing. Buddy also shared how his little brother has begun to volunteer more with BBBSNZ as one of their oldest mentees during training nights and community outreach events, which builds his resilience through social connection and community engagement (Zimmerman et al., 2013).

From Buddy's perspective, mentoring is not about providing the answer or solution, but rather teaching the mentee to engage in critical thinking so that they learn to solve problems and articulate plans for themselves. This approach relates well to the findings of Kuperminc et al. (2020), where they discuss how the positive outcomes of youth mentoring

are usually a result of the skills mentors teach their mentees. Ceja (2013) found that these skills help the mentees overcome difficulties and disadvantages in the future. Considering his little brother is now reaching adulthood, Buddy's approach represents a more hands-off, supportive role as his little brother begins to decide what he wants to do in life and how he wants to achieve this. This could be the result of the years of mentoring and role-modelling Buddy has already provided him with. Buddy's story is an example of how fostering resilience in such a practical, grounded way has shaped his little brother's approach to life and his personal development as he now becomes an adult.

Harrison's case provides a story of how Harrison is fostering resilience in his little brother primarily through the support and guidance he offers his little brother (Gilligan, 1999). Even though his little brother exists in a challenging environment, Harrison can teach him critical thinking skills and practical life skills, such as fiscal management. He also teaches his little brother problem-solving skills, through role modelling a thoughtful approach to issues going on around him. Emphasis is placed on the young man learning to decide how he would want to act and think in those situations, including his cousin's behaviour. As Keller (2007) points out, youth mentoring is based on the intuitive understanding that young people understand themselves and their world through their relationships with older adults. Harrison's position as a source of support for his little brother fosters resilience by also helping him cultivate his support network and by role modelling positive behaviours and worldviews (Day, 2006). In contrast to Buddy's case, Harrison's little brother is still quite young and still has many questions about the issues and situations going on around him. Harrison can foster resilience in him by teaching him early on in his life how to think critically about the people and issues around him and begin to think about what he wants his future to look like. Thus, this relationship reflects the early intervention aspect of youth mentoring that both reduces the likelihood of engagement in negative behaviours as well as increasing the chance of engaging in positive behaviours.

Rocket fosters resilience in her little sister's life by being an external support outside of the family. She sees herself as simply there for her little sister, ready to support her in whatever way that looks. Rocket's story sheds light on the importance of family on a young person's resilience. It also demonstrates how a significant support person can also foster resilience in a young person by being there to listen and support them (Luthar et al., 2000). Rocket's optimistic perspective of her little sister and family reveals how having someone like this in a young person's life can encourage them to have hope in themselves and self-

worth (Ye et al., 2016). Rocket tries to show her little sister that she cares about her and is invested in her life, thereby fostering resilience through that consistent source of support and encouragement. Rocket is also ready to adapt and be there for her little sister as she goes through changes in her life, such as beginning high school. Having that solid and reliable person in her life fosters her little sister's resilience by providing her with a person to go to with questions or concerns and receive care and advice from.

Rocket raised a relevant point to this discussion during the focus group about how resilience factors operate in a person's life can change as they changed as a person and what they have happening as their life develops. This perspective speaks to the need for a mentor to help a young person adapt to their situation and to foster relevant aspects of resilience in response to their needs (Spencer, 2021). Having a mentor to provide external support and an outside perspective can help a young person foster relevant factors of resilience in response to different challenges (Eby et al., 2008).

In this section, I discussed how the mentors view their role as mentors and how they foster resilience in their mentoring relationships. Each mentor approaches this slightly differently, which reveals the separate ways and opportunities there are for fostering resilience through mentoring. What this demonstrates is that when a person chooses to mentor and fully engage with their mentee and their life, they can offer support and guidance in specific ways that foster resilient factors such as problem-solving skills, communications skills, community engagement, increased network of support, and enhanced self-esteem and hope. These mentors all admitted that they had never specifically considered their actions or responses as fostering resilience, suggesting that resilience is a natural by-product of successful mentoring (Beltman & MacCallum, 2006). This suggests that if resilience were specifically focused on, these outcomes could be enhanced, and the mentors could have a more specific approach to how they handle the challenges and issues they encounter as mentors. Their insights about fostering resilience and how they have done so could be helpful for other mentors seeking guidance and direction about how to approach mentoring. In the next section, I discuss BBBSNZ's conceptualisation of resilience and how the mentors in this study view the merit of their training and ongoing development opportunities.

BBBSNZ and Organisational Influence on Participating Mentors

My final research question sought to understand how BBBSNZ influenced the mentors' understanding and practices for cultivating resilience with young people. Since the mentors did not receive resilience-specific training, they were not able to answer this question directly. However, watching the resilience training video during the focus group did provide an opportunity to discuss the merit of the video and how the mentors believed it could be better incorporated into any future training or ongoing development in the organisation. Participants also discussed the organisation in more general terms, talking about the benefits they have received from the meet ups and training nights that BBBSNZ have organised in the past. Overall, the mentors' feedback about BBBSNZ and the resilience video was proactive and encouraging, indicating that the organisation is doing well supporting their mentors and mentees.

In this section, I discuss insights and suggestions made during the focus group and within the interviews about BBBSNZ and the resilience video to demonstrate the merit of the mentors' training and ongoing development through the organisation. I begin by discussing the mentor's reactions to the resilience video during the focus group. This is followed by the suggestions made by the mentors regarding the video, such as ideas on how to distribute this among the mentors in an efficient manner and how its content could be better incorporated into the mentoring relationship. From there, I share the feedback about the organisation that the mentors gave, both in their interviews and during the focus group. This section provides the information and context necessary to develop the recommendations I make in the next section below, where I will bring together the information from this study to create recommendations for the future.

All the mentors agreed that the video would have been a helpful resource at the beginning of their training. References to specific factors when conceptualising resilience was also noted by Buddy as helpful for grounding resilience in real life. Rocket added that it would also be helpful to watch partway through the mentoring relationship once you have gotten to know your mentee. She suggested the video could be used as an opportunity for the mentor to reflect on the resilience factors that they do or do not see in their mentees and come up with some ideas about how to foster resilience more. Buddy agreed, saying that he would be happy to watch the video again to gain more insights.

Newburn & Shiner (2006) raise the issue of under-theorising and the lack of explicit models as reasons why mentoring programs do not see the outcomes they may be seeking.

Karcher et al. (2010) also found that mentors and mentoring organisations would benefit from clearer terminology about the mentoring relationship and expectations. By having such a clear model of resilience and making the mentors more aware of this model, it is possible that BBBSNZ would see a more consistent improvement in the resilience of their mentees. If the mentors have a clearer idea of what resilience means to the organisation and have ideas about how to foster resilience through their mentoring relationships, they may well see improved outcomes for these young people and a heightened sense of self-efficacy among mentors.

Rocket suggested that the video could be sent out as a link for mentors to click on and watch in their own time so that the training sessions still have space to prepare the mentors for any negative or difficult situations. She suggested this link could be sent out before the training so that the mentors could watch it before meeting with the facilitators and other mentors to encourage a discussion about it during the training. Improving the accessibility of this video would be beneficial for the reasons discussed above and, considering this video was not seen by the mentors before the focus group, it appears to be a tool being under-utilised right now.

As noted above, the mentors' feedback about the organisation was positive. Buddy highlighted the motivation and passion of the workers to encourage the mentors and mentees to get together and spend time as a larger group. Rocket discussed how she and her little sister had enjoyed going on a nature walk with the other Big and Little Sisters as it gave them both a chance to chat to other mentors and mentees. Harrison added to this saying it helps normalise the relationship for his little brother by seeing other mentoring relationships within the organisation. Here we can see the emphasis BBBSNZ places on improving relationship quality, which is one of the strongest predictors of the success of a mentoring match. As Benard (2002, p. 27) points out, the "successful development and transformative power (of mentoring) exists not in the program per se, but at the deeper level of the relationships."

Rocket put forward the idea that it might be worth having parents watch the video as well so that they can be on the same page as the mentors about the young person's development. Buddy agreed with this idea, saying it could also encourage consistency between the parents and the mentor in terms of supporting the mentees in the program. This is an idea shared by DeWit et al. (2016) who suggested that mentoring programmes would benefit from parental involvement in the ongoing training sessions and outings. Keller (2005, p.169) phrased this as recognising the "mutually reinforcing (or inhibiting) network of

relationships” within a child’s life and working with a more holistic perspective. As the mentors in this study point out, this would improve the consistency of expectations between the parents and mentors about the purpose of the mentoring relationship and could help them incorporate these factors of resilience into the child’s life at home.

Even though Harrison and Buddy could not remember the specifics of the training received, Rocket had undergone the training more recently and could recall specific details about how the training was run. Despite the difference in how much they each remembered about the training, all of the mentors demonstrated a high level of self-efficacy as mentors and referred to things they remembered from the training when discussing their approaches. This indicates that the training may aid self-efficacy in mentors and made them feel ready for their mentoring relationship (Parra et al., 2001). Rocket said that she really enjoyed the training, saying that it was interactive and engaging, with a good balance of fact-based discussion as well as stories from the facilitators’ experience to ground the teaching in real-life scenarios. For example, all three mentors raised the point during their interviews that they recognised that they were not alternative parents for their mentees. Rocket attributed this self-positioning to the clear boundaries they were taught during their training about their involvement with the family. This includes how mentors cannot be part of any punishments at home or how they should not feel responsible for making sure the child finishes their homework. Rocket believed that not only does this take a pressure off mentors, but it also sends a message to the child that no matter how things are going at home, their relationship was separate and would not be affected.

All the mentors raised their struggles to be able to attend the ongoing training sessions available to the mentors due to work and life commitments. Buddy mentioned how this can be a bit frustrating. Harrison also pointed out that he would not even know what training he is missing out on and if it was something that could have been helpful for him and his little brother. While he does feel prepared as a mentor, he cannot know what he does not know. These training nights consist of one hour of engaging a specific topic, such as introducing and educating the mentors to organisations that offer help for young people. They also feature one hour of socialising and networking, which provides the mentors with a chance to swap ideas and ask for advice from each other. Parra et al. (2017) specifically highlight ongoing training for mentors as a strong predictor of relationship success, suggesting that this inability to attend the meetings is something that should be addressed. It is possible that BBBSNZ should consider alternative ways of sharing this information with mentors who are unable to attend,

perhaps by recording the sessions and sending this recording out for mentors to watch in their own time.

In this section, I discussed the mentors' perceptions of BBBSNZ and the training and support the organisation offers mentors. The mentors had a lot to contribute in terms of praise for the ways the organisation trained them and continues to foster their relationships with their mentees. They also provided much food for thought about ways the organisation could improve their service delivery and promote the resilience-fostering aspect of the mentoring relationship. These participants appreciate the support they do receive from the organisation but could think of ways this could be improved considering common obstacles or factors in a mentor's life. Key considerations included work and life commitments preventing them from attending ongoing training. This conversation was a constructive and positive one, offering practical and grounded suggestions for recommendations for the organisation.

Recommendations

To follow, I pose recommendations anchored in key insights from the accounts of mentors participating in this research and are informed by previous research. All recommendations relate specifically to the practice of youth mentoring and aim to assist mentors and mentoring organisations with their practices. As mentioned in Chapter 2, I have shared a policy brief (see Appendix E) based on insights this research with BBBSNZ. This chapter offers general recommendations that relate to youth mentoring practices in a broader sense. First, I discuss how mentoring organisations need to keep developing a practice-grounded and contextually orientated approach to mentor development to better reflect the unique approaches different mentors take into and develop through their mentoring relationships. Second, I discuss how mentoring organisations could make training and ongoing development of their mentors more accessible to encourage more consistent engagements from mentors. Third, I address the point raised by Harrison about the barriers for men choosing to mentor and how these barriers could be overcome. Fourth, I discuss the benefit of making the discoveries of studies such as this one more public to improve community awareness of the benefit of mentoring programmes such as BBBSNZ. Finally, I consider the point initially raised by Rocket and further confirmed by the other mentors about the benefit of including parents and family in the mentoring process.

The unique approach to mentoring narrated by each mentor demonstrates the value of engaging in more contextual, practice-focused approaches to the further development of effective practices (Evans & Ave, 2000; DuBois et al., 2002; Karcher et al., 2006; Raposa et al., 2019). As emphasised throughout this thesis, each mentoring situation can be different and can only be assisted so much by general tips and guidelines, especially when these emerge from different cultures (Faruggia et al., 2011; Green, 2017). As the mentors agreed during the focus group, being able to get together and swap stories and advice has been incredibly helpful for their development as mentors. Mentoring organisations and their training and ongoing development programs may consider adopting more of a contextual approach to their mentors' development. This involves creating further spaces (including online), whereby the mentors can share the approaches and learning they have gained with their little brothers or sisters. As Ramani et al. (2006, p. 405) put it, "Mentors need a forum to express their uncertainties and problems." This mutual support group approach, facilitated by senior mentors and assisted by external experts in particular fields, can help other mentors adapt to their own situations in a positive and sustainable way.

This recommendation is not necessarily a new one. Weller et al (2014) called for more focus to be placed on the mentors' perceptions and strategies to guide and promote successful experiences for other mentors. Within the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, Evans & Ave (2000) encouraged mentoring organisations to take a considered approach to the development of their programmes so that they would better suit the unique culture of Aotearoa New Zealand. Taking a more contextually informed approach to the ongoing training of youth mentors would allow BBBSNZ and other mentoring organisations to ground their principles and training within the culture and values of their mentors, thus promoting a successful experience for the mentor and positive outcomes for the mentee (Weller et al., 2014).

In relation to the networking and training nights discussed above, the mentors discussed the difficulty attending these nights due to work and life commitments. Strauss et al. (2013) found that an inconsistency of training among mentors results in an inconsistency of mentoring effects and approaches, which could result in a negative experience for the mentee. It may be beneficial for this mentoring organisation to consider how they can make these events and the information shared during these more accessible to all the mentors. Recently, mentoring organisations have been exploring online training as an alternative to in-person training to improve mentoring outcomes (Garcia-Melgar, 2018; Rogers et al., 2022).

Rogers et al. (2022) found that providing this alternative increased the number of training hours among mentors, which was positively associated with mentoring outcomes. This association indicates that more training does improve mentoring outcomes. However, Rogers et al. (2022) point out some issues with adopting online approaches, such as the loss of conversation opportunities and the ability of participants to request further clarification. Therefore, perhaps the best way for mentoring organisations to utilise online training would be to record and upload presentations or information from the training nights online for any mentors unable to attend these nights and continue to offer them in-person as well. This would also ensure that the networking aspect of the training nights is not lost.

This study included two male mentors who spoke about their experiences. Whilst generally positive about their experiences, male mentors remain comparatively scarce within youth mentoring organisations (Henderson et al., 2022a; Soklaridis et al., 2018). Harrison proposed that feedback he receives from his male friends about why they do not mentor is that they are nervous about being alone with a child due to dominant social narratives and media portrayals about such situations that can be stigmatizing for men (Hodgetts & Rua, 2008). Harrison proposed that it would be helpful for society to work on changing this stigmatising narrative as part of a broader processes of removing barriers for men wanting to become mentors and positive role models in boys' lives. This is a complicated issue, and one that is not well researched or discussed. I was unable to find any articles or studies directly addressing this issue of detrimental social narratives or assumptions that stop men from mentoring young people. When Henderson et al. (2022a) engaged in a systematic literature search on voluntary male adult mentoring using five academic databases, they were only able to find 29 relevant publications. However, in a later study consisting of semi-structured interviews with male mentors, Henderson et al. (2022b) made the point that it is stories like theirs that challenge masculine gender norms and change narratives about socially appropriate behaviour (Adegbosin et al., 2019). Hodgetts & Rua (2010) support this notion through their critical consideration of the role media portrayal of masculinity impacts men's lives. They suggest that since masculinity is a social construct, it can be challenged through the portrayal of men engaging in positive social activities, such as youth mentoring. There is no simple solution to this problem of the lack of male mentors. However, promoting and sharing stories like Buddy's and Harrison's may assist in empowering men to engage in mentoring and change the social narrative about male mentoring.

Along similar lines of thought, it may be beneficial to improve community awareness of the benefits of mentoring organisations such as BBBSNZ for mentors and mentees (Tierney, 1995). BBBSNZ does advertise their need for mentors. Harrison's report of hearing an advertisement for mentors on the radio and Rocket mentioning that she learned about the program via a Facebook post attests to that fact. Promoting the purpose and outcomes of youth mentoring may assist mentoring organisations further. By normalising an intervention approach such as youth mentoring, more people may consider becoming mentors. This would also assist in the shift of social narrative about male mentors by normalising men getting involved in mentoring programmes. All three mentors had positive experiences with the organisation and their mentoring relationships. These positive experiences could be shared more broadly to encourage the community to engage in a more active way with young people.

Finally, another aspect of healthy mentoring in New Zealand could be the more formal inclusion of family in the mentoring relationship. Rocket's story has brought forward the value of a strong family in the life of a young person. Correspondingly, Rocket proposed that she struggled to figure out what her role was when there were already so many positive adult role models in her little sister's life. Though she did eventually realise that her role was to be an external source of support outside of the family, she still values the support of that family, having now met many of the aunts and uncles and grandparents. It is possible that mentoring in New Zealand should reflect the whanau value within our eclectic culture, embracing the support of families and working with them to provide the young person with a consistent, connected network of support. Organisations such as BBBSNZ may benefit from exploring ways to incorporate this within their training and ongoing support and social events (DeWit et al., 2016).

This section presents five recommendations based on insights from this study to assist mentoring organisations. These recommendations are specifically aimed at mentoring organisations because the purpose of this study is not only to learn more about how mentors foster resilience. Recommendations reflect the practice-focused approach of both the study and the mentors' insights and could also assist organisations in designing programmes and practices that promote this aspect of the mentoring relationship. It is also aligned with the collaborative and transformative values discussed in Chapter 3 (Drew, 2006), where I use the findings and discussions of this study to give back to the organisation by highlighting their

strengths and suggesting ways they can further empower and support their mentors. Below, I will provide a concluding statement as a close for this study.

Concluding Statement

This thesis documents mentor experiences of fostering resilience in young people. When so much of the literature on resilience emphasizes the importance of social relationships and support (Vance, 2002; Hoss & Graydon, 2008; Maldonado et al., 2008; Goodrich, 2020), it is vital to consider how we can utilise social relationships to build resilient outcomes in young people. When done well and with care, mentoring can provide young people with a supportive adult in their lives who can assist them in their development (Day, 2006; Southwick et al., 2007; Greeson, 2013). In today's socio-economic climate, where there are various stressors in the lives of many young people, such as personal struggles, political unrest, online pressures, and global events such as the pandemic, it is important to ensure that these young people have the support and guidance necessary to foster their resilience. The need for more preventative measures in supporting the positive development of young people has been well documented (Osterling & Hines, 2006; Cavell et al., 2009). Engaging with a mentoring service such as BBBSNZ can provide such preventative measures and give a young person and their family the support they need. Though there are arguments in the literature for the benefits of mentoring for a variety of factors, in this study, I have argued specifically for the benefit of mentoring for fostering resilience. Recognising the positive influence of a mentor and their ability to be a source of resilience is important for the development of society and creating communities of support and care.

In closing, greater emphasis should be placed in public discourse on the importance of mentoring organisations such as BBBSNZ and their training of mentors. BBBSNZ must compete with a range of other social services to gain the funds necessary to maintain their service, and this has resulted in a reduced ability to expand their reach to vulnerable youth. Additionally, they struggle to recruit people to become mentors, making it difficult to create matches for the children and families who are looking for one. Building the sustainability of such organisations could assist the young people of New Zealand to build their resilience as well as providing a chance for adults to perform such prosocial roles. In this thesis, I have attempted to shed more light on the benefits of mentoring for both the mentor and the mentee, with the intention of assisting the organisation in their work. As mentioned, a policy brief

was written for BBBSNZ to communicate the recommendations that I developed considering the findings of this thesis. This policy brief is provided below (see Appendix E).

References

- Abbott, A. (1992). What do cases do? Some notes on activity in sociological analysis. In C. C. Ragin & H. S. Becker (Eds.), *What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry* (pp. 53-82). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Adegbosin, A. E., Plummer, D., Yau, M., Franklin, R., Cordier, R., & Sun, J. (2019). Larrikins? Wowsers? Hipsters? Snags? What does it mean to be a 'real man' in modern-day Australia?. *Journal of Sociology*, 55(3), 551-570. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1440783319837601>
- Afifi, T. D. (2018). Individual/relational resilience. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46(1), 5-9. <https://doi-org/10.1080/00909882.2018.1426707>
- Ahern, N. R., Kiehl, E. M., Lou Sole, M., & Byers, J. (2006). A review of instruments measuring resilience. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, 29(2), 103-125. <https://doi-org/10.1080/01460860600677643>
- Ali, M. M., Dwyer, D. S., Vanner, E. A., & Lopez, A. (2010). Adolescent propensity to engage in health risky behaviors: The role of individual resilience. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 7(5), 2161-2176. <https://doi-org/10.3390/ijerph7052161>
- Allen, T. D. (2003). Mentoring others: A dispositional and motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62(1), 134-154. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00046-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00046-5)
- Allison, E., Williams, M. Mentor Handbook. Mentoring Resource center. Wake Forest University, 2012: 14-28.
- Altschuler, E. (2013). Natural youth mentoring and resiliency in low-income adolescents (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1412726497?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>
- Alvord, M. K., & Grados, J. J. (2005). Enhancing resilience in children: A proactive approach. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 36(3), 238. <https://doi-org/10.1037/0735-7028.36.3.238>
- Arora, R., & Rangnekar, S. (2014). Workplace mentoring and career resilience: An empirical test. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 17(3), 205–220. <https://doi-org/10.1037/mgr0000021>

- Bandura, A. (2000). Self-efficacy: The foundation of agency. *Control of human behavior, mental processes, and consciousness: Essays in honor of the 60th birthday of August Flammer*, 16.
- Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2017). Comparative case studies: An innovative approach. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)*, 1(1).
<https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.1929>
- Basualdo-Delmonico, A. M., & Spencer, R. (2016). A parent's place: Parents', mentors' and program staff members' expectations for and experiences of parental involvement in community-based youth mentoring relationships. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 61, 6-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.11.021>
- Behzadi, M. A., & Noushadi, N. (2016). Prediction of critical thinking disposition based on mentoring among faculty members. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 8(2), 1964-1978. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jfas.v8i2s.145>
- Beltman, S., & MacCallum, J. (2006). Mentoring and the development of resilience: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 8(1), 21-32. <https://doi-org/10.1080/14623730.2006.9721898>
- Benard, B. (2002). From risk to resiliency: what schools can do. Portland, OR: Western Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities.
- Black, K., & Lobo, M. (2008). A conceptual review of family resilience factors. *Journal of Family Nursing*, 14(1), 33-55. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1074840707312237>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi-org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Brooks, R. B. (1994). Children at risk: Fostering resilience and hope. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 64(4), 545-553. <https://doi-org/10.1037/h0079565>
- Brown, W. K. (2004). Resiliency and the mentoring factor. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 13(2), 75.
- Bukko, D., Cardenas, J. M. M., & Coletto, R. (2019). Ripple Effects. *Journal of Transformative Leadership & Policy Studies*, 8(1), 7-29.
<https://doi.org/10.36851/jtlps.v8i1.1919>
- Cahill, H., Beadle, S., Farrelly, A., Forster, R., & Smith, K. (2014). Building resilience in children and young people. *Youth Research Centre, Melbourne Graduate School of Education, University of Malbourn*, 16-21.
https://web.archive.org/web/20180515053853id_/http://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/about/department/resiliencelitreview.pdf

- Carlson, J. L., Haffenden, R. A., Bassett, G. W., Buehring, W. A., Collins III, M. J., Folga, S. M., ... & Whitfield, R. G. (2012). *Resilience: Theory and Application* (No. ANL/DIS-12-1). Argonne National Lab.(ANL), Argonne, IL (United States).
- Cavell, T., DuBois, D., Karcher, M., Keller, T., & Rhodes, J. (2009). Strengthening mentoring opportunities for at-risk youth. *Policy Brief. Oakland, CA: The Mentoring Center*. http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/237
- Ceja, J. (2013). *Barriers, resiliency, leadership, mentoring and networking: Factors influencing the ascension of Latino/as to the superintendency of public school districts in California* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://hdl.handle.net/10211.9/2087>
- Chan, C. S., Rhodes, J. E., Howard, W. J., Lowe, S. R., Schwartz, S. E., & Herrera, C. (2013). Pathways of influence in school-based mentoring: The mediating role of parent and teacher relationships. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*(1), 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2012.10.001>
- Cherry, M. G., Fletcher, I., & O'Sullivan, H. (2013). Exploring the relationships among attachment, emotional intelligence and communication. *Medical Education, 47*(3), 317-325. <https://doi-org/10.1111/medu.12115>
- Cicchetti, D. (2013). Annual research review: Resilient functioning in maltreated children—past, present, and future perspectives. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 54*(4), 402-422. <https://doi-org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02608.x>
- Connor, K. M., & Zhang, W. (2006). Resilience: Determinants, measurement, and treatment responsiveness. *CNS Spectrums, 11*(S12), 5-12. <https://doi-org/10.1017/S1092852900025797>
- Cordingley, P. (2008). Research and evidence-informed practice: Focusing on practice and practitioners. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 38*(1), 37-52. <https://doi-org/10.1080/03057640801889964>
- Day, A. (2006). The power of social support: Mentoring and resilience. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 14*(4), 196. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/c09c15bc35d632963b5f0e160cc85230/1?cbl=33810&parentSessionId=PrLzEfEYCuHmUN61fOnfvowfDPSZLwRF5qZJL8JEdSM%3D&pq-origsite=gscholar&accountid=14574>
- Deutsch, N., Lawrence, E., & Henneberger, A. (2013). Social class. In D. DuBois, & M. Karcher (Eds.), *The SAGE Program on Applied Developmental Science: Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 175–189) (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412996907.n12>.

- Deutsch, N. L., & Spencer, R. (2009). Capturing the magic: Assessing the quality of youth mentoring relationships. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 2009(121), 47-70. <https://doi-org/10.1002/yd.296>
- DeWit, D. J., DuBois, D., Erdem, G., Larose, S., Lipman, E. L., & Spencer, R. (2016). Mentoring relationship closures in Big Brothers Big Sisters community mentoring programs: Patterns and associated risk factors. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 57(1-2), 60-72. <https://doi-org/10.1002/ajcp.12023>
- Distelberg, B., & Taylor, S. (2015). The roles of social support and family resilience in accessing healthcare and employment resources among families living in traditional public housing communities. *Child & Family Social Work*, 20(4), 494-506. <https://doi-org/10.1111/cfs.12098>
- Dondero, G. M. (1997). Mentors: Beacons of hope. *Adolescence*, 32(128), 881-887. <https://eric-ed-gov.ezproxy.massey.ac.nz/?id=EJ563650>
- Drew, A. L., & Spencer, R. (2021). Mentors' approach to relationship-building and the supports they provide to youth: A qualitative investigation of community-based mentoring relationships. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 121, 105846. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105846>
- Drew, N. (2006). The seagull imperative. *Australian Community Psychologist*, 18(1), 40-41. https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/sci__article/7/
- 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. <https://doi-org/10.1023/A:1014628810714>
- DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(2), 57-91. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1529100611414806>
- Dutton, H., Bullen, P., & Deane, K. (2017). Getting to the heart of it: understanding mentoring relationship quality from the perspective of program supervisors. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 26(4), 400-419. <https://doi-org/10.1080/13611267.2018.1530132>
- Dutton, H., Deane, K. L., & Bullen, P. (2018). Distal and experiential perspectives of relationship quality from mentors, mentees, and program staff in a school-based youth mentoring program. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 85, 53-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.12.008>

- Dzoba, N. (2014). Investigating mentors' perceptions of the effectiveness of using resiliency-building strategies within an at-risk adolescent intervention program. *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*, 488. <https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/488>
- Eady, M. J., & Rifenburg, J. M. (2023). More Hawk, Less Seagull: The Importance of Community-Led SoTL Research. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearning.11.21>
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(2), 254-267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.005>
- Egeland, B., Carlson, E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1993). Resilience as process. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5(4), 517-528. <https://doi-org/10.1017/S0954579400006131>
- Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Toronto: Collier Macmillan Canada.
- Ellis, B. J., Bianchi, J., Griskevicius, V., & Frankenhuis, W. E. (2017). Beyond risk and protective factors: An adaptation-based approach to resilience. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(4), 561-587. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1745691617693054>
- Emelo, R. (2006). Harnessing the power of assumptions. *Masterful Mentoring Newsletter*, Triple Creek Consulting.
- Evans, I. M., & Ave, K. T. (2000). Mentoring children and youth: Principles, issues, and policy implications for community programmes in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 29(1), 41.
- Farruggia, S. P., Bullen, P., Davidson, J., Dunphy, A., Solomon, F., & Collins, E. (2011). The Effectiveness of Youth Mentoring Programmes in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 40(3).
- Farruggia, S. P., Bullen, P., Solomon, F., Collins, E., & Dunphy, A. (2011). Examining the cultural context of youth mentoring: A systematic review. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 32, 237-251. <https://doi-org/10.1007/s10935-011-0258-4>
- Fathi-Ashtiani, A., Ejei, J., Khodapanahi, M. K., & Tarkhorani, H. (2007). Relationship between self-concept, self-esteem, anxiety, depression and academic achievement in adolescents. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 7(7), 955-1000. <http://eprints.bmsu.ac.ir/id/eprint/907>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>

- Frecknall, P., & Luks, A. (1992). An evaluation of parental assessment of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program in New York City. *Adolescence*, 27(107), 715.
- Fried, R. R., Karmali, S., Irwin, J. D., Gable, F. L., & Salmoni, A. (2018). Making the grade: Mentors' perspectives of a course-based, smart, healthy campus pilot project for building mental health resiliency through mentorship and physical activity. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 16(2), 84-98. <https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.853121979597746>
- Garcia-Melgar, A. (2018). Online learning strategies to recruit and train Student Mentors: Opportunities for development and integration with face-to-face strategies. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 12(1), A1-A14. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/531>
- Garnezy, N. (1991). Resiliency and vulnerability to adverse developmental outcomes associated with poverty. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 34(4), 416-430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764291034004003>
- Ghosh, R., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2013). Career benefits associated with mentoring for mentors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(1), 106-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.03.011>
- Gibb, S. (1994). Evaluating mentoring. *Education+ Training*.
- Gilligan, R. (1999). Enhancing the resilience of children and young people in public care by mentoring their talents and interests. *Child and Family Social Work*, 4, 187-196. <https://doi-org/10.1046/j.1365-2206.1999.00121.x>
- Goodenow, C. (1993). The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents: Scale development and educational correlates. *Psychology in the Schools*, 30(1), 79-90. [https://doi-org/10.1002/1520-6807\(199301\)30:1](https://doi-org/10.1002/1520-6807(199301)30:1)
- Gray, D. M. (2015). Mentoring for success: an evaluation of a middle school mentoring program. *The California State University*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10211.3/138225>
- Green, M. D. (2017). Mentoring Youth Across Cultures Incorporating Different Worldviews: A Zones of Proximal Exploration Model. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 26(4), 307-325. <https://doi-org/10.1080/15313204.2017.1344947>
- Greene, R. R., Galambos, C., & Lee, Y. (2004). Resilience theory: Theoretical and professional conceptualizations. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 8(4), 75-91. https://doi-org/10.1300/J137v08n04_05

- Greeson, J. K. (2013). Foster youth and the transition to adulthood: The theoretical and conceptual basis for natural mentoring. *Emerging Adulthood, 1*(1), 40-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696812467780>
- Griffin Jr, J. P., Holliday, R. C., Frazier, E., & Braithwaite, R. L. (2009). The BRAVE (Building Resiliency and Vocational Excellence) Program: Evaluation findings for a career-oriented substance abuse and violence preventive intervention. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 20*(3), 798-816. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.0.0174>.
- Grossman, J. B., & Tierney, J. P. (1998). Does mentoring work? An impact study of the Big Brothers Big Sisters program. *Evaluation Review, 22*(3), 403-426. <https://doi-org/10.1177/0193841X9802200304>
- Guryan, J., Christenson, S., Cureton, A., Lai, I., Ludwig, J., Schwarz, C., ... & Turner, M. C. (2021). The effect of mentoring on school attendance and academic outcomes: A randomized evaluation of the Check & Connect Program. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 40*(3), 841-882. <https://doi-org/10.1002/pam.22264>
- Haggard, D. L., Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2011). Who is a mentor? A review of evolving definitions and implications for research. *Journal of Management, 37*(1), 280-304. <https://doi-org/10.1177/0149206310386227>
- Hamilton, S. F., & Hamilton, M. A. (1992). Mentoring programs: Promise and paradox. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(7), 546.
- Handler, J. F., & Hasenfeld, Y. (1997). *We the poor people: Work, poverty, and welfare*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hass, M., & Graydon, K. (2009). Sources of resiliency among successful foster youth. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*(4), 457-463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2008.10.001>
- Hawkey, K. (1997). Roles, responsibilities, and relationships in mentoring: A literature review and agenda for research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(5), 325-335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487197048005002>
- Henderson, M., Hughes, M., Hurley, J., & Smith, G. (2022). A scoping review of voluntary male mentoring: Themes to connect adult men. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 30*(6), e3300-e3308. <https://doi-org/10.1111/hsc.13906>
- Henderson, M., Hughes, M., Hurley, J., & Smith, G. (2022). Voluntary male mentors' lived experience of social engagement with men in their community. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 30*(6), e6286-e6293. <https://doi-org/10.1111/hsc.14067>

- Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., & McMaken, J. (2011). Mentoring in schools: An impact study of Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring. *Child Development*, 82(1), 346-361. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01559.x>
- Herrera, C., Sipe, C. L., & McClanahan, W. S. (2000). Mentoring school-age children: Relationship development in community-based and school-based programs. *Office of Educational Research and Improvement*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED441066>
- Hodgetts, D., & Chamberlain, K. (2014). Analysing news media. In U. Flick (ed.), *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis* (pp. 380-393). London: Sage.
- Hodgetts, D., & Rua, M. (2008). Media and community anxieties about men's interactions with children. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 18(6), 527-542. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.965>
- Hodgetts, D., & Rua, M. (2010). What does it mean to be a man today?: Bloke culture and the media. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45, 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-009-9287-z>
- Hodgetts, D. J., & Stolte, O. E. E. (2012). Case-based research in community and social psychology: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 22(5), 379-389. <https://doi-org/10.1002/casp.2124>
- Hurd, N. M., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2010). Natural mentoring relationships among adolescent mothers: A study of resilience. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20(3), 789-809. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00660.x>
- Janssen, S., Van Vuuren, M., & De Jong, M. D. (2016). Informal mentoring at work: A review and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(4), 498-517. <https://doi-org/10.1111/ijmr.12069>
- Jones, R. L., Harris, R., & Miles, A. (2009). Mentoring in sports coaching: A review of the literature. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 14(3), 267-284. <https://doi-org/10.1080/17408980801976569>
- Joyce, S., Shand, F., Tighe, J., Laurent, S. J., Bryant, R. A., & Harvey, S. B. (2018). Road to resilience: a systematic review and meta-analysis of resilience training programmes and interventions. *BMJ Open*, 8(6), e017858. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017858>
- Karcher, M. J., & Nakkula, M. J. (2010). Youth mentoring with a balanced focus, shared purpose, and collaborative interactions. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 2010(126), 13-32. <https://doi-org/10.1002/yd.347>

- 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. <https://doi-org/10.1002/jcop.20125>
- Katz, M. (1994). From challenged childhood to achieving adulthood: Studies in resilience. *Chadder, May*, 8-11.
- Keller, T. E. (2005). A systemic model of the youth mentoring intervention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26(2), 169-188. <https://doi-org/10.1007/s10935-005-1850-2>
- Kincheloe, J. (2005). On to the next level: Continuing the conceptualization of the bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11, 323-350. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1077800405275056>.
- Kirkman, M. (2002). What's the plot? Applying narrative theory to research in psychology. *Australian Psychologist*, 37(1), 30-38. <https://doi-org/10.1080/00050060210001706646>
- Korhonen, M. (2007). Resilience: Overcoming challenges and moving on positively [Tittatuuniq: aniguatittiniq pijariatujunik amma sivumuagiarniq naggaittukkut]. *Ottawa: Ajunnginiq Centre, National Aboriginal Health Organization*. https://ruor.uottawa.ca/bitstream/10393/30325/1/2007_Inuit_Resilience_Book.pdf
- Kram, K. E. (1985). Improving the mentoring process. *Training & Development Journal*, 39(4), 40-43. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-24008-001>
- Kuperminc, G. P., Chan, W. Y., Hale, K. E., Joseph, H. L., & Delbasso, C. A. (2020). The role of school-based group mentoring in promoting resilience among vulnerable high school students. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 65(1-2), 136-148. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12347>
- Landefeld, T. (2009). Mentors and mentoring. In *Mentoring and Diversity* (pp. 11-17). Springer, New York, NY.
- Larson, R. (2006). Positive youth development, willful adolescents, and mentoring. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(6), 677-689. <https://doi-org/10.1002/jcop.20123>
- Ledbetter, P. B. (2003). *A study of the effect of mentoring on teen parents' school attendance, high school completion and aspirations to attend college* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/305249715?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>
- Lee, T. Y., Cheung, C. K., & Kwong, W. M. (2012). Resilience as a positive youth development construct: a conceptual review. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1100/2012/390450>

- Leugers, L. L. (2018). *The effects of mentoring and induction programs and personal resiliency on the retention of early career teachers* (Doctoral dissertation, Antioch University). http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=antioch154091272482252
- Levine Daniel, J., & Eckerd, A. (2019). Organizational sensegiving: Indicators and nonprofit signaling. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(2), 213-231. <https://doi-org/10.1002/nml.21383>
- Levine Daniel, J., & Eckerd, A. (2019). Organizational sensegiving: Indicators and nonprofit signaling. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(2), 213-231. <https://doi-org/10.1002/nml.21383>
- Liu, Y., & Wang, X. (2023, July). A Neural Network Approach to Explaining Donation Behavior. In *2023 3rd International Conference on Public Management and Intelligent Society (PMIS 2023)* (pp. 88-95). Atlantis Press.
- Lou, Y., Taylor, E. P., & Di Folco, S. (2018). Resilience and resilience factors in children in residential care: A systematic review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 89, 83-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.04.010>
- Low, R., King, S., & Foster-Boucher, C. (2019). Learning to bounce back: A scoping review about resiliency education. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 58(6), 321-329. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20190521-02>
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*, 71(3), 543-562. <https://doi-org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164>
- Maldonado, N. L., Quarles, A., Lacey, C. H., & Thompson, S. D. (2008). Mentoring at-risk adolescent girls: listening to ‘Little Sisters’. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(2), 223-234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611260801916721>
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. London: Sage.
- Masten, A. S., & Barnes, A. J. (2018). Resilience in children: Developmental perspectives. *Children*, 5(7), 98. <https://doi-org/10.3390/children5070098>
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227>
- Masten, A. S. (2014). Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Development*, 85(1), 6-20. <https://doi-org/10.1111/cdev.12205>
- Masten, A. S. (2018). Resilience theory and research on children and families: Past, present, and promise. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 10(1), 12-31. <https://doi-org/10.1111/jftr.12255>

- Mattingly, C. (1991). Narrative reflections on practical actions: Two learning experiments in reflective storytelling. In D. A. Schön (Ed.), *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice* (pp. 235-257). New York: Teachers College Press
- McCubbin, M., Balling, K., Possin, P., Frierdich, S., & Bryne, B. (2002). Family resiliency in childhood cancer. *Family relations*, 51(2), 103-111. <https://doi-org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2002.00103.x>
- McMahon, B. J. (2007). Resilience factors and processes: No longer at risk. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2). <https://doi.org/10.11575/ajer.v53i2.55258>
- Mech, E. V., Pryde, J. A., & Rycraft, J. R. (1995). Mentors for adolescents in foster care. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 12, 317-328. <https://doi-org/10.1007/BF01875982>
- Miller, A. (2007). Best practices for formal youth mentoring. In T.D. Allen, & L.T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring* (pp. 307 - 324). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell
- Moodie, M. L., & Fisher, J. (2009). Are youth mentoring programs good value-for-money? An evaluation of the Big Brothers Big Sisters Melbourne Program. *BMC Public Health*, 9(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-9-41>
- Mucci, J. M. (2009). Mentoring towards resilient thought. *Critical and Creative Thinking Capstones Collection*. 214. https://scholarworks.umb.edu/cct_capstone/214
- Murray, R. B. (2002). Mentoring: Perceptions of the process and its significance. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services*, 40(4), 44-51. <https://doi-org/10.3928/0279-3695-20020401-13>
- Naglieri, J. A., LeBuffe, P. A., & Ross, K. M. (2013). Measuring resilience in children: From theory to practice. *Handbook of Resilience in Children*, 241-259. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4614-3661-4_14
- Nakkula, M. J., & Harris, J. T. (2014). Assessing mentoring relationships. In D. DuBois, & M. Karcher (Eds.), *The SAGE Program on Applied Developmental Science: Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 45–62) (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412996907.n12>
- Newburn, T., & Shiner, M. (2006). Young people, mentoring and social inclusion. *Youth Justice*, 6(1), 23-41. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1473225406063450>
- Newman, T., & Blackburn, S. (2002). Transitions in the Lives of Children and Young People: Resilience Factors. *Interchange*, 78. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED472541>

- Noddings, N. (2007). Caring as relation and virtue in teaching. *Working virtue: Virtue ethics and contemporary moral problems*, 41-60.
- Noonan, K., Bullen, P., & Farruggia, S. P. (2012). School-based mentoring: Examining the cultural and economic variations in engagement and effectiveness. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(1), 47-64. <https://doi-org/10.3316/informit.671335563666698>
- Nowicki, A. (2008). *Self-efficacy, sense of belonging and social support as predictors of resilience in adolescents*. Edith Cowan University. https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses_hons/1155
- Oliver, K. G., Collin, P., Burns, J., & Nicholas, J. (2006). Building resilience in young people through meaningful participation. *Australian e-Journal for the advancement of Mental Health*, 5(1), 34-40. <https://doi-org/10.5172/jamh.5.1.34>
- Olsson, L., Jerneck, A., Thoren, H., Persson, J., & O'Byrne, D. (2015). Why resilience is unappealing to social science: Theoretical and empirical investigations of the scientific use of resilience. *Science advances*, 1(4), e1400217. <https://doi-org/10.1126/sciadv.1400217>
- Ong, A. D., Bergeman, C. S., Bisconti, T. L., & Wallace, K. A. (2006). Psychological resilience, positive emotions, and successful adaptation to stress in later life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(4), 730–749. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.4.730>
- Osterling, K. L., & Hines, A. M. (2006). Mentoring adolescent foster youth: Promoting resilience during developmental transitions. *Child & Family Social Work*, 11(3), 242-253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2006.00427.x>
- Ozbay, F., Fitterling, H., Charney, D., & Southwick, S. (2008). Social support and resilience to stress across the life span: a neurobiologic framework. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 10(4), 304-310. <https://doi-org/10.1007/s11920-008-0049-7>
- Ozbay, F., Johnson, D. C., Dimoulas, E., Morgan Iii, C. A., Charney, D., & Southwick, S. (2007). Social support and resilience to stress: from neurobiology to clinical practice. *Psychiatry (Edgmont)*, 4(5), 35. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2921311/>
- Park, H., Liao, M., & Crosby, S. D. (2017). The impact of Big Brothers Big Sisters programs on youth development: An application of the model of homogeneity/diversity relationships. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 82, 60-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.09.009>

- Park, H., Yoon, J., & Crosby, S. D. (2016). A pilot study of big brothers big sisters programs and youth development: An application of critical race theory. *Children and Youth Services Review, 61*, 83-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.12.010>
- Parra, G. R., DuBois, D. L., Neville, H. A., Pugh-Lilly, A. O., & Povinelli, N. (2002). Mentoring relationships for youth: Investigation of a process-oriented model. *Journal of community psychology, 30*(4), 367-388. <https://doi-org/10.1002/jcop.10016>
- Penner, L. A., Craiger, J. P., Fritzsche, B. A., & Freifeld, T. S. (2014). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J.N. Butcher & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (pp. 147-164). Psychology Press. <https://doi-org/10.4324/9781315806228>
- Philip, K., & Hendry, L. B. (2000). Making sense of mentoring or mentoring making sense? Reflections on the mentoring process by adult mentors with young people. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 10*(3), 211-223. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1298\(200005/06\)10:3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1298(200005/06)10:3)
- Philip, K. L., Shucksmith, J. S., & King, C. (2004). Sharing a laugh? A qualitative study of mentoring interventions with young people. Unknown Publisher.
- Pryce, J., & Keller, T. E. (2012). An investigation of volunteer-student relationship trajectories within school-based youth mentoring programs. *Journal of Community Psychology, 40*(2), 228-248. <https://doi-org/10.1002/jcop.20487>
- Rabe, K. S. (2018). *Cross-age peer mentoring: A case study of resiliency building relationships* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2070573280?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>
- Radley, A., & Chamberlain, K. (2012). The study of the case: Conceptualising case study research. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 22*(5), 390-399. <https://doi-org/10.1002/casp.1106>
- Ramani, S., Gruppen, L., & Kachur, E. K. (2006). Twelve tips for developing effective mentors. *Medical Teacher, 28*(5), 404-408. <https://doi-org/10.1080/01421590600825326>
- Raposa, E. B., Rhodes, J., Stams, G. J. J., Card, N., Burton, S., Schwartz, S., ... & Hussain, S. (2019). The effects of youth mentoring programs: A meta-analysis of outcome studies. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48*, 423-443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-00982-8>

- Raymond, I. J., Iasiello, M., Jarden, A., & Kelly, D. M. (2018). Resilient futures: An individual and system-level approach to improve the well-being and resilience of disadvantaged young Australians. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 4(3), 228. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000169>
- Rhodes, J., & Lowe, S. R. (2008). Youth mentoring and resilience: Implications for practice. *Child Care in Practice*, 14(1), 9-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13575270701733666>
- Rhodes, J. (2005). A Model of Youth Mentoring. In D. DuBois, & M. Karcher (Eds.), *The SAGE Program on Applied Developmental Science: Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 30–43) (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412996907.n12>
- Rhodes, J. E., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Mentoring relationships and programs for youth. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(4), 254-258. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20183295>
- Rhodes, J. E., Spencer, R., Keller, T. E., Liang, B., & Noam, G. (2006). A model for the influence of mentoring relationships on youth development. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(6), 691-707. <https://doi-org/10.1080/13575270701733666>
- Rhodes, J.E. (2002). Stand by me: The risks and rewards of mentoring today's youth. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Roberts, H., Liabo, K., Lucas, P., DuBois, D., & Sheldon, T. A. (2004). Mentoring to reduce antisocial behaviour in childhood. *BMJ*, 328(7438), 512-514. <https://doi-org/10.1136/bmj.328.7438.512>
- Rogers, J., Gong, X., Byars-Winston, A., McDaniels, M., Thayer-Hart, N., Cheng, P., ... & Pfund, C. (2022). Comparing the outcomes of face-to-face and synchronous online research mentor training using propensity score matching. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 21(4), ar62. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.21-12-0332>
- Royse, D. (1998). Mentoring high-risk minority youth: Evaluation of the Brothers Project. *Adolescence*, 33(129), 145.
- Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57(3), 316-331. <https://doi-org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1987.tb03541.x>
- Rutter, M. (1989). Pathways from childhood to adult life. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 30(1), 23-51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1989.tb00768.x>
- Rutter, M. (2012). Resilience as a dynamic concept. *Development and Psychopathology*, 24(2), 335-344. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579412000028>

- Ryan, A. (2015). *Exploring the Influence of Mentoring on the Resiliency of Alberta's Foster Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Calgary (Canada)).
<https://prism.ucalgary.ca/server/api/core/bitstreams/09dd3078-7911-46df-8ea2-3c8da7ba817c/content>
- Salisu, I., & Hashim, N. (2017). A critical review of scales used in resilience research. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(4), 23-33. <https://doi-org/10.9790/487X-1904032333>
- Sameroff, A. J., & Rosenblum, K. L. (2006). Psychosocial constraints on the development of resilience. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1094(1), 116-124.
<https://doi-org/10.1196/annals.1376.010>
- Sanders, J., Munford, R., Thimasarn-Anwar, T., & Liebenberg, L. (2017). Validation of the child and youth resilience measure (CYRM-28) on a sample of at-risk New Zealand youth. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 27(7), 827-840. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1049731515614102>
- Schatz, E. (1999). Mentors: Matchmaking for young people. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 11(2), 67-87. <https://doi.org/10.4219/jsge-1999-617>
- Schwartz, S., & van Dam, L. (2020). Cultivation of natural mentors to strengthen resiliency in youth: A program theory of Youth Initiated Mentoring (YIM). *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*, 29(1), 3-20.
- Searby, L. (2009). "But I Thought..." An examination of assumptions in the mentoring relationship. *Adult Learning*, 20(1-2), 10-13.
- Secombe, K. (2002). "Beating the odds" versus "changing the odds": Poverty, resilience, and family policy. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(2), 384-394. <https://doi-org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00384.x>
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1995). The effectiveness of psychotherapy: The *Consumer Reports* study. *American Psychologist*, 50(12), 965-974. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.50.12.965>
- Simeon, D., Yehuda, R., Cunill, R., Knutelska, M., Putnam, F. W., & Smith, L. M. (2007). Factors associated with resilience in healthy adults. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 32(8-10), 1149-1152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2007.08.005>
- Sippel, L. M., Pietrzak, R. H., Charney, D. S., Mayes, L. C., & Southwick, S. M. (2015). How does social support enhance resilience in the trauma-exposed individual?. *Ecology and Society*, 20(4). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26270277>

- Small, M. L. (2009). How many cases do I need?' On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research. *Ethnography, 10*(1), 5-38. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1466138108099586>
- Smith, C., & Carlson, B. E. (1997). Stress, coping, and resilience in children and youth. *Social Service Review, 71*(2), 231-256. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/604249>
- Smith-Osborne, A., & Whitehill Bolton, K. (2013). Assessing resilience: A review of measures across the life course. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work, 10*(2), 111-126. <https://doi-org/10.1080/15433714.2011.597305>
- Soklaridis, S., Zahn, C., Kuper, A., Gillis, D., Taylor, V. H., & Whitehead, C. (2018). Men's fear of mentoring in the# MeToo era—what's at stake for academic medicine. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 379*(23), 2270-2274. https://www.east.org/content/documents/nejmms1805743_mens_fear_of_mentoring_in_the_metro_era_whats_at_stake_for_academic_medicine.pdf
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 5*(1), 25338. <https://doi-org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338>
- Southwick, S. M., Morgan III, C. A., Vythilingam, M., & Charney, D. (2007). Mentors enhance resilience in at-risk children and adolescents. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 26*(4), 577-584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07351690701310631>
- Spencer, R., Basualdo-Delmonico, A., & Lewis, T.O. (2011) Working to make it work: The role of parents in the youth mentoring process. *Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(1), 51-59. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20416>
- Spencer, R., Collins, M. E., Ward, R., & Smashnaya, S. (2010). Mentoring for young people leaving foster care: Promise and potential pitfalls. *Social work, 55*(3), 225-234. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/55.3.225>
- Spencer, R. (2006). Understanding the mentoring process between adolescents and adults. *Youth & Society, 37*(3), 287-315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558405278263>
- Spencer, R. (2007). "It's not what I expected" A qualitative study of youth mentoring relationship failures. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 22*(4), 331-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558407301915>
- Stake, R. E. (2013). *Multiple case study analysis*. Guilford Press.

- Stein, M. (2008). Resilience and young people leaving care. *Child Care in Practice*, 14(1), 35-44. <https://doi-org/10.1080/13575270701733682>
- Stewart, C., & Openshaw, L. (2014). Youth mentoring: What is it and what do we know?. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 11(4), 328-336. <https://doi-org/10.1080/10911359.2014.897102>
- Straus, S. E., Johnson, M. O., Marquez, C., & Feldman, M. D. (2013). Characteristics of successful and failed mentoring relationships: A qualitative study across two academic health centers. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 88(1), 82. <https://doi-org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e31827647a0>
- Styles, M. B., & Morrow, K. V. (1992). *Understanding how youth and elders form relationships: A study of four linking lifetimes programs*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Sulimani-Aidan, Y., & Tayri-Schwartz, T. (2021). The role of natural mentoring and sense of belonging in enhancing resilience among youth in care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 120, 105773. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105773>
- Szabo, S., Lloyd, B., McKellar, D., Myles, H., Newton, H., Schutz, J., ... & Galletly, C. (2019). 'Having a mentor helped me with difficult times': a trainee-run mentoring project. *Australasian Psychiatry*, 27(3), 230-233. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1039856218822735>
- Taylor, A. S., & Porcellini, L. (2013). Family involvement. *Handbook of Youth Mentoring*, 2, 457-468.
- Tierney, J. P. (1995). Making a Difference. An Impact Study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters.
- Tiet, Q. Q., Huizinga, D., & Byrnes, H. F. (2010). Predictors of resilience among inner city youths. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 19, 360-378. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-009-9307-5>
- Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An ethnography of global connections*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ungar, M. (2008). Resilience across cultures. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 38(2), 218-235. <https://doi-org/10.1093/bjsw/bcl343>
- Ungar, M. (2013). Resilience after maltreatment: The importance of social services as facilitators of positive adaptation. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37(2-3), 110-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.08.004>
- Van Breda, A. D. (2018). A critical review of resilience theory and its relevance for social work. *Social Work*, 54(1), 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15270/54-1-611>

- Vance, J. E. (2002). Mentoring to facilitate resiliency in high-risk youth. *Community treatment for youth: Evidence-based interventions for severe emotional and behavioral disorders*, 139-153.
- Wagnild, G. M., & Collins, J. A. (2009). Assessing resilience. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services*, 47(12), 28-33. <https://doi-org/10.3928/02793695-20091103-01>
- Walsh, F. (1998). Beliefs, spirituality, and transcendence: Keys to family resilience. In M. McGoldrick (Ed.), *Re-visioning family therapy: Race, culture, and gender in clinical practice* (pp. 62–77). The Guilford Press.
- Weiler, L. M., Zarich, K. J., Haddock, S. A., Krafchick, J. L., & Zimmerman, T. S. (2014). A comprehensive model of mentor experiences: Perceptions, strategies, and outcomes. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 42(5), 593-608. <https://doi-org/10.1002/jcop.21640>
- Werner, E. E. (1993). Risk, resilience, and recovery: Perspectives from the Kauai Longitudinal Study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5(4), 503-515. <https://doi-org/10.1017/S095457940000612X>
- Werner, E. E. (1995). Resilience in development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(3), 81-84. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.massey.ac.nz/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772327>
- Werner, E. E. (2000). Protective factors and individual resilience. *Handbook of Early Childhood Intervention*, 2, 115-132.
- Widuroyekti, B., Widyani, I. P., Hartanti, J., & Bergsma, L. N. (2023). Contribution of Self-Concept and Learning Independence to the Resilience of Students in Open University. *IJORER: International Journal of Recent Educational Research*, 4(2), 213-222. <https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v4i2.335>
- Wierenga, A., Wood, A., Trenbath, G., Kelly, J., & Vidakovic, O. (2003). *Sharing a new story: Young people in decision-making*. Australian Youth Research Centre, the University of Melbourne.
- Windle, G., Bennett, K. M., & Noyes, J. (2011). A methodological review of resilience measurement scales. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 9(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-9-8>
- Windle, G. (2011). What is resilience? A review and concept analysis. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology*, 21(2), 152-169. <https://doi-org/10.1017/S0959259810000420>

- Wittrup, A. R., Hussain, S. B., Albright, J. N., Hurd, N. M., Varner, F. A., & Mattis, J. S. (2019). Natural mentors, racial pride, and academic engagement among black adolescents: Resilience in the context of perceived discrimination. *Youth & Society*, 51(4), 463-483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X16680546>
- Wu, G., Feder, A., Cohen, H., Kim, J. J., Calderon, S., Charney, D. S., & Mathé, A. A. (2013). Understanding resilience. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 7, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2013.00010>
- Yardley, L. (2015). Demonstrating validity in qualitative psychology. In J. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (3rd ed., pp. 257-272). Sage.
- Yates, T. M., Tyrell, F. A., & Masten, A. S. (2015). Resilience theory and the practice of positive psychology from individuals to societies. *Positive psychology in practice: Promoting human flourishing in work, health, education, and everyday life*, 773-788. <https://doi-org/10.1002/9781118996874.ch44>
- Ye, Z. J., Liang, M. Z., Qiu, H. Z., Liu, M. L., Hu, G. Y., Zhu, Y. F., ... & Quan, X. M. (2016). Effect of a multidiscipline mentor-based program, Be Resilient to Breast Cancer (BRBC), on female breast cancer survivors in mainland China—A randomized, controlled, theoretically-derived intervention trial. *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*, 158(3), 509-522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-016-3881-1>
- Zachary, L. J. (2011). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Zimmerman, M. A., Bingenheimer, J. B., & Behrendt, D. E. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships. *Handbook of Youth Mentoring*, 30, 143-157.
- Zimmerman, M. A., Stoddard, S. A., Eisman, A. B., Caldwell, C. H., Aiyer, S. M., & Miller, A. (2013). Adolescent resilience: Promotive factors that inform prevention. *Child Development Perspectives*, 7(4), 215-220. <https://doi-org/10.1111/cdep.12042>
- Zolkoski, S. M., & Bullock, L. M. (2012). Resilience in children and youth: A review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(12), 2295-2303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.08.009>

Appendix A

Project title: (Maximum of 25 words): Resilience in the Mentoring Context

Recruitment/Data collection start date: 30 May 2023

What date do you expect data collection and analysis activities to be completed by? 10 July 2023

Project type: Postgraduate student research

Aim of the project: The core aim of this project is to contribute further depth of present understandings of how mentors (associated with a particular service in Palmerston North) understand their efforts to support the development of resilience in young people.

Project summary: no more than 2000 characters in lay language (What you are doing, how doing it, who you're doing it with):

A case-based approach will be conducted in partnership with the Manawatū branch of Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand (BBBSNZ). This service is part of the international organisation of Big Brothers Big Sisters, which recruits mentors to work alongside mentees (typically between the ages of 6 and 12 years) for at least one hour a week for at least one year. The organisation offers both community-based and school-based mentoring to increase the accessibility of the services. The service has been operating for 25 years in New Zealand.

This research has been co-designed with the Practice Manager of the service. The organisation has also committed to supporting the recruitment of mentors for this research by liaising with the local branch manager and has provided their training materials and service support documents for analysis.

The Manawatū branch of BBBSNZ provides the case for this research that encompasses three primary information sources: organisational documents (specifically, training materials, the content of outcome evaluation forms, and annual reports) and a focus group discussion with up to six mentors from the organisation, and individual interviews with the same six mentors. Insights from each of these different sources will be used to corroborate findings from other

sources to build a fuller picture of the meaning of resilience within the service. Such information allows us to not only better understand the present situation, but to also gain a better idea of what the future could look like and how scholars can assist organisations in creating positive alternatives. The materials and analysis will be used to create a policy brief for the organisation to help them develop their training materials and mentoring model.

This project aims to provide insights into the practical realities of fostering resilience in a mentoring environment within the participating organisation that may be of use to similar mentoring programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Describe the peer review process that has been used to discuss and analyse the ethical issues in this project (4000 characters): My supervisor (Professor Hodgetts) has helped me to conduct the risk assessment and to complete the low-risk application. The draft application plus a brief proposal was sent to Dr Amanda Young-Hauser and Dr Veronica Hopner. The points they raised were as follows:

Dr Amanda Young-Hauser supported this project as a low-risk study, raising only points about the need to clarify certain pieces of information in the documents and ensure consistency across the documents. These points were acted upon, and the necessary changes were made to the wording to provide more clarity and avoid any confusion.

Dr Veronica Hopner also found no ethical issues and supported this as a low-risk study.

Summarise the ethical issues considered and explain how each has been addressed (2000 characters)

Autonomy: Participants will be autonomous in their decision to participate. They will be given an information sheet and informed consent (see attached) that includes information about research aim, design, goals, and their rights. I will clarify to participants their right to withdraw from the research up to one week after completion of individual interviews.

Non-Maleficence: While there are no direct risks of physical injury, nor does this research encourage participants to undertake dangerous or harmful acts, care will be taken to ensure that each participant feels safe and respected.

Beneficence: Insights gained from this research will be used to inform staff training and service development of BBBSNZ.

Special relationships: There are no special relationships between the organisation and researcher.

Justice: There is no discrimination towards selection or recruitment. However, the purpose of this research means that only persons who have experience as mentors within the organisation will be asked to participate.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi: This research does not focus specifically on Māori. However, relevant aspects of Te Tiriti o Waitangi are that the research has been co-designed with BBBSNZ and is being conducted in partnership with this mentoring agency. Although not specifically aiming to recruit Māori, if a Māori person show interest in participating, I will speak with them openly about what their involvement will encompass, how the information they provide will be used and if they have any particular issues that they feel are important to cover in the research. I will also strive to demonstrate manaaki towards all participants by engaging in an open manner and offering refreshments during their participation. In terms of mana, I will show respect towards participants and work to not bring the participants or the organisation into disrepute.

With whom did you peer review the ethical aspects of your research (2000 characters)

Dr Amanda Young-Hauser is a Lecturer in the School of Psychology at Massey University.

Dr Veronica Hopner is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Psychology at Massey University.

Appendix B



School of Psychology

Psychology Building

Turitea Campus

Massey University

Tennent Drive

Palmerston North 4474

Resilience in the Mentoring Context

INFORMATION SHEET

Researcher Introduction

I am a postgraduate researcher at Massey University undertaking my Master's research in Psychology under the supervision of Professor Darrin Hodgetts. The aim of this study is to research the experiences of mentors and produce anonymised accounts that can be used to inform the training and mentoring that is offered by Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand.

Project Description and Invitation

You are invited to take part in this research by sharing your experiences of mentoring young people and fostering resilience in them. Your contribution will help build a clearer understanding about how mentors understand resilience in young people and engage in mentoring relationships to foster such resilience. The aim of this study is to research the experiences of mentors and produce anonymised accounts that can be used to inform the training and mentoring that is offered by Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand.

Project Procedures

This study involves participation in a focus group discussion and one individual interview. The focus group will take place in a pre-determined location, while the interview will take place at a mutually agreed

location. Before you take part in this study, you will need to sign a consent form to confirm your willingness to participate.

The focus group discussion will involve a group of five to six mentors. You will be provided topics for our group discussion about mentoring. The discussion will focus on the group's understandings of resilience, and your experience in working with Big Brothers Big Sisters to promote resilience in mentees. The focus group will be approximately 1.5 to 2 hours long and will be audio recorded and later transcribed into written text. Refreshments will be provided during the focus group.

You will also be asked to take part in a follow up open-ended interview during which you will be asked to share your experiences of mentoring and fostering resilience in young people. The individual interview will take approximately 1 to 1.5 hours in duration. Each interview will be audio-recorded and later transcribed into a written text.

Information Management

All information gained in this study will be used solely for the purposes of completing the master's thesis and creating a policy brief for Big Brothers Big Sisters. The information you provide will be stored on two password-protected computers, one being the researcher's and the other being the supervisors. No one else will have access to these research materials. Once the study is completed, the information will be kept by the supervisor for five years and then destroyed. You will be asked to provide a pseudonym that you will be identified by in relation to any quotes that appear in the thesis or policy brief. Only other participants in the focus group would be able to associate you with any quoted responses in the thesis or policy brief.

Participant's Rights

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study up to one week after the completion of the individual interview;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during your participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- be given access to a summary of the project findings when it is concluded;
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the focus group or interview.

Project Contacts

If at any point, you have questions or concerns about this study, please do not hesitate to contact:

Elise O'Shea

School of Psychology, Massey University, Manawatu

Email: [REDACTED]

OR

Professor Darrin Hodgetts

School of Psychology, Massey University, Auckland

Email: D.J.Hodgetts@massey.ac.nz

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Prof Craig Johnson, Director, Research Ethics, telephone 06 356 9099 x 85271, email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Appendix C

School of Psychology

Psychology Building

Turitea Campus

Massey University

Tennent Drive

Palmerston North 4474

Resilience in the Mentoring Context

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Research Team: Elise O'Shea (Researcher), Professor Darrin Hodgetts (Supervisor)

We would like to invite you to take part in a focus group discussion followed by an individual interview. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to share your experiences of mentoring and fostering resilience among young people. Both the focus group and the interview will be audio recorded and then transcribed by the researcher. In order to take part in this research, we ask you to sign this consent form.

I have read and I understand the Information Sheet for this research. I have had the details of the research explained to me, any questions I had have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time. I have been given sufficient time to consider whether to participate in this study and I understand participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time up to one week after the individual interview.

1. I have been informed about this research and understand my participation in it.
2. I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary, and I can opt out at any stage of the interview process and withdraw from the study up to one week after the completion of the interview.
3. I am aware the information I provide will be used in a thesis, a policy brief and reports.
4. I understand that I can choose not to answer any particular questions.

5. I understand that I can request the audio recorder to be turned off at any time during an interview and any information I have provided to that point can be withdrawn from the research.
6. I understand that I have an obligation to respect the privacy of the other members of the group by not disclosing any personal information that they share during our discussion.
7. I understand that all the information I provide will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law, and the names of all people in the study will be kept confidential by the researcher.

I confirm that:

- I agree to take part in this research, both the focus group and the interview.
- I understand that anonymized information will be used in a master's thesis.
- I understand that information will be stored securely for the duration of the study and then deleted.

We encourage you to consider your participation in this study and raise any concern about the study with the research team. Please get in touch with the researcher listed at the bottom of this page if you have any further questions.

Declaration by Participant:

I _____ hereby consent to take part in this study.

[print full name]

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Elise O'Shea

School of Psychology, Massey University, Manawatu

Email: [REDACTED]

For any concerns regarding ethical issues, you may contact

Ngā mihinui! Thank you in advance for your time and consideration of this project

Appendix D

1. Focus Group Protocol

2. Step 1: Welcome and thank everyone for coming. Re-introduce myself and then open the floor for the mentors to introduce themselves.
3. Step 2: Re-introduce the topic of the study and the purpose of the focus group. Point out the notebooks as a chance to write down any thoughts throughout the session. Remind the mentors about the focus group being audio recorded and then turn on the recorder.
4. Step 3: Introduce the training video about resilience, explaining the general content of the video, and explain how there will be prompts for further discussion within the video that we will engage in.
5. Step 4: Play the video.
6. Step 5: Pause for the first prompt. Allow the mentors to guide the discussion and wait for a natural and clear end before playing the video again.
7. Step 6: Resume the video.
8. Step 7: Repeat Step 5 for the second prompt for discussion.
9. Step 8: Resume the video.
10. Step 9: Repeat Step 5 for the third prompt for discussion.
11. Step 10: Once the video has ended and the mentors have finished discussing the content and any other topics that arise, signal the conclusion of the focus group and turn off the recorder.
12. Step 11: Thank the participants for attending.
13. Step 12: Once everyone has left, engage in a written debrief and take notes about the focus group.

Appendix E

Resilience in the Youth Mentoring Context

A Research Brief for the Management of Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand

Elise O'Shea

Resilience is an important aspect of life that enables people to respond effectively to adversity and grow from the experience (Arora & Rangnekar, 2014; Lou et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2013). Youth mentoring has shown promise as a strategy for cultivating resilience, wellbeing, and future prospects with young people (Arora & Rangnekar, 2014; Dzoba, 2014; Southwick et al., 2007). Researchers (Day, 2006; Ledbetter, 2003; Mucci, 2009; Rabe, 2018) propose that mentoring promotes resilience by providing the young person with nurturance, empathy, stability, and a sense of belonging, perseverance, and resilience. Mentoring can offer young people opportunities to model beneficial worldviews and ways of interacting with others that can have positive impacts on their future decision making and lifepaths. The introduction of warm and nurturing mentoring relationships is also associated with buffering youth against depression and anxiety (Southwick et al., 2007).

Approach & Results

Approach

This brief draws insights from an in-depth case-based investigation of the understandings and specific ways three mentors fostered resilience in young people. Also considered was how formal mentoring organisations such as BBBSNZ can support further resilience among young people. All three mentors worked with Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand and inform the recommendations for enhancing this service that are presented below to the management of Big Brothers Big Sisters of New Zealand.

Results

The key finding of this study was that the mentors took unique, but overlapping, approaches to promote resilience, wellbeing and positive future aspirations among their mentees. All involved their mentees in activities where they could overcome problems, develop problem-solving and communication skills, and experience positive community engagements that enhanced their sense of self-esteem and hope for the future. The three participating mentors utilised practical challenges and reflective conversations with their mentee to teach them life lessons, offer advice and guidance, and model a proactive and optimistic approach to life.

Whilst sharing variations on this strategy, each mentor also conceptualised and worked to foster resilience in their mentees differently. One mentor focused more on building problem-solving skills and critical thinking. Another on regular engagements in difficult, but important conversations to teach his mentee the importance of taking different perspectives when thinking through problems in life. The third mentor focused on acting as a reliable and external source of support and encouragement to the mentee's family. These personalised

approaches reflected each mentor's unique relationship with their mentee and the different challenges each mentee was facing. Their approaches provide insights about how resilience can be fostered through everyday interactions within a purposeful and thoughtful mentoring relationship.

Also evident from the accounts of these mentors were gaps in the use of the BBBSNZ resilience-focused training (including a video resource). These mentors had not been shown the video or provided with an opportunity to work through it with a guide. This suggests that BBBSNZ may not have utilised this resource or peer support and training opportunities as effectively as the organisation could have.

Implications & Recommendations

Recommendations below are anchored in the three case studies as well as insights into best practice from relevant research.

1. Mentors may benefit from more training with explicit frameworks of resilience that offer clear and well-communicated expectations about how mentors can foster resilience. Such frameworks need to be used flexibly to supplement the mentors own organic approaches and personal styles as mentors. The flexible use of such framework has been associated with improved overall outcomes from mentoring relationships (Newburn & Shiner, 2006; Karcher et al., 2006).
2. The way each mentor has created their own approach to mentoring without resilience-specific training from BBBSNZ is probably a common process. Considering the resilience-specific video was provided by the organisation with the understanding that it was currently being used for training, it is possible that there are inconsistencies in the training across branches. Mentor access to helpful resources likely varies substantively across branches. The organisation and its mentors may benefit from ensuring that all branches have training resources and are facilitating access to these for their mentors, both during initial training and during ongoing development events.
3. Seeking and incorporating insights from more experienced mentors about how new mentors can foster resilience would also enhance the organisation's training efforts.
4. This thesis and previous research suggest that mentors may struggle to attend in-person networking events due to work and life commitments. BBBSNZ should consider alternative channels through which open networking can occur for mentors to share insights and learn from one another. These could include a moderated online chat forums and pre-recorded instructional resources to assist mentors with the application of the training recommendations. Such a forum could be trialled on a social platform or the organization's website and offer ready access to shared training resources.
5. The organisation should strengthen the networks of relationships within a child's life and consider ways in which they can cooperate more with family in the mentoring process (Keller, 2005). Reflecting the whanau value within our eclectic national culture, mentors and families could be guided by BBBSNZ on how to embrace the support of one another and work together to provide young mentees with a consistent, connected network of support (DeWit et al., 2016). This could occur through organised social events, initial training, or ongoing support review meetings. This

strategy would likely improve the consistency of expectations between the parents and mentors about the purpose of the mentoring relationship.

References

- Arora, R., & Rangnekar, S. (2014). Workplace mentoring and career resilience: An empirical test. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 17(3), 205–220. <https://doi-org/10.1037/mgr0000021>
- Beltman, S., & MacCallum, J. (2006). Mentoring and the development of resilience: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 8(1), 21-32. <https://doi-org/10.1080/14623730.2006.9721898>
- Day, A. (2006). The power of social support: Mentoring and resilience. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 14(4), 196. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/c09c15bc35d632963b5f0e160cc85230/1?cbl=33810&parentSessionId=PrLzErfEYCuhmUN61fOnfvowfDPSZLwRF5qZJL8JEedSM%3D&pq-origsite=gscholar&accountid=14574>
- DeWit, D. J., DuBois, D., Erdem, G., Larose, S., Lipman, E. L., & Spencer, R. (2016). Mentoring relationship closures in Big Brothers Big Sisters community mentoring programs: Patterns and associated risk factors. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 57(1-2), 60-72. <https://doi-org/10.1002/ajcp.12023>
- Dzoba, N. (2014). Investigating mentors' perceptions of the effectiveness of using resiliency-building strategies within an at-risk adolescent intervention program. *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 488. <https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/488>
- 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. <https://doi-org/10.1002/jcop.20125>
- Keller, T. E. (2005). A systemic model of the youth mentoring intervention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26(2), 169-188. <https://doi-org/10.1007/s10935-005-1850-2>
- Ledbetter, P. B. (2003). *A study of the effect of mentoring on teen parents' school attendance, high school completion and aspirations to attend college* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/305249715?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>
- Lou, Y., Taylor, E. P., & Di Folco, S. (2018). Resilience and resilience factors in children in residential care: A systematic review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 89, 83-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.04.010>
- Mucci, J. M. (2009). Mentoring towards resilient thought. *Critical and Creative Thinking Capstones Collection*. 214. https://scholarworks.umb.edu/cct_capstone/214
- Newburn, T., & Shiner, M. (2006). Young people, mentoring and social inclusion. *Youth Justice*, 6(1), 23-41. <https://doi-org/10.1177/1473225406063450>
- Rabe, K. S. (2018). *Cross-age peer mentoring: A case study of resiliency building relationships* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2070573280?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>
- Ramani, S., Gruppen, L., & Kachur, E. K. (2006). Twelve tips for developing effective mentors. *Medical Teacher*, 28(5), 404-408. <https://doi-org/10.1080/01421590600825326>
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5(1), 25338. <https://doi-org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338>
- Straus, S. E., Johnson, M. O., Marquez, C., & Feldman, M. D. (2013). Characteristics of successful and failed mentoring relationships: A qualitative study across two academic health centers. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 88(1), 82. <https://doi-org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e31827647a0>
- Van Breda, A. D. (2018). A critical review of resilience theory and its relevance for social work. *Social Work*, 54(1), 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15270/54-1-611>
- Wittrup, A. R., Hussain, S. B., Albright, J. N., Hurd, N. M., Varner, F. A., & Mattis, J. S. (2019). Natural mentors, racial pride, and academic engagement among black adolescents: Resilience in the context of perceived discrimination. *Youth & Society*, 51(4), 463-483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X16680546>
- Wu, G., Feder, A., Cohen, H., Kim, J. J., Calderon, S., Charney, D. S., & Mathé, A. A. (2013). Understanding resilience. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 7, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2013.00010>

- Yates, T. M., Tyrell, F. A., & Masten, A. S. (2015). Resilience theory and the practice of positive psychology from individuals to societies. *Positive psychology in practice: Promoting human flourishing in work, health, education, and everyday life*, 773-788. <https://doi-org/10.1002/9781118996874.ch44>
- Zimmerman, M. A., Stoddard, S. A., Eisman, A. B., Caldwell, C. H., Aiyer, S. M., & Miller, A. (2013). Adolescent resilience: Promotive factors that inform prevention. *Child Development Perspectives*, 7(4), 215-220. <https://doi-org/10.1111/cdep.12042>
- Zolkoski, S. M., & Bullock, L. M. (2012). Resilience in children and youth: A review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(12), 2295-2303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2012.08.009>