

Managing Boundaries in the Multiple Relationships Created by Mentorship

Pressley R. Rankin IV, PhD

School of Applied Leadership

Abstract

Boundaries define the spaces or domains in which one lives her or his life. They also define the roles that one enacts in each domain, e.g., being the boss at work or being a spouse at home. Leaders are most often responsible for creating some of the rules that define the boundaries within the work domain. Additionally, socially constructed ideas about a role (faculty) or a domain (the university) automatically suggest the boundaries that are in place and how one should behave. However, in a mentorship relationship, the ideas about what is appropriate are not as clearly defined (Barnett, 2008; Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000). This chapter will explore the nature of boundary setting in mentorships where there is a power differential and a strong chance of multiple relationships (PDSCMR), like program director to a faculty member. The specific example discussed here will be faculty/student mentorship, which best illustrates the complexity that can emerge in PDSCMR mentorships.

Introduction

Boundaries play an important role in the regulation of human relationships as well as the creation of the spaces, or *domains*, where people live, work, and play. Boundaries provide limits or rules that guide how one interacts with people. Leaders, whether in an educational setting or in an organization setting, are typically highly involved in boundary creation for their students or employees.

The domains that are created by boundaries typically have physical or mental borders. For example, a faculty member may consider the work domain as an assigned office on campus with four solid walls, a specific desk at home used to grade papers, a coffee

shop with Wi-Fi access, or a combination of all three. That all depends on how that faculty member defines the borders of the space and the boundaries or rules set to enforce those borders, mental or physical.

When a person creates borders through boundary setting, those borders are crossed often during the course of the day. Checking Facebook at work is an example of border crossing. Leaders in the domain, such as faculty members in the school domain, are responsible for setting or maintaining the domain boundaries and thus the boundaries' borders. They are in charge of making sure boundary rules are followed. These domain leaders are sometimes referred to as border keepers, and it is they who regulate the ease at which a border between boundaries can be crossed (Clark, 2000).

Therefore, if faculty members or leaders become involved as a mentor to a student or junior colleague, they are creating another domain (the mentorship space) that they must define and border-keep. Plaut (2008) defined the management of boundaries in professional relationships in terms of the power differential that exists between two parties, e.g., physician-patient or faculty-student. Some power differentials are small, such as a peer mentorship between faculty. Some are larger, like the difference between a dean and faculty member.

Plaut (2008) saw boundaries as important in establishing healthy professional relationships. If the faculty member who is defining the mentorship boundaries is also someone who is a border keeper for the school domain, that mentor is now in a multiple relationship with the protégé (both as a mentor and as a grader). Managing the boundaries and borders in a multiple relationship is more difficult because each relationship or role one has with the other person may have a different set of boundaries. Being clear about those boundaries from the beginning sets up expectations for the mentorship and minimizes the misunderstandings that lead to ineffective mentorships.

While faculty/student mentorship or professional mentorship within an organization typically involves multiple relationships, professional development through an outside

organization where the mentor has no other connection to the protégé other than through the organization would not typically involve multiple relationships and would not be considered in this chapter. The same is true for peer mentorships that don't often have strong power differentials. Instead, this chapter first presents a discussion of how boundaries create domains, borders, and roles. Then, in that context, the specifics of mentorship boundaries are discussed from the psychological perspective. The chapter ends with the final recommendations for mentors.

Domains, Roles, and Boundaries in Mentorship

Domains

Domains are spaces to which people subscribe specific categorical boundaries to such as work, home, and the gym. Categorical boundaries are socio-cognitive borders that individuals or cultures create and must continually maintain in order to exist (Nippert-Eng, 1996b). Other social scientists have defined categorical boundaries as “conceptual lines of demarcation that separate domains and domain-relevant behaviors” (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010, p. 330). Since individuals socially construct the characteristics of the boundaries between the domains, some domains may have less rigid boundaries and perhaps even overlap or exist within other domains (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996a, 1996b; Rankin, 2013). The domain of mentorship could, therefore, be constructed mentally and be entered into when the mentor and protégé get together in other spaces. The separation or overlap of these domains and the boundaries used to define them are based on individuals actively defining what those spaces are and who is a member of them (Clark, 2000; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006; Nippert-Eng, 1996a).

Boundary work. Nippert-Eng defines the act of maintaining categorical boundaries as *boundary work* and she asserts “each time we engage in the process, the actual practice of sorting out, assigning, and defending the inclusion/exclusion or categorical contents into specific mental and physical spaces and times, we show the

collective, mental frameworks that guide our lives” (1996, p. 564). While each individual constructs and maintains these domain boundaries within his or her own cognitive borders, some domains, such as work and home, can be considered to be institutionalized in that most people share a consensus of what *home* and *work* mean (Ashforth et al., 2000). Mentorship literature suggests that the central concepts defining the role of mentor and what constitutes the domain of mentorship are less defined than domain concepts, such as *home* and *work*. (Barnett, 2008; Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000; Johnson, 1999; Lechuga, 2011; Straus, Johnson, Marquez, & Feldman, 2013). The lack of consistent cultural norms for the practice of mentorship means that each mentor must define the nature of the mentorship boundaries and must define the extent of the domain for themselves and the protégé.

Border power. Clark (2000) posits that while individuals have the power to negotiate and make changes to the domain borders, whether they choose to exercise this power is tied to their identification with domain responsibilities. Depending on the nature of the power relationship between the mentor and protégé, the protégé may place all the responsibility on the mentor for the establishment of the domain boundaries. However, protégés are likely to pay close attention to border keeping and management if their values and identity are embedded or closely tied with their role in a specific domain (Clark, 2000). A senior faculty member mentoring a junior faculty member would be an example of closely tied identity. Nevertheless, even an individual who is closer in power to their mentor does not automatically have unlimited power to change domain borders since the setting of these borders is most often socially constructed by many actors within the domain, including border keepers (leaders).

Roles

Ashforth et al. (2000) expanded Nippert-Eng’s (1996a, 1996b) ideas around domain boundaries to the idea of roles and summarized the concept of roles:

Roles tend to be associated with specific individuals who are labeled accordingly (e.g., employee, parent, parishioner). Thus, a role boundary refers to whatever

delimits the perimeter—and thereby the scope—of a role. Given the more or less institutionalized nature of work, home, and third-place domains, roles tend to be bounded in both space and time—that is, they are more relevant in certain physical locations and at certain times of the day and week. (p. 475)

This definition of role adds an important aspect to the discussion of boundaries since roles can be enacted within, between, and across the boundaries that are associated with domains. Roles can be domain-specific or carried into other domains, such as in the role of doctor, which is most often thought of as being associated with a hospital, but one could still be a doctor on a plane if called upon to exercise this role.

Bazalgette (2009) examined roles in relation to the system (domain) in which they are played. Using a group relations perspective, he divided role into two components: psychological and sociological. Bazalgette asserts that a “system” is a construct created within an individual’s mind to organize persons, equipment, finances, buildings, and resources (2009). Using the system as a reference, individuals express their psychological roles in behaviors they believe are associated with their purpose in the system. Mentors may believe that their roles require them to act as an aloof professional or perhaps a kindly father figure depending on their internal thoughts and beliefs associated with their role.

While this psychological role is internal, the sociological role is contingent on an individual’s perception of the expectations of others within the system: as to how he or she should behave within his or her role in the system (Bazalgette, 2009). The experiences mentors have with their previous mentors or the behaviors they are modeling from peer faculty members dictate the sociological role behaviors in their mentorship relationships. Therefore, the sociological expectations of the domain it is embedded in often flavor the type of mentorship a protégé receives.

Barnett (2008) asserts that faculty typically have multiple roles in a student’s life, which often include grading, advising, recommending, and serving as the border keepers for the profession by monitoring each student’s progress in their program. As a mentor, the

faculty member is also serving as a role model to aid students in their professional development. For this environment to be safe, boundaries must be established for the role of mentor that help to differentiate the mentor role from the other roles.

Role transitions. As with domains, role boundaries can also be transitioned. Ashforth, Kreiner, and Fugate (2000) refer to the regular movement between roles as micro-transitions (e.g., moving from the role of father to the role of spouse). Role segmentation (how different one likes to keep the roles) and role integration (how similar one feels the roles are) influence micro role transitions (or, more simply, role transitions). To understand this process, one must first understand role identity, a concept that is similar to Bazalgette's (2009) concepts of sociological and psychological roles.

Role identity. Ashforth (2001) defines role identity as including the goals, values, beliefs, norms, interaction styles, and time horizons associated with a particular role. He also asserts that role identities are socially constructed and can be either strongly associated with a person's sense of self-worth or weakly associated. Therefore, a mentor can believe she or he is an incredible mentor and thus have a strong role identity or he or she could feel unqualified to mentor someone and thus have a weak role identity as mentor. The relative strength of one's role identity affects role transitions in that weaker role identities are easier to transition from but may be harder to transition into from a stronger role identity. Following this reasoning, a mentor's role identity is strongly influenced by his or her self-in-role definition (self-worth) for the role in which he or she is mentoring the protégé to succeed (e.g., an engineering faculty mentoring an engineering student). It is therefore easier for a mentor with strong self-worth to create a mentor role with firm boundaries. Mentors with weaker self-worth will struggle with multiple roles overlapping.

Role identity also effects role transitions based on the contrast between roles. Low-contrast roles (e.g., mentor vs. faculty member) are easier to transition between, in comparison to high-contrast roles (e.g., faculty member vs. friend). The ease of transition is due to the similarity of the key features of the roles. This is irrespective of

the domain. For example, a woman may have trouble transitioning between the role of mother to the role of wife within the domain of home if there is high contrast between the key features of each role. Roles or mentorships that have high power differentials are also high in contrast and vice versa. For example, if as a faculty member one is also the dean, the role of dean has more power than the role of faculty and thus more contrast. Switching then to a mentor role from that of a dean would be more challenging than that of faculty to mentor.

However, high contrast isn't always a bad thing; in faculty mentorship relationships, the ability to create a high contrast between the role of mentor and the role of faculty member can help the mentor manage the boundaries in multiple relationships. By firmly defining the boundaries and borders on the mentoring relationship, the mentor is less inclined to slide into another role and the protégé receives clear communication as to her or his expected role within the relationship. This is especially important since the roles of protégé and student are very low contrast. Ashforth et al. (2000) argued that high-contrast role identities are highly segmented with inflexible and impermeable boundaries, whereas low-contrast role identities are more likely to be highly integrated with flexible and permeable boundaries.

Role segmentation. The benefit of highly segmented roles is the reduction of role blurring (confusing role boundaries), but the cost is an increase in the magnitude of transition between roles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Bulger et al., 2007). Having a large magnitude of transition makes role exit more difficult. This difficulty means mentors need to put time and energy into transitioning from a faculty role into a mentoring role. This may include leaving the school domain in order to escape the sociocultural role expectations embedded in that domain. Transitioning role boundaries involves what Ashforth et al. (2000) refer to as role exit, which they described as psychologically and sometimes physically disengaging from the role. This can be accomplished as on the domain level through the use of rituals, external cues, or internal cues. Ashforth et al. (2000) provided an example of role exit:

A commuter may begin to psychologically disengage from her home role and prepare for her work role by following her daily routine of showering, dressing in work attire, reading the business section of the newspaper over breakfast, and listening to traffic reports. (p. 478)

Role entry may also be marked with similar rituals or routines.

Role integration. Role integration in opposition to segmentation increases role blurring but decreases the difficulty of role transition. The lack of difficulty in the transition between roles inherently means “the role exit–movement–role entry sequence may occur rapidly with little or no conscious awareness” (Ashforth et al., 2000, p. 480). The lack of conscious awareness can result in role blurring that weakens boundaries between roles, and thus allows for more frequent role identity confusion and disruption of a role activity. Therefore, if a mentor believes that the role of mentor is part of the role of faculty, the boundaries between both domains are blurred. This means the protégé will have trouble seeing the mentor outside of the faculty role, which can cause conflicts of interest and minimize the establishment of a safe space.

The choice: Transition work or boundary work. A mentor who integrates his or her role may have issues with role overlap. One might think it is better to highly segment or separate the roles of mentor and faculty. Ashforth et al. (2000) posit that there is perhaps a greater concern for role identity being interrupted when there is high segmentation between roles, given that a boundary violation from another role will cause the segmented roles to compete in one’s mind for supremacy in the moment. For example, if a faculty mentor highly segments his or her roles, having the protégé as a student in class could create a mental disruption if the student asks a mentorship question in that space. Ashforth et al. (2000) go on to suggest that:

Because the cost of segmentation . . . [roles are very different] . . . is the benefit of integration . . . [roles are similar] . . . and the benefit of segmentation . . . [clear role borders] . . . is the cost of integration . . . [vaguely defined roles] . . .

there is an ongoing tension between segmentation and integration that necessitates ongoing boundary and transition work. (p. 482)

This work takes the form of segmentors spending more energy on transitions work and intergraters spending more energy on boundary work. Nippert-Eng (1996a) would also agree that the boundary work associated with maintaining boundaries around domain transitions would also share the same qualities as with role transitions. Therefore, mentors who choose to see their roles as similar (professional/mentor, faculty/mentor) need to take extra care and be mindful of boundary creation and management.

Psychological Prospective on Mentorship Boundaries

The very nature of faculty mentorship creates a multiple relationship between the student and the faculty member. The faculty member is both a professor who can grade the student and a role model or professional mentor to the student. Barnett (2008) related the psychological concept of boundaries to mentorship and defined them as:

Boundaries are the basic ground rules for the professional relationship. They add a structure to mentorships that provides guidance regarding appropriate actions and interactions for mentors and protégés . . . the boundaries construct is relevant to all professional relationships that involve a power differential. Thus, boundaries are relevant to the roles of psychotherapist, clinical and research supervisor, faculty advisor, mentor, and all other professional roles. . . .

Boundaries in professional relationships include dimensions such as touch, location, self-disclosure, time, gifts, fees, and personal space. Boundaries may be rigidly enforced, crossed, or violated. (pp. 5–6)

Barnett's definition allows room for the mentor and protégé to decide how the boundaries in the relationship will be enforced and what the difference might be from boundary crossing, which may be necessary, and boundary violation, which is never acceptable.

Boundary crossing. While boundary crossings may or may not always be negative, they can lead to a slippery slope that may carry the professional into a boundary violation. The crossing of a professional boundary that is harmful for the client or protégé is a boundary violation (Barnett, 2008). Most commonly these boundary violations are of a sexual nature (Barnett, 2008; Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995). Looking at boundary violations from a mentorship perspective, Barnett states:

Effective mentors will have an emotional investment in their protégés' personal and professional development; a true caring. Yet, at the same time, this closeness and emotional investment must not lead the mentor to boundary violations and inappropriate multiple relationships. Similarly, protégés may easily come to idealize the mentor, feel special as a result of the commitment and caring evident in the mentor's behavior and the extra time spent together, and be vulnerable to boundary transgressions by the mentor which would violate students' dependency and trust. (2008, pp. 7–10)

While the violation of boundaries is never acceptable, the crossing of boundaries may be a necessary part of mentorship when one has multiple relationships with protégés. Yet as a border keeper, the mentor is responsible for the way in which these crossings occur. An important part of mentorship is the understanding that boundaries are necessary and engaging in serious consideration of the ethical implications involved when a boundary is crossed (Barnett, 2008).

Recommendations

Faculty/student mentorships offer the opportunity for students to develop their professional identity, learn important career tips, and practice strategies that will create success in their future careers (Clark et al, 2000; Noonan, Ballinger & Black, 2007; Lechuga, 2011). From the mentor's perspective, mentorships offer less tangible rewards like the development of future colleagues and the reward of seeing her or his students' success in the workplace (Barnett, 2008; Lechuga, 2011). The benefit of mentorship is

skewed toward the protégé, while the power differential is skewed toward the mentor. Barnett (2008) asserts that effective mentorship involves the mentor emotionally investing in the protégé. At the same time, protégés “may easily come to idealize the mentor . . . [and] feel special as a result of the commitment and caring evident in the mentor’s behavior and the extra time spent together . . . [thus becoming] vulnerable to boundary transgressions” (Barnett, 2008, p. 10). The following section lists this author’s recommendations drawn from the literature on mentorship and discussed through the lens of PDSCMR faculty mentors who are considering starting a mentorship with a student.

Recommendation 1: Awareness. Clark et al. (2000) found training, instruction, role modeling, acceptance, support, and encouragement to be highly rated traits by protégés. Mentors have to balance the need for a personal and close relationship with their desire to create a relationship free of boundary violations. The mentor is the border keeper for the domain of the mentorship. He or she is in the power position and must not lose sight of his or her position even as the protégé grows in her or his professional development to the point of becoming closer to the mentor in professional status. Barnett (2008) suggests faculty mentors pay close attention to their motivations during the mentorship, being sure that all actions are in the best interest of the protégé. He also asserts that mentors remain aware of their “own emotional state, stresses, relationship history, and emotional vulnerabilities” (Barnett, 2008, p. 14).

Awareness also includes being aware of cultural, gender, and age differences between the mentor and the protégé. Understanding the power differences can help to minimize boundary crossings and boundary violations. Finally, self-awareness and self-worth in the faculty member’s role as mentor allow for higher contrast between the mentorship role and the faculty role. The faculty mentors should be aware of their own feelings of competence within their role as mentor and as faculty member.

Recommendation 2: Communicate clear boundaries expectations. Barnett (2008) suggests having an open discussion at the start of a mentorship relationship to discuss role and domain boundaries. Mentors in their role as border keeper should

discuss how their role as mentor is different from the other multiple roles they may have with the protégé: such as friend, faculty member, and/or professor. Defining the domain would also include a discussion about what is safe to do or say when in the mentorship space, what responsibilities the mentor and protégé have for confidentiality, and both parties' need for privacy. The mentor should discuss what boundary crossings are acceptable and what to do if a boundary violation occurs. Being clear about boundaries from the beginning sets up expectations for the mentorship and minimizes the misunderstandings that lead to ineffective mentorships.

Recommendation 3: Be a good boundary role model. The protégé is watching the mentor closely. This is the nature of mentorship. The mentor is a role model professionally, but she or he is also modeling relationship behaviors. Mentors must strive to create a mentorship domain, which is bounded and has rules, rituals, and mental or physical domain boundaries. By being clear in one's role, the mentor is modeling effective professional boundaries and minimizing role blurring. The mentor must also be careful to obey the rules and boundaries she or he creates. Even a small lapse could signal to the protégé that the space is not safe or that the mentor is not serious.

The mentor may want to designate a place for the mentorship to take place, such as an office or a coffee shop, and be strict about not allowing mentorship conversations outside of those boundaries. However, such a segmented approach may not work in situations where the mentee needs to observe behaviors and reflect on them. In such cases, the mentor may need to create flexible boundaries or integrate the mentorship domain into other domains. However, the decision to allow domains to overlap should be a conscious decision with open communication about how that overlap affects the boundaries. For example, a faculty member who has a student observe him or her teaching a class would need to clearly communicate boundaries and role expectations concerning how the student should behave in the classroom and what expectations the faculty member will have of him or her for participation and interaction with the other students. In turn, the faculty member would need to respect the role assigned to the

student and not ask the student to do other tasks, such as run off copies or write on the board.

Recommendation 4: Policies and standards. Policies and standards are also forms of boundaries. Barnett (2008) recommends consulting with colleagues about professional standards and mentorship expectations. If the department or organization that a mentor is a part of does not have policies on the mentorship process, it is important that the mentor create a document that defines their role and the role they expect the mentee to take in the mentorship. Mentors need to create personal boundaries to address how much time he or she is willing to devote to the process and set expectations with protégés about what their expectations about the mentor's availability should be. Clark et al. (2000) found that 25 percent of their eight-hundred-student sample complained that the mentor was not as available as they would have preferred. Clear establishment of time boundaries and expectations would minimize that type of complaint. Finally, be sure that there is a formal policy to handle disputes and conflicts. That policy should designate a person or group to process and handle conflicts and disputes.

Summary

Mentors are the leaders and boundary creators in the mentorship relationship. Mentorship allows for the professional and social development of the protégé and can establish a collegial relationship that might last a lifetime. This author asserts that the need to communicate boundaries, overtly, is necessary due to the lack of strong socially constructed boundaries on the domain of mentorship and the role of mentor. There is also an added ethical need to be clear with boundaries whenever there is a power differential or multiple relationships between the mentor and protégé. The establishment of policies and procedures to address where and when the mentorship relationship will be enacted can defuse many of the common complaints protégés have with their mentor. The open discussion of boundaries is not a typical conversation faculty members are used to having with their students. However, some faculty may be

familiar with the process from setting up rules to govern their classes. Therefore, all it takes is transferring that type of collaborative rule setting to the setting of boundaries within the mentorship. This author also asserts that the recommendations presented herein can be applied to other mentorships as long as there is a difference in power and a chance for multiple relationships to occur.

References

- Ashforth, B. E. (2001). *Role transitions in organizational life: An identity-based perspective*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/259305>
- Barnett, J. E. (2008). Mentoring, boundaries, and multiple relationships: Opportunities and challenges. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(1), 3–16. doi:10.1080/13611260701800900
- Bazalgette, J. (2009). Leadership: The impact of the full human being in role. In E. Aram, R. Baxter & A. Nutkevitch (Eds.), *Adaptation and innovation: Theory, design and role-taking in group relations, conferences and their applications* (pp. 31–50). London, United Kingdom: Karnac Books.
- Bulger, C. A., Matthews, R. A., & Hoffman, M. E. (2007). Work and personal life boundary management: Boundary strength, work/personal life balance, and the segmentation-integration continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(4), 365–375. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.365
- Clark, R. A., Harden, S. L., & Johnson, W. B. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training: Results of a national survey. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27(4), 262–268. doi: 10.1207/s15328023TOP2704_04

- Clark, S. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations, 53*(6), 747–770. doi:10.1177/0018726700536001
- Johnson, W. B., & Nelson, N. (1999). Mentor-protege relationships in graduate training: Some ethical concerns. *Ethics & Behavior, 9*(3), 189. doi: 10.12074/s15327019eb0903_1
- Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(2), 347–367. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002
- Lechuga, V. M. (2011). Faculty-graduate student mentoring relationships: Mentors' perceived roles and responsibilities. *Higher Education, 62*(6), 757–771. doi:10.1007/s10734-011-9416-0
- Matthews, R. A., & Barnes-Farrell, J. L. (2010). Development and initial evaluation of an enhanced measure of boundary flexibility for the work and family domains. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*(3), 330–346. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pdh&AN=ocp-15-3-330&site=ehost-live>
- Nippert-Eng, C. E. (1996a). *Home and work negotiating boundaries through everyday life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Nippert-Eng, C. (1996b). Calendars and keys: The classification of “home” and “work.” *Sociological Forum, 11*(3), 563–582. doi:10.1007/BF02408393
- Noonan, M. J., Ballinger, R., & Black, R. (2007). Peer and faculty mentoring in doctoral education: Definitions, experiences, and expectations. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education, 19*(3). Retrieved from <http://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=33719133&site=ehost-live>

- Plaut, S. M. (2008). Sexual and nonsexual boundaries in professional relationships: Principles and teaching guidelines. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy, 23*(1), 85–94. doi: 10.1080/14681990701616624
- Rankin, P. R. (2013). *Work/life boundary management in an integrative environment: A study of residence life professionals who live at their place of work*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1429526281?accountid=1230>
- Smith, D., & Fitzpatrick, M. (1995). Patient-therapist boundary issues: An integrative review of theory and research. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice, 26*(5), 499–506. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.26.5.499
- 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. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0b013e31827647a0