



**Mentoring of nursing students – a comparative study of
Japan and five European countries**

Journal:	<i>Japan Journal of Nursing Science</i>
Manuscript ID	JJNS-2021-0332.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	mentoring, clinical practice, nursing student

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title:** Mentoring of nursing students - a comparative study of Japan and five European countries
4
5

6 **Abstract** (250 words):
7
8
9

10 *Aims:* This study aimed to explore mentoring competence in nursing student mentors during clinical
11 practice by identifying different mentor profiles and connections between different competence areas
12 among five European countries and Japan. ~~Japanese data comprised the primary analysis and~~
13 ~~European country data comprised the secondary analysis.~~
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *Methods:* The study implemented a cross-sectional design in Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Slovenia,
21 Spain, and Japan during 2016 and 2019. In total, 6208 mentors were invited, and 1862 participated
22 from 58 healthcare organizations. ~~The data was collected with survey questionnaire by including~~
23 ~~items of background questions and the Mentor Competence Instrument.~~ K-clustering and structural
24 equation modeling were used for data analysis.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *Results:* Four mentor profiles, A (43%), B (30%), C (18%), and D (9%), were identified according to
33 the seven mentoring competence areas with high statistical significance ($p < 0.001$). Higher mentoring
34 competence (~~mean >3.50~~) was observed among Finnish, Lithuanian and Slovenian mentors with
35 university education in nursing, older ages, more work experience and previous education in
36 mentoring. Lower competence (~~mean <2.49~~) was observed among Japanese and Italian mentors with
37 diplomas in nursing, younger ages, less work experience and no previous education in mentoring.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 *Conclusion:* Mentoring requires motivated, highly competent mentors since mentoring is a critical
48 aspect of nursing education. Mentoring roles should be given to nurses with higher education and
49 mentoring training. Younger, less experienced nurses without formal mentoring training may need
50 support from senior nurses when performing mentoring roles and could also facilitate a more balanced
51 workload between patient care and mentoring for senior nurses.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Keywords:* clinical, competence, learning environment, mentoring, nursing students, nursing
4 education, student placement
5
6

7 8 **Introduction** 9

10
11 Nursing education is frequently discussed in higher education research and development at the
12 international level (Mamaghani et al., 2018; Raymond et al., 2018; Song & Tang, 2019). The most
13 recent arguments focus on methods for recruiting and sustaining more nurses for work in healthcare
14 organizations. The World Health Organization (WHO) is greatly concerned about a looming lack of
15 nurses worldwide (WHO, 2020). Several studies have shown that nursing education, and clinical
16 practice in particular, play an important role in preparing highly competent and motivated
17 professionals (Fang et al., 2018; Kantek et al., 2017; Sibandze & Scafide, 2017).
18
19

20
21 According to the latest evidence, nurses worldwide face challenges comprising low satisfaction with
22 their work, decreased wellbeing, high stress levels and low wages, causing feelings of
23 underappreciation (Adnan, 2018; Niskala et al., 2020; Lopes et al., 2017). Nursing students already
24 begin to experience higher stress levels with a greater percentage of turnover (i.e., nurses changing
25 or leaving their jobs) during the final years of their nursing education (He et al., 2018; Ye et al., 2018).
26
27 Educational factors are critical and must be reexamined and evaluated.
28
29

30
31 The most recent evidence showed that mentoring and colleague support is a key influential factor
32 contributing to young graduate nurses keeping their nursing jobs (Dames, 2019; Kaihlanen et al.,
33 2020). During their education, nursing students are already entering clinical practice to work
34 alongside other nurses in healthcare organizations. Mentoring is fundamental for students'
35 development of an understanding of nursing professional competence and of motivation (Kaihlanen
36 et al., 2020; Tuomikoski et al., 2020).
37
38

39
40 **In previous studies it was** found that mentoring within nursing in European countries varies greatly,
41 yet is directed by European Union (EU) regulations and guidelines contradicting the practice
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(Mikkonen et al., 2019; Pramila-Savukoski et al. 2020). For example, only few countries provide compulsory mentors' education to registered nurses, who take the role of mentor by ensuring the successful clinical practice of nursing students. Nursing students are placed into clinical practice under the full supervision of registered nurses who have a mentoring responsibility (Pitkänen et al., 2018). The nursing teacher at a tertiary institution is completely removed from the learning process occurring during student clinical practice at a healthcare facility.

Contrary to Asian practices, the role of nursing teachers in the Japanese nursing education system as a clinical facilitator is essential for the learning process occurring during student clinical practice (Yang & Chao, 2018). Commonly, the clinical facilitator's task at tertiary institutions in Japan also involves managing academic duties such as teaching theoretical classes, research, and administration (Mamagani et al., 2018).

In this international comparison, we aim to examine and explore mentoring practices and the required competence of registered nurses for mentoring nursing students in clinical practice in five European countries and Japan. We believe this information can provide further guidance, instructions and collaboration areas between Europe and Japan on aspects of clinical practice and nursing student mentoring that require focus.

Background

According to EU directive 2013/55, nursing education involves at least three years (or at least 4600 hours) of theoretical education, and clinical practice which must comprise at least half of the total educational duration. In Asian countries such as Japan and Taiwan, students must have at least 3000 hours of clinical practice during the total three- to four-year-long nursing education program (Yang & Chao, 2018). Clinical practice is conducted in the clinic with authentic patients in both Europe and Asia.

1
2
3 European countries integrate students into clinical practice under the direct mentoring of registered
4
5 nurses. Nursing teachers maintain an official connection between the tertiary institution and the
6
7 healthcare organization (Mikkonen et al., 2019), and play a more passive role by holding
8
9 responsibility for organizational purposes rather than actively participating in student learning during
10
11 clinical practice (Mikkonen et al., 2017; Pitkänen et al., 2018).
12
13

14
15 In Japan, clinical nurse instructors collaborate closely with registered nurses to mentor nursing
16
17 students during clinical practice (Yamada & Ota, 2012; Yang & Chao, 2018). The role of clinical
18
19 nurse instructors is more relevant in Japan than in Europe. However, despite the more clearly defined
20
21 role of nurse instructors in Asia, the challenges and lack of resources seen in Europe also exist in Asia
22
23 (Yang & Chao, 2018).
24
25

26
27 For nursing students engaged in clinical practice, the mentors' role is significant for students'
28
29 professional development and wellbeing (Pramilla-Savukoski et al., 2019; Tuomikoski et al., 2020).
30
31 Mentors need high levels of competence in professional nursing and, further, in mentoring while
32
33 incorporating pedagogical factors to aptly mentor nursing students in clinical practice. Recent
34
35 systematic reviews (Pramilla-Savukoski et al., 2019; Tuomikoski et al., 2020) showed that mentoring
36
37 in nursing included mentors' competence in: supporting students' professional development;
38
39 facilitating collaboration between a student and other mentor stakeholders; supporting students'
40
41 learning; and taking strong initiative for building collaborative mentor-student relationships during
42
43 clinical practice (Tuomikoski et al., 2020).
44
45
46
47

48
49 Elements comprising support of student learning include: understanding students' nursing curricula;
50
51 assisting students with establishing learning outcomes; providing regular and constructive feedback;
52
53 and participating in formative and summative student evaluation (Pramilla-Savukoski et al., 2019).
54

55
56 Despite these elements, the studies presented in the abovementioned systematic review by Pramilla-
57
58 Savukoski et al. (2019) showed that all mentors were not educated in mentoring outside of what they
59
60 learned through their nursing education and work experiences.

1
2
3 Many studies have been conducted on nursing students' experiences with and perceptions of
4 mentoring and the clinical learning environment (Antohe et al., 2016; Husebø et al., 2018; Kaihlanen
5 et al., 2018; Mikkonen et al., 2016a). However, only a few studies examined mentors' experiences
6 with and perceptions of mentoring nursing students (Mikkonen et al., 2016b; Pramilla-Savukoski et
7 al., 2019; Tuomikoski et al., 2020).
8
9

10
11
12 Several systematic reviews found that students' experiences varied and was generally good but was
13 highly dependent on the student-mentor relationship (Dickson et al., 2015; Husebø et al., 2018).
14
15 Kaihlanen et al. (2018) reported that the quality of supervision and of the support system created in
16 clinical practice was related to the successful transition of graduate nurses from student to work as a
17 registered nurse. Mamaghani et al. (2018) and Mikkonen et al. (2016a) reported on more challenging
18 experiences of nursing students with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds; for example,
19 discrimination issues and learning challenges, unavailability of more diverse learning opportunities
20 in clinical practice, the strain of being different, and even considerations of leaving nursing studies
21 for other professions.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 Previous studies examining mentors' perspectives and experiences revealed that mentors considered
37 their competence levels high (Pramilla-Savukoski et al., 2019) and strongly emphasized the need for
38 building mentorships with students (Tuomikoski et al. 2020). Moreover, mentors described
39 challenges associated with having to mentor culturally and linguistically diverse students and not
40 knowing how to treat them appropriately (Mikkonen et al., 2016b). Mentors highlighted the
41 importance of the student's independence as a learner and of the outcome of their learning experiences
42 in clinical practice (Mikkonen et al., 2016b), contradicting the recent study by Mikkonen et al.
43 (2020a) which indicated the vulnerable position of the student when having to build mentor-student
44 relationships and to influence the success of their learning during clinical practice.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 In nearly all systematic reviews discussed above, a focus on collaboration between clinical practice
59 at healthcare facilities and tertiary institutions is considered a limitation of the present reality
60

1
2
3 worldwide. Mentors assume the important responsibility of mentoring nursing students in their
4
5 clinical practice, which requires them to have sufficient levels of nursing experience, motivation and,
6
7 most of all, mentoring competence.
8
9

10 11 Methods

12 13 14 Study aim

15 This study aimed to explore mentors' competence in mentoring nursing students during clinical
16
17 practice by identifying different mentor profiles and connections between different competence areas
18
19 among five European countries and Japan.
20
21

22 23 Study design

24
25 The study was conducted according to the methodological standards of cross-sectional study in
26
27 Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Slovenia, Spain, and Japan during 2016 and 2019. Data from the European
28
29 countries were used for secondary analysis (authors-blinded), whereas data from Japan were used for
30
31 the primary analysis.
32
33

34 35 Participants

36
37 The inclusion criteria for participation were mentors, registered nurses, responsible and/or
38
39 undertaking mentoring duties with nursing students during their clinical practice. The exclusion
40
41 criteria were nurse teacher educators employed by higher education institutions mentoring nursing
42
43 students at the clinical practice. In total, 6208 mentors were invited from 58 inpatient and/or
44
45 outpatient clinical facilities in health organizations from the six countries. Mentors were invited to
46
47 participate once and received two reminders within two to three weeks from the contact person at
48
49 each organization undertaking the study. The sample size in each country was predetermined using
50
51 Cohen's *d* effect size value on the large effect size level ($d=0.8$) (Cohen, 1992) based on previous
52
53 research studies on mentoring competence (Pramila-Savukoski et al., 2020). The aim of sample size
54
55 was set at the level of 500 mentors in total in order to properly perform k-clustering (Wedel &
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kamakura, 2000). Moreover, in order to test the SEM model, given 100 parameters to estimate and a
4 recommended participants: parameter ratio ranging from 10:1 to 20:1 (Kline, 2010; Schreiber et al.,
5 2006), a sample size from 1000 to 2000 participants was necessary to test the model. The total
6 response rate was 30%, varying between 10-30% among the countries.
7
8
9
10
11

12 13 Instrument

14
15 The Mentor Competence Instrument (MCI), a psychometrically validated self-assessment instrument
16 with a Likert scale (ranging from 1 - fully disagree to 5 - fully agree), was used to measure mentors'
17 competence. The MCI comprises seven sum variables and 43 items: workplace mentoring practice (6
18 items), mentor characteristics (7 items), mentor motivation (5 items), goal orientation in mentoring
19 (6 items), reflection during mentoring (6 items), student-centered evaluation (9 items), and
20 constructive feedback (4 items; Mikkonen et al., 2019; Tuomikoski et al., 2018). The instrument was
21 forward-backward translated by four separate researchers of each country, according to the
22 recommendations of scientific language translators, into six languages. The translations back into
23 English has been examined by instrument developers (authors-blinded) to ensure the meaning of each
24 item has not been lost after back translations. Validation of the MCI was reported for data from the
25 five European countries by Mikkonen et al. (2020), and from Japan by Nakaoka et al. (2021). The
26 Cronbach's alpha values for this study data varied from 0.86 to 0.94.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Data collection

44
45 Data was collected from 1862 registered nurse mentors at 58 healthcare organizations in five
46 European countries and Japan. Mentors were invited to respond either to a paper or electronic version
47 of a questionnaire comprising the 43 MCI items and 8 background questions (including gender, age,
48 country of origin, work experience, education, job title, mentoring frequency, and previous education
49 in mentoring). The data was collected via email or sealed envelope by a contact person provided by
50 each healthcare organization to support the study. Researchers directly involved in the study had no
51 direct contact with participants and did not directly receive participant identifying information.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Ethical issues

Permission to conduct research was requested and granted for all 58 organizations in all six participating countries according to the ethical standards of each country. In Japan, the primary research has been approved by the IRB of Osaka Prefecture University (approval number: 30-51); and for the use of secondary data, by the IRB of Osaka University (approval number: 20193). In Spain the Ethics Committee of the University of Alicante has granted ethical permission for international research with ID number: UA-2018-12-12. In Lithuania the Ethics Committee of the Lithuanian University of Health Sciences has granted ethical permission for international research with ID numbers: No. BEC-SL(B)-194 and No. BEC-SL(B)-230. There was no need for an ethical statement from the ethical committee in the rest of European countries involved in the study to conduct the research since the study did not violate physical integrity of the subjects; did not involve children under 15 years; did not involve harmful psychological or physical effects upon the participants; and did not involve a security threat towards participants (Medical Research Act 488/1999, 295/2004, 794/2010, Declaration of Helsinki 2013). The research permissions were obtained from each organization involved in the study of EU countries. Study participation was voluntary for all participants, and freedom for study withdrawal and anonymity were guaranteed. All participants received additional information about the study and provision of a questionnaire with their responses was considered consent agreement to participate in the study.

Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS (IBM, 24v.) and Stata (StataCorp, V12.0) software. Descriptive data frequencies and comparisons among cluster groups were computed using Chi-square with categorical data and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Bonferroni correction for continuous data (Munro, 2005). K-clustering methods were used to classify mentor profiles by area of mentor competence. Several versions of mentor clustering were tested prior to determining the

1
2
3 four-group clustering of the profiles. The set rule was that each cluster had to score higher than 5%
4 of the total sample. The four clusters were examined using one-way ANOVA (Rauf et al., 2012).

5
6
7
8 Furthermore, structural equation modeling (SEM) was performed to examine the theoretical model
9 found and reported by Authors-blinded (2020) for the five European countries. The SEM model was
10 validated using the following goodness of fit indexes: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
11 (RMSEA, ≤ 0.08), Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR, ≤ 0.08), Comparative Fit Index (CFI,
12 ≥ 0.90), and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI, ≥ 0.90 ; Kline, 2010). A coefficient of determination (CD) was
13 calculated to identify the overall variance of the model explaining the phenomena. The statistical
14 significance threshold was set at a p-value < 0.05 for all study analyses.

25 Results

26 Participants

27
28 Participants were distributed in this study as follows: 31% from Finland, 16% from Italy, 18% from
29 Lithuania, 14% from Slovenia, 6% from Spain, and 15% from Japan. Among the participants: 76%
30 were female; the most common age groups were 40-49-year-olds (34%) and 30-39-year-olds (26%);
31 87% had a university bachelor's degree in nursing; 90% were registered nurses; the average duration
32 of work experience was 18 years, and 81% worked in an inpatient specialized healthcare area.
33 Participants mentored students on a weekly (36%), monthly (23%) and yearly (30%) basis. Half of
34 the participants (52%) had no previous education in mentoring of any kind.

46 Mentor competence in five European countries and Japan

47
48 This study identified four mentor profiles, A, B, C, and D, based on the seven areas of mentor
49 competence (see Table 1). The differences between all four mentor profile competence areas and their
50 characteristics were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).

51
52 Profile A included the most competent mentors in all seven competence areas, with the lowest mean
53 of 3.64 (SD 0.37) observed for workplace mentoring practices and the highest mean of 3.91 (SD 0.16)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for reflection during mentoring. Profile A comprised mainly Finnish (33%), Lithuanian (23%) and
4 Slovenian (23%) participants and included most of the male participants (30%) compared to the other
5 three profiles. Most Profile A mentors were 40-49 or 50-59 years old and had more work experience
6 in years (M 20.24, SD 10.70), and 99% of Profile A mentors held a university degree. Profile A also
7 included the highest percentage of public health nurses (7%) and managers (3%) compared to the
8 other three profiles. Profile A had the highest percentage of mentors (59%) who had received
9 education in mentoring.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Profile B mentors varied in competence with the lowest mean of 3.11 (SD 0.40) observed for student-
21 centered evaluation and the highest mean of 3.59 (SD 0.34) for reflection during mentoring. Profile
22 B comprised mainly Finnish (41%) and Lithuanian (21%) participants, most of whom were 40-49
23 years old and held a university degree (97%).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Mentors comprising profiles C and D presented poorer evaluations than mentors comprising profiles
31 A and B. For Profile C mentors, the lowest mean (2.59, SD 0.50) was observed for workplace
32 mentoring practices and the highest mean (3.00, SD 0.35) was observed for reflection during
33 mentoring. For Profile D mentors, the lowest mean (1.80, SD 0.52) was observed for mentor
34 motivation and the highest mean (2.35, SD 0.54) was observed for reflection during mentoring.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Profile C mentors were predominantly from Japan (38%) and Italy (20%), while Profile D mentors
42 were mainly from Japan (77%), Finland (24%) and Italy (14%).
43
44
45

46 Profiles C and D comprised primarily of female participants (C, 83%; D, 87%), and most participants
47 were either 20-29, 30-39 or 40-49 years old. Mentors in both profiles had the least work experience
48 in years (C, 15 years; D, 12 years). Profiles C and D had the most mentors with a vocational nursing
49 diploma and no bachelor's degree (30% and 56%, respectively), and most mentors fitting these
50 profiles mentored students weekly, compared to Profile A and B mentors. These profiles also
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 comprised the highest percentage of mentors with no previous education in mentoring (C, 61%; D,
4
5 76%).
6
7

8 9 Mentor competence areas and their connections in five European countries and 10 11 Japan 12

13
14 The SEM model of the total sample (n = 1852) was further tested according to the evidence-based
15
16 model computed and reported with the EU data presented by Authors-blinded (2020) by showing the
17
18 goodness of fit with statistical significance of p-value < 0.001 ($p < 0.001$; $\chi^2 = 6035.052$);
19
20 RMSEA = 0.058; SRMR = 0.070; CFI = 0.920; TLI = 0.915; CD = 0.944 (see Tables 2 and 3, and
21
22 Figure 1). The following connections between mentor competence areas were identified.
23
24 Characteristic area of mentor competence was associated with mentor motivation (0.85) and
25
26 reflection during mentoring (0.38). Mentor motivation was associated with competence in workplace
27
28 mentoring practices (0.76) and reflection during mentoring (0.48). Workplace mentoring practices
29
30 were related to mentor competence in goal-orientated mentoring (0.36), which further led to
31
32 competence in student-centered evaluation (0.83). Reflection during mentoring was related to
33
34 competence in giving constructive feedback (0.59) and, also, to goal-orientated mentoring (0.59). All
35
36 model parameters were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 44 Sensitivity analyses

45
46 Missing data and multivariate normality should be carefully managed to effectively perform SEM
47
48 modeling as deleting multivariate outliers and missing data while improving SEM testing could
49
50 remove useful information about cluster characteristics. Thus, in this study, we decided to keep the
51
52 whole sample to perform both clustering and SEM modeling. We also managed missing data and
53
54 multivariate outliers to ensure model validity, and treated the sample in order to achieve multivariate
55
56 normality. Then we ran the SEM model again to determine possible differences between the re-run
57
58 model and the model computed using the whole sample.
59
60

1
2
3 In detail, we checked for missing data characteristics in the sample and assessed multivariate
4 normality requirements in order to perform SEM properly (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2006). Little's
5 Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) test was used to check missing data with a rule that any
6 data greater than 5% MCAR in each record be deleted (Graham, 2009; Little, 1988). In this study,
7 use of Little's MCAR test demonstrated no statistical significance ($p = 0.193$; $\chi^2 = 1596.004$),
8 providing the premise for a listwise deletion of missing data. Accordingly, missing data exceeding
9 5% were deleted, resulting in a sample of 1852 participants (10 records deleted; Graham, 2009).

10
11
12 Assessment and deletion of multivariate outliers are required to achieve multivariate normality in
13 distribution and to properly perform multivariate statistics. Mahalanobis distances and p-values of
14 chi-squared statistics were calculated, accounting for 43 degrees of freedom. Deletion of multivariate
15 outliers yielded a sample of 1623 participants, and multivariate normality was demonstrated by a
16 Mardia's kurtosis index of 1635.877, falling within the threshold value of 1935 necessary for
17 multivariate normality (Lombardi and Pastore, 2012; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2006).

18
19
20 The model's fit indexes improved slightly with these sensitivity analyses. In detail, RMSEA = 0.057;
21 SRMR = 0.063; CFI = 0.929; TLI = 0.925; and CD = 0.953. These indexes were similar to the whole
22 sample model. Likewise, this model's parameters had the same pattern as that of the whole sample
23 model (Table 2).

24 Discussion

25
26 This study aimed to explore mentor competence in mentoring nursing students during clinical practice
27 by identifying different mentor profiles and connections between different competence areas among
28 nurse mentors from five European countries and Japan. Four different mentor profiles were identified
29 and analyzed for levels of mentor competence areas and for the backgrounds of mentors who fit these
30 profiles. For the four different profiles and their associated mentoring areas, we found significantly
31 different mentor characteristics.

1
2
3 Nurse educational background, varying between bachelor's degrees from a university/university of
4 applied sciences and vocational nursing diploma colleges, influenced the mentor competence levels
5 of the study participants. A growing change in nursing education level from diploma to university
6 degree has been observed since the 1990s (Delaney & Piscopo, 2004). The worldwide lack of nurses
7 has reopened discussions about whether nursing education should revert to the diploma level to
8 accelerate the education of nurse graduates and increase the number of nurses internationally.
9 However, according to the evidence, higher education in nursing encourages nurses to undertake
10 continuous career development, raises nurses' personal and professional satisfaction and self-image,
11 and creates better opportunities for job mobility and higher wages (Christiansen et al., 2018; Sultan
12 et al., 2017).

13
14
15
16
17 Among study participants, most nurses with diplomas were from Japan, and Japanese nurses produced
18 the lowest scores in mentoring competence. The EU established strict educational standards,
19 regulated by the European Qualifications Framework (EQF), that have positively influenced nursing
20 education since the start of the millennium (EQF, 2020). However, in Japan, the nursing career path
21 may begin with any of several different educational options ranging from a three-year nursing college
22 education without achieving a bachelor's degree to a nursing degree from a university (Japanese
23 Nursing Association, 2016). Higher education in nursing is a critical factor for professional growth
24 and leadership, and quality of patient care.

25
26
27
28
29 Furthermore, this study demonstrated that mentoring education was not a regular practice among the
30 six countries. According to the results, mentors with education in mentoring gave higher self-
31 evaluation scores for their competence in each mentoring area. The latest systematic review revealed
32 that, commonly, mentors undertake the critical role of shaping the professional competence of future
33 nurses despite having no mentoring education (Pramilla-Savukoski et al., 2019). Tuomikoski et al.
34 (2020a) showed that education in mentoring significantly affected mentor competence growth and,
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 further, introduced the requirement that mentors receive basic education before undertaking the role
4
5 of mentoring nursing students.
6
7

8 In this study, older and more experienced mentors presented higher competence self-evaluations,
9
10 whereas younger, less experienced mentors provided lower mentoring competence self-evaluations.
11
12 The support of older nurses with more work experience has proven to help younger nurses transition
13
14 from student to registered nurse (Kaihlanen et al., 2013).
15
16

17
18 Profile D mentors scored the lowest in mentor motivation, yet they mentored students on a weekly
19
20 basis, most frequently of all study participants. Motivation is an essential factor for mentors assuming
21
22 a mentoring role, since it influences: students' wellbeing and willingness to continue in the nursing
23
24 profession (Mikkonen et al., 2016a); mentors' ability to cover the gap between classroom education
25
26 and clinical practice (Zohoorparvande et al., 2018); improvement of stress levels, reduction of
27
28 loneliness, and enhancement of self-efficacy in students (Raymond & Sheppard, 2017).
29
30

31
32 Of the four profiles identified in this study, all mentors gave themselves the lowest scores for
33
34 competence in workplace mentoring practices, and the highest scores for competence in reflection
35
36 during mentoring. This finding support a novel view of mentoring competencies related to the role of
37
38 the organizational environment in supporting mentoring and clinical learning: in order to enhance
39
40 mentoring in the clinical settings, it is essential to consider the workplace and to support better
41
42 integration of the mentors' role in the ward team (Mikkonen et al., 2020).
43
44
45

46
47 Workplace mentoring practices involve mentors' knowledge of quality requirements and criteria and
48
49 of the social and healthcare systems of their country, and skills in their own tasks as a mentor and in
50
51 clinical practice within their healthcare organization (Tuomikoski et al., 2018). The low score in
52
53 workplace mentoring practices may be explained by the fact that more than half of study participants
54
55 had no education in mentoring.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Reflection during mentoring involves elements of mentor-student dialogue about students' learning
4 experiences and preset outcomes, mentor encouragement of student discussions about their learning
5 process, as well as offers of empathetic acceptance and creation of a permissive and open atmosphere
6
7 for these types of communications (Tuomikoski et al., 2018). Such elements of reflection have shown
8
9 to motivate, orientate and encourage students, especially during their first years of studying nursing
10
11 (Kol & Ince, 2018).
12
13
14
15

16
17 Moreover, in this study, we tested the evidence-based model reported by Authors-blinded (2020).
18
19 The evidence-based model was found statistically significant for the total study sample. The model
20
21 represents connections between mentors' individual competence and workplace interactions, such as
22
23 the relationships between mentor characteristics, mentor motivation and workplace mentoring
24
25 practices. Furthermore, the model encompasses the competence areas of reflection during mentoring,
26
27 constructive feedback, goal-orientation and student-centered evaluation, which can be defined as
28
29 mentor competence areas that support the student learning process.
30
31
32
33

34
35 Mentor characteristics and motivation were associated with mentors taking time to reflect with
36
37 students, which further connected to provision of constructive feedback by the mentor. The model
38
39 also showed an association with better student-centered evaluation and provided an overview of the
40
41 mentoring process that could enhance students' clinical learning and competence mastery.
42
43

44
45 This study confirmed the validity of the model detected by Authors-blinded (2020) from a broader
46
47 perspective by including an international sample from a non-European country. Our findings support
48
49 an evidence-based view of a theoretical perspective that guides professional clinical learning and the
50
51 mentoring process for nursing students.
52
53

54 Limitations

55
56 This study represents an international sample from five European countries and Japan. Generalization
57
58 of results must be considered only for the six countries observed in the study. Additional data
59
60

1
2
3 collection from and comparisons of other larger international regions could offer a wider perspective
4
5 on mentoring internationally. The low response rate and unbalance between sample of six countries,
6
7 especially in Italy, Spain and Japan, is an additional limitation of the data analysis and reporting; but
8
9 the study offers large effect outcomes regardless (Cohen's d effect size $d=0.8$ and above; Cohen,
10
11 1992). In order to enhance the validity and reliability of the study, the guidelines for reporting
12
13 observational studies *Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology*
14
15 (STROBE) statement has been used when conducting the research and reporting of the data (von Elm
16
17 et al., 2007).
18
19
20
21

22 Implications for nursing education and practice

23
24 The study outcomes can be applied to nursing education by emphasizing higher education and
25
26 additional career development opportunities for nurses. The mentor role is fundamental for nursing
27
28 students' learning process and for their future professional development into registered nurses. Since
29
30 the nurse teacher's role is distant from clinical practice, mentor competence must be guaranteed and
31
32 must continually develop to sustain high quality mentoring practices. Mentors must be offered and
33
34 should be required to undertake basic education in nursing student mentoring.
35
36
37
38

39 Conclusion

40
41 Mentoring proved to be an important competence for nurse mentors to have and maintain in each
42
43 country observed in this study. Nursing student mentoring requires motivated, highly competent
44
45 mentors, since mentoring is a critical aspect of nursing education. Mentoring roles should be given
46
47 to nurses with higher education who are trained in mentoring. Younger, less experienced nurses may
48
49 need support from senior nurses when performing mentoring roles and could also facilitate a more
50
51 balanced workload, between patient care and mentoring, for senior nurses. Such support can sustain
52
53 mentoring motivation for students and provide a positive attitude towards mentoring in a student-
54
55 centered manner. This study could guide healthcare educational systems in the provision of effective
56
57 nursing student learning during clinical practice, and could also advise healthcare organizations in
58
59
60

1
2
3 provision of an effective mentoring process for newcomer nurses (with special focus on inpatient
4 clinical facilities).
5
6
7

8 9 References

10 Adnan, Y. (2018). Low nurse retention: a global issue. *International Journal of Nursing Care*, 6(2),
11 93-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5958/2320-8651.2018.00031.5>
12

13
14
15 Antohe, I., Riklikiene, O., Tichelaar, E., & Saarikoski, M. (2016). Clinical education and training
16 of student nurses in four moderately new European Union countries: assessment of students'
17 satisfaction with the learning environment. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 17, 139-144. doi:
18 10.1016/j.nepr.2015.12.005
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 Christiansen, A., Jacob, E., & Twigg, D. (2018). *Is it time to consider a four year Nursing Bachelor*
27 *Degree in Australia? A discussion paper*. Retrieved from
28 [https://https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2018.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2018.01.004)
29
30
31

32
33 Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 112 (1), 155-159.
34

35
36 Dames, S. (2019). The interplay of developmental factors that impact congruence and the ability to
37 thrive among new graduate nurses: a qualitative study of the interplay as students transition to
38 professional practice. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 36, 47-53.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Declaration of Helsinki (2013). Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3 EQF (2020). *European qualifications framework. European Centre of the Development of*
4
5 *Vocational Training*. Retrieved from: [https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/events-and-](https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/events-and-projects/projects/european-qualifications-framework-eqf)
6
7 [projects/projects/european-qualifications-framework-eqf](https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/events-and-projects/projects/european-qualifications-framework-eqf)
8
9
- 10 Fang, W., Zhang, Y., Mei, J., Chai, X., & Fan, X. (2018). Relationships between optimism,
11
12 educational environment, career adaptability and career motivation in nursing undergraduates:
13
14 A cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, 68, 33-39. <https://10.1016/j.nedt.2018.05.025>
15
16
17
- 18 Graham, J.W., (2009). Missing data analysis: making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of*
19
20 *Psychology*, 60, 549-576.
21
22
- 23 He, F. X., Turnbull, B., Kirshbaum, M. N., Phillips, B., & Klainin-Yobas, P. (2018). Assessing
24
25 stress, protective factors and psychological well-being among undergraduate nursing
26
27 students. *Nurse Education Today*, 68, 4-12. <https://10.1016/j.nedt.2018.05.013>
28
29
30
- 31 Husebø, A., Storm, M., Våga, B. B., Rosenberg, A., & Akerjordet, K. (2018). Status of knowledge
32
33 on student-learning environments in nursing homes: A mixed-method systematic review.
34
35 *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 27(7-8), e1344–e1359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14299>
36
37
38
- 39 IBM (2017). *IBM SPSS Statistics 25*. Ibm. doi.org/10.1080/02331889108802322
40
41
- 42 Japanese Nursing Association (2016). *Nursing in Japan*. Retrieved from [https://www.nurse.or.jp](https://www.nurse.or.jp/jna/english/pdf/nursing-in-japan2016.pdf)
43
44 [/jna/english/pdf/nursing-in-japan2016.pdf](https://www.nurse.or.jp/jna/english/pdf/nursing-in-japan2016.pdf)
45
46
- 47 Kaihlanen, A., Lakanmaa, R., & Salminen, L. (2013). The transition from nursing student to
48
49 registered nurse: the mentor's possibilities to act as a supporter. *Nurse Education in*
50
51 *Practice*, 13(5), 418-422. <https://10.1016/j.nepr.2013.01.001>
52
53
54
- 55 Kaihlanen, A., Haavisto, E., Strandell-Laine, C., & Salminen, L. (2018). Facilitating the transition
56
57 from a nursing student to a Registered Nurse in the final clinical practicum: a scoping literature
58
59 review. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 32(2), 466-477. <https://10.1111/scs.12494>
60

- 1
2
3 Kaihlanen, A., Elovainio, M., Haavisto, E., Salminen, L., & Sinervo, T. (2020). Final clinical
4
5 practicum, transition experience and turnover intentions among newly graduated nurses: a
6
7 cross sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, 84.
8
9 [https://https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.104245](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.104245)
10
11
12
13 Kantek, F., Kaya, A., & Gezer, N. (2017). The effects of nursing education on professional values:
14
15 A longitudinal study. *Nurse Education Today*, 58, 43-46. <https://10.1016/j.nedt.2017.08.004>
16
17
18 Kol, E., & Ince, S. (2018). *Determining the opinions of the first-year nursing students about clinical*
19
20 *practice and clinical educators*. Retrieved from
21
22 [https://https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2018.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2018.04.009)
23
24
25
26 Kline, R.B. (2010). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. The Guilford Press,
27
28 New York.
29
30 Little, R.J.A. (1988). A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing
31
32 values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83 (404), 1198-1202.
33
34 Lombardi, L., & Pastore, M. (2012). Sensitivity of fit indices to fake perturbation of ordinal data: a
35
36 sample by replacement approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 47, 519-546.
37
38 Lopes, S. C., Guerra-Arias, M., Buchan, J., Pozo-Martin, F., Nove, A., & Castro Lopes, S.
39
40 (2017). *A rapid review of the rate of attrition from the health workforce*. BioMed Central.
41
42 Retrieved from <https://10.1186/s12960-017-0195-2>
43
44
45
46 Mamaghani, E. A., Rahmani, A., Hassankhani, H., Zamanzadeh, V., Campbell, S., Fast, O., &
47
48 Irajpour, A. (2018). Experiences of Iranian Nursing Students Regarding Their Clinical
49
50 Learning Environment. *Asian Nursing Research*, 12(3), 216-222. doi:
51
52 10.1016/j.anr.2018.08.005
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Medical Research Act 488/1999, 295/2004, 794/2010. (2010). *Ministry of Social Affairs and*
4
5 *Health, Finland*. Retrieved from
6
7
8 URL:<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990488>.
9
10
11 Mikkonen, K., Elo, S., Kuivila, H., Tuomikoski, A., & Kääriäinen, M. (2016a). Culturally and
12
13 linguistically diverse healthcare students' experiences of learning in a clinical environment: A
14
15 systematic review of qualitative studies. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 54, 173-187.
16
17
18 <https://10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2015.06.004>
19
20
21 Mikkonen, K., Elo, S., Tuomikoski, A., & Kääriäinen, M. (2016b). Mentor experiences of
22
23 international healthcare students' learning in a clinical environment: A systematic
24
25 review. *Nurse Education Today*, 40, 87-94. <https://10.1016/j.nedt.2016.02.013>
26
27
28
29 Mikkonen, K., Tomietto, M., Kääriäinen, M., Oikarainen, A., Tuomikoski, A.M., Riklikiene, O.,
30
31 Juskauskienė, E., Vizcaya-Moreno, F., Pérez-Cañaveras, R., De Raeve, R., Filej, B., Plazar, N.,
32
33 Čuk, V., & Kaučič B.M. (2019). Development of an evidence-based nurse mentor's
34
35 competence model. QualMent EU-project. Celje. CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji.
36
37 Univerzitetna knjižnica Maribor, Slovenia. ISBN 978-961-6889-35-3
38
39
40
41 Mikkonen, K., Merilainen, M., & Tomietto, M. (2020a). Empirical model of clinical learning
42
43 environment and mentoring of culturally and linguistically diverse nursing students. *Journal of*
44
45 *Clinical Nursing (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.)*, 29(3), 653-661. <https://10.1111/jocn.15112>
46
47
48
49 Mikkonen, K., Tomietto, M., Cicolini, G., Kaucic, B. M., Filej, B., Riklikiene, O., Juskauskienė, E.,
50
51 Vizcaya-Moreno, F., Pérez-Cañaveras, R. M., De Raeve, P., & Kääriäinen, M. (2020).
52
53 Development and testing of an evidence-based model of mentoring nursing students in clinical
54
55 practice. *Nurse Education Today*, 85, 104272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.104272>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Munro, B.H. (2005). *Statistical methods for health care research*, 5th edn. Philadelphia, Lippincott
4
5 Williams, Wilkins.
6
7
8
9 Nakaoka, A., Utsumi, M., Inoue, M., Yayama, S., & Uesugi Y. (2021). The Reliability and Validity
10
11 of the Japanese version of the Mentors' Competence Instrument in Clinical Mentoring of
12
13 Nursing Students. *Japan Academy of Nursing Science*, 31 (1), 43-54.
14
15
16
17 Niskala, J., Kanste, O., Tomietto, M., Miettunen, J., Tuomikoski, A.M., Kyngäs, H., & Mikkonen,
18
19 K. (2020). Interventions to improve nurses' job satisfaction: a systematic review and meta-
20
21 analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. <https://10.1111/jan.14342>
22
23
24
25 Pitkänen, S., Kääriäinen, M., Oikarainen, A., Tuomikoski, A., Elo, S., Ruotsalainen, H., Saarikoski,
26
27 M., Kärämänoja, T., & Mikkonen, K. (2018). Healthcare students' evaluation of the clinical
28
29 learning environment and supervision - a cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, 62,
30
31 143-149. <https://10.1016/j.nedt.2018.01.005>
32
33
34
35 Pramila-Savukoski, S., Juntunen, J., Tuomikoski, A., Kääriäinen, M., Tomietto, M., Kaučič, B. M.,
36
37 Filej, B., Riklikiene, O., Vizcaya-Moreno, M. F., Perez-Cañaveras, R.,M., De Raeve, P., &
38
39 Mikkonen, K. (2020). Mentors' self-assessed competence in mentoring nursing students in
40
41 clinical practice: A systematic review of quantitative studies. *Journal of Clinical Nursing (John*
42
43 *Wiley & Sons, Inc.)*, 29(5), 684-705. <https://10.1111/jocn.15127>
44
45
46
47 Raymond, J.M., & Sheppard, K. (2017). Effects of peer mentoring on nursing students' perceived
48
49 stress, sense of belonging, self-efficacy and loneliness. *Medicine*. <https://10.5430/jnep.v8n1p16>
50
51
52
53 Raymond, C., Profetto-McGrath, J., Myrick, F., & Strean, W. B. (2018). Process Matters: Successes
54
55 and Challenges of Recruiting and Retaining Participants for Nursing Education
56
57 Research. *Nurse Educator*, 43(2), 92-96. <https://10.1097/NNE.0000000000000423>
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rauf, A., Mahfooz, S., Khusro, S., & Javed, H. (2012). Enhanced K-Mean Clustering Algorithm to
4
5 Reduce Number of Iterations and Time Complexity. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific*
6
7 *Research, 12(7)*, 959-963.
8
9
- 10 Schreiber, J. B., Nora, A., Stage, F. K., Barlow, E. A., & King, J. (2006). Reporting structural
11
12 equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *The Journal of*
13
14 *Educational Research, 99(6)*, 323-338.
15
16
17
- 18 Sibandze, B. T., & Scafide, K. N. (2018). Among nurses, how does education level impact
19
20 professional values? A systematic review. *International Nursing Review, 65(1)*, 65-77.
21
22 <https://10.1111/inr.12390>
23
24
25
- 26 Song, P., & Tang, W. (2019). The community-based integrated care system in Japan: health care
27
28 and nursing care challenges posed by super-aged society. *Bioscience Trends, 13(3)*, 279-281.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.5582/bst.2019.01173>
31
32
33
- 34 StataCorp., (2011). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 12*. College Station (TX): Stata Corporation
35
36 LP. Coll. Station. TX StataCorp LP.
37
- 38 Tabachnick, B.G., Fidell, L.S. (2006). Cleaning up your act. Screening data prior to analysis. *Using*
39
40 *Multivariate Statistics 5*, 61-116.
41
- 42 Tuomikoski, A.M., Ruotsalainen, H., Mikkonen, K., Ohtonen, P., Miettunen, J., & Kääriäinen, M.,
43
44 (2018). The Nurse mentor competence of mentoring nursing student in clinical practice in
45
46 Finland -cross sectional survey. *Nurse Education Today 71*, 78-83.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.09.008>
49
50
- 51 Tuomikoski, A., Ruotsalainen, H., Mikkonen, K., & Kääriäinen, M. (2020). Nurses' experiences of
52
53 their competence at mentoring nursing students during clinical practice: A systematic review of
54
55 qualitative studies. *Nurse Education Today, 85*, N.PAG. <https://10.1016/j.nedt.2019.104258>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tuomikoski, A., Ruotsalainen, H., Mikkonen, K., Miettunen, J., Juvonen, S., Sivonen, P., &
4
5 Kääriäinen, M. (2020a). How mentoring education affects nurse mentors' competence in
6
7 mentoring students during clinical practice - A quasi-experimental study'. *Scandinavian*
8
9 *Journal of Caring Sciences*, 34(1), 230-238. <https://10.1111/scs.12728>
- 10
11
12
13 von Elm, E., Altman, D. G., Egger, M., Pocock, S. J., Gøtzsche, P. C., Vandenbroucke, J. P., &
14
15 STROBE Initiative (2007). Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
16
17 Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ*
18
19 *(Clinical research ed.)*, 335(7624), 806-808. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD>
- 20
21
22
23 Wedel, M., & Kamakura, W. A. (2012). *Market segmentation: Conceptual and methodological*
24
25 *foundations* (Vol. 8). Springer Science & Business Media.
- 26
27
28 World Health Organization (WHO), 2020. *Nursing and midwifery*. Retrieved from:
29
30 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/nursing-and-midwifery>
- 31
32
33 Yamada, S., & Ota, K. (2012). Essential roles of clinical nurse instructors in Japan: A Delphi
34
35 study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 14(2), 229-237. <https://10.1111/j.1442-2018.2012.00683.x>
- 36
37
38
39 Yang, C., & Chao, S. (2018). Clinical nursing instructors' perceived challenges in clinical
40
41 teaching. *Japan Journal of Nursing Science*, 15(1), 50-55. <https://10.1111/jjns.12167>
- 42
43
44
45 Ye, Y., Hu, R., Ni, Z., Jiang, N., & Jiang, X. (2018). Effects of perceived stress and professional
46
47 values on clinical performance in practice nursing students: A structural equation modeling
48
49 approach. *Nurse Education Today*, 71, 157-162. <https://10.1016/j.nedt.2018.09.036>
- 50
51
52 Zohoorparvande, V., Farrokhfall, K., Ahmadi, M., & Dashtgard, A. (2018). Investigating factors
53
54 affecting the gap of nursing education and practice from students and instructors' viewpoints.
55
56 *Future of Medical Education Journal*, 8 (3), 42-46.
- 57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Estimation of SEM's parameters (n=1852).

* statistical significance <0.001

Table 1. Mentors' profiles, characteristics and mentor competence (n=1852).

	Profile A (n=794)	Profile B (n=561)	Profile C (n=335)	Profile D (n=164)	F* / χ^2 **	p-value
Gender, n(%)					$\chi^2=37.563$	<0.001
Male	238 (30.0)	121 (21.6)	56 (16.7)	22 (13.4)		
Female	555 (69.9)	439 (78.3)	279 (83.3)	142 (86.6)		
Missing	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		
Age					$\chi^2=100.733$	<0.001
20-29 years	68 (8.6)	87 (15.5)	46 (13.7)	41 (25.0)		
30-39 years	188 (23.7)	145 (25.8)	102 (30.4)	54 (32.9)		
40-49 years	263 (33.1)	189 (33.7)	135 (40.3)	51 (31.1)		
50-59 years	227 (28.6)	110 (19.6)	49 (14.6)	16 (9.8)		
60 and above years	43 (5.4)	26 (4.6)	2 (0.6)	1 (0.6)		
Missing	5 (0.6)	4 (0.7)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.6)		
Country					$\chi^2=930.972$	<0.001
Finland	263 (33.1)	230 (41.0)	80 (23.9)	3 (1.8)		
Italy	99 (12.5)	101 (18.0)	67 (20.0)	23 (14.0)		
Lithuania	183 (23.0)	119 (21.2)	30 (9.0)	2 (1.2)		
Slovenia	179 (22.5)	67 (11.9)	18 (5.4)	4 (2.4)		
Spain	65 (8.2)	26 (4.6)	13 (3.9)	5 (3.0)		
Japan	5 (0.6)	18 (3.2)	127 (37.9)	127 (77.4)		
Work experience in years (mean, SD)	20.24 (10.70)	17.23 (10.56)	15.54 (9.56)	11.80 (7.91)	F=3.264	<0.001
Education					$\chi^2=638.899$	<0.001
Graduate school or junior college	1 (0.1)	2 (0.4)	12 (3.6)	9 (5.5)		
Vocational nursing diploma college	3 (0.4)	14 (2.5)	100 (29.9)	90 (54.8)		
University / university of applied sciences	788 (99.2)	545 (97.1)	223 (66.6)	65 (39.6)		
Job title					$\chi^2=161.528$	<0.001
Registered nurse/midwife	713 (89.8)	522 (93.0)	299 (89.3)	131 (79.9)		
Public health nurse	53 (6.7)	23 (4.1)	6 (1.8)	1 (0.6)		
Manager	21 (2.6)	10 (1.8)	4 (1.2)	2 (1.2)		
Other	7 (0.9)	6 (1.1)	26 (7.8)	30 (18.3)		
Mentored last time					$\chi^2=43.665$	<0.001
Last week	275 (34.6)	171 (30.5)	143 (42.7)	82 (50.0)		
Last month	198 (24.9)	132 (23.5)	66 (19.7)	40 (24.4)		
On yearly frequency	243 (30.6)	195 (34.8)	90 (26.9)	21 (12.8)		
Less frequently	71 (8.9)	53 (9.4)	30 (9.0)	13 (7.9)		
Missing	0 (0.0)	10 (1.8)	6 (1.8)	0 (0.0)		
Education in mentoring					$\chi^2=88.905$	<0.001

1							
2	Yes	468 (58.9.)	250 (44.6)	131 (39.1)	39 (23.8)		
3	No	326 (41.1)	311 (55.4)	203 (60.6)	124 (75.6)		
4	Mentor competence areas	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	F* / χ^2 **	p-value
5	Mentoring practices in the workplace	3.64 (0.37)	3.12 (0.49)	2.59 (0.50)	1.90 (0.44)	F=929.180	< 0.001
6	Mentors' characteristics	3.81 (0.22)	3.50 (0.36)	2.91 (0.43)	2.10 (0.51)	F=1406.790	< 0.001
7	Mentors' motivation	3.73 (0.32)	3.37 (0.39)	2.71 (0.46)	1.80 (0.52)	F=1380.239	< 0.001
9	Goal-orientated mentoring	3.78 (0.27)	3.25 (0.42)	2.73 (0.40)	2.14 (0.46)	F=1242.006	< 0.001
10	Reflection during mentoring	3.91 (0.16)	3.59 (0.34)	3.00 (0.35)	2.35 (0.54)	F=1505.218	< 0.001
11	Students-centered evaluation	3.74 (0.30)	3.11 (0.40)	2.72 (0.35)	2.12 (0.44)	F=1286.781	< 0.001
12	Constructive feedback	3.77 (0.30)	3.27 (0.42)	2.83 (0.40)	2.11 (0.53)	F=1084.534	< 0.001

*One-way ANOVA F-test; multiple comparisons conducted with Bonferroni correction;

** Chi-square test, Fisher exact test performed if the expected frequency of cells was less than 20%.

The mean difference is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Likert scale classification of mentor competence: >3.50 high competence; 2.50-3.49 moderate competence; <2.49 competence

Peer Review

Table 2. SEM model’s parameters estimation and statistical tests in the whole sample (n=1852) and sensitivity analysis (n=1623). (z-test and p-values)

SEM model	Outcome variable	Explanatory variable	Parameter	Standard Error	z-test	p-value
Data (n=1862)	Mentors’ motivation	Mentors’ charactersitics	0.856	0.009	94.13	<0.001
	Reflection during mentoring	Mentors’ motivation	0.489	0.036	13.43	<0.001
	Reflection during mentoring	Mentors’ characteristics	0.381	0.036	10.44	<0.001
	Mentoring practices in the workplace	Mentors’ motivation	0.766	0.012	63.57	<0.001
	Goal-orientation	Mentoring practices in the workplace	0.366	0.021	16.72	<0.001
	Goal-orientation	Constructive feedback	0.599	0.020	29.18	<0.001
	Constructive feedback	Reflection during mentoring	0.831	0.009	84.10	<0.001
	Student-centered evaluation	Goal-orientation	0.837	0.008	94.34	<0.001
Data (n=1623)	Mentors’ motivation	Mentors’ charactersitics	0.882	0.008	108.54	<0.001
	Reflection during mentoring	Mentors’ motivation	0.460	0.040	11.53	<0.001
	Reflection during mentoring	Mentors’ characteristics	0.430	0.040	10.81	<0.001
	Mentoring practices in the workplace	Mentors’ motivation	0.783	0.012	66.35	<0.001
	Goal-orientation	Mentoring practices in the workplace	0.344	0.022	15.54	<0.001
	Goal-orientation	Constructive feedback	0.643	0.020	31.58	<0.001
	Constructive feedback	Reflection during mentoring	0.853	0.009	92.46	<0.001
	Student-centered evaluation	Goal-orientation	0.864	0.008	107.30	<0.001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 3. Model's fit indexes and Coefficient of Determination (CD) – whole sample and sensitivity analysis.

Model	Chi-square	p	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	CD
Data (n=1852)	6035.052	<0.001	0.058	0.070	0.920	0.915	0.944
Data (n=1623)	5373.340	<0.001	0.057	0.063	0.929	0.925	0.953