



original papers

mentor had in dealing with such a situation? The authors themselves note that more guidance is needed about how the mentoring relationship should work. They seem to assume that the mentor should be from outside the new consultant's immediate service even though this has led to difficulties in all new appointees having a mentor. Does this have to be the case? Could a more local colleague be an effective mentor, and if not, why not? And what is an 'effective mentor'? Is the goal the peace of mind and emotional well-being of the person being mentored, a more productive employee or some combination of the two? Many businesses and schools that promote mentoring schemes have more formal guidelines that involve clearly set objectives, meeting schedules and built-in evaluation. van Beinum *et al* suggest that mentoring is 'strongly recommended'. I suspect they may be right but before we can recommend what may be a helpful process we should be much clearer about what we want to achieve, how we intend to achieve it, provide training and support for those providing it, agree ground rules for the conduct of all involved (e.g. confidentiality, boundaries, frequency of meetings, how to complain

about the mentor/mentee and renegotiate) and agree formal methods of evaluation. Such a process would also necessitate being clear about how mentoring differs from other supports and ensuring that those other supports are also in place for newly appointed consultants. van Beinum *et al* are to be commended for starting the process of looking more carefully at the mentoring relationship others need to follow.

Declaration of interest

None.

References

- COTTRELL, D., KILMINSTER, S., JOLLY, B. & GRANT, J. (2002) What is effective supervision and how does it happen? A critical incident study. *Medical Education*, **36**, 1042–1049.
- KILMINSTER, S. M. & JOLLY B. C. (2000) Effective supervision in clinical practice settings: a literature review. *Medical Education*, **34**, 827–840.

David Cottrell Dean of Medicine, University of Leeds, Level 8, Worsley Building, Clarendon Way, Leeds LS2 9NL, email: d.j.cottrell@leeds.ac.uk

Psychiatric Bulletin (2009), **33**, 48. doi: 10.1192/pb.bp.108.024117

MICHAEL VAN BEINUM, SANDRA DAVIES AND MYRA DAVID

Authors' response. Invited commentary on... Mentoring scheme for child and adolescent psychiatry consultants in Scotland[†]

Professor Cottrell raises a number of challenging questions in his commentary on our article, and we welcome further debate. Dialogue may create a space in which new possibilities can be thought about and explored, and this lies at the heart of our conception of mentoring.

Our assumption has been that the step from trainee to consultant is challenging and that newly appointed consultants are often anxious, particularly about non-clinical aspects of their new job. Such anxiety sometimes makes it hard to think. At the core, mentoring is about facilitating thought by the mentee, and often by the mentor too. In that sense, considering mentoring as 'a wise older colleague imparting wisdom' is unhelpful, as it both implies a power inequality and fails to acknowledge the possibility of new thinking taking place.

Cottrell asks how much support mentors had. In our scheme, mentors met at least yearly for peer supervision and support, and these meetings were facilitated by a consultant in psychodynamic psychotherapy. Scotland is a small country, where most people in our field know each other and where the Scottish Institute of Human Relations, by providing a variety of training courses in psychological therapies, has provided a common training experience in psychodynamic ways of thought. Let us be clear, however: mentoring was never conceived of as a therapeutic relationship – the aim has always been to facilitate thinking about uncertainty and ambiguity at work.

Given the potential entanglement between work and private concerns, the mentor comes from outwith the mentee's immediate working service, both to provide a degree of privacy and confidentiality to the mentoring relationship and to facilitate thinking about potentially difficult relationships with colleagues. We argued it would be harder to explore such organisational dynamics if the mentor was intimately acquainted with the colleagues the mentee was struggling with. Having a mentor from outwith one's immediate working service also provides some protection against the potential of continuing local poor practice such as 'perpetuating ethnic or gender biases'.

Lastly, Cottrell asks difficult questions about evaluation of mentoring relationships that go to the heart of what it is to be a consultant child and adolescent psychiatrist. We would counsel against a narrow and positivistic definition of the role of a consultant as an unthinking cog in a machine, but tough questions of how one demonstrates that a good job is being done do not go away. We would argue that a good consultant is able to continue to think empathically and creatively in complex organisational dynamics, and mentoring aims to promote that ability. How does one evaluate quality of thinking?

***Michael van Beinum** Consultant Child and Adolescent Psychiatrist, Andrew Lang Unit, Viewfield Lane, Selkirk TD7 4LJ, email: michaelvanbeinum@selkirkhsc.borders.scot.nhs.uk, **Sandra Davies** Consultant Child and Adolescent Psychiatrist, Andrew Lang Unit, Selkirk, **Myra David** Consultant Child and Adolescent Psychiatrist, Department of Adolescent Psychiatry, Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health Board, Glasgow

[†]See original paper, pp. 45–47, and invited commentary, pp. 47–48, this issue.