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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

When I was a graduate student, I overheard a professor remark, "Our Ph.D. students must understand the importance of having a mentor--someone who can counsel them, give them advice, and open doors for them, so to speak". The professor went on to add that mentoring was one of the keys to success whether it was in the corporate world or in academe. He emphasized that having a mentor as a graduate student could lead to opportunities for research and publishing, nominations for awards, and recommendations for employment--just to name a few things. I wondered if his philosophy about mentoring was inclusive or if it only pertained to Whites—or only to White males. After all, the professor is a White male, and he had been very successful in more than one career. Did his philosophy of mentoring also apply to people of color, and more specifically to African Americans? Since my goal is to become a university professor, I wondered if my success would be dependent on a mentor-protégé relationship. Could the absence of a mentor mean that I might not have a "successful career"? If I was mentored would this mean that I would be mentored by a White male or female, given the underrepresentation of African Americans in higher education. Had the absence of this seemingly very important
relationship meant failure or less than stellar careers for other African Americans in academe? In a culture where mentoring has traditionally been reserved for White males, these were important questions for me and for African American faculty.

Numerous definitions of the word mentor as it relates to the corporate world and to higher education have been offered since the early '70s. Kanter (1977) defined mentors in the corporate world as sponsors—those who are in a position to fight for the person in question, enable lower-level members of the organization to bypass the hierarchy, and provide an important symbol to other people—a form of reflected power. Other researchers (Collins, 1982; Gerstein, 1985; Levinson et al., 1978) also identified power as a critical element in the corporate world mentor-protégé relationship, where the mentor is able to exercise personal power to ensure the allocation of resources and rewards to the protégé.

Mentoring in higher education has been described as a relationship in which the mentor, usually a more experienced faculty member, does more than an academic advisor. The mentor works closely with the protégé for the purposes of supporting and facilitating the professional growth and development of a colleague—a junior faculty member or a student (Artis, 1979; Taylor, 1992). But Blackwell (1989) described mentoring in higher education as a relationship which is more intense than that of the corporate sponsor or role model. He has argued that true mentoring relationships—relationships that are intense, close, interactive, and quite often immensely complex—may be rare as individuals may perform functions which are oriented toward being a mentor, but which are much less intense. Blackwell defined
mentoring as a "process by which persons of superior rank, special achievements, and prestige instruct, counsel, guide and facilitate the intellectual and/or career development of persons identified as protégés."

Traditionally, mentoring--both in the corporate world and in higher education--and the advantages associated with it--has been reserved for White males (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Hill et al., 1989; Levinson et al., 1978; McCormick, 1991; Sands et al., 1991; Stonewater, 1990). Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee (1978) in The Seasons of a Man's Life referred to "mentors in the male gender" and emphasized that this reference reflected the current reality. Hill, Bahniuk, and Dobos (1989) reported that in higher education, informal communication systems have tended to function as "old boys" networks in which male mentors foster and guide male mentees. In the context of higher education, the traditional nature of the mentoring process suggests that just as in the corporate world, faculty members either consciously or unconsciously mentor those persons who are like themselves. Faculty members who are mentors will most likely choose protégés who share the same ethnic, religious, academic and/or social backgrounds.

Mentoring, as it has traditionally been practiced, has several implications for African American faculty members in higher education, and particularly for African Americans in predominantly White institutions. First, mentors (who are usually White males) tend to initiate the mentor-protégé relationship. Scott (1992) reports that there may be problems with the willingness of mentors or protégés to select from other racial or ethnic groups. Problems of identification with a cross-race mentor and
understanding the problems faced by the minority protégé seem to have commonalities as well as differences. Second, the relationship will most likely be based on what is comfortable for the mentor—same race and same gender, with race being the stronger preference. Third, since African Americans are the least likely to be selected, the benefits of a mentor-protégé relationship are not often afforded to them. That is African Americans who do not have mentors are less likely to be offered prestigious faculty positions, invited to collaborate in research and publishing, and are less likely to be granted promotion and tenure.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the experiences of African American faculty members who were involved in formal and informal mentoring relationships, to determine what effect the faculty members thought the mentoring relationship had on their careers, and to explore to what extent race and gender match affected the mentor-protégé relationship.

Statement of the Problem

There is an extensive body of literature on the concept of mentoring in the corporate world. However, there is not as much literature on the subject of faculty-to-faculty mentoring in higher education. Moreover, even less has been written on the subject of mentoring African American faculty. The major research question which was explored in this study was: What were the experiences of ten (10) selected African American faculty members in two predominantly White institutions who were involved in mentor-protégé relationships?
The following questions guided the process of inquiry:

1. What do protégés and mentors say are the major characteristics of the mentoring relationship?

2. What effect do the protégés think the mentoring relationship has had on their careers?

3. How do protégés and mentors describe the impact of race/gender match on their mentoring relationship?

4. To what extent does the context of the relationship (e.g. formal versus informal relationship) affect the mentoring relationship?

The Significance of the Study

This study represents a first step in examining how involvement in a mentoring relationship affects the personal and academic lives of African American faculty. Additionally, the findings in this study will enhance our knowledge with regard to how formally and informally established mentoring relationships affect the professional development of African American faculty members. By using a small sample, I had the opportunity to study close up mentor-protégé relationships in settings where there were a small number of African American faculty and hence the phenomenon of cross-race, cross-gender mentoring was likely to occur. This research topic is one which is underinvestigated, and in this study I attempted to identify larger issues and questions which could be considered for further research.
Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used for purposes of this study:

Mentoring. A process by which persons of superior rank, special achievements and prestige instruct, counsel, guide and facilitate the intellectual and/or career development of persons identified as protégés (Blackwell, 1989).

Mentor. A faculty member or some other tenured academic employed in the university who engaged in the activities as described in the definition of the term mentoring.

Protégé. A junior or senior faculty member who was being mentored by a tenured faculty member or some other tenured academic.

Primary Mentor. The individual whom the protégé identified as that person who consistently engaged in the activities defined in the term mentoring. All of the primary mentors were employed at the same university as their protégés. Noe (1988) defines primary mentoring relationships as those "which provide the complete range of career and psychosocial functions".

Secondary Mentor. The individual whom the protégé identified as that person who engaged in the activities as defined in the term mentoring, but to a lesser extent. All of the secondary mentors were employed in the same institution as their protégés. The term secondary mentor as used in this study is not intended to mean that this individual performed mentoring functions in the absence of the primary mentor. Rather some protégés had more than one mentor and this term was used to distinguish between the them.
**Formal Mentoring Relationship.** A mentoring relationship which was established as a result of assignment through a university mentoring program. Protégés were assigned mentors when they became faculty members at the institution. The assigned mentor was usually, but not always from the protégé’s home department.

**Informal Mentoring Relationship.** A mentoring relationship which was established through a voluntary, mutually agreed upon arrangement. Mentors and protégés usually picked each other, and the pairs usually came from the same department.

**University A.** The institution where protégés were involved in informal mentoring relationships.

**University B.** The institution where protégés were involved in formal mentoring relationships.

**Successful Mentoring Relationship.** In this study a successful mentoring relationship is defined by the protégé and the mentor. The relationship was successful if the protégé and the mentor perceived the relationship to be beneficial to the protégé, and to some extent, the mentor.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Corporate Model of Mentoring

Some Definitions

Mentoring is a concept which can be traced back to Greek mythology when the Greek poet Homer's faithful and wise Mentor first advised Odysseus, and to medieval history when Merlin taught the young King Arthur (Gertstein, 1985; Knox and McGovern, 1988; Roche, 1979). These early mentors not only taught their protégés, but were also responsible for their professional and personal development and their socialization into the existing hierarchy. Since that time, mentoring has been practiced in many professions, including the arts, sports, and entertainment. But mentoring has received the most attention in the corporate world, where it has been used as a method to develop and enhance the careers of young business executives.

A review of the literature reveals that the terms mentor and mentoring are often used synonymously with words such as sponsor/sponsorship (Cameron and Blackburn, 1981; Collins, 1982; Fowler, 1982; Kanter, 1977; Merriam et al., 1987; Sands et al., 1991;), and role model (Merriam et al., 1987; Noe, 1988; Schneider, 1991; Scott, 1992;). Other terms such as adviser/advising, guide/guiding, and
coach/coaching have also been as used synonyms for the terms mentor and mentoring (Daloz, 1986; Hall and Sandler, 1983; Hill et al., 1989).

Various definitions of the concept of mentoring have also been used in the corporate world. Levinson et al. (1978) studied 40 mid-life men and as a result of their work they identified the mentor as a developmentally significant transitional figure and described the mentoring relationship as one of the most complex and developmentally important relationships a person can have in early adulthood. In Levinson’s definition, the mentoring relationship is not defined in terms of formal roles, but in terms of the character of the relationship and the functions it serves. Levinson et al. further described the relationship as one where mentors support and facilitate the realization of a young person’s dream, and emphasized the integration of the qualities of a parent-child relationship. Other researchers have used the work of Levinson et al. as a framework for the following definitions of the term mentoring:

The winning couplet, the teaming of a senior and junior executive who advance through the corporate ranks together (McNeer, 1993).

An intense relationship calling for a high degree of involvement between a novice in a discipline and a person who is knowledgeable and wise in that area...the mentor is involved with the protégé as a whole person in both cognitive and affective domains and feels a sense of responsibility for her (Donovan, 1990).

The development of a leader through an individually delivered and intentional process that is supportive, nurturing, insightful, and protective (Anderson and Shannon, 1986).

A relationship in which a person of greater rank or expertise teaches, guides and develops a novice in an organization or profession. The Dictionary of Occupational Titles ranks it as the highest and most complex level of functioning in the people related hierarchy of skills (Alleman, 1986).
Thomas (1990) reports that the mentor-protégé relationship is a developmental relationship which provides support for the enhancement of an individual's career development and organizational experience. It is also a relationship in which the parties have knowledge of one another and from which both may potentially benefit. In addition, Thomas reports that mentoring—a process where mentors consistently show a concern for the psychosocial as well as the career benefits that individuals derive—and sponsorship which occurs because there is a concern for the organizational necessity to obtain the rewards of such a relationship, are both developmental relationships.

The corporate model of mentoring focuses on the professional, personal, and social development of the protégé. The mentor, usually a senior, experienced employee assumes a combination of roles which include: teacher, adviser, guide, sponsor, and friend. The mentoring experience can be described as a series of events designed to provide a young executive with opportunities to enhance his/her career with the assistance of the more experienced executive. The mentor, in essence, takes responsibility for the protégé by performing functions which are related to career development. Noe (1988) found that data from numerous case studies, testimonials, and descriptive research indicated that mentors can facilitate personal development and advancement of their protégés in an organization by providing challenging assignments, guidance and counseling, increased exposure, and visibility to top management, and by serving as role models.
The functions mentors perform may be instrumental—mentor behavior which influences the protégé's visibility in the organization; and intrinsic—mentor behavior which provides psychological support to the protégé. Six mentoring functions which were identified by Levinson (1978) are: teacher, one who enhances the skills and intellectual development of the young person; sponsor, one who uses influence to facilitate the young person's entry and advancement; host and guide, one who welcomes the initiate into the new occupational and social world, and acquaints the initiate with its values, customs, resources, and cast of characters; exemplar, one who serves as a model that the young person admires and seeks to emulate because of his or her virtues, achievements, and way of living; counselor, one who provides advice and moral support in times of stress; and one who fosters the realization of the dream, by helping to define the newly emerging self by supporting and facilitating the young person's dream, by believing in the person and by giving the dream his or her blessing.

Types of Mentoring Relationships

Mentoring relationships have been categorized as either formal or informal (Claque, 1992; Gerstein, 1985; Noe, 1988; Scott, 1992). Formal mentoring relationships—also termed assigned mentoring—are those in which protégés are assigned a mentor by means of an established in-house program which has been implemented by a corporation or business. Murray (1991) defined formal mentoring as follows:
Facilitated mentoring is a structure and series of processes designed to create effective mentoring relationships, guide the desired behavior change of those involved, and evaluate the results for the protégés, the mentors, and the organization.

The mentoring process may consist of a structured series of activities where the mentor and the protégé meet in both formal and informal settings. Some corporations have used formal mentoring programs as a method to socialize new employees into the organization and to facilitate their understanding of both the administrative and technical aspects of the organization. Other formal mentoring programs may require protégés to perform a series of job-related tasks while under the supervision of an assigned mentor. The focus in formal mentoring programs is usually on the completion of designated tasks or activities, or protégé skill learning. Mentors may also provide valuable counseling, coaching, and role-modeling functions to the protégé (Noe, 1988). Formal mentoring programs have been found to be most beneficial to the mentor and the protégé when they are developed according to a set of guiding principles (Gerstein, 1985; Scott, 1992). That is, organizations should design formal mentoring programs based on the unique needs of the employees involved. These guiding principles could include: ensuring that the participation of mentors is voluntary, minimizing rules and maximizing the freedom of the mentor, and a reward structure and increased visibility for the mentors (Gerstein, 1985).

There are several advantages to assigned mentoring. Direct assignment expedites the process of securing a mentor, decreases the likelihood that the protégé will be rejected (which would defeat the purpose of mentoring), and balances the number of men and women who are chosen as protégés. Assigned mentoring can also
be disadvantageous for the protégé. Assigned mentoring usually requires careful monitoring because of problems such as incompatibility between the mentor and protégé, incongruent expectations of success due to program visibility, and perpetuation of the myth that people must have mentors to succeed. Additionally, some researchers have argued that mentoring that involves a commitment to help a person develop cannot be mandated or commanded—rather it should be based on trusting communications, mutual respect, and mutual benefit (Gerstein, 1985; Noe, 1988; Scott, 1992).

The willingness of the mentor is important to the success of the mentor-protégé relationship in formal mentoring relationships since any reluctance on the part of the assigned mentor to participate in the mentoring relationship could negatively effect the relationship. Noe (1988) has argued that the importance that individuals place on their relationships in the workplace will likely have a significant influence on the success of the mentoring relationship. In successful mentoring relationships, the protégés allow their mentors to influence their development through modeling, counseling, assigning challenging work assignments, and protection from organizational politics. But if the protégé does not believe that interpersonal relationships are essential for his/her personal and professional development, he/she will be less likely to be receptive to the mentor’s attempts to be influential.

Informal mentoring relationships—also termed self-selection—are relationships which are not monitored. Researchers report that most mentoring relationships are of this type, where the relationship develops because of shared interests and mutual
admiration and where discussion between the mentor and the protégé usually go beyond career-related issues to more in-depth personal sharing of interests, needs, and values (Gerstein, 1985; Noe, 1988; Roche, 1979; Scott, 1992). The informal mentor-protégé relationship can begin in a variety of ways. The protégé may initiate the relationship by seeking out prospective mentors from whose experiences they can benefit, the mentor may initiate the relationship by engaging in professional and social interaction with the prospective protégé, or a combination of the two may occur, where both the prospective mentor and protégé become engaged in a friendship in which the initial goal is not a mentor-protégé relationship, but where the relationship eventually develops into one. Thus, some mentoring relationships may develop naturally over time due to interactions in professional and social settings. These interactions may be facilitated by common interests such as race, religion, organizational affiliations, and extra-curricular activities. Informal mentoring relationships are based on a mutual commitment by both parties—a commitment which could be absent in some assigned mentoring relationships.

Race and Gender Match in Mentoring Relationships

Thomas (1989) has described organizations as the seats of irrational life where group members’ unconscious hopes and fears, the dreams and myths they live by, and the history embedded in them—all influence their actions. Artis (1979) reported that interests, race, and gender are three factors which should be considered in mentor-protégé matches to address cross-race/cross-gender issues.
Mentoring is usually more important for women than it is for men. Women are usually mentored by men and may be more motivated than men to utilize the relationship than males, since there has traditionally been a shortage of women mentors (Kanter, 1977; Levinson et al., 1978; Noe, 1988; Roche, 1979). Additionally, it has been reported that women tend to have more than one mentor—usually males—and that fatherlike sponsorship is often a necessity for women protégés to reach the top management positions (Roche, 1979; Thomas, 1990). Noe (1988) found that protégés who were matched with mentors of the opposite gender utilized the relationship more effectively than did protégés of the same gender as the mentor. Noe reported that a possible explanation for this finding was protégés in cross-gender mentoring relationships worked harder to make the relationship work because of an awareness of the possible negative outcomes that are believed to result from cross-gender mentoring relationships.

But cross-gender mentoring relationships can be affected by the organizational culture—the values, norms and attitudes that shape the organization. Several researchers have reported that the development of successful cross-gender mentoring relationships may be limited by perceptions that women lack managerial skills and are unsuitable for challenging positions, preferences for interaction with members of the same gender in the work environment, and concerns that peers may perceive the mentoring relationship as sexual in nature (Goldstein, 1979; Hill et al., 1989; Noe, 1988). Additionally, McCormick (1991) reported that comfort-discomfort levels in cross-gender matches may occur when there is a lack of socialization on the part of
both sexes to interact with each other as peers in close relationships. McCormick concluded that this finding suggests that high rates of success in mentoring relationships usually occur when both the mentor and the protégé are White males. In a study of mentoring for administrative advancement, Mertz (1989) found that in cross-gender mentoring relationships the male mentors identified no problems or special concerns related to the relationship, while the female protégés acknowledged that in reality there were special issues and problems involved in such a relationship. Female protégés indicated that they were constantly in the spotlight and had to prove overcompetence the majority of the time, that they were not seen as equals, and that there were unwritten rules prohibiting social interaction, such as being alone with the male mentor.

The subjects of race and race relations as organizational factors have received little attention by organizational theorists (Alleman, 1986; Thomas, 1989; Thomas, 1990). Alleman (1986) investigated the mentoring experiences of African Americans employed in corporate positions and the relationship of those experiences to perceived career benefit. Findings indicated that there was no significant difference in the perceived career benefit from the relationship reported by African American protégés with African American mentors, than those African American protégés with White mentors. However, African American protégés did rate the benefit of the relationship to their careers significantly higher than White protégés did. Based on these findings, Alleman concluded that mentoring relationships are generally similar regardless of race. But Mertz (1989) in her study of cross-race/cross-gender mentoring, reported
that African American protégés experienced special problems in cross-race mentoring relationships. Minority protégés indicated that discrimination usually existed in the prevailing attitudes that African Americans were more aspiring than capable and that their developmental level was below that of Whites. An African American protégé stated that in the eyes of White males, African Americans could never reach a level of superiority or achieve parity, and emphasized that it was not overt racism or sexism, but that African Americans simply did not exist. Mertz also found that while the White mentors denied (or seemed to be unaware of) the existence of any problems, African American protégés chose not to deal with the problems--thus limiting the development of the mentoring relationships.

Thomas (1989) reported that Whites who are in superior positions and African Americans who are in subordinate positions can enact the history of race relations in their everyday interactions of mentoring. He reported that there were interracial taboos associated with White males mentoring African American females, and to a lesser extent, White males mentoring African American males. In a study of cross-race mentor-protégé relationships of senior and junior executives, Thomas found that White men rarely formed close mentoring relationships with African Americans which facilitated extra-work relationships, but preferred to keep the relationship confined to the work environment. In a later study of African American and White managers, Thomas (1990) investigated whether African Americans and Whites in the same organizational context had significantly different experiences in developmental relationships (relationships in which the mentor provides support for the enhancement
of an individual’s career development and organizational experience) and in what ways same-race and cross-race relationships differed. He found that White protégés rarely had developmental relationships with persons of another race, but that African American protégés formed 63% of their developmental relationships with Whites. He also found that same race relationships provided significantly more psychosocial support (support which enhances the protégé’s sense of competence, identity, and work role effectiveness) than cross-race relationships. These same-race relationships were usually formed across traditional boundaries of hierarchy and area specialization. That is, two parallel systems of developmental relationships existed for African Americans—one defined by the culture of the organization and the other by the need, both developmental and organizational, for African Americans to form relationships with one another. This is consistent with the work of Levinson et al. (1978) which emphasized that a high level of identification is a major element of the mentor-protégé relationship. That is, protégés and mentors tend to identify with others who are like themselves based on a group of characteristics.

Cross-race mentoring can be problematic for African Americans since they are usually not in a position to develop or take advantage of developmental relations with Whites. In the corporate arena, African Americans are usually on the periphery of the information and social networks that are a natural part of the organizational culture. Thomas (1990) has argued that African Americans must learn to manage the issues of race and racism to overcome this obstacle. And Mertz (1989) has argued that the failure to recognize and address the problems of cross-race and cross-gender
mentoring relationships may mean that minorities and women could be denied the full benefit of mentoring.

**Mentoring in Higher Education**

**Faculty to Student Mentoring**

In academia, the primary model for mentoring has been the relationship that can develop between an undergraduate or a graduate student and a special professor. This relationship may begin when the professor takes the student "under his or her wing", helps the student to set goals and develop skills, and facilitates the student’s successful entry into academic and professional circles (Desjardins, 1993; Hall and Sandler, 1983; Perez, 1993; Sands et al., 1991; Willie, et al., 1991). Other researchers have characterized the faculty to student mentoring relationship as the initial career socialization which takes place while the student is in graduate school and before he or she takes a junior faculty position (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Johnsrud, 1993; McNeer, 1983). Findings from studies on faculty-student mentoring relationships indicate that interaction between faculty members and graduate student protégés have a significant impact on students’ future employment possibilities at quality institutions (Blackburn et al., 1981; Merriam et al., 1987; Scott, 1992). Protégés were usually employed in similar types of institutions and specialized in similar academic areas as their mentors.

Desjardins (1993) reported that the mentor can help prepare the student protégé for the transition from graduate student to faculty member. In this process the graduate student is establishing basic competence in the new roles he/she must fulfill.
Bourguignon, Blanshan, Chiteji, Meckling, Sagaria, Shuman, and Taris (1987), who conducted a study of the lives of junior faculty members in a large major research university, reported that respondents who felt that they had a good relationship with their graduate advisors were more likely to perceive themselves as better prepared for the role of a faculty member.

Similar to the corporate structure, faculty-student mentoring relationships tend to be informally initiated. However, Merriam, Thomas and Zeph (1987) report that in some higher education institutions, students do participate in formal (assigned) mentoring programs. These programs range from assigning women students to women professors in a private college setting, to apprenticeship programs where students teach courses with mentor professors to facilitate their personal and professional growth, to mentor-type programs designed to assist disadvantaged students in adjusting more completely to college.

Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring

Sands, Parson, and Duane (1991) report that not much is known about mentoring between faculty members, and that there is no distinct line of research which can be traced with respect to mentoring in academic settings. These researchers explored how faculty at a public research oriented university envisioned and practiced mentoring among themselves and found that mentoring between faculty members in universities of this type is not prevalent. A large percentage of the respondents in this study had mentors at some time during their educational, academic, or professional career. However, only one third of the respondents,
including assistant professors, reported having a mentor at the university in which the study took place. The authors concluded these findings could be generalized to other universities of this type, and that having a mentor when one is a faculty member is not normative.

Researchers have examined the literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring and have reported that few studies on faculty mentoring have attempted to assess the impact of mentoring on the lives and careers of faculty members. Additionally, they report that only a limited number of studies have been conducted which examine the senior faculty mentoring junior faculty relationship (Merriam et al., 1987; Sands et al., 1991). Boice (1992) has argued that researchers are only beginning to learn the specifics of what are the best ways to mentor new faculty since most studies have emphasized faculty to student mentoring.

Once again, researchers have used the definition of mentoring offered by Levinson et al. (1978) as a framework to define faculty to faculty mentoring in higher education. Mentoring has been defined as a relationship which can be psychologically supportive and which can enhance the career and professional development of the protégé, build a professional network, and bring personal benefits such as increased competence and self esteem to the protégé (Claque, 1992; Hall and Sandler, 1983; McNeer, 1983; Sands et al., 1991; Wright and Wright, 1987). Artis (1979) described a mentor as one who exceeds an academic advisor by providing timely information in funding, publishing and employment possibilities and by contributing to the political awareness of the protégé. Hill et al. (1989) describe mentoring as a communication
relationship in which a senior person supports, tutors, guides, and facilitates a junior person's career development, and that such relationships are important in the academic world at various levels. Communication support systems operate when individuals within a formal social system offer and receive information and support from one another in a one-way or reciprocal manner within that system. Thus, the exchange of information is a key element in the mentoring relationship. In this model, support behavior can be in the form of traditional mentor-protégé behavior or in the form of reciprocal peer or collegial support. Hill et al. found that faculty who perceived they had high levels of information adequacy and communication support scored higher at academic success, measured in terms of professional activity and performance, which are normal elements considered in the tenure and promotion process.

Stonewater (1990) describes mentoring as career helping where a faculty member has an important impact on the career development and professional identity of another faculty member. Faculty-to-faculty mentoring has also been described as useful in the early development of a career with a senior faculty mentoring a junior colleague, whereas sponsorship is more useful in the later stages of a faculty member's career (Moses, 1989). Blackburn, Chapman, and Cameron (1981) examined faculty-to-faculty mentor-protégé relationships from the perspective of the mentor and defined mentoring as cloning, a symbiotic partnership where the stature and accomplishments of the mentor are important to both the academic productivity and advancement of the protégé.
Mentors provide both career and psychosocial functions to protégés in traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships. Career functions prepare the protégé for career advancement. These functions include protection (protection from assignment to committees that are particularly time demanding which enables the junior faculty member to devote time to activities that are explicitly tied to achieving competence in research, teaching and service); coaching (providing direction not only on how to ask research questions but also what are the most important questions to ask, inspiring self-confidence and encouragement, providing frank but confidential feedback, sharing ideas, and suggesting strategies for accomplishing specific academic tasks); and sponsorship (nominating the protégé for desirable projects, positions, and promotion, assuring that needed resources and career enhancing opportunities are available, and assigning projects that increase the protégé’s exposure and visibility to influential colleagues with similar research interests).

Psychosocial functions enhance the protégé’s sense of competence, identity, and work-role effectiveness. These functions include role modeling (serving as an appropriate role model regarding attitudes, values, and behaviors); acceptance and confirmation (conveying unconditional positive regard for the protégé), and counseling (encouraging the protégé to talk openly about anxieties and concerns, and giving the protégé support that facilitates socialization and helps in coping with job stress and work demands of the new faculty role). Thus the faculty member mentor may perform a variety of functions which range from socializing the protégé to the organizational culture to providing emotional support. The greater the number of
career and psychosocial functions that are provided by the mentor, the more beneficial
the relationship will be to the protégé (Noe, 1988).

A number of benefits have been identified which can accrue to the protégé
faculty member as a result of a successful mentoring relationship. These benefits
include: opportunities for professional networking, higher publication rates, receipt of
grants, greater research collaboration, advice on how to balance teaching, research
and other professional responsibilities, nominations for awards, and support for
promotion and tenure (Hall and Sandler, 1983; Stonewater, 1990). Hill et al. (1989)
have reported that faculty members benefit from such mentoring relationships because:

Academics, like other professionals, operate primarily through
'colleague systems'. Standards for professional behavior and criteria
for evaluating teaching, research and publications are largely
determined by 'unwritten rules' handed down from one generation of
scholars to the next, and communicated informally from one colleague
to another. To be successful it is not enough to be capable or talented,
a new faculty member or a graduate student needs to be socialized into
the profession by these informal tutors. (p. 15)

Alexander (1992) reported that in academia women with or without mentors enjoy less
success than men. A possible explanation for this is certain mentors lack power, and
for a mentoring relationship to be effective in helping a protégé achieve success, the
mentor must have a measure of power within the organization. Alexander added that
perhaps some females do not have mentors in high places or that they have female
mentors who might not be as influential. Friedman (1992) has suggested that mentors
have power. Friedman emphasizes that in academia it is beneficial to the protégé to
identify with someone who has power because power is transferred to the protégé
through association with the power figure in the perception of others. In answering
the question, "Can women succeed without mentors", Friedman has argued that while some women have and will continue to succeed without mentors, there is overwhelming evidence that women in most careers and professions who have had mentors have experienced accelerated career growth. Johnsrud (1994) concurs, reporting that since women do not enjoy the same advantages of mentoring as males due to salary inequities, disparities in workloads, and lower levels of productivity, they could gain from increased interaction with senior colleagues.

Faculty members can also benefit from having mentoring relationships with more than one person. When applied to higher education, Granovetter’s weak-tie hypothesis suggests that faculty who have had or have multiple mentors may progress more rapidly than those faculty who have had or only have one mentor (Blackburn et al., 1981; Cameron and Blackburn, 1981; Hall and Sandler, 1983; Merriam et al., 1987). The assumption of the weak-tie theory is that more information for scholarly productivity will come from interacting with a larger set of people than with a smaller number. In the former case, the links will be looser and relationships will be more on a professional than a personal basis. The latter case will have more of a closed network of colleagues who will more likely know each other more intimately (Granovetter, 1973). The weak-tie theory suggests that productivity may be significantly correlated with the number of personal contacts.

Researchers have reported that the mentor is also a beneficiary in the mentoring relationship (Blackburn et al., 1981; Kirk, 1992; Merriam, 1983; Schatzberg-Smith, 1988; Wunsch, 1994a). Sponsoring protégés can enhance the
mentor's reputation, especially when the protégés become well known. Schatzberg-Smith (1988) reports that mentoring is seen as a leadership ability by others in the field, and that the protégé helps extend the mentor's sphere of influence. In addition, the mentor experiences a sense of pride and satisfaction, his/her productivity is enhanced through new ideas from the protégé, and he/she has an opportunity to gain credit for service to the university. And Wunsch (1994a) reports that mentoring relationships provide the generative and revitalization functions sought by older scholars and professionals.

Wunsch (1994b) reports that institutions benefit from formal mentoring programs because junior faculty experience a smoother process in attaining promotion and tenure and remain in their positions longer. Wunsch adds that for each of the individual benefits that accrue to the protégé and the mentor, there is a positive institutional consequence. That is, the quality of the academic institution depends in large part, on the quality of the work and learning experiences of its faculty. According to Wunsch, the mentor-protégé-institution dynamic meets both the personal and communal needs of junior faculty—and particularly minority faculty who may experience loneliness and isolation in the academic community. Hall and Sandler (1983) report that institutions benefit from effective mentoring because of the increased productivity of faculty members, the cooperation and cohesiveness of those involved in the relationship, and the increased likelihood that faculty members will be ambassadors for, rather than critics of, their institution and support the institution's recruitment and fundraising efforts.
Otto (1994) modified Kram's four phases of the mentoring relationship to fit higher education. The four phases coincide with the career development of the protégé. During the initiation phase the mentor and the protégé establish a relationship with the mentor providing concrete assistance by suggesting committee assignments, providing help with teaching, and discussing directions for scholarship. The protégé must be receptive to advice and counsel from the mentor and the mentor treats the protégé as a colleague. The cultivation phase lasts until the protégé receives a promotion and/or tenure. During this time, the mentor and the protégé develop a meaningful relationship based on personal and professional similarities. The separation phase takes place after a significant change in the structural relationship—that is when the protégé joins the tenured faculty ranks and no longer expresses a clear need for the mentor. The redefinition phase begins when both parties have adjusted to the protégé's new status. The most common characteristic of the redefinition phase is friendship.

New faculty members are likely candidates for mentoring since they need to be guided in the development of a plan that will allow them to make the appropriate progress to gain tenure (Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992; Otto, 1994). In addition, a mentor can help new faculty members to understand their abilities, determine their strengths, and help them to decide if they are on the right career path. According to Alexander (1992), "While talent and success are necessary ingredients in this process,
new faculty members must also be socialized into this profession by these informal tutors by that infamous right of passage known as the process of 'Tenure and Promotion'.

Western Carolina University used Zey's hierarchy of mentoring functions--teaching, counseling, organizational intervention and promotion--to assist junior faculty members in making progress for promotion and tenure. At the teaching level the experienced faculty member instructs the protégé on the institutional framework in terms of the formal and informal structures that must be mastered to achieve successful career development which ultimately results in tenure and promotion. At the counseling level, the mentor provides psychological support to the protégé, moving beyond mere information sharing to a more personal level of enhancing the self esteem of the protégé. At the organizational intervention level the mentor openly supports the protégé, intercedes on the protégé's behalf, recommends him/her to other colleagues inside and outside of the department, and recommends the protégé for tenure and promotion. In the Western Carolina University program, the most critical level of mentoring relates to the process of promotion and tenure--helping the protégé to achieve maximum career development. Additionally, this type of mentoring which includes a structured process for achieving promotion and tenure, alleviates the sometimes unethical situation of denying tenure or promotion without having provided appropriate counsel during the probationary period (Alexander, 1992).

Just like most mentoring relationships, faculty-to-faculty mentoring is usually informally initiated--a voluntary, mutually agreed upon arrangement. Mentors and
protégés usually pick each other, mentors are usually older than the protégés, and the pairs are often from the same departments (Boice, 1992; Fowler, 1982; Sands et al., 1991). Faculty members may also participate in formal mentoring programs which have been established by the institution (Alexander, 1992; Diehl and Simpson, 1989; Johnsrud, 1994; Lowe, Boyd and Brunette, 1991; Wunsch, 1994b). Lowe, Boyd, and Brunette (1991) described a mentoring program for pre-tenure faculty at the University of British Columbia which was designed to give equitable consideration to all tenure candidates. Senior faculty members were expected to perform functions which included providing encouragement, assisting junior faculty members in locating resources, and providing information about the bureaucratic system. Junior faculty members were assigned several mentors who would essentially guide them through a five year pre-tenure program. The five year program activities included formulating definite objectives to facilitate teaching, scholarly activity, and service; assignment of both a teaching and a research mentor to assist the junior faculty member in these areas; and, a semi-annual department review. Preliminary results indicated that the protégés appreciated the regular input regarding their progress and mentors enjoyed the positive interactions with the protégés.

Johnsrud (1994) described a faculty mentoring program for women at the University of Hawaii which included systematic assessment of the impact of the program upon the participants and the culture of the university. Mentoring, in this program, was part of a long-range career development strategy with an emphasis on three goals: entry level survival needs as a priority in the first year, early
establishment of a career development plan, and meeting the sociopsychological needs which contribute to a sense of belonging. Protégés were paired with tenured senior women faculty from a related discipline outside the protégé’s home department. The pairings were based on the career needs of the protégés. Each colleague pair agreed to complete a written agreement in which they detailed how often they would meet and what specific activities they would pursue based on the interests and needs of the protégé. Protégés also met once as a group with the program coordinator to analyze their own experiences, to identify common problems, and to detail actual strategies used to address critical issues. In an assessment of the program, protégés indicated that the relationships were most helpful in the areas of departmental and institutional politics, and the tenure process. Protégés also indicated that time was the major barrier to establishing quality relationships.

On campuses where formal mentoring programs have been instituted, high levels of satisfaction on the part of junior and senior faculty have been reported (Boice, 1992; Johnsrud, 1993; Johnsrud, 1994). Some researchers have suggested that formal mentoring programs for faculty should be a part of university policy and should be used as a method of facilitating the career and personal development of junior faculty. Formal mentoring can reach those faculty for whom mentoring does not usually happen at all—particularly women and minorities (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Moses, 1989; Wright and Wright, 1987; Wunsch, 1994b).

Wunsch (1994b) reports that a clear operating definition that reflects the needs of participants and the goals of mentoring within a particular institution is needed.
when planning a formal mentoring program in higher education. Wunsch suggests that mentoring programs which are targeted, structured and have custom-designed goals and activities are needed if persons who can benefit from mentoring are to be identified. She describes informal mentoring as a process which relies on natural selection, personality congruence, and happenstance and where protégés tend to take a passive role. This type of mentoring, while beneficial for a few, results in a limited number of successes in the academy. Factors which should be considered in the mentoring process include the time devoted to mentoring, the pairing of mentors and protégés, the training of participants, the selection of mentoring activities, and the life cycle of the process. Additionally, planners must assess the institutional mores and culture in doing cross-racial or cross-gender pairing. Wunsch emphasizes that planned mentoring requires a rationale for pairing participants and questions which should be asked should include: Should the protégé be able to select their mentors from a pool of volunteers? Should the mentors be of the same sex, from the same ethnic group, in the same academic discipline? How does one predict compatibility of pairs? Are there required characteristics of good mentors? Wunsch concludes that in a comprehensive program, training and orientation are key components in ensuring that participants understand the goals of the program and the effective use of the mentoring process.

Herr (1994) reports that questions regarding the issues of cross-discipline, same-sex, same-race mentoring, and the subculture of the department are also applicable to formal mentoring programs developed at the departmental level. Two
disadvantages to mentoring at the department level are: there will likely be a limited pool of potential mentors, and differences in the expectations of older faculty members which could negatively affect formal mentoring at this level. Herr has argued that mentoring at the departmental level should be purposeful and consider the complexity of the institution, recognize individual differences, be flexible, and reflect the culture and structure of the unit. Herr also states that the person responsible for assigning mentors may have to rely on his/her best judgement when it comes to cross-race, cross-gender assignments since same-sex, same-race mentoring may not be possible at the departmental level. Herr concludes the discussion by stating that institutions will have to make choice between "institutionally encouraged" and "institutionally mandated" mentoring programs and suggests using both an formal and informal approach, each using the principles of effective mentoring.

Mentoring: The Implications for African American Faculty

The literature is generally void with respect to the mentoring of minority faculty and the special issues they may face (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Scott, 1992; Wright and Wright, 1987). Research on minorities is usually grouped in the category of "women and minorities" (Artis, 1979; Hall and Sandler, 1983; Johnsrud, 1993; McCormick; 1991; Stonewater et al., 1990). One explanation for this could be that some researchers often view the problems that women face with regard to mentoring as similar, and in some cases, even more extreme for minorities (Johnsrud, 1993; Scott, 1992). But Bourguignon et al. (1987) found that minorities, and especially
African Americans, more often encountered obstacles or a professional atmosphere that hindered them in their pursuit of an academic career.

Several authorities have reported that mentoring is not only essential to the professional growth of African American faculty, but it is also an important element in achieving cultural diversity. It is a method of facilitating African American involvement at all levels of the institution (Blackwell, 1989; Bourguignon et al., 1987; Edlefsen and Wagstaff, 1993; Epps, 1989; Kalbfleisch and Davies, 1991; McCormick, 1991; Willie et al., 1991). In addition, the mentoring of African American faculty is directly linked to the retention and graduation rates of African Americans and to the number of African Americans who become trained and then hired and retained in faculty positions.

Researchers have reported that formal mentoring programs may be particularly advantageous for minorities (Boice, 1992; Desjardins, 1993; Wunsch, 1994a). Boice (1992) found that minority faculty who were engaged in formal mentoring programs said they benefitted from the opportunity to analyze their accomplishments and clarify the university's expectations of what were reasonable accomplishments for new colleagues under constant scrutiny. Once mentors became invested in protégés, they were stimulated to provide support for them. Examples of such support included opportunities to co-teach with the mentor and opportunities to participate in collaborative writing projects. Desjardins (1993) reports that some universities have developed mentoring programs specifically targeted at traditionally underrepresented
minority faculty and that such programs are designed to develop a sufficient number of senior faculty who are willing to mentor junior colleagues.

Three factors may affect the prospects for mentoring relationships for African American faculty: The underrepresentation of African Americans in higher education, organizational and individual barriers which prevent African Americans from being selected as protégés, and problems associated with cross-race, cross-gender mentoring relationships.

Minorities are at a distinct disadvantage if identification as protégés is based on race because they are extremely underrepresented in academia (Wright and Wright, 1987). The problem of underrepresentation of minority faculty is a problem of supply, flow into and through the academic pipeline, and retention. In a national study conducted by the Educational Testing Service in 1988 it was concluded that African American Ph.D.'s had the "most fragile status of all minorities and that their participation in academe is, at best, marginal" (Johnsrud, 1993). The underrepresentation of African Americans in higher education affects the pool from which mentors may be drawn (Scott, 1992). Blackwell (1989) reported that 90% of all faculty in American colleges and universities are White, and that this leads to an under-selection of African Americans as protégés in the mentoring process. The tendency to choose protégés which mirror one's own image in academe, as in business, has allowed only a few African Americans to have what Blackwell calls "true mentoring" relationships--relationships which are intense, close, interactive and quite often immensely complex. Blackwell (1987b), in his study of the mentoring
experiences of African Americans during their graduate and professional years, found that only one in eight persons had ever had a "true mentor", as distinguished from advisers and guides, and sponsors for specific purposes.

Research has shown that African American faculty members experience the academy differently than White faculty. African American faculty members may be subjected to a variety of negative organizational and individual barriers which can affect whether they are mentored, who will mentor them, and the success of the mentoring relationship. Johnsrud (1993) pointed out that the minority faculty experience is a "succession of exclusions" occurring at each stage of the faculty career. African American faculty are often more closely scrutinized than their White counterparts, hence they may be less likely to be actively recruited, promoted, tenured, be considered for administrative positions, offered research opportunities, and accepted into the overall academic culture of higher education (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Epps, 1989; Johnsrud, 1993). For example research by African American faculty is often judged by their White colleagues who are conservative and unappreciative of nontraditional subjects or nontraditional views (Moses, 1989; Padilla, 1994). Epps (1989) reports that mainstream values and culture of major research universities largely determine standards of acceptable research designs and topics. He adds that the minority scholars's work may be devalued because it is judged as too narrowly focused--that is, it does not include White comparisons--or because it appears in journals that focus on non-White concerns.
African Americans Ph.D.'s also have the lowest promotion and tenure rates among minority groups, and except for promotions to associate professor rank, their rates are consistently below the national average (Blackwell, 1987a; Johnsrud, 1993). Carter and Wilson (1992) found that minority faculty are less likely to be tenured than White faculty members. Additionally the tenured proportions for minority groups remained essentially constant from 1979 to 1989, indicating that even when minority faculty left their former institutions they did not secure tenure in the new positions either.

Upton and Pruitt (1985) report that in addition to being underrepresented, African American faculty tend to be hired for short-term and part-time positions, have lower salaries, and tend to be untenured. In addition, Frierson (1990) has reported that the decline in the number of African Americans who earn doctorates has seriously affected the number of African American educational researchers in this country. Frierson attributes this phenomenon partly to the fact that few African American scholars enjoy successful mentor-protégé relationships after taking faculty positions at predominantly White institutions. That is, they have difficulty becoming part of networks which lead them to collaborate in funded research projects, joint authorship on publications, and opportunities for paid consulting.

Bourguignon et al. (1987) found that race and its companion assumption of lesser competence and professional seriousness, were prominent factors involved in the marginal treatment of minority faculty members. In their study of the lives of junior faculty members, the researchers found that minorities, and especially African
Americans, frequently encountered obstacles in the form of a professional atmosphere that hindered them in their pursuit of academic careers.

According to Banks (1984) African American faculty are likely to benefit more from mentor-protégé relationships with senior African American faculty members because they are usually more sympathetic to the multifaceted needs of other African American faculty. And mentoring may be particularly important for African American women (Hughes, 1988; Luna and Cullen, 1992; Moses, 1989). Moses (1989) has argued that a successful academic career for African American women is the product of not only the intelligence and ability to do outstanding scholarship, but also of acceptance into a small fraternity of scholars, since African American women may have a difficult time winning that acceptance, especially in predominantly White colleges and universities. Howard-Vital and Morgan (1993) utilized Blackwell’s definition of the functions that mentors perform as a basis for construction of a survey which was used to develop insights into the mentoring experiences of Black women in higher education. The authors report that Black women are often the most isolated, underused and demoralized segment of the academic community. Mentoring is viewed as a mechanism to minimize alienation by helping women of color develop self-confidence, take risks, and increase competence in such environments. Results from the survey indicated mentors most frequently performed the functions of building self-confidence, socializing protégés regarding role requirements, expectations and organizational imperatives, and providing emotional support and encouragement in developing coping strategies. While the
mentoring functions are neither race nor gender specific, the authors report that it is important for Black women to serve as mentors to assist other Black women in developing a sense of connectedness to the institution.

Sudakarsa (1987) reports that African Americans in predominantly White institutions may face overt and hidden obstacles to their advancement and that their experiences with the requirements and rewards of the professoriate will be different from those experienced by Whites. She adds that African Americans are usually at a disadvantage when it comes to tenure due to a combination of "legitimate competing demands on their time, the non-traditional nature of much of their scholarship, and biases in the publication process itself, which make it very difficult for them to compile the type of scholarly record demanded for advancement in academia." Other researchers (Blackwell, 1988; McKay, 1988; Wilson, 1987) report that African American faculty face a dilemma because they are often involved in activities which are unrelated to scholarly productivity and that they may be penalized at the promotion and tenure review for responding to student demands and committee work. Blackwell (1988) has argued that as long as minority faculty members are expected to respond to the needs of minority students over and above their regular duties, this work should be "factored into the scale of values used to determine merit for tenure."

But since African Americans are underrepresented in the faculty ranks, when they are mentored, it is more likely that they will be mentored by a White faculty member. Researchers have found that same-race match is the strongest predictor of success in a mentor-protégé relationship and that most mentor relationships tend to be
same race rather than cross-race relationships (Kalbfleisch and Davies, 1991; Mertz, 1989). Kalbfleisch and Davies (1991) found that inter-racial taboos were a factor in the degree to which cross-race mentoring relationships occurred and that African Americans and Whites usually selected mentors of their own race, rather than of the opposite race. Other researchers have found that nonminority mentors were less likely to be as accepting, trusting and supporting with minority protégés than with nonminority protégés (Willie, 1988; Willie et al., 1991). Thus, while mentoring is important for Black scholars, in the competitive world of higher education, the possibility that many Black scholars will not be mentored is a very real one.

Wilson (1987) has argued that once institutions have recruited minority faculty, they are responsible for maximizing their chances for success. He states that the lack of success for minority faculty can be attributed to social isolation and lack of scholarly productivity. Wilson reports that scholarly productivity is often tied to mentor relationships with senior faculty members and the amount of assistance one receives in the development of his/her research. He adds that majority scholars do not become successful by accident and that this should not be expected of minority faculty. Rather minority faculty need to become involved in mentoring relationships early in their careers so that they will learn how to use their time and are productive in their efforts to achieve promotion and tenure. Additionally, persons involved in the tenure review decisions should not wait until a minority faculty members are up for tenure review to apprise them of their probable status. Instead, department heads and other persons involved in the tenure review process should inquire if minority faculty
are publishing, working of research projects, need help in proposal writing, submitting manuscripts to refereed journals, and if senior faculty members are critiquing their work. Collins (1990) has argued that majority faculty should be encouraged to mentor and interact with other faculty, and to recognize and value different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Mentors who are willing to spend informal time with and involve African American faculty in research projects, conferences, and workshops to help them become familiar with all the components of a successful career appear to be a critical ingredient for increasing diversity in higher education.

Frierson (1990) has argued that African Americans as a group can affect their collective destiny by actively supporting one another professionally, providing assistance to young African American faculty members, and by developing mentor-protégé relationships which can be beneficial in advancing their scholarship.

**Conclusion**

According to the literature there are five major dimensions of faculty-to-faculty mentoring.

1. **Mentor-protégé pairs.** In traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships, mentors and protégés usually pick each other, mentors are usually older than the protégés, and the pairs are often from the same department.

2. **Mentor functions.** Mentors provide both career and psychosocial functions to protégés in traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships. Career functions prepare the protégé for career advancement, and psychosocial functions enhance the protégé's sense of competence, identity, and work-role effectiveness.
3. Benefits to the protégé. Both career and psychosocial benefits can accrue to the protégé faculty member as a result of a successful mentoring relationship. Career benefits include opportunities for professional networking, higher publication rates, greater research collaboration, advice on how to balance teaching, research and service, and support for promotion and tenure. Psychosocial benefits include friendship, role modeling, socialization into the academic culture, emotional support, and defense from criticism by others.

4. Phases of the mentor-protégé relationship. Traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships are characterized by four phases: the initiation phase, the cultivation stage, the separation phase, and the redefinition phase.

5. Race/gender match. Same-race match is likely to be the strongest predictor of success in a mentor-protégé relationship. Minority and female faculty members may experience difficulty in finding same race and same gender mentors because of the small numbers of minorities and females in academia.

The corporate model of mentoring tells us what should happen and what normally does happen in a typical mentor-protégé relationship. But this information is based on a Eurocentric model which may be more applicable to White males. And Thomas (1990) has reported that African Americans in the corporate world rarely have the same kinds of mentor-protégé relationships that Whites do--those that provide support for the enhancement of their careers and organizational development. But beyond this, we still do not know how African Americans are mentored for success in the corporate world.
The literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring also does little to enhance our knowledge about the experiences of African American faculty members who have been involved in mentor-protégé relationships. Researchers have reported that mentoring is essential for African American faculty, but there is little empirical evidence from studies of this group to illustrate that this is the case. We also do not know how African American faculty members perceive the mentoring process. Is mentoring important to African Americans? Is mentoring critical to their professional growth and development? Do they prefer formal or informal mentoring relationships? Additionally, the literature does not fully address the problematic nature of mentoring for African Americans, but gives only cursory attention to the issues of underrepresentation in the academy, organizational and individual barriers, and problems associated with cross-race, cross-gender mentoring.

Given the limited amount of information we have with regard to the mentoring of African American faculty members, I conducted an investigation of the mentoring relationships of African American faculty members in two predominantly White institutions to address these and other questions which are not covered in the literature.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Rationale for Qualitative Research

An assumption fundamental to qualitative research is that the participant's perspective on the phenomenon of interest should unfold as the participant views it, not as the researcher views it (Marshall and Rossman, 1989). The purpose of this study was to examine the mentoring relationships of African Americans in two predominantly White institutions. I wanted the protégés to reflect on their professional and personal experiences in these relationships. By using qualitative research methods, I was able to uncover the participants' perceptions of mentoring—that is, I was able to discover theories which were grounded in the experiences of the participants. The use of qualitative research techniques also allowed me to describe, to some extent, how the complex culture of predominantly White institutions could be a factor in these relationships.

To gain the participant perspective, the unstructured in-depth interview was used as the primary method of data collection for this research. The interview method allowed me to enter into what Patton (1990, p. 278) calls "another person's perspective." Researchers using qualitative interview methods accept the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit. Marshall and Rossman (1989, p. 82) describe in-depth interviewing as a "conversation
with a purpose". The researcher enters into a conversation with the participant to understand how the participant socially constructs his/her reality with regard to the phenomenon under study. There were several advantages to using the in-depth interview as a data collection technique. The in-depth interviews allowed me to collect large amounts of data quickly, ask follow-up questions immediately, and when necessary for clarification, schedule follow-up interviews.

While the primary purpose of the research was to investigate the mentoring experiences of the protégés, the perspective of the mentors added to my understanding of the mentoring process for African American faculty. My major concern was not whether the mentors and protégés had the same perspectives with regard to the mentoring relationship. Rather, I was primarily concerned with gaining the individual perspectives of each person.

Rationale for Cross Case Analysis and the Case Study Approach

The findings in this study are presented using both cross case analysis and the case study approach. Using cross case analysis the reader can note the similarities in the cases, particularly when the data is analyzed around the literature. However, this type of analysis does not expose the reader to the variations and the details in the cases. Therefore, I used the case study approach to focus on what was unique and idiosyncratic in six of the cases.

Marshall and Rossman (1989) report that case studies examine a bounded system of a program, an institution, or a population. Case study research has several purposes—to chronicle events; to render, depict, or characterize; to instruct; and to try
out, prove, or test. Donmoyer (1990) reports that the case study approach allows the reader to experience vicariously unique situations and unique individuals within our own culture, and to see things we might not otherwise see. In addition, Donmoyer argues that there is an equivalence between the real world and the narrative—they both integrate thought and feeling. The vignettes which describe six mentor-protégé relationships highlight particular themes in the cases which may have implications for mentoring African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. The case study approach also allowed me to study a range of relationships and examine the cases in relation to each other. The cases are an integration of the feeling and thoughts of the protégés and the mentors.

The Role of the Researcher

My role as the researcher could have been a factor in some of the responses the participants gave me, and in my interpretation of the findings in this study. Because I am an African American and because my goal is to become a faculty member, it is possible that some of the protégés answered my questions based on what I consider to be our same-race level of communication. In fact a female protégé told me that she would not have said the same things to a White researcher that she said to me. The protégé added that as African Americans we validate stories, that "we need to say how we made it through". A male protégé told me he wanted me to know what life in the academy was like for an African American and, in many instances, he extended his answers into a discussion beyond the question I had asked him. The protégé remarked to me several times that the academy was a "cultural stretch" for
African Americans. He seemed to feel that it was important for me to know that while African Americans can be successful in predominantly White institutions, to some extent their success was dependent on their ability to adapt to a culture where successful African Americans are often "perceived as tokens."

And so, in most cases, the protégés opened up to me and told me how they "made it through". In other cases, protégés were more cautious. Even though I am an African American, I was still the outsider, the researcher who was delving into their personal experiences as African American protégés in a predominantly White institution. Because of my role as the outsider, the researcher, perhaps some of the protégés gave me brief answers or did not elaborate on my questions—and particularly those questions regarding race as a factor in the relationship, race as an issue in the academy, and individual and organizational attitudes about African Americans in the academy. Both protégés and mentors were somewhat cautious when responding to my questions about differences in the expectations for African American and White scholars. Again, I was the outsider, the researcher who was asking sensitive questions about a very competitive and political culture. Perhaps some of the tentativeness on the part of the protégés was because their professional careers were being showcased in a very public document—my dissertation. I can only speculate that even given my same-race level of communication, some of the protégés did not wish to divulge too much of their academic and personal lives. Doing so could possibly jeopardize their professional careers and their unspoken agenda to transform higher education.
My own interpretation of what the subjects told me, could at times, have been different from what they actually meant. For instance, it seemed that the majority of the protégés understood that mentoring itself could take on a political dimension. If the protégés wanted to make an impact on the institution, they might have to re-define traditional mentoring to include the political aspect. (For example, in the case of David, being used as a symbol of the commitment to increase diversity, and in the case of Terry, strategizing how he would gain acceptance of his critical scholarship). And it appeared that protégés understood that in order to make an impact on the institution not only did they need a mentor, but they needed a mentor who had power—a mentor who could help them to access the political structure of their institution. It also seemed that some of the protégés felt that they needed to re-define mentoring to conform to who they were as African Americans. For instance, a female protégé felt that the academy needed to change to include African Americans, and especially African American females. Still another female protégé said she was among a new generation of scholars who had come to the academy on her own terms and who would not compromise her scholarship. I interpreted this redefinition of mentoring in predominantly White institutions as a strategy for including more African Americans in the discussion in higher education. Thus, at times my own perceptions of what mentoring means for African Americans in predominantly White institutions could have been a factor in the interpretation and reporting of my findings. A continual self-check of my own biases was necessary throughout the study (Peshkin, 1988).
While the context of the institution (formal versus informal) was not a significant factor in this study, it is possible that my findings would have been different in another type of institution. For instance, protégés in historically Black institutions would probably have had same race mentors. Thus my questions about same-race match and individual and organizational attitudes which could affect the mentoring relationships might have been irrelevant in an historically Black institution. Since I do not have data to support this, I can only speculate that African American protégés in historically Black institutions would not have been as cautious in their responses about their experiences as protégés in a culture that presumably is more accepting of African American faculty.

Data Collection

Site Selection and Participants

The study was conducted in two large predominantly White research universities in two different states—University A where mentoring is accomplished informally by mutual arrangement, and University B where there is a formal faculty-to-faculty mentoring program for new untenured assistant professors. Conducting the study at two different sites had a definite advantage. The researcher had the opportunity to study participants in institutions with similar academic cultures, but with different methods of facilitating faculty-to-faculty mentoring. In addition, in both sites the researcher had the opportunity to study participants in institutions where there were small numbers of African American faculty and hence the phenomenon of
cross-race/cross-gender mentoring was likely to occur. The selection of the institutions was based on the following criteria:

1. There were at least five (5) African American faculty members who were being mentored in each site.

2. The protégé and his/her primary mentor were employed at the same institution.

A stratified purposeful sample of ten (10) African American faculty members (five in each institution) who were identified as protégés was used (n=10). Small purposeful samples are used when the researcher desires to conduct an in-depth study of information-rich cases (Patton, 1990). The participants selected for this study were examples of faculty members who had extensive knowledge about mentoring based on their personal experiences and who were able to give me valuable information about the issues which were of central importance to this study. The participants were selected using the snowball sampling technique. Snowball sampling is an approach for locating information-rich key informants by soliciting names from well-positioned people who can answer the question, "Who can I talk to about this phenomenon?" (Patton, 1990:176). Glesne and Peshkin (1992) refer to this sampling technique as "networking"--the researcher makes one contact and uses the referrals from that contact to make other contacts.

Based on the referrals obtained from the snowball approach, I compiled a list of prospective participants (grouped by institution) and contacted these persons by telephone. During the telephone conversation, I gave each prospective participant
brief description of the proposed research. In addition, I asked each faculty member the following series of questions to determine whether he/she qualified for participation in the study.

1. Are you now being mentored? (If the respondent answers yes, the next question will be asked. If the respondent answers no, the researcher will skip to question 6.)

2. Is your mentor now employed at your institution? (If the respondent answers yes, the researcher will ask for the name of the mentor and his/her telephone number and proceed to the next question. If the respondent answers no, the researcher will skip to question 6.)

3. Would you be willing to participate in my research? (If the respondent answers yes, the mentor will also be contacted to request his/her participation in the research. If both the protégé and the mentor agree to participate in the study, their names will be placed on the list of possible participants. If the respondent answers no, the researcher will skip to question 6.)

4. What is the race and gender of your mentor?

5. Do you have other mentors? If so, how many? Where are they? What are their names and telephone numbers?

6. Can you refer me to any other African American faculty members at your institution who might be willing to talk to me?

This process continued until five (5) African American protégés and at least five (5) mentors (White, African American, male, and female) had been selected from each institution. The resulting sample was composed of African American faculty members who were participating in either same-race, same-gender, or cross-race, cross-gender mentoring relationships, and whose primary mentor was employed at the same institution. Additionally, in an effort to maximize diversity within and across
institutions, every attempt was made to select participants who represented a range of academic disciplines. The sample in University A consisted of five (5) African American protégés (two females and three males), five (5) White primary mentors (one female and four males), and one (1) African American female secondary mentor. The sample in University B consisted of five (5) African American protégés (two females and three males), four (4) White primary mentors (two females and two males), and one (1) African American male primary mentor, and one (1) African American female secondary mentor.

In my original proposal, I planned to interview twenty (20) participants—ten protégés and ten mentors. But there was one protégé in each institution who identified both a primary mentor and a secondary mentor. Thus, I interviewed a total of twenty-two (22) participants, ten protégés, ten primary mentors, and two secondary mentors.

The definition of mentoring in this study is not limited to mentoring for promotion and tenure. Consequently, the sample consisted of nine untenured assistant professors who were being mentored for a variety of reasons, and a tenured associate professor who was being mentored for mid-career advancement. In traditional grounded theory, researchers look at the same phenomenon in different circumstances, thus the tenured associate professor would likely have been discarded from the sample. However, the definition of mentoring is an inclusive one and this protégé was an example of one of the many ways in which faculty-to-faculty mentoring is practiced.
Once the participants were selected, I contacted them by letter and requested their participation in the research (A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix E.). Each participant was also sent a confirmation letter to confirm the date and time of the interview(s). In this letter I also asked the participant to complete and return a Protégé/Mentor Participation Information Form which I used to collect demographic information. (A copy of the letter and the form can be found in the Appendix F and A.) A follow-up phone call was made to provide additional information to the participants, and to answer any additional questions which the participants had.

** Interviews

A general interview guide was used to collect the data. This guide contained a list of questions and/or topic areas that I wished to explore during the interview. I also used the general interview guide as a checklist to make sure that all of the relevant topics were covered during the interview (Patton, 1990). Each interview guide covered topics related to the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the protégé and the mentor as well as general questions related to the concept of mentoring.

I used several sources to develop the questions/topics on the general interview guide. First, I developed some of the questions based on the literature on corporate and faculty-to-faculty mentoring. Second, I added questions/topics to the general interview guide based on the research questions for the study. And third, before I began my actual data collection, I developed additional questions based on my informal conversations with five (5) African American faculty members in a
predominantly White institution who had been involved in mentoring relationships. It was not my intent to conduct a pilot study, and these faculty members were not a part of the actual study. Rather my intent was to informally test the instrument which I had developed and to modify the instrument in light of my conversations with African American faculty members who could discuss their experiences as protégés. This technique proved to be advantageous since these faculty members raised some issues which were not covered in the literature and which could possibly be included in the general interview guide.

The interview questions were essentially the same for both the formal and informal relationships, and varied only when the question related to the context of the relationship. For instance, I asked the protégés and mentors in the formal mentoring relationships questions which dealt with their perceptions of the assigned mentoring program at University B.

I was also able to develop some questions through probing. That is, there were occasions when I asked the respondent to elaborate and/or clarify his/her responses. For example, one of my first interviews at University B was with Phillip a protégé who was being mentored by Kenneth, a White male. When I asked Phillip, "Tell me about the mentoring program at University B", he replied, "I don’t know anything about it". When I asked Phillip what he meant by this statement, he told me that he was not aware that his institution had a formal mentoring program and that he was unaware that Kenneth had been assigned as his mentor. This led me to ask Phillip a series of questions which were not on the general interview guide. This in
turn, led Phillip to discuss his impressions of formal and informal mentoring. After my interview with Phillip, I added modified some of my questions about the formal mentoring program at University B and the concept of assigned mentoring in general. After modifying the general interview guide, I conducted follow-up interviews with participants in University B who had already completed the interviews.

At times, questions were also developed as a result of topics/issues raised by the participants themselves. One issue which was raised by several respondents during the early stages of data collection was the importance of mentoring for African American faculty. Thus, the question, "Why is it important for African American faculty members to have a mentor?" was added to the general interview guide. Whenever questions were added to the general interview guide, I conducted follow-up interviews with the participants to assure that each participant had the opportunity to respond to the new questions.

Each interview was tape recorded and the length of each interview varied depending on the course of the conversation and the time constraints imposed by the participant. While the majority of the interviews were completed in two sessions, several interviews did take three sessions to complete. In addition, after completing an entire interview with a protégé and her mentor, I also conducted a follow-up interviews with them after the protégé was denied promotion and tenure.

In the first interview with each participant, I attempted to cover as many of the questions/topics on the interview guide as possible. In the second interview I attempted to clarify/expand on statements which were made in the first interview when
necessary, and to complete the remainder of the interview questions. After the initial data analysis, in some cases it was necessary for me to conduct a third interview (usually by telephone) to further clarify unclear statements and/or meanings, and to confirm/disconfirm some of the conclusions and interpretations of earlier interviews.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other materials the researcher accumulates to increase his/her understanding of the phenomenon. Data analysis involves working with the data, organizing the data, breaking the data into manageable units, synthesizing the data, and searching for patterns (Bodgan and Biklen, 1992). Researchers use data analysis to bring order, structure and meaning to what has been collected.

**Procedure**

Data analysis does not refer to a stage in the research process, rather it is a continuing process that should begin as soon as the research begins (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992). I analyzed the data as they were collected. After each interview was completed, I listened to the taped conversation and made notes which I later used when I began the actual coding and analysis of the data using the typed transcript. I used the inductive method to analyze the data from three perspectives. First, I used the research questions which, to some extent, were developed based on theories of mentoring presented in the literature. Second, guidance came from various theories presented in the literature on the mentoring of non-minorities in the corporate and academic worlds. Third, guidance came from theories grounded in the data—that is, I
also analyzed the data from the "insider's perspective". Patton (1990) describes inductive analysis as that where patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from the data, and where the researcher can use the categories developed and articulated by the participants studied to organize the presentation around particular themes. Inductive analysis also allowed me to become aware of categories or patterns for which the participants did not have labels or terms, but which could be inductively generated. My objective was to understand the participants' perspectives and to compare those perspectives to the theories in the literature which generally do not deal with African Americans.

My analysis was limited to some extent by the necessity of maintaining confidentiality. In some cases participants were concerned that their identities and the identities of their departments would be revealed by reporting the details of their relationships. Thus, in some of the cases I chose not to report all of the details of the cases for ethical reasons.

Each interview was transcribed in its entirety and I began the process of data analysis by reading the transcribed interviews and handwritten fieldnotes several times to become familiar with the data. Next, I began searching for recurring words, phrases, and patterns of thinking in the comments of the participants. Two sets of coding categories were used to analyze the themes and patterns, as well as any contradictions that I found in the data: (1) codes which were developed based on the theories of mentoring presented in the literature and (2) codes which were developed based on the narratives (language) of the participants (i.e. isolation, benefits to the
mentor, promotion and tenure, separation of the personal from the professional).

Coding the data involved searching through the data for regularities and patterns and writing down words and phrases to represent the themes and patterns. The words and the phrases represented coding categories—major codes represented specific topics and subcodes represented items related to the major codes. Codes (category abbreviations) were assigned to "units of data" (usually paragraphs and sentences of data from the fieldnotes and/or interview transcripts) (Bodgan and Biklen, 1992). Glesne and Peshkin (1992) recommend that researchers use a codebook to begin developing a coding scheme shortly after the research begins so that it will reflect the emerging, evolving structure of the manuscript. I adopted this strategy and began developing a codebook at the beginning of my data collection. Based on the research questions, some of my initial category codes included: definition of mentoring, nature of the mentoring relationship (hierarchical, collegial), context of the relationship (formal, informal) major characteristics, race/gender match, and effects on career.

After establishing coding categories, I used a computerized word processing and data base program to facilitate the coding/categorization of the data. The computerized program allowed me to extract units of data and match those units with the corresponding codes. The data was then printed out according to the codes, sorted in logical order, and stored in files for easy reference.

Trustworthiness

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) state that efforts to achieve trustworthiness require the researcher's continual alertness to her own biases and subjectivity, as well as the
continual search for negative cases. The researcher then, must, from the outset of the study make a conscious effort to achieve trustworthiness. From the outset of the study, the researcher must be concerned with how she will convince the readers that the data are valid—that is, that it is worth reading, that it is credible, and that it is indeed an accurate description of what was gained from the participants.

I employed several strategies suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) to insure trustworthiness in this study.

1. **Reflexive journal.** From the outset of the study I kept a reflexive journal which included my daily schedule and logistics, methodological decisions, rationales and my personal reflections about what was happening in terms of my own values and interests, and for speculation about growing insights into the experiences of African American protégés.

2. **Member checks.** Lincoln and Guba describe this as the "single most crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p. 239). Since the goal of the researcher is to understand the perspectives of the participants, it is essential that the researcher verify/clarify the statements made during the interviews. I employed this process continually by providing the participants in this study constant opportunities for participant feedback, both during data collection and during data analysis. I conducted member checks at the end of each interview and after subsequent telephone interviews, and a copy of the interview transcript was given to each participant to allow the participant to make corrections to any part of the transcript.
3. **Negative Case Analysis.** Lincoln and Guba describe this as a process of revising the working hypotheses in light of hindsight—that is, the researcher should not expect that all cases will fit into appropriate categories (p. 238). I employed this technique during data analysis by searching for negative cases—those that did not fit the categories I had identified based on my pre-established coding scheme.

4. **Peer Debriefing.** I solicited the critiques/insights of a peer debriefer who is an African American faculty member and who had been involved in a mentor-protégé relationship. The peer debriefer helped me to understand my own posture and values and what role they had played in the inquiry, helped to facilitate my working hypotheses, and provided opportunities for me to try out successive methodological steps in my emergent design.

**Treatment of Ethics**

Bogdan and Biklen (1992) make several suggestions related to ethics in fieldwork. Three of these suggestions were particularly applicable to this research. First, the identities of the participants were protected so that the information that I obtained would not embarrass or in other ways harm them. I extended anonymity not only to my writing, but also to the verbal reporting of information that I learned through any observations. Second, in negotiating permission to do this study, I made it clear to the participants the procedures that I would use to conduct the study, and I abided by our verbal agreement. Third, I have attempted to accurately report my findings—even when I did not always agree with some of the conclusions.
The participants were also given a description of the research project and the purpose for conducting the research was explained. I have used pseudonyms to protect the identity of each participant in this written report, as well as in the codes that I used to sort my data. Additionally, I informed the participants and/or obtained their permission whenever changes were necessary which would dramatically alter our original agreement.

Ethical considerations were particularly important in this study because several of the protégés and the mentors were concerned about the issue of confidentiality. These individuals requested that certain details of their relationship not be reported in my dissertation. In addition, several protégés and mentors deleted portions of text from the original transcript and/or changed the wording of some of their statements. Thus, there was data which I was unable to use. Therefore, in reporting the findings (and particularly in the case studies) I did not always reveal the participant’s discipline. Consequently, because I wanted to maintain confidentiality, some aspects of certain relationships might appear to be more important than the protégé and the mentor actually perceived them to be. For instance, in one case it appears that based on my interviews with the protégé, the race of the mentor (a White male) was a dominant factor in the relationship. While I was unable to go into greater detail about the specific discipline, my analysis suggests that the mentor downplayed the issue of cross-race mentoring not because race was unimportant to him, but because he was a Skinnerian behaviorist and his views about cross-race mentoring were consistent with his academic training. In some cases, there was a conflict between the ethics of
confidentiality and reporting the details of the case. I attempted to resolve this
conflict by accurately reporting what the participants told me while at the same time
honoring their requests for confidentiality.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: CROSS CASE ANALYSIS

The Context of Mentoring: Informal and Formal Relationships

This study was conducted in two predominantly White research institutions located in the midwest region of the United States. In University A mentoring is practiced informally among faculty members who are usually, but not always, from the same department. While there may be some attempt in some departments in this university to implement loosely structured mentoring activities, there is no specific university policy with regard to faculty-to-faculty mentoring. Informal mentoring, as described in the literature, most often occurs when relationships develop because the mentor and the protégé share the same or similar research interests, there is mutual admiration, and when the parties form a more personal relationship which involves a sharing of interests and needs. These relationships can begin when either the prospective mentor or protégé initiates contact, or they can develop naturally over time due to both professional and social interactions. Additionally, these relationships are often facilitated by commonalities such as race, religion, organizational affiliations, and extra-curricular activities.

Participants in University A who were selected for this study were involved in mentoring relationships which developed by mutual agreement. That is, the mentors and the protégés were faculty members in the same departments, they interacted with
one another on a regular basis professionally and/or socially, and the mentoring relationships developed naturally based on these interactions. Four of the five participants involved in the informal mentoring relationships identified a senior faculty member from their home department as their primary mentor. One of these participants also identified a secondary mentor who was also from his home department. The fifth participant identified a top level university executive as his primary mentor. The sample in University A consisted of five (5) African American protégés (two females and three males), five (5) White primary mentors (one female and four males), and one (1) African American female secondary mentor. The sample for University A is represented in Table 1 in Appendix G.

Mentoring junior faculty for promotion and tenure is the purpose of the formal mentoring program at University B. The mentoring program is carried out at the departmental level where each new junior faculty member is assigned a three member tenure review committee. The members of this committee evaluate the progress of the junior faculty member for promotion and tenure each year for a six year period. As described in the literature, in formal mentoring programs protégés are assigned a mentor who interacts with him/her through a series of structured activities in both formal and informal settings. Mentors usually provide counseling, coaching, and other professional growth activities such as advice on how to balance teaching, research, and service.

Junior faculty members who were involved in the formal mentoring program in this study could request that particular persons become members of their committee
and could change the members of the committee at their discretion. In addition, committee members could rotate or serve only a portion of the six year term (due to leaves of absence, sabbaticals, etc.). The three member committee was usually made up of senior faculty members who are from the junior faculty member’s home department, although in some cases one member of the committee did come from another department. The tenure review committee meets with the junior faculty member at least once a year and submits yearly evaluations of the junior faculty member’s progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service to the department chairperson.

For this study, four of the protégés identified one senior faculty member from their three member tenure review committee as their primary mentor. One of these protégés also identified another senior faculty member who had previously served on her tenure review committee as her secondary mentor. The fifth protégé identified her mentor in the women’s mentoring program at University B—a program which was distinct from and supplementary to, the university’s regular mentoring program—for this study. When I contacted this protégé she made a distinction between the mentor who had been assigned to her in the women’s mentoring program and the members of her tenure review committee. It appears that this protégé was responding to my request for the name of a person who had been designated as her mentor as a result of her participation in this program, and considered this person to be her official mentor rather than any of the members of her tenure review committee.
While some of the protégés in the formal mentoring program had met their mentors prior to the official assignment, their formal mentoring relationships were initiated as a result of the senior faculty member becoming a member of their tenure review committee. The sample in University B consisted of five (5) African American protégés (two females and three males), four (4) White primary mentors (two females and two males), one (1) African American male primary mentor, and one (1) African American female secondary mentor. The sample for University B is represented in Table 2 in the Appendix.

Organization of the Chapter

The findings from this study are presented using two methods: an analysis of the ten mentor-protégé relationships, and case studies of six mentor-protégé pairs. The analysis of the ten mentor-protégé relationships are presented in this chapter. In this analysis, I characterize the ten cases by using the major concepts from the literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring. Faculty-to-faculty mentoring as defined in Chapter Two of this study, is a process by which persons of superior rank, special achievements, and prestige instruct, counsel, guide and facilitate the intellectual and/or career development of persons identified as protégés (Blackwell, 1989).

A Note on the Definition of Success

In the findings that are presented in this chapter, and to some extent in the next chapter, there is frequent mention of the term success. It is reasonable to ask what success is. Although success is often mentioned in the literature, the term is seldom defined. This study reveals the multiple images of mentoring and implicit in the
different perceptions of mentoring and the different ways of acting out mentoring relationships are very different criteria for what mentoring is. Consequently in this dissertation, I have not tried to define success a priori. Rather I have allowed the data to shed light on the different perceptions of the term success and have posed an empirical question: What is mentoring for these particular people?

In this study the term success is defined by the protégés and the mentors. Some protégés and mentors equated a successful mentoring relationship with whether the protégé was a success in his/her career. Quite often this definition of success meant the protégé was granted promotion and tenure, and/or that the mentor and the protégé were confident that the protégé would be granted promotion and tenure. In other cases, a successful relationship meant that the mentor and the protégé had a "good" relationship—that is they liked each other and they had a collegial relationship. In other cases, success was equated with the word commitment. For instance, a female protégé in University B felt that her relationship was successful because her mentors were committed to her as friend first and as formally designated mentors second, and that the two could not be separated. Her mentors were committed to mentoring female faculty members, thus they described the relationship as successful because they were able to help a female faculty member to grow personally and professionally. Thus the terms success and successful mentoring relationship represent the perceptions of the mentors and the protégés in each case.
Dimensions of Traditional Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring Relationships

There are five major dimensions of mentoring which are prominent in the literature on corporate and faculty-to-faculty mentoring. As discussed in Chapter Two of this study, they are:

1. Mentor-protégé pairs. In traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships, mentors and protégés usually pick each other, mentors are usually older than the protégés, and the pairs are often from the same department.

2. Mentor functions. Mentors provide both career and psychosocial functions to protégés in traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships. Career functions prepare the protégé for career advancement, and psychosocial functions enhance the protégé's sense of competence, identity, and work-role effectiveness.

3. Benefits to the protégé. Both career and psychosocial benefits can accrue to the protégé faculty member as a result of a successful mentoring relationship. Career benefits include opportunities for professional networking, higher publication rates, greater research collaboration, advice on how to balance teaching, research and service, and support for promotion and tenure. Psychosocial benefits include friendship, role modeling, socialization into the academic culture, emotional support, and defense from criticism by others.

4. Phases of the mentor-protégé relationship. Traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships are characterized by four phases: the initiation phase, the cultivation stage, the separation phase, and the redefinition phase.
5. Race/gender match in mentoring relationships. Same-race match is likely to be the strongest predictor of success in a mentor-protégé relationship. Minority and female faculty members may experience difficulty in finding same race and same gender mentors because of the small numbers of minorities and females in academia.

Mentor-Protégé Pairs

In traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships, mentors and protégés usually pick each other, mentors are usually older than the protégés, and the pairs are often from the same department. These characteristics were applicable to four of the informal mentor-protégé pairs and four of the formal mentor-protégé pairs. In these eight pairs, the mentors were older than the protégés and usually had fifteen to twenty years more university teaching and/or administrative experience than their protégés. They were also from the same department. There were two exceptions: David, a tenured associate professor who was being mentored informally by a university executive, and Beverly, who was assigned a mentor from a different department through the women’s mentoring program. While protégés in the assigned mentoring program could be assigned a mentor that they did not know, none were in this study. All of the mentors and protégés knew each other before the official assignment. In one formal mentoring relationship, the protégé asked the mentor to be a member of his tenure review committee because of their previous interactions in the department.

In both the informal and formal relationships, the pairs were formed primarily due to their mutual personal and professional interests. There was also an exception to this characteristic: Beverly, the protégé in the women’s mentoring program and
her mentor, Elizabeth, had different personal and professional interests. In the
women's mentoring program, an attempt is made to match the protégé with a mentor
from the same department. While Beverly and Elizabeth were from the same college,
they were from different departments and they had very different personal, academic,
and professional backgrounds.

Another factor related to mentor-protégé pairs is what Carden (1990) calls
perceived personality fit. This characteristic was applicable to all of the informal
mentor-protégé pairs and four of the formal mentor-protégé pairs. The protégés and
mentors had similar or the same philosophies regarding their work, and protégés and
mentors considered their friendship to be an important aspect of their relationship.
Consequently, the mentor was willing to give the protégé guidance because he/she
"liked" him/her and the protégé was willing to accept guidance/direction from the
mentor because he/she "liked" him/her, trusted his/her judgement, and felt that the
mentor had his/her best interest at heart. For instance a White female mentor in an
informal mentoring relationship told me that for her it was important that the mentor
and the protégé have a similar world view. She used the example of mentoring
relationships between teachers at the elementary/secondary level to illustrate this point
in the following statement:

Mentoring has more to do with world view. If somebody really likes a
certain kind of research and looks at the world in a certain way and
thinks in a certain way about the world, I think that might be a better
mentor than someone who teaches the same grade level but with an
entirely different philosophy.
The mentor-protégé pair in the women's mentoring program did not fit this characteristic. Beverly, the protégé had requested a mentor who "was a Black woman with children", but was assigned Elizabeth, who was White and had no children. The mentor called the protégé after she was assigned to her, and they had talked briefly at several university functions. However, they had never met to discuss how the mentor could assist the protégé. Thus, while Beverly and Elizabeth did have a mentor-protégé relationship on paper, the absence of a perceived personality fit seemed to be a factor in their failure to meet for the purpose of mentoring. The following statement by Beverly is illustrative of this point:

Well, I think she and I are not a good pairing for this process. I like her and I'm sure she likes me and we get along, but I probably need someone who is not as busy as I am. I mean, I probably need someone who is further along in their career. Now I'll tell you who would have been perfect for me, and who began to work in that way before she left and that was Catherine.

So while Beverly liked Elizabeth, perhaps she felt that Catherine, an African American female who had mentored her informally before leaving University B, was more compatible with her professionally and personally. Beverly did not indicate if she had requested that Catherine be assigned as her mentor prior to her leaving the university.

The majority of the mentors and protégés in both the formal and informal relationships said that there were no hierarchial aspects to their relationships at a personal level. Rather the protégés viewed their mentors as colleagues who had more experience in the academy and who could provide them with guidance. But some of the protégés and mentors did feel that there was some degree of hierarchy at the
professional level. Phillip, who was a protégé in the formal program did not like the label "junior faculty member", and explained that this label implied that he was a subordinate. Phillip had been on the faculty at another prestigious university, and he preferred to think of his relationship with his mentor as one in which they were both equals. While Phillip said that he respected his mentor, he told me that his relationship with his mentor was based on friendship. But Nancy, an African American female who was a secondary mentor in a formal relationship, said that there is always some degree of hierarchy in such relationships because the mentor is usually a secure, tenured faculty member and the protégé is usually working toward achieving this status. And Scott, a White male who was a primary mentor in an informal mentoring relationship, felt that there was some degree of hierarchy in his mentor-protégé relationship due to his position. Scott was a university executive who was mentoring David, a tenured associate professor.

While the literature suggests that there is likely to be some degree of hierarchy when a senior faculty member mentors a junior faculty member, it is less clear about the mentoring relationship between two senior faculty members. Otto (1994) reports that a mentor of a mid-career protégé helps the protégé examine his/her accomplishments and make decisions about how he/she will continue his/her career, and that the relationship can be mutually beneficial to the mentor and the protégé. But Otto does not extend this discussion to consider whether there are any differences in the manner a full professor interacts with an associate professor or how two full professors interact in a mentor-protégé relationship. Since Scott was not only a full
professor, but was also a university executive, there was a distinct dividing line in terms of rank and experience. While the hierarchial line was blurred on the personal level, there was a hierarchial aspect to this relationship which is more likely to occur in senior faculty-junior faculty mentor-protégé relationships. Since David was helping Scott to revise an earlier edition of his book he was, to some extent, assuming a junior faculty role—he was being supervised by his mentor on a project about which the mentor had more knowledge and experience. While both David and Scott referred to the relationship as an equal partnership, Scott also described the relationship as a junior-senior partnership. So while the relationship was between two senior faculty members, at least one aspect of the relationship—the task of revising the book—was characteristic of a traditional mentor-protégé relationship.

Another factor related to the issue of hierarchy in traditional mentoring pairs is the "paternalistic" aspect (Levinson, 1978). That is, a male mentor may assume the role of a father figure in his relationship with his protégé. Mark, who was a protégé in an informal relationship said that there were times when his relationship with his mentor had taken on a paternalistic quality. His mentor had either consciously or unconsciously interceded on his behalf because he felt that he knew what was best for the protégé, or because he felt that he could fix the situation for the protégé. But Mark told me that he was confident that he would have been able to resolve these situations. He added that although he appreciated his mentor's support, he would have preferred to handle his own problems.
So, with a few exceptions, the majority of the mentor-protégé pairs in this study were characteristic of traditional faculty-to-faculty mentor-protégé pairs. Interestingly, the major exception was Beverly, a protégé in the formal mentoring program, who was matched with a mentor with whom she shared few personal and professional interests. As a result, there was only limited interaction between the Beverly and her mentor. While the purpose of the formal women’s mentoring program is to provide support for female faculty members, in this case the mentor did very little to support the protégé, and the protégé did not seek the support of the mentor. This may be an isolated case, but it does suggest that more consideration should be given to the process of assigning mentors to protégés and that protégés should be given other alternatives when there is an incompatible match.

Mentor Functions

Mentors provide both career and psychosocial functions to protégés in traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships. Career functions prepare the protégé for career advancement. These functions include protection (protection from assignment to committees that are particularly time demanding so that the junior faculty member’s time is devoted to activities that are explicitly tied to achieving competence in research, teaching and service); coaching (providing direction not only on how to ask research questions but what are the most important questions to ask, inspiring self-confidence and encouragement, providing frank but confidential feedback, sharing ideas, and suggesting strategies for accomplishing specific academic tasks); and sponsorship (nominating the protégé for desirable projects, positions, and
promotion, assuring that needed resources and career enhancing opportunities are available, and assigning projects that increase the protégé’s exposure and visibility to influential colleagues with similar research interests).

**Psychosocial functions** enhance the protégé’s sense of competence, identity, and work-role effectiveness. These functions include role modeling (serving as an appropriate role model regarding attitudes, values, and behaviors); acceptance and confirmation (conveying unconditional positive regard for the protégé), and counseling (encouraging the protégé to talk openly about anxieties and concerns, and giving the protégé support that facilitates socialization and helps in coping with job stress and work demands of the new faculty role). Thus, the faculty mentor may perform a variety of functions which range from socializing the protégé to the organizational culture to providing emotional support. The greater the number of career and psychosocial functions that are provided by the mentor, the more beneficial the relationship will be to the protégé (Noe, 1988).

Four of the five mentors in the informal relationships and four of the five mentors in the formal relationships provided both career and psychosocial functions to their protégés. While the number and type of functions provided by the mentor varied, mentors did provide assistance which both the mentors and the protégés considered to be career and psychosocial functions at various stages in the mentoring relationship. But the majority of the protégés said that they relied on their mentors more for career functions than they did for psychosocial functions. For example, Mark, a protégé in a formal mentoring relationship told me that he relied less on his
mentor for psychosocial functions such as role modeling and counseling than he did career functions. Mark explained that while it was important to him that his mentor provide guidance and/or suggestions with regard to his research, he was not as concerned that his mentor was emotionally supportive.

Nine of the ten primary mentors in this study were White, and like their protégés, the majority of these mentors placed less importance on providing some of the psychosocial functions. While the mentors did, in at least half of the cases, provide some level of psychosocial support, the mentors also seemed to recognize that there could be limitations to the amount of psychosocial support they could provide their protégés. For example, most of the mentors felt that they could provide acceptance and confirmation and sponsorship, but they named someone other than themselves as the person whom their protégé would probably identify as their role model or counselor. And their protégés seemed to agree with their mentors on this point. Three of the protégés who were in informal relationships and four of the protégés who were in the formal relationships said that their mentors provided more career functions than psychosocial functions. Two protégés told me that they relied on their secondary mentors, who were African Americans, for psychosocial functions, and particularly for emotional support. Gary, a protégé in an informal relationship, and Joann, a protégé in a formal relationship both had White primary mentors who provided them with professional support and to a lesser extent, personal support. But their secondary mentors provided them with professional, emotional, and cultural support. Terry, the only protégé in this study with a same-race primary mentor told
me that he relied on his mentor for both career and psychosocial support. While only three of the protégés in this study had a same-race primary or secondary mentor, this would lend support to Thomas’ (1990) finding that same race mentor-protégé relationships provide significantly more psychosocial support than cross-race relationships, and that African Americans have a need to form both organizational and developmental mentoring relationships.

Generally, the protégés felt that their mentors did what mentors should do for their protégés in terms of providing them with career guidance and helping them to grow as professionals. Mentors performed a variety of functions which included nominating their protégés for awards, introducing their protégés to influential persons, collaborating with their protégés on research and publications, and advising their protégés on the specific requirements for promotion and tenure. Jacqueline, a protégé in an informal relationship told me that her concept of what a mentor does for a protégé was an uncomplicated one. She said, "If a mentor is mentoring, there’s a change in your professional development. It affects how you develop professionally."

These findings suggest that African American faculty members may make a distinction between the professional and personal/cultural roles of their mentors, particularly if the mentor is White. Gary made this distinction and told me that his primary mentor mentored him professionally and his secondary mentor mentored him professionally and culturally. And it appears that the majority of the White mentors were not as comfortable providing their protégés with emotional support as they were providing professional support and that this lack of comfort was, to a great extent,
based on cultural differences. Marcia, a White female who was a mentor in the formal program told me that she realized that there were limitations to what she could provide her protégé in this area because her protégé "would always face a different set of challenges" as an African American female than she would as a White female. For this reason Marcia said she knew that she would not be the first person her protégé would come to for emotional support. While the literature does not explain the linkages between the types of functions mentors provide and race of mentor-protégé pairs, findings from this study indicate that both protégés and mentors do make such distinctions. Other mentors made the following comments about their role as a personal/cultural mentor:

Kenneth: The demography of the institution (University B) is terrible. This is not a place for minorities to feel very comfortable or have very many colleagues. To go back to your statement about same race, same gender mentor relationships, I would say that other things being equal it probably would be better. I think it would be a good role model, I think it would daily reinforce the notion that Black people have tenure, they have a voice, they have succeeded. These may be in some small way, role models to Phillip which say, yes there are some successful Blacks on the faculty.

Pamela: She can manage the African American community. I can’t introduce her to that. I’ve worked a lot with African American kids and I know that community, but I also know that I’m an outsider.

Victor: Hearing him out. Trying to provide him with somebody who he feels he can come to and let off some steam. Trying to create an environment where he can do what he wants to do. That’s about the best I can do. But it’s all marginal, I’ll be honest about it, it’s all marginal. He pretty much separates his work here from his personal life. His life is elsewhere, you know, his family life and
all. We talk about, we banter back and forth about family. He does separate them. Obviously, if he could have an older, accomplished Black mentor, those needs would have been met much better.

In addition, African American protégés may find other mentors to provide them with the support they need in predominantly White institutions to combat feelings of loneliness and isolation. Several protégés told me that they had experienced feelings of isolation and that at times they felt they might have to compromise their cultural identity to fit into their institution. The point is emphasized in the following comments which were made by several protégés:

Gary: There are times when I still feel alone. There are times when I still feel that even though I'm able to interact and intermingle in the culture, that I'm clearly not understood. And so even though I'm here I still feel somewhat alone. That's probably where someone like Carolyn comes in or some of my other colleagues who are African American at other universities where we can dialogue about the cultural stretch and also the stress of dealing with a lot of different issues. There's another issue that comes up too and that deals squarely with African Americans and our own perception of the environment. That perception of, that feeling of alienation, that feeling of being left out, is it real or is not real? And needing somebody who is African American to dialogue about that with because somebody from the dominant culture would say, "Oh, no that's not the way it is." But you need to talk to somebody who is responsible, reasonable and that you trust and say, "This is what was going on. This is how I felt about it, what do you think?" and getting some feedback. Because you can be very systematically isolated and you can never prove that you've been discriminated against.

Beverly: And that was my biggest fear—that there wasn't a way to fit in the academy and be my real self.
Mark: You’re constantly doing a self check, as well as trying to function within this institution because you have to be a certain way with your colleagues and with your students. You wear a lot of hats. That kind of wreaks havoc on your own identity. On the one hand you want to be who you are, but you can’t really be who you are to a certain degree.

Phillip: There is ambivalence and there’s tension about working in a White world because no one looks like you and no one talks like you and no one understands some of the funnier things that go on sometimes. There’s no one to laugh with. You know, there is sort of an implicit understanding that Black people have. That, you know, you don’t have to go through a whole long elaboration. Black writers talked about the isolation of Black scholars in the 1930’s and 1940’s and it’s changed a little bit, but not a whole lot. So that’s something you deal with, but you should be able to talk to people in general no matter how isolating it (the institution) is.

It seems then that while protégés did have what they considered to be successful mentoring relationships, they also perceived themselves to be outsiders in their institution.

Benefits to the Protégé

Career benefits which can accrue to the protégé faculty member as a result of a successful mentoring relationship include opportunities for professional networking, higher publication rates, receipt of grants, greater research collaboration, advice on how to balance teaching, research and other professional responsibilities, nominations for awards, and support for promotion and tenure. All of the protégés in this study said they had benefitted from the mentoring relationship in ways which were the same or similar to the traditional benefits that accrue to the protégé. Not all of the protégés
had experienced the same type of professional growth, but each protégé said that he/she had benefitted in areas that were important to his/her success as a faculty member.

David was an interesting example of how a protégé would benefit from his relationship with his mentor. David, who was a tenured associate professor, was co-authoring a textbook with his mentor, Scott, a university executive. The tangible benefits from this relationship would include the possibility of promotion to full professor, royalties from the publication of the book, and recognition as a scholar and an author in a field where there are very few African Americans. This type of mentoring is rather non-traditional for an academic, because David had already made the transition from a junior faculty status and understood the expectations of the academy. David’s relationship with Scott was a business relationship in which both the mentor and the protégé would benefit from the relationship financially as well as professionally because of the publication of the textbook. Thus, while this relationship does not look like the traditional model of mentoring, there are still rewards which will enhance the protégé’s career.

All of the protégés who were untenured assistant professors (except for Beverly, who was in the women’s mentoring program) felt that they had benefitted from the guidance of their mentor in the most important area, support for promotion and tenure. The protégés in the assigned mentoring program are mentored specifically for promotion and tenure. Since the expectation of the tenure review committee in each department at University B is that the junior faculty member has shown progress
in the areas of teaching, research, and service--but most importantly, research--a great deal of the mentoring in this program is focused on the protégé’s research focus and publication record. Protégés said their mentors had explained to them the expectations of the tenure review committees at the departmental and divisional levels, given them advice about where they should put more or less emphasis in their research, and kept them apprised of their chances for being granted promotion and tenure.

The protégés in the informal relationships said that they had received similar types of assistance from their mentors while preparing for their promotion and tenure reviews. Mentoring for promotion and tenure was particularly important for Rosemary, who became a protégé in an informal relationship after she had received a negative fourth year review and was facing a questionable tenure decision. Her mentor had helped her to develop a clear research focus, helped her to edit her manuscripts, and had become an advocate for her on the departmental promotion and tenure committee. In Rosemary’s case, her mentoring relationship began late, was in response to a particular problem, and was focused on how this problem (a weak publication record) could be solved. Thus, the manner in which mentors assisted their protégés varied depending on specific situations. In some instances, mentors performed functions which were focused on a specific area, such as developing a research focus or resolving a specific problem. In other instances, mentors performed functions which were not focused in any particular area but which were designed to assist the protégé in making the adjustment to life as a new faculty member.
But the extent to which the protégé’s success was related to the type of mentoring that he/she received varied from case to case. For example, Gary, a protégé in informal mentoring relationships received mentoring which included most of the career and psychosocial functions and was very successful. He had collaborated with his mentors, edited a textbook, and received a university teaching award. Gary’s mentors performed a range of mentoring functions and Gary benefitted personally and professionally. But Mark who was also a protégé in an informal relationship, and had also received mentoring which included most of the career and psychosocial functions, was not as successful. Mark told me that while he had a successful mentoring relationship, he was in jeopardy of being denied promotion and tenure because of some of the decisions that he had made about his career. Mark was required to write a book to achieve promotion and tenure and his mentor had advised him where he should publish his book. Because Mark had not taken his mentor’s advice, he was forced to request an additional year to complete the book. He was granted the extra year, but admitted that this situation could have been avoided if he had taken the advice of his mentor. Even though Mark’s mentor performed a number of career and psychosocial functions, it would take Mark almost eight years to achieve promotion and tenure because of choices that he made. Beverly, the protégé in the women’s mentoring program, had a mentor who performed only one mentoring function (she nominated Beverly for two committee assignments). But Beverly’s first book had just been published, she was also co-authoring a book with another colleague, and she was a much sought after speaker and consultant. In the case of
Beverly, she was successful despite the fact that she received a very limited amount of career and psychosocial support from her mentor.

There is very little in the literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring which suggests that mentors enter into informal or formal relationships with protégés for specific purposes or in response to specific situations. Instead the literature characterizes an informal mentoring relationship as beginning when the junior faculty member begins his/her career and ending when he/she achieves promotion and tenure. In addition, the literature suggests that mentors in informal relationships perform general rather than specific career and psychosocial functions for their protégés throughout their probationary period (the first six years of the faculty member’s career). But in Rosemary’s case, her mentor performed functions which were specifically designed to help her achieve promotion and tenure. Rather than providing Rosemary with career and psychosocial support during her probationary period, her mentor focused his mentoring functions on the areas of research and publication—the areas which were most important to Rosemary at the time. The mentor performed functions which were in direct response to the question: How can I help the protégé to improve her publication record so that she will achieve promotion and tenure? This form of mentoring more closely resembles the formal mentoring program in University B, where protégés are mentored to achieve promotion and tenure, with an emphasis on research and publication.
Phases of the Mentor-Protégé Relationship

According to the literature, traditional faculty-to-faculty mentor-protégé relationships are characterized by four phases. Four of the formal mentor-protégé relationships in this study had gone through what could be called the initiation and the cultivation stages. All of the mentor-protégé pairs, except David, the tenured associate professor, and Beverly, who was in the women's mentoring program, were in mentoring relationships which had developed in a manner which was similar to these first two phases. Otto (1994) reports that the initiation stage usually lasts for a two year period leading up to the protégé’s first review for promotion and tenure. During this phase the mentors and protégés establish a relationship where the mentor provides assistance in the areas of teaching, research and service. In addition, during this phase, the new faculty member adjusts to being a "junior" and having what Otto calls a limited status. It is during this stage that the protégé must be receptive to advice and counsel from the mentor and the mentor must treat the protégé as a colleague and not as a graduate student.

According to Otto the cultivation stage of the relationship lasts until the protégé has received promotion and tenure, usually three to five years. During this phase the mentor and the protégé develop a relationship based on personal and professional similarities, sometimes become involved in the same professional organizations, and collaborate on publications together. The cultivation stage is uncertain and at times, difficult, because it is during this phase that the protégé begins to experience a positive sense of accomplishment and the mentor takes pride in his/her positive
influence on the protégé’s career development. The difficulty usually arises when the protégé begins to rely less on the mentor and begins to take more of an active role in the relationship. The protégé may begin to be more assertive about the direction of his/her career while the mentor may be somewhat reluctant to consider the protégé as more of an equal and allow the protégé to take credit for his/her own accomplishments. The mentor and the protégé begin to move closer to the separation stage—the point when the protégé moves from junior to senior faculty status.

Three of the protégés (Jacqueline, Terry, and Cameron) who were untenured assistant professors, had already received their first formal evaluation and had just completed what could be called the initiation phase. All three of the protégés described this period of their relationship as one where they had to become comfortable with their mentor as a mentor—that is, they had to be willing to take direction from the mentor and be willing to accept advice from the mentor with regard to their professional growth. The protégés took more of a passive role during this period, deferring to the mentor in many situations because of his/her experience. The mentors also described this period as one in which they gave more direct guidance to their protégés. For instance, in this stage mentors were more likely to give protégés advice about their teaching, how to develop their research, and where to submit their manuscripts for publication.

Four of the protégés (Gary, Mark, Joann, and Phillip) who were also untenured assistant professors, were nearing the end of what could be called the cultivation stage, and were preparing or had already prepared their dossiers for the
promotion and tenure review. These protégés described this period of their
relationship as one where they began to have more confidence in their own abilities
and began to become more active in making decisions about their career. Both the
protégés and mentors who were nearing the end of this period agreed that in this
phase the protégé had assumed more of an active role in planning his/her career than
in the beginning stages of the relationship. For example, Gary a protégé in an
informal relationship, told me that it was after his first formal evaluation that he
became more confident about his teaching and his research. And as Gary began to
experience success in his career, he was more comfortable making decisions about his
career before consulting with his mentor.

Mentors and protégés in this study did not describe their relationship in terms
of "stages" but the majority of them did agree that their relationships had developed
over time. When applied to higher education, Kram’s (1985) stages of mentoring
appear to be a series of discrete steps that occur over a defined period of time. But
the findings in this study suggest that, at least in some cases, the stages of a mentor-
protégé relationship are more complex. For instance, Phillip, a protégé in the formal
program did not experience Kram’s initiation phase as it has been described in the
literature. Phillip had been a faculty member at another university and also knew his
mentor before coming to University B. From Phillip’s perspective, his mentor
provided minimal assistance with teaching, research, and service. And Phillip had
already made the adjustment to "junior" status at his former institution. Thus, while
there was a period of adjustment for both Phillip and his mentor, what could be called
the initiation phase was more directly related to how the mentor socialized Phillip to a new institution rather than to the life of a new faculty member.

Rosemary, who began her mentor-protégé relationship with her mentor after her fourth year review, is another example of the complexity of the stages of a mentoring relationship. In this case, Kram’s initiation and the cultivation stage were merged together. Rosemary had to be receptive to the advice and counsel of her mentor and, at times, deferred to the experience of her mentor. At the same time, Rosemary had experienced some success as a faculty member, thus there were times when she worked without the guidance of her mentor. Her relationship with her mentor was a combination of what could be called the initiation and cultivation stages. She had to make the adjustment of accepting her colleague as a mentor during the same period when she was nearing the end of her probationary period (the cultivation stage). In Rosemary’s case there was no definitive beginning and end to the initiation phase and the line between the two stages was somewhat blurred.

Beverly, the protégé in the women’s mentoring program, and David, the tenured associate professor, did not experience the traditional development of a mentoring relationship. In Beverly’s case, she and her mentor did not engage in any mentoring activities. With the exception of a few telephone conversations and casual exchanges at university functions, Beverly had very little contact with her mentor. And in the case of David, who was tenured, the mentoring was focused on a specific project, and David rarely interacted with his mentor other than to discuss this project. Thus, while it is probably the case that most mentor-protégé relationships do go
through Kram’s stages in some form, findings in this study suggest that this does vary depending on the situation. In addition, since the protégés and mentors did not define their relationships in terms of Kram’s stages of the mentoring relationship, no conclusions can be made about the applicability of this model to the sample in this study.

Race and Gender Match in Mentoring Relationships

Borrowing from the literature on traditional mentoring relationships in the corporate world, researchers have reported that same-race match is likely to be the strongest predictor of success in a mentor-protégé relationship, and that most mentor-protégé relationships tend to be same race rather than cross-race relationships. In higher education, African Americans may experience difficulty in finding mentors who are accepting of their cultural differences and the nature of their scholarship, and who are not concerned about inter-racial taboos. With regard to cross-gender mentoring, female faculty members may experience difficulty finding female mentors because of the small number of women in academia generally, and within the same department more specifically. And McCormick (1991) reports that comfort-discomfort levels in cross-gender matches may occur when females and males have not been socialized to interact with each other as peers in close relationships. Herr (1994) reports that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that same-race, same-gender faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships are any more successful than cross-race, cross-gender, mentoring relationships.
All of the protégés in this study, except one, had White mentors. Terry, who was a protégé in the formal program and had a same-race mentor, told me that race was an important issue for him. For Terry, the success of his mentor-protégé relationship, personally, professionally, and culturally, was dependent on the race of his mentor. But Terry was the exception in this study. Despite what the literature on traditional mentoring relationships tells us about the potential problems in cross-race mentoring relationships, none of the protégés expressed concerns about their cross-race mentoring relationships. While all of the protégés agreed that race could sometimes be a factor that affected the relationship on a social/cultural level, they expressed few concerns about race as a factor in their professional relationship. For the protégés it was important that they had access to a mentor who could help them advance professionally, regardless of his/her race.

The majority of the protégés as well as mentors emphasized that the essence of their relationship was mentoring for professional growth and development, and that the most important factor was whether the mentors could provide the protégés with the kind of guidance necessary to achieve promotion and tenure. And in the case of David, it was the power and the position of his mentor which was most important. This finding challenges the assumption that same-race match is likely to be the strongest predictor of the success of a mentoring relationship. As I have reported earlier, same-race match was a factor in the extent to which protégés relied on their mentors for psychosocial functions.
Cross-race match did not seem to be a factor in the mentor-protégé relationships in terms of the protégé’s success in terms of negotiating the system. Both protégés and mentors admitted that racial/cultural differences were a reality in their relationships, but they did not consider these differences to be an obstacle which prevented them from working together and having a successful mentoring relationship. While I do not have data to support this, perhaps some of the protégés and mentors were uncomfortable discussing the issue of race. Since the topic of race is one which permeates our society at all levels, it seems doubtful that the participants would be unaffected, at least to some extent, by the issue of race both in their interactions with one another and as it is discussed in their institutions. While some of the participants alluded to the fact that they had, on occasion, experienced strains in the relationship due to racial/cultural differences, for the most part they were unwilling to share the specifics of these experiences with me. Even when participants did speak candidly about the issue of race in their mentoring relationships and in the academy, they continued to emphasize that these differences did not prevent them from having a successful mentoring relationship. It is possible that if I had spent an extended amount time in the field interacting with the participants in this study, I might have received different responses with regard to this issue. However, given the fact that I conducted a short-term study, I am only able to report what the participants told me during the interviews.

In this study, there was only one female and one male protégé who had cross-gender mentoring relationships. Rosemary had a White male primary mentor, and
Gary had an African American female secondary mentor. Neither of these protégés expressed any concerns with regard to cross-gender mentoring. But James, Rosemary’s mentor, did tell me that he had wondered how his relationship with Rosemary would be perceived by other faculty members in their department. James said that since none of their colleagues had ever made an issue of the cross-race, cross-gender match, this had not been a problem in their relationship. Jacqueline, a protégé in an informal mentoring relationship who had a White female mentor told me that having a mentor of the same gender did facilitate the relationship, but added that it was more important for her to have a mentor who could help her to grow professionally, regardless of his/her race or gender.

The findings in this study regarding race-gender match seem to support Boice’s (1990) argument that it is not who the mentor is, but what the mentor does that is important in mentoring relationships. But while Boice’s argument may be valid in terms of the professional aspect of the mentor-protégé relationships in this study, some of the protégés did seek out African American mentors to fulfill their social/cultural needs. While their White mentors fulfilled their career needs, protégés sometimes turned to African American colleagues inside and outside of the university to fulfill their psychosocial needs.

The literature suggests that African Americans may have difficulty finding mentors who are accepting of their non-traditional scholarship. But this was not a factor in the mentor-protégé relationships in this study. Terry, Joann, Mark, Rosemary, and Beverly were engaged in scholarship which focused on racial issues.
Four of these protégés had White mentors, but neither the protégés nor the mentors said that the nature of the protégé's scholarship had a negative effect on the relationship. Rather the protégés felt that their mentors accepted their scholarship, and had been helpful to them by suggesting publication outlets which might be more receptive to their particular type of research.

Since there were only two protégés in this study who had cross-gender mentoring relationships, my findings provided only limited insight into the dynamics of cross-gender mentoring relationships. As I have noted earlier, Rosemary's mentor had some concerns about how their relationship would be perceived by others. Aside from this, there was no evidence in this study to suggest that either Rosemary or Gary had difficulty with their cross-gender relationships.

**Discussion**

With a few exceptions on each of the dimensions of faculty-to-faculty mentoring, the mentor-protégé pairs in this study appear to be very similar to traditional mentor-protégé pairs as described in the literature. In addition, findings from this study indicate that individual characteristics of mentors and protégés seemed to be more significant than contextual variables (i.e., formal versus informal mentoring). The one dimension that I found in every mentor-protégé pair in this study was benefits which accrue to the protégé. All of the protégés experienced professional growth and development as a result of their mentoring relationships. While Beverly's relationship with her mentor from the women's mentoring program was an exception to most of the dimensions of traditional mentoring, even she
benefitted because her assigned mentor nominated her for two important university level committee assignments. Her work on these committees would help her to meet the service requirements for promotion and tenure, and promote her visibility in the university community.

The findings in this study challenge the literature on traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring in three areas: mentor functions, phases of the mentor-protégé relationship and race match.

**Mentor Functions**

Noe (1988) reported that the greater the number of career and psychosocial functions mentors perform, the more beneficial the relationship will be to the protégé. In this study however, both mentors and protégés said that career functions were more important than psychosocial functions. This finding suggests that at least in this study, protégés felt that they benefitted more from the number of career functions than from the total number of career and psychosocial functions. Rosemary, the protégé who was facing a questionable tenure decision, and David, the tenured associate professor were obvious examples of this finding. Rosemary’s mentor performed career functions which would help her achieve promotion and tenure. David’s mentor performed a small number of career functions which would help David advance in a new field. Both of these protégés were involved in relationships designed to provide a specific beneficial outcome to the protégé.

In fact, the protégés in this study deliberately separated their professional and personal/cultural relationship with their mentors, particularly when the mentor was
White. Additionally, the majority of the mentors seemed to accept that their African American protégés would seek emotional support, role modeling, and counseling from persons with whom they could identify socially and culturally. This challenges the presumption that African Americans would turn to their mentors for both career and psychosocial functions. In some cases even when the mentor did perform both career and psychosocial functions, protégés still turned to other African Americans for psychosocial support. This was especially the case for Gary and Joann who both had secondary mentors. Both of these protégés had primary mentors who performed a number of psychosocial functions. But both Gary and Joann told me that they relied on their secondary mentors and other African Americans for social/cultural support and other psychosocial functions.

In this study, there was no relationship between the number of career functions the mentors performed and the ultimate success of the protégé. For example, Beverly’s lack of contact with Elizabeth had virtually no effect on her ability to meet the expectations of the academy and the requirements for promotion and tenure.

Phases of the Mentor-Protégé Relationship

The literature suggests that the mentoring relationship is a series of distinct, separate phases. Kram (1985) reports that the mentor-protégé relationship progresses through a series of phases which have identifiable beginnings and endings based on where the protégé is in his/her career. While this may be appropriate for the corporate model from which higher education has adapted this theory, there was no indication that the pairs in this study recognized or went through these phases as they
are described in the literature. Gary, a protégé in an informal relationship, came closest to conforming to Kram's model. Rosemary's experience as a protégé in an informal mentoring relationship on the other hand, was completely contrary to the model.

Factors such as the culture of the institution, the context of the mentoring relationship, and mentor-protégé match may be significant for African Americans, but are not articulated in Kram's model. In addition, the phases appear to be based on a Eurocentric model which has limited applicability to African Americans. The model is highly abstract and the assumptions inherent in the model may be limited to White males. While this model may be appropriate for White males (and to some extent, White females) it is not necessarily appropriate for African Americans and other minorities. Thus, even when African Americans faculty do participate in mentoring relationships, Kram's model may only be used as a point of reference when discussing mentoring relationships for this group.

Race Match

An interesting finding in this study was that the race of the mentor appeared to have no discernable effect on the mentoring relationships at the professional level. Nine of the ten protégés had White mentors, but they did not perceive the cross-race match to be a problem in their relationships. This challenges the argument that same-race match is likely to be the strongest predictor of success in a mentoring relationship. Based on the findings in this study, it appears that African American faculty members can find cross-race mentors who are willing to assist them in their
professional growth and development, who are willing to accept their cultural
differences, and who are willing to accept their non-traditional scholarship. And
while the literature suggests that African Americans and other minorities may have
difficulty finding mentors due to underrepresentation, three of the protégés in this
study did have same-race primary or secondary mentors. This suggests that African
American senior scholars are available to mentor African American junior faculty.
The African American protégés in this study formed their mentoring relationships
using traditional methods. In some cases the mentors selected the protégés, in some
cases the protégés selected the mentors, and in some cases the relationships began as a
result of informal interactions inside and/or outside of the department.

The literature provides only a cursory discussion of the dynamics which may
be involved when African Americans interact with their cross-race mentors. Since
some of the protégés in this study separated their professional and personal
interactions with their mentors, they seemed to assign roles to their White mentors
allowing them to provide career support, while selecting African American mentors to
provide professional and personal/cultural support. This finding supports Thomas’
(1990) argument that African Americans need both organizational and developmental
mentors and may go outside of their department to find one or the other.

The findings in this study also make two important contributions to the
literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring: an analysis of assigned mentoring
relationships, and an introduction of the concept of isolation among African American
faculty members in predominantly White institutions.
Formal Versus Informal Mentoring

The literature suggests protégés will benefit more from planned, structured mentoring experiences than they will from informal mentoring (Herr, 1994; Wunsch, 1994a). The findings in this study seem to indicate that contextual variables (planned mentoring experiences versus informal mentoring experiences) are not nearly as important as factors such as the participation and commitment of both the mentor and protégé to the relationship. In the case of Beverly, University B had an assigned mentoring program specifically designed to assist female faculty members. In spite of the structured program, Beverly received very little career and no psychosocial support from her assigned mentor. And Terry, who was also in a formal mentoring relationship, felt that the mere assignment of a mentor did not necessarily constitute a mentoring relationship. In Terry’s case it was his active participation in making his career decisions that made the process relevant for him. In Rosemary’s case, I cannot say conclusively that she would have benefitted from an assigned mentoring program because she seemed resistant to the concept of mentoring in general. Once again, the participants’ perceptions of the importance of mentoring, along with their commitment and participation seemed to be more significant.

Because the sample consisted of only ten-mentor pairs, I cannot make any conclusions about other African Americans in formal or informal relationships in these institutions. However, the results do suggest that the assignment of a mentor, in and of itself, does not determine the success of the mentoring relationship.
The Professional and Social Isolation of African American Faculty

Moore and Wagstaff (1974) reported that many Black faculty members existed almost independently in White institutions, experienced bigotry in their institutions, and were "frustrated by the institution's impotent efforts to increase the small number of Black professionals on their campuses". But recent literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring is virtually silent on the subject of isolation and its effect on African Americans in predominantly White institutions. The majority of the protégés interviewed mentioned a need to interact with others who shared their unique feelings and experiences. While the relationships they had with their White mentors and other Whites in their institution were successful and productive, in most cases these relationships failed to provide the emotional, cultural, and personal support protégés desired. As one protégé said, she was concerned that she would have to compromise her identity, her scholarship, and her cultural beliefs to fit into an institution that had a history of being unaccepting of cultural differences.

Perhaps these African American protégés were successful because of their ability to adapt to and negotiate the mainstream academic culture. But it seems clear that despite their ability to adapt to the culture of the academy, some of the protégés felt that they were outsiders in their institutions and that success, in and of itself, did not necessarily translate into a feeling of belonging. While I cannot say this is true of other African American faculty in predominantly White institutions, it appears that the culture of the academy, to some extent, does influence the African American faculty member's perception of their acceptance in the institution. That is, African American
faculty may feel that they are viewed as tokens and/or that they were hired only to fulfill affirmative actions requirements. As Gary, a protégé in an informal mentoring relationship said, he sometimes experienced feelings of alienation—a feeling of being left out—and wondered if he had reason to suspect that he and other African Americans were being "discriminated against".

Some of the findings in this study may suggest that there are more similarities among the pairs than differences. While there are some patterns that exist in this study (particularly with respect to traditional mentor-protégé pairs, benefits to the protégé, and cross-race match), and while I have tended to emphasize these similarities, there is also variation among the pairs. Thus it is important to describe in more detail some of the mentor-protégé relationships to capture the diversity in the sample. Therefore, in the next chapter I will use the case study approach to emphasize the variation which exists among the mentor-protégé pairs in this study.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: CASE STUDIES

Like the optimist and the pessimist who see a glass as half full and half empty respectively, the data in this study can be read differently. In the previous chapter, the focus was on the similarity of the cases—within the literature and with each other. Some variation was noted, but there was a definite skewing of perception toward commonality. A cross case analysis—particularly one organized around concepts from the literature—virtually guarantees such a focus.

The data, however, can be read differently. A different analysis strategy, in other words, might reveal fundamentally different things. Here I employ a case study approach to focus on what is unique and idiosyncratic in six of the cases. These six cases were selected because they represent the maximum variation among the data set.

These six cases, of course, can not be expected to generalize in a traditional scientific sense. Rather there is a particular theme in each case which may have implications for the mentoring of African Americans in predominantly White institutions. They may generalize, in other words, in a more psychological rather a more traditional statistical sense (Donmoyer, 1990).

These cases are important because while the literature does make some reference to mentoring minorities in higher education, an in-depth discussion of the
mentoring of African Americans in predominantly White institutions is missing. In these cases I extend the discussion of mentoring as it applies to minorities to include themes which may be particularly applicable to African Americans.
Rosemary and James: Too Little? Too Late?

Rosemary is a Black female who is midway through her sixth year as an assistant professor of journalism at University A. Rosemary came to this university ABD (she had not completed her dissertation) with some university teaching experience which she gained while she was a doctoral student. Rosemary considers herself to be a "trailblazer", since she is one of only four African Americans in her discipline who holds a faculty position in major research universities. She feels that she can be a mentor to other African Americans who aspire to become professors not only in her field, but in other disciplines as well.

When I met Rosemary, she had been approved for promotion and tenure at the departmental level, but had received a negative vote at the college level. However, the dean of the college had submitted a letter to the provost supporting Rosemary, and she was awaiting the final approval from the provost. Rosemary told me that she was somewhat concerned about her chances for being granted promotion and tenure, and cited her small number of publications as the reason for her concern.

Rosemary has been informally mentored by a White male faculty member for two years. Her mentor, James, is a tenured associate professor in the same department who has over twenty years of university teaching experience and has taught at both small and large institutions. He has also published extensively, been the editor of several scholarly journals, and has an extensive knowledge of his discipline and research university systems. James and Rosemary have similar research
interests, but Rosemary’s research focus is on the contributions of African Americans in her discipline.

Rosemary met her mentor when she became a faculty member, but it was not until after her fourth year review that James became her mentor. The mentoring relationship was initiated in response to a departmental request that James provide Rosemary with some guidance so that she could become a stronger candidate for promotion and tenure. Thus, James was "informally assigned" as Rosemary’s mentor. James explains the departmental committee’s decision to "informally assign" him as Rosemary’s mentor in the following statement:

In the case of Rosemary, about the time of her fourth year review the Tenure and Promotion Committee felt that she needed some kind of direction, or to bring out a direction in her research so that when she came up for promotion and tenure she could say yes, I’ve done all of these things and I have established a research plan and an area of expertise in a particular area. And that was what I was to help her and encourage her to do. One of the concerns of any promotion and tenure decision at this university is that the faculty member present evidence of developing a clear plan of research or an area of expertise.

Rosemary was aware of the deficiencies in her research, and said that she had come to this university without a clear research agenda. She said that this was due in large part, to her doctoral training where she focused on a different type of research which usually did not lead to publications. Rosemary did her graduate work at another research university and was enrolled in a doctoral program that was in the early stages of development. There was an emphasis on survey research in her doctoral program, but she had very little training which would prepare her to conduct research in the area that she eventually became interested in—journalism history. And
since Rosemary had taken only a few journalism history courses, she left her doctoral program without a clearly defined research agenda in her area of interest. While Rosemary had some idea of the type of research she wanted to pursue, she had received little guidance with regard to how to develop a research agenda, and the methodological skills required to conduct this type of research. When I asked Rosemary if she understood that there was an emphasis on research and publications at University A when she accepted the position, she said that she was aware of the publish or perish expectation, but that at the time she felt she was prepared to meet those expectations. She added that she quickly realized that she lacked the skills that were needed to develop a research focus and to conduct, write, and publish research in an efficient and timely manner. It did not take Rosemary long to discover that teaching, research, and service were all very time consuming activities, and sometimes it was difficult for her to find the time she needed to devote to her research. Elaborating on the difficulties of conducting research, she said, "I am still trying to analyze what the factors were in my not having as many publications as I think I need to have."

Rosemary was grateful that James had agreed to mentor her, but wished that the relationship had started earlier. She felt she would have been in a better position for promotion and tenure if she had been assigned a mentor when she was first hired. During the interviews, Rosemary continued to focus on two points: her lack of publications and her regrets about not having a mentor both in graduate school and when she first came to University A.
Rosemary’s story is unique in this study because it is an example of a mentoring relationship which started later rather than early in the faculty member’s career. And the relationship was initiated in response to a specific problem: Rosemary was facing a potentially negative tenure decision. An important issue in Rosemary’s story is the lack of mentoring early in her faculty career which, according to Rosemary and her mentor, contributed to the problems she was facing with respect to being granted promotion and tenure. James had the difficult task of providing Rosemary with guidance so that she could build a credible publication record in two years, a task which normally takes most faculty members three to five years. The literature suggests that faculty members who have been involved in long-term mentoring relationships are more productive than faculty members who have only been involved in mentoring relationships for a short period of time (Merriam, 1987). Rosemary and James had very little time to actually develop a relationship. Rather, their relationship was defined by the urgency of the situation—Rosemary needed more publications if she expected to achieve promotion and tenure.

Another issue which was related to Rosemary’s problems were her lack of any previous experience as a protégé and her own perception of the importance of mentoring. It has been reported that faculty members who had mentors as graduate students were better prepared to meet the expectations of the professoriate and that early socialization into the academy is important for all junior faculty members (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Johnsrud, 1993; McNeer, 1983). Rosemary said she did not have a mentor as a graduate student and had only a cursory knowledge of what
would be expected of her as a faculty member in a major research university. While Rosemary did not have a mentor in graduate school, she told me that her major professor, did, at times, act as a mentor. When I asked Rosemary if she felt that her advisor had prepared her for a career in higher education, she replied:

Well, he reinforced things that I already knew. He said to try to get articles out of my dissertation and he even gave me some advice as to what kinds of articles and offered to co-author them, work with me on those articles. He said, "It's up to you if you want us to co-author some things together, we can do that, but if you want to be the single author, you can do that too. I'll read over what you are submitting for publication." Well, I already knew that you single-author your work. So I chose to single author my work. I sent him a manuscript, he looked at it and I submitted it for publication, and it was published. He extended that hand in terms of preparation for academic life, but I chose to go on my own because I instinctively knew it would be more in my favor if I single-authored a piece rather than co-authored something. Something about that just didn't--well, also, I guess in co-authoring, I didn't know if I would be able--I didn't know if I was a good co-author for anyone. Sometimes it's best to work by yourself. I thought it would be best for me to work by myself.

Since Rosemary seemed to feel that it was to her advantage to work independently of the guidance of others, I asked her if she felt that it was important to have a mentor as a graduate student. I wanted to know if she felt that having a mentor as a graduate student could influence the direction of a faculty member's career. Rosemary had made a point of telling me that she had never had a mentor, and I wondered why she chose to take such an individualistic approach. Rosemary seemed to contradict herself on this point in the following statement:

I think it probably would have been helpful if when I had started, I had that kind of relationship. It appears that other people who tend to have a better publication record had that type of relationship. There are some males and females that I know of who had twice as many publications going into promotion and tenure than I have. They did
have that type of nurturing, mentoring relationship as graduate students. So I think that would have made a difference for me. But I don’t regret not having that either, because I just think I’m forming my own path. My path is going to be—is different from other people’s, and I think it’s a workable path. Again, I’m a trailblazer.

While it appears that Rosemary did have some opportunities to be mentored as a graduate student, she seemed to prefer not to take advantage of them. Rosemary lamented the absence of a mentoring relationship, but she choose not to accept one when offered. Later in the interview, Rosemary would remark that she should have had a research focus before she left graduate school and that she should have taken advantage of the opportunity to co-author work with her advisor. Based on Rosemary’s statement about the importance of collaborating with recognized scholars, it is interesting that Rosemary would choose to single author all of her work when she became a faculty member.

Rosemary also spent the first four years of her faculty career without a mentor, and received very little guidance/feedback with respect to her research and writing—two very important areas in the evaluation of faculty members in research institutions. The absence of mentoring experiences in the formative years of Rosemary’s career seemed to contribute to her perception of mentoring. In fact, it is not clear if Rosemary had ever considered that the type of support a faculty member receives could, to some extent, be related to his/her success.

When I asked Rosemary to define the terms mentor and mentoring she responded as follows:
The way I define it [mentor] is someone who will show me the rudiments of things... I would have appreciated a mentor who would have sat down with me and shown me the ropes and told me the little things that you would not learn in graduate school.... could be my friend basically, someone that I could visit with informally. In terms of mentoring, in terms of my scholarship, maybe somebody would have had me work on a project with them and co-authored something.

But Rosemary hesitated when I asked her to describe some of the mentoring functions that a mentor would perform for a protégé. While she talked in vague generalities, she was unable to come up with any specific list. She told me that because this was her first experience in a mentoring relationship, it was difficult for her to think of a specific list of functions. Although she was, at the time, being mentored for promotion and tenure, Rosemary did not use this as a frame of reference to define these terms. She did not, in other words, describe what James had done for her, even though further questioning of Rosemary and her mentor revealed that he had, in fact done a great deal.

James, Rosemary’s mentor, had no trouble giving me a definition of the terms mentor and mentoring. He prefaced his definition by referring to his own mentors, how those mentors had helped him to grow as a professional, how he was able to draw on their experiences, and how they influenced his life in general. James emphasized that the whole concept of mentoring for him, was a result of his positive mentor-protégé relationships both as a graduate student and as a junior faculty member. He defined the terms in the following statement:

The mentor is someone who has more experience. To me a composite mentor would be someone with similar interests in teaching and research as the younger faculty member. Who because of their greater experience and maybe broader knowledge base is able to get the person
who is being mentored to see their capabilities. Mentoring works at several different levels. It could be at the beginning of a relationship where you may have someone who is fairly new to a field, just out of graduate school, and is trying to get a balance between teaching and how to approach classes, and getting their research started. I think a mentor can be very active in providing suggestions and recommendations and all kinds of assistance and advice....it’s someone with more understanding and knowledge who is helping to point the person in the direction that would be best for them to go. Sometimes the relationship might reach a point where the mentor becomes more of a sounding board. It’s encouraging, a lot of encouraging. It’s providing answers sometime. You always want to make the person see for themselves where they can go and what they can do. I think that’s what a mentor should do.

Interestingly, like Rosemary, James did not refer to any of the specifics of their relationship in his definitions. Rather they both talked about these terms based on their own previous personal experiences as a protégé, or lack of them, in the case of Rosemary. Rosemary, who had no previous mentoring experiences to refer to, spoke in general terms about what she would like a mentor to do and what form she would like a mentoring relationship to take. But she did not indicate what form her own mentoring relationship should take given the seriousness of her situation. James talked specifically about being a mentor and mentoring others based on his own personal experiences. He talked at length about the benefits of participating in a mentoring relationship which is structured to meet the needs of the protégé. In fact James was very much in favor of formal mentoring programs. But as he talked about the advantages of the formal mentoring programs, he did not relate this to his own relationship with Rosemary. Although James told me that he and Rosemary had a good relationship, the fact that he made no reference to the relationship suggests that neither he nor Rosemary viewed their relationship as a successful model of mentoring.
Rosemary and James’ definition of a successful mentoring relationship seemed to be based to a great degree on whether Rosemary was granted promotion and tenure. In fact, when I asked James if his relationship with Rosemary had been a successful one, he told me, "It will be successful if she gets promotion and tenure".

James and Rosemary had a collegial relationship, and James was committed to helping Rosemary achieve promotion and tenure. While their relationship did not extend outside the boundaries of work, they did tell me that their mutual interests and friendship were assets to their relationship. But Rosemary seemed to separate her professional relationship with James from any personal relationship with him. The following conversation with Rosemary is indicative of Rosemary’s thoughts on this matter.

Linda: Do you think that your mentor can understand and articulate your needs as an African American female in a traditionally White male department?

Rosemary: I doubt it. Because I don’t think, I think only Black women can articulate that need. I would be surprised if he could. And I’m sure he would try if I asked and if need be. But I don’t know of anyone who has ever in society who has tried to articulate the needs of Black women other than Black women. Nobody cares about Black women.

Linda: If you feel that he cannot articulate your needs, that he does not recognize your cultural needs, why do you think your relationship is successful? Why do you get along with him as well as you do?

Rosemary: I think it’s because we’re focusing on one aspect of my life, of my professional life, which is the research aspect of my career. We’re learning from each other on the cultural end. I’m able to fill in some blanks when we have discussions about Black history or the Black press,
Black journalism history. Actually we’ve learned from each other. So, we’re able, I think in a very positive way, to share and appreciate our different cultures.

Linda: Would you have preferred to have had a mentor of the same sex and same race?

Rosemary: Not necessarily.

Linda: It would not have mattered if you had a Black woman as a mentor when you came here?

Rosemary: No. I would say it wouldn’t have mattered to me if I had a Black woman as a mentor. Because I think I need to have someone who can share different cultures. We’re able to share our different cultures and whatever our professions are. I think that’s needed. Maybe socially, more to fit our social needs [I would want a Black woman mentor]. But professionally, it wouldn’t have mattered to me.

Linda: Rosemary, you said that you didn’t think that your mentor could articulate your cultural needs, and now you say that it’s important to share. Can you clarify the difference between these two statements?

Rosemary: Well, I guess what I’m saying is I really don’t want somebody else to articulate my needs. I can articulate my own needs. I would feel as if I’m being patronized if he were out there articulating the needs of a Black woman, and it wouldn’t be believable anyway. So, I’m not looking for that from him. I’m looking for him to share with me what I need to know to succeed professionally. He can give me insights about things that I don’t think of, about the power structure, because he’s into the power structure. He will truthfully tell me what is on the minds of the power structure. And I want to know that. I want to know what the inside game is. So I guess that’s why I don’t have any problem with his not being able to articulate the needs of a Black woman.
It is possible that in the case of Rosemary and James the line between the personal and the professional was so clearly drawn that it placed limits on how much James was able to assist Rosemary.

I asked Rosemary to discuss specifically how James had mentored her in the two year period in the three areas in which faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure: teaching, research, and service. Rosemary told me that since the goal of their relationship was for her to get tenure, most of the mentoring had been focused on helping her to develop her research agenda and improving her publication record.

Since the number of publications in refereed journals is a critical element in the evaluation of a candidate’s research, I asked Rosemary if she and her mentor had ever collaborated on any research projects or co-authored publications of any kind. Rosemary told me that although she and James had talked about collaborating on some work, this had never gone beyond the discussion stage. James did help Rosemary to focus her research and develop her research agenda. Through discussions and the exchange of ideas with James, Rosemary was able to conceptualize her research and began to conduct her research in a more systematic and productive manner. James was also able to help Rosemary improve her writing skills. He had been the editor of several scholarly journals and he used his knowledge in this area to help Rosemary edit her manuscripts, suggested areas for improvement, and suggested publication outlets which would be receptive to her work.

James was Rosemary’s advocate on the promotion and tenure committee. He was able to explain her research agenda to other faculty members in the department so
that they would understand how her scholarship made a contribution to the discipline. Rosemary told me that she was probably the only person in her discipline who conducted research on the contributions of African Americans to the field of journalism. Rosemary also said that only a few faculty members in her department understood the historical nature of her work, its relevance to the field, and why this type of research takes longer to complete. She explained that this lack of understanding could have been a barrier to her success at the departmental level, but that her mentor had made a strong case for her as a member of the tenure and promotion committee. James told me that because there were two different philosophies in the department regarding the study of journalism, this was a factor in how other faculty members perceived Rosemary’s scholarship. He and Rosemary were the only members of their department who specialized in journalism history. Thus, it was often the case that their work was not viewed as traditional journalism scholarship.

James believed that Rosemary had made a great deal of progress since her fourth year review and that she was now a much stronger candidate for promotion and tenure. However, Rosemary was still unsure of her chances. She told me she had worked very hard to make up for lost time, but that she understood that although she had made progress, this still might not be enough for a favorable promotion and tenure decision. Rosemary felt that over the two-year period, James had been a supportive mentor. While she was still concerned about her weak publication record, she seemed to be satisfied with the outcome of the mentoring relationship itself.
James told me that he wished he could have done more to help Rosemary. But he realized that given the time constraints, there was only so much that could be accomplished in such a short period of time.

But ultimately, neither Rosemary nor James had any control over external factors such as the journal review process, which can often take several months with no guarantee that one’s manuscript will be accepted. So even if Rosemary was successful in getting more articles published, it still might not have been soon enough to help her achieve promotion and tenure. Perhaps this is why James continually referred to his own structured mentoring experiences. James felt that it was important for faculty members to have long-term, consistent, planned mentoring, and he was an advocate of some system of "voluntary assignment" to assure a compatible mentor-protégé match. Based on his own experiences, James felt that the protégé faculty member received the greatest benefit from the relationship when the mentor and the protégé made a commitment to participating in a series of structured activities that would help the protégé to grow professionally. It could be that James had difficulty implementing a "quick course in mentoring" since this was contrary to his own experiences.

When I first began my interviews with Rosemary, she was somewhat tentative about the concept of mentoring. Although she had identified James as her mentor, she seemed unsure of her own role in this relationship. But by the end of our interviews, Rosemary was less tentative about the concept of mentoring and her mentor-protégé relationship. Perhaps Rosemary had given more thought to her
mentoring relationship between our interviews. Or perhaps it was easier for
Rosemary to discuss her professional relationship with James than it was for her to
discuss her personal relationship with him. While she continued to minimize any
personal relationship with James, she was more open about their professional
relationship. But Rosemary still was not totally sold on the importance of mentoring.
When I asked her, "Do you think that African American faculty members in majority
White institutions can succeed without a mentor?", she replied as follows:

Yes. I think they can. Because they have made it to the point of
getting in the majority institution. They probably went to a majority
institution to earn their doctorate, and if they could make it through that
experience, they can make it in a majority institution as a faculty
member. They (African American faculty) go in knowing they have to
get the job done. And they already know that they are blazing a trail;
they have been trailblazers all of their professional lives. So this is just
another trail to blaze.

I was surprised by Rosemary’s answer, because even as her own career was in
jeopardy, she continued to minimize the importance of mentoring for African
American faculty. Rosemary’s perception of mentoring suggested that she would be
receptive to a mentoring relationship if someone approached her, but if not, she would
do what she had always done—make it on her own.

When I asked Rosemary if she felt that African American faculty members in
major research institutions were at a disadvantage because they have so few
opportunities to mentor each other, she replied:

No, I don’t see it as problematic. I think they (African Americans)
should have the same opportunities to advance and advantages to
advance as other people. Then I think you might find more us having
more publications, and more a part of the system if we had that
advantage. But a lot of us don’t (have those opportunities) and have
already learned how to make it on our own. The problem is how many Black people do you see in the graduate schools getting their doctorates. That’s the problem.

Rosemary said she considered herself a trailblazer and an independent scholar. And she said she realized that the academy could be a difficult place to negotiate, but she still maintained that she and other African American scholars did not necessarily need a mentor. Rosemary’s last two statements seemed contradictory to earlier statements she had made about the absence of mentors in her graduate and faculty career. Once again it seemed that Rosemary had not yet made up her mind about the importance of mentoring for her.

It is possible that Rosemary was confused by the conflicting messages of the academy. While scholars are encouraged to be individualistic, they are also encouraged to collaborate with their colleagues. It could be that while Rosemary chose the individualistic approach, she also wanted the support of her colleagues. And it could be that she was not sure how she should go about forming collaborative relationships with other colleagues. As an African American and a female it could be that Rosemary simply could not sort out these conflicting messages and apply the appropriate message to her own situation.

**Rosemary: An Epilogue**

Several months after completing my interviews with Rosemary, I learned that she had been denied promotion and tenure by the provost. I asked Rosemary and James if they would be willing to discuss with me the issues involved in Rosemary’s
failure to get promotion and tenure. They both consented and I conducted separate interviews with them.

Rosemary told me she was denied promotion and tenure by the provost "because of an insufficient number of publications and teaching scores which were not high enough to offset the weak publication record". Hence, Rosemary was deficient in two of the three areas of evaluation for promotion and tenure: a scholarly publication record and teaching evaluation scores which were below the college and university average.

I asked Rosemary to discuss with me what factors were involved in the negative promotion and tenure decision. Rosemary said that the rules for evaluating faculty members for promotion and tenure had changed—that is, the university had put more emphasis on scholarship. She explained that when she interviewed for the position she was told that if she published a few articles in a journal or a trade magazine, this would be sufficient for promotion and tenure. She said that beyond this there were no scholarly guidelines. Rosemary also said that there was nothing in the Dean’s report that suggested that she did not have an acceptable number of publications at the time she submitted her dossier for promotion and tenure. Since faculty members are given no specific guidelines in terms of how many publications they should have at the time of their promotion and tenure review, Rosemary said that she still has not been told what would have been an acceptable number of publications.
I asked Rosemary if her mentoring relationship was a factor in her failure to get promotion and tenure. That is, I wondered if Rosemary felt that she had not been given good guidance by her mentor, or if the mentor had failed in some way to prepare her for the research requirements for promotion and tenure. In addition, given the fact that Rosemary had contradicted herself several times about the importance of mentoring for African American faculty members, I wondered if she had fully accepted the guidance of her mentor. Rosemary said that the mentoring was a factor. But she clarified this statement and said that if the mentoring had started when she first accepted her position, she was sure that she would have been granted promotion and tenure. I asked Rosemary what she thought the results would have been if she had been mentored for six years instead of only two years. She told me that she would have been more focused on her research and consequently would have had a stronger publication record. Rosemary also felt she would have had higher teaching scores if she had a mentor to assist her in her first two years. Rosemary was assigned two classes per quarter--usually one large lecture class with up to 300 students, and one smaller seminar class. She said that the tasks of developing lesson plans, developing her teaching strategies, grading papers, and advising students all took up a great deal of her time--time which took her away from her research.

Even though Rosemary had her doubts about assigned mentoring, perhaps some form of assigned mentoring would have beneficial to her. Since she was aware of her own weaknesses, it is possible that an assigned mentor would have been able to help Rosemary early in her career. Rosemary said that she now realized that
mentoring was crucial to a faculty member's survival, particularly with regard to
gaining promotion and tenure.

James agreed that the mentoring relationship had been a successful one. He
said that two more of Rosemary's manuscripts had been accepted, that she had
become more confident as a scholar, and that she had begun to receive more
recognition in her field. In discussing the reasons for the negative decision, he stated:

Speaking as a whole, the university level committee and the college
level committee for the most part, failed to see Rosemary's case as it
should be viewed. Not so much that it should be a special case,
although it is a special case, but in the sense that Rosemary...the typical
tenure process has the probationary period of six years and in the
normal run of things, whether the person is a male or a female, African
American or White or Hispanic, there are certain presumptions in the
tenure process. Assistant professors who are in the probationary period
either come into the university with a program of research that they
have established in graduate school, that they continue to build on and
are expected to build on, and are judged on the basis of how well they
have built on this program of research through that six year period,
and/or they come into the program of research that is related to a senior
faculty's area. They may be linked up in a kind of formal or informal
mentoring process and the senior faculty will guide them in what
they're doing through those six years and they are expected to be
productive. But that was not Rosemary's case. I mean there are issues
involved with her sex and race that affect, I think, anyone going up for
tenure and have for a long time, particularly depending on who is on
the committee that is looking at her.

Since Rosemary's scholarship is focused on the contributions and presence of
African Americans in her discipline, I asked her if she felt that this could have been a
factor in the negative promotion and tenure decision. That is, I wanted to know if she
felt that her scholarship was not valued by her university. Rosemary said that there
were no indications that her scholarship was not valued at the university. But she
added that the decision to deny her promotion and tenure was a decision to eliminate
the type of scholarship that she does. For Rosemary, being denied promotion and
tenure meant that the university would be deprived of the opportunity to benefit from
her scholarly contributions. So while she did not feel that there had been an attack on
her personally, she did feel that the decision reflected a lack of understanding of the
important contributions that she could make as an African American scholar. She
added that students in the university would be deprived of the exposure to faculty
members who could present different perspectives in the field of journalism.
Rosemary said that it is not only the number of publications a faculty member has, but
it is also the opportunity for students to benefit from faculty of all races which also
makes an important contribution to the university.

I asked James if African American scholars in this university were subject to
different expectations in terms of their teaching and their scholarship. He replied that
he did not know if there was a difference in what was expected or if it was a
difference in the perspective of those who were evaluating the faculty member's
scholarship, teaching scores, and what contributions the scholarship makes to the
institution. He elaborated in the following statement.

For example, and maybe using Rosemary as a matter of an example.
Now both of us teach the same class, an introductory journalism class.
It's a large class, 300-400 students. When you walk out there you have
to be able to assert some kind of authority. Not necessarily in an
oppressive way, but just that people will notice you and will pay
attention to you when you start talking. That's the neutral kind of
dynamics. When it comes to issues like sex, I think the instructor's sex
is a dynamic. That is, males generally would be perceived...it might be
easier for a male to establish a presence in the eyes of the students than
for a female. Simply because of social conventions about females.
Race, I think, particularly in a class such as this, where a large...most
of the students by far are White students, who come from middle class
backgrounds, a lot of them where there's not a lot of contact with people of color, people other than people just like them for the most part. And so there's more of a link or something with a White American male instructor than there would be with, let's say a female Black instructor or other minority male or female instructor. I think it's just a reflection of the dynamics of society.

James said that these issues could sometimes lead to unfavorable teaching evaluations for African American women. He said it is a case where students are being asked to evaluate a teacher and much of that evaluation will be based on whether or not the student likes the teacher. He added that while these kinds of issues are typically not supposed to be a dominant factor in the promotion and tenure decision, they sometimes are, particularly in the case of women and minorities. James told me the departmental committee had indicated that these were factors in Rosemary's low teaching scores—she was being compared against a standard for the university, and that standard was White males.

With regard to Rosemary's scholarship, James told me that this was the major problem that the departmental committee had tried to convey to the university level committee. That is, Rosemary had come to the university without good guidance in terms of her research, and that instead of having six years to work on establishing her research and publication career she had only begun to do this in the last two years. And when Rosemary came to this university she was left to her own resources, and no one had considered whether she might need any help in these areas. James said that essentially the committee did not look at Rosemary's last two years of work: that she had worked very hard to catch up and had become very productive and that she now
had a clearly defined research focus. Instead, James said "the committee became lost in counting the number of publications that Rosemary had".

I asked Rosemary if her thoughts about the importance of mentoring had changed since the negative promotion and tenure decision. I wanted to know if, in retrospect, she now felt that one's success as a faculty member was, at least to some degree, tied to having a mentor. She replied:

No, I don't think my thoughts have changed. I think people who tend to be successful had mentors and had mentors for a long time. Maybe at the beginning of their careers. And then you have the other people who don't have mentoring and get lost in the shuffle or they have to create their own trail and mentor other people. For African American women that's where we're at. Either we're lost in the shuffle or we have to create people who...we have to be the mentors ourselves to other African American women. And so, I guess, in terms of independence we're forced to be independent. In a way I think we're forced to be that way because there are very few people who have gone the paths that we've gone, at least the paths I've gone at this university in my discipline. So you're pretty much forced to do that.

Note: After a review of her case by the provost, Rosemary was given another year to resubmit her promotion and tenure dossier.
Gary: Two Different Worlds, Two Different Mentors

Gary is an African male assistant professor of education at University A. When I met Gary, he was in the beginning stages of preparing his dossier for promotion and tenure. Gary is a busy person who balances the demands of his family, his profession, and church activities. While all of his activities are very important to Gary, his family comes first. Gary and I met several times to complete my interviews with him because of his activities with his family.

Gary comes from a family of professionals and he told me that he always knew that he would go to college. While he said that he did not necessarily know that he would get a Ph.D., attending college was not optional for him. Indeed his family expected nothing less from him. Gary earned a bachelor’s degree in a field related to his Ph.D. area, taught public school and found that he enjoyed teaching. After earning a masters degree, he was encouraged by his advisor and other faculty members in his department to enter the doctoral program. Gary has spent all of his academic and professional career at University A. He is very familiar with not only his department, but with the university as a whole.

Gary has been involved in mentor-protégé relationships with a White male and an African American female in his department for almost ten years. Howard, who is Gary’s primary mentor, is a full professor and was Gary’s advisor in graduate school. Howard was instrumental in persuading Gary to accept the faculty position in his department. Howard is widely recognized as an expert scholar in his field, has an extensive research and publishing background, and has over twenty years of university
teaching experience, the majority of them at University A. Howard and Gary have very similar, and sometimes the same, research interests and usually conduct similar types of research. Both Gary and Howard have a commitment to special populations and both of them told me that this commitment is one of the defining characteristics of their continued relationship. Gary and Howard have collaborated on a number of research and writing projects, a collaboration which began when Gary was in graduate school. When I met Howard, he was eager to show me a textbook which Gary had recently edited. The textbook will be used in university classrooms across the country and includes chapters written by professionals who are considered experts in their field, including Howard. Howard said he encouraged Gary to be the editor of the book because he knew that this would be an important addition to his publication record and almost certainly assure that Gary would be successful in achieving promotion and tenure.

Carolyn, who is Gary's secondary mentor, is also a full professor and has known Gary since he was her graduate research assistant. Carolyn shares similar research interests with Gary and has collaborated with him on several research projects and has also co-authored several articles with him. Carolyn is also a highly regarded scholar. When I met her, the second edition of a textbook which she co-authored had recently been published and she was in the process of co-authoring another textbook.

Gary, Howard, and Carolyn all agree that their mentoring relationships are an extension of the philosophy of their department--mentoring graduate students to
become faculty members. And in the case of Gary, while the mentoring has continued at a different level, it is nonetheless similar to the mentoring which graduate students in their department receive. During our interviews, Gary, Howard, and Carolyn often referred to their philosophy of mentoring graduate students when describing their own successful mentoring relationships. Both Howard and Carolyn said that they prefer to think of their relationship with Gary as a friendship rather than mentoring, and they considered Gary to be a valued colleague and a good friend.

Ultimately the mentoring that Gary received as a graduate student led to his being offered a faculty position at University A. Gary told me that both of his mentors, but particularly Howard, lobbied very aggressively for him to be hired. Howard and Carolyn both said that Gary was the most qualified person for the position he now holds and Howard told me that he was especially vocal and "very directly and very purposely" helped Gary obtain his faculty position. Howard also said that Gary’s presence on the faculty was important for two reasons: His presence added to the diversity of the faculty, and minority students had two faculty members with whom they could identify. He added that Gary had been instrumental in helping to recruit African American and other minority students for the graduate program in their department.

Early in our conversation, Gary told me that the mentoring he received from Howard had been critical to his success as faculty member. Howard had provided opportunities for Gary to become involved in research, joint authorship, and speaking engagements. As a result of his mentoring, Gary said he was "able to interact in a
positive, constructive and professional manner, not only with his mentors but with
other faculty members in the department".

Gary’s story is an example of how participation in a long-term, consistent
mentoring relationship which begins in graduate school can lead to a successful faculty
career. In striking contrast to Rosemary, who had only been in a mentoring
relationship for two years, Gary had been involved in very focused and very
successful mentoring relationships for almost ten years. Thus, an important theme in
Gary’s story is the importance of long-term, consistent mentoring which socializes the
protégé to the academic culture and to the expectations of the professoriate. Gary’s
career was shaped to a great extent, by his experience as a protégé.

The issue of race in the academy was also a theme which was important to
Gary. While the cross-race mentor-protégé match did not seem to be a negative
factor in his relationship with Howard, Gary said that the issue of race was central to
any discussion about African Americans in the academy. It was Gary, rather than
myself who initiated much of the discussion about the issue of race as it pertains to
African American faculty in predominantly White institutions.

In this case, the message is consistent with the behavior of the mentors and the
and the protégé. Gary, and his mentors had a similar philosophy about mentoring,
and this was evident in their definitions of the terms mentor and mentoring. Gary
defined the term mentor as follows:

A mentor is someone who will allow you to pick their brain, allow you
to work with them on projects even though they could probably do it
better by themselves, and then give you critical feedback, support and
couragement. I think the whole process of realizing that this
individual is starting essentially at square one. That mentor realizes that he/she might be a light year, a couple of light years, ahead of the protégé but still takes the time to sort of get them off of the snide and gets them moving in the direction they need to go. And then provide them opportunities to try some things on their own with the knowledge that they can come back, bounce ideas, bounce questions, talk about failures as well as successes.

For Gary mentoring was also defined by mutual respect between the mentor and the protégé, and he told me that the mentoring relationship was a reciprocal one. Gary said that the mentoring relationship might not always be a smooth one, thus mutual respect was important. He added that the reciprocal nature of the relationship required that not only the mentor bring skills to the relationship, but that the protégé also bring both social and professional skills to the relationship. Of the two, Gary said that social skills were more important because not only did mentors want protégés who were productive, they also wanted to be able to get along with them. Gary said that when he was a graduate student, Howard was a rather forceful mentor/advisor. Howard always told him what he would need to do to prepare for a career as a faculty member, and then he would have a plan in place for Gary follow. Gary said it was his job to follow through and to take advantage of those opportunities.

Howard recalled his own experiences as a protégé and described the mentor as someone who was more knowledgeable than the protégé, but who was always available in the literal and physical sense. Howard defined a mentor as "one that knows the particular environment of the institution and uses that knowledge to assist the protégé". Howard said that it is important for the mentor, as a senior faculty member, to take a leadership role rather than letting the new faculty member flounder.
Carolyn also referred to her own mentors when she defined the terms mentor and mentoring. Carolyn said "a mentor is committed to the success of the protégé and will sit down with the protégé and analyze what that commitment involves". Like Gary, Carolyn said that the protégé must be willing to be mentored—that is, he or she must be willing to take some direction from the mentor. She said that if the protégé is not willing to take advice, "all the mentoring in the world will not help him or her—the protégé must be a willing participant".

Faculty members spend the first six years of their career working toward promotion and tenure. Gary is no exception to this rule, and I asked him how he had been mentored specifically towards this end. As Gary discussed this, he was optimistic about his chances for achieving promotion and tenure. Indeed, this is something for which Gary had been preparing for almost ten years. Gary told me that the mentoring he received in graduate school and as a faculty member had definitely helped him to prepare for the promotion and tenure review. He elaborated on this point in the following statement:

I think it would be difficult (without a mentor) because when you come into the academy there are no clear cut standards. Nobody says, "Okay, if you get five articles published in refereed journals, you will be tenured and promoted." It's not that cut and dry. No one tells you that if you teach effectively, you will get it either. It's just nebulous and therefore you need somebody to tell you are going in the right direction and if you keep doing this everything should turn out alright. Also just walking into any type of department, there are politics. There are just a lot of things that a mentor can guide you around.

Gary told me that Howard was his specialty representative for promotion and tenure. (The specialty representative is an advocate who can respond to questions
about the candidate’s work to the promotion and tenure committee.) Gary said that he
did not meet with Howard on a regular basis to discuss his promotion and tenure
review, but that he knew Howard kept a watchful eye on where he was in the review
process. That is, Howard periodically checked on Gary’s progress in the areas of
teaching, research, and service, and occasionally made suggestions to Gary--
for example, suggesting scholars whom Gary might consider using as external
reviewers.

In the areas of teaching and service, both Howard and Carolyn assisted Gary
in the first few years of his career, helping him choose textbooks, prepare lesson
plans, develop his teaching style, and advising him about committee work.
Obviously, Gary had taken advantage of the mentoring and was rewarded for
excellence in teaching when he won a university level teaching award. Howard said
that teaching was just another one of Gary’s strengths and that winning this award was
very prestigious since he was one of only eight faculty members to win the award.
Gary and his mentors all agreed that he had made the most of his mentoring and that
this was clearly evidenced in the way in which his career was progressing. While
Gary preferred to remain cautiously optimistic about his future, his mentors were very
optimistic that Gary had a very promising future.

While Gary was not involved in a formal mentoring relationship, he did engage
in structured mentoring. Gary’s mentors believed that protégés should be guided in a
step by step fashion. So Howard and Carolyn monitored Gary’s progress throughout
his probationary period. And while Gary did make his own decisions about his
career, his mentors assisted him by giving him advice and providing opportunities for him to grow as a professional.

Gary began to talk about race even before I approached this subject. For Gary, race was always an issue for African Americans in the academy. Gary said that he did not dismiss his relationship with Howard or the value of it both personally and professionally, but they did see the world from different perspectives. So for Gary it was important for him to also have an African American mentor. Gary said that his relationship with Carolyn was definitely related to race—that is, he had a "different level of communication" with Carolyn than he did with Howard. Gary said that one of the reasons he had such a positive relationship with Carolyn was that she was an African American with whom he could talk openly and discuss his concerns from an African American perspective. He told me that it was very important for African American faculty in major research institutions to have same-race mentors (or at least have other African American colleagues they could talk to) because there are very few people of color in these institutions. Gary added that while he and Howard had a good relationship, they did not have a relationship where they could "just say whatever they wanted to each other" because as a White male, Howard came from a different place. Gary considered Howard to be his professional mentor and considered Carolyn to be his professional, emotional, and cultural mentor.

Carolyn agreed with Gary that same-race mentor-protégé relationships were particularly important for African Americans in the academy. She emphasized that same-race relationships could be helpful when advising students, since in many cases
both the mentor and the protégé had experienced some of the same frustrations as their students. Thus, they could often provide insights about students that White faculty members might not have. Carolyn said that she and Gary had been able to help African American students because of their own relationship: they both had been where some of these students were now, and unlike some White faculty members, they did not necessarily look at every student’s situation from an "objective stance". That is, they were careful to consider some of the subjective issues which African American students might face—financial constraints, family obligations, and the racial/cultural differences of their peers and professors.

Gary said that African Americans also need other African Americans to mentor them because of the isolation they quite often feel in large research universities. He told me that because there were so few African Americans in University A in his discipline, he was sometimes faced with the dilemma of wanting to be recognized for his good research and scholarship, but that another part of him wanted to be recognized as an African American who was a role model for other African Americans. He explained:

So if I’m doing good things, I want people to know that an African American has done this; that might open up another door for another African American and might encourage some who are already in the pipeline. It’s the whole idea of being the token and that struggle with that. I don’t know how you ever resolve it. I still struggle with it.

Gary said an African American mentor could help a protégé sort out these kinds of issues. And he added that African American faculty may have to form a network of
African American colleagues/mentors in other universities if they could not find African Americans to mentor them in their own institution.

I asked Gary why he felt his relationship with Howard was so successful given his feelings about the issue of race in the academy. That is, how did having a mentor of a different race affect the relationship. Or did it, since from all that I had learned about Gary, he seemed to have benefitted from his relationship in terms of his career development and growth. And Gary and Howard also seemed to have a genuine friendship. Gary told me that he did have a positive relationship with Howard. But he said that race was a subject that he and Howard rarely discussed because as he had told me earlier, they had somewhat different perspectives about life and Howard had accepted this as a limitation in the relationship.

Howard preferred to downplay the issue of race both in his relationship with Gary, and in the academy. Howard did not feel that African Americans encountered problems that were any different from those of other faculty members. He told me that while African American might face different kinds of challenges, "the fundamental needs of African American faculty members are no different from other faculty members." But Carolyn disagreed with Howard on this point. Carolyn said that African Americans do have special concerns that White faculty might not have. She elaborated on this point in the following statement:

One of the things, and this is not only true for faculty, but I think it's true for the overwhelming majority of Black professionals today, most of us are playing catch up. So we often have extended problems or maybe extended family concerns, or community concerns that don’t affect White faculty to the extent that they do us. And we're often dealing with perceptions that other faculty or administration might have
where people are quick to misperceive or misinterpret our behaviors. I think that they (Whites) are more likely to view us as being oppositional and so therefore it takes a little more work on our part to demonstrate that we are team players—at the same time maintaining our own integrity and identity. I find that the expectations for us are a little different.

Just as Rosemary did, to a certain extent Gary separated his personal relationship with Howard from his professional relationship with him. Perhaps Howard downplayed the issue of race because he knew that there was a limit to the amount of personal/cultural support he could give Gary. For example, when I asked Howard if he could articulate Gary's needs as an African American faculty member or if he felt that he was a role model for Gary, he said that I should ask Gary. Unlike Gary, Howard seemed unwilling to consider that there could be limits to their relationship because of racial differences. While Howard minimized the issue of race, he seemed to be more comfortable responding to my question about increasing diversity in the academy. When I asked him, "How do you think your mentoring relationship has helped to increase diversity in the scholarly community?", he replied:

That's a great question. That's probably your best question. I feel most comfortable with that because that's something you can look for objectives and outcomes, I believe. Clearly Gary's presence. He's here and I'm certain by Gary's presence here, we'll do a better job of recruiting, attracting, and training more minorities, in particular Black leaders for our field.

Howard was a Skinnerian behaviorist and perhaps this influenced his perception of the issue of race in his relationship with Gary. Perhaps he was uncomfortable with issues that are not easily quantifiable—issues that were more subjective in nature. And it could be that because the subject of race is not one which
can be easily quantified, Howard was not comfortable addressing the reality of race as a factor in his relationship with Gary and in the academy. It is interesting that when I asked Howard about the importance of mentoring for African Americans, he told me that it was important that they have a good mentor. Gary’s success was easy to measure—Howard’s mentoring relationship with Gary involved specific objectives and outcomes.

Note: At the time of this writing, Gary had just been granted promotion and tenure.
David: Mentoring As a Business Relationship and Symbolic Leadership

David is an African American male who is a tenured associate professor in University A. He is in his fourth year at this institution, but has nearly twenty years of university teaching and administrative experience. David has both an academic and a professional degree and has joint faculty appointments. He has been the recipient of numerous awards including a university award for teaching excellence. He has an established career as an academic, but he told me that he is a "relatively new scholar" in his professional area. David has a busy professional and personal life which includes joint teaching appointments, university administrative responsibilities, volunteer work in the community, and family responsibilities.

David has an informal mentoring relationship with Scott, a White male, who holds an executive level position at the university. Scott also has nearly twenty years of university experience and has been a faculty member and an administrator at several universities. He is widely recognized as an expert scholar in his field and has an extensive publication record. David’s mentoring relationship with Scott was initiated when Scott approached him and asked him if he would be interested in co-authoring a new edition of his textbook. Although David and Scott had never met, they knew of each other because of their respective positions. Scott was familiar with David’s work and felt that he would make a positive contribution to the textbook. David and Scott share degree backgrounds and have other similar academic interests and both of them told me that their relationship was formed primarily because of their mutual interests. Scott was looking for someone who wanted to write textbooks and
who needed support in gaining access to that arena. For David, this was an opportunity to establish himself as a leading scholar in what is considered to be a very prestigious field.

The essence of this mentor-protégé relationship is the collaborative effort between two well established scholars—a collaboration which will add a new dimension to the career of the protégé. While the dimensions of traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships have some limited applicability, they are not central to this relationship. The exchange of ideas, meeting deadlines, and the end result—the publication of the book—is the focal point of this relationship. David’s case is illustrative of one of the many ways faculty members can be mentored: mentoring for mid-career advancement in a new academic field.

The literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring makes some reference to the benefits which accrue to the mentor and to the institution (Herr, 1994; Wunsch, 1994b). But most of the literature suggests that it is the protégé who benefits most from the mentoring relationship. However in this case, the relationship will be mutually beneficial to both the mentor and the protégé. The mentor-protégé relationship in this story adds another characteristic to traditional faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships—a senior faculty member mentoring another senior faculty member. Two senior scholars have entered into a relationship which is essentially a business arrangement. The protégé will benefit in several ways which includes the possibility of promotion to full professor, financial gain from the publication of the
book, recognition as an author and a scholar in his field, and he will also gain entré into the publishing field.

The mentor will benefit from this relationship because the protégé will do the majority of the researching, writing, and editing of the book. Because the mentor has a demanding work schedule, he cannot devote as much time as he would like to the day-to-day details of writing the book. The mentor deliberately choose a protégé who would be willing to accept such an ambitious project, and who could work independently with only minimal input from him. The mentor will still maintain his position as first author on the book, receive royalties from the publication of the book, and establish a working relationship with the protégé for future collaborations.

Another related issue in this story is the implication of a successful cross-race mentoring relationship for promoting diversity in a predominantly White institution. Since the issue of diversity has received a great deal of attention not only in this institution, but in other predominantly White institutions as well, a mentoring relationship between a highly visible White male executive and an African American faculty member could be used as a model not only in University A, but in other institutions as well.

Most faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships are between a senior faculty member and a junior faculty member. Usually the senior faculty mentor helps to socialize the junior faculty protégé to the expectations of the academy. But in this relationship, the protégé knew and understood the rules of the academic game. And for David and Scott, the traditional stages of a mentor-protégé relationship did not
apply. This mentoring relationship is a rather one-dimensional one instead of a multi-dimensional one. David and Scott have a collegial relationship, but it is a relationship which is very intense and very focused on the publication of the textbook. Because of this, David and Scott have agreed not to operate outside of these boundaries and they rarely interact with one another when they are not meeting to work on the book.

David described his relationship with Scott as collegial, and referred to it as an "educator's relationship". But Scott told me that due to his position there was a hierarchial aspect to their relationship. He said that he preferred to think of the relationship as collegial, but that "it is inevitable that the basis of their relationship is that of a senior-junior partnership". As if to clarify this last statement, Scott said David was an equal partner in the relationship and he did not view the senior aspect as "necessarily being higher". Scott seemed to have some difficulty contrasting the collegial and hierarchial aspects of his relationship with David. Several times during our conversation, he emphasized that David was an equal partner in the relationship.

The standard list of career and psychosocial functions did not apply to David’s relationship with Scott. And as David said, most of the traditional issues as described in the mentoring literature were not applicable to his relationship with Scott, since this was not mentoring in the traditional sense. Even though David could be considered a junior scholar in his new field, he had been a full professor at another university and did not choose to apply any of the dimensions of traditional mentoring to his relationship with Scott. David told me that there was mutual intellectual sharing with Scott, but because there was not much difference in their ages or in their levels of
experience, he did not feel that "guidance" was a term that applied to their relationship. But David said that since he was still a relatively new scholar in his second degree area, he felt that he could benefit from more assistance from Scott in terms of networking, involvement in organizations, and the expectations of the profession.

I asked David how his relationship with Scott had helped his career. He said the opportunity to become involved with some of the best known publications in his field that would also affect change in the lives of students, and to become a recognized scholar in his field had been an opportunity for him. Then I asked David if there would have been any barriers for him with regard to publishing a textbook if Scott had not approached him. He replied that he was not sure. But he added that he would not have been able to write the book from beginning to end without a great deal of help, and that Scott had made it fairly easy for him to get support in the form of graduate assistants, copy support and other essential items. He said without Scott’s assistance it would have been difficult for him to obtain this kind of support. David had what he called a "ready made platform" and viewed this as a positive. And Scott had also been helpful in educating him about the textbook publishing industry and the mechanics of completing such a rigorous task.

David summed up how his relationship with Scott had helped his career in the following statement:

This is a platform, and make no mistake about it, that this is a platform into a higher level of visibility that few people in our profession attain. The fact that an African American is doing this I think is extremely important and says something about Scott choosing me. Other people
of color ought to have that kind of opportunity. What better way for a novice...to get to begin on the ground floor. Actually what it boils down to is getting in on the ground floor, the first floor, the second floor, and the third floor as well. It would be good to be able to get people in the pipeline to do this.

Scott told me that David had been responsible for completing most of the work on the book and that he had taken care of the day-to-day details involved in the project. Scott also said that he had been eager to assist David in establishing himself in the publishing arena. He added that because he had an extensive background in textbook publication, his work was always well received and that he had no problems securing contracts with publishing companies. Scott realized that he could open doors for David in this area and told me it was his job to enhance David’s career since this was an important issue in a mentoring relationship.

Since a mentor-protégé relationship between a highly visible White male university executive and an African American faculty member could be considered unusual, I asked David if there had ever been any occasions when Scott had defended their relationship. He told me that while this had probably happened, particularly with regard to his role in writing the book, it had never been brought to his attention. David said he knew that there was bound to be opposition to the opportunity that he was being given. But he dismissed this as nothing more than a continuation of the affirmative action debate. David said that while there was a period when affirmative action policies played a major role in providing opportunities to African Americans, he did not believe that this applied to him, or to many other African Americans, since this was no longer the method by which most African Americans were hired.
I also asked David if the cross-race match had affected his relationship with Scott. David told me that from his perspective, his cross-race mentor-protégé relationship had been a positive one. He said he was asked to contribute to the book because of his experience, and for him the issue of race was unimportant at a professional level. In addition, David said he could also argue that race was not a factor because:

Nine out of ten people, nine and three quarters out of ten people that I would meet in this field would be White. And that’s just the way it is. The moment you talk about the kinds of people that you’re going to meet in this field, you will be talking about Whites, so I wouldn’t have any choice in the matter.

I also asked Scott if there had ever been any occasions when he had defended his relationship with David. He did not give me a direct answer to this question, but he told me that he had asked David to be a contributor on the book because he and David were "intellectually compatible, not because of his race". He said that there would always be critics but that this was not an issue for him. Scott said that the important issue for him was his working relationship with David as it led to the completion of the book. Scott emphasized that he had a commitment to mentoring minority faculty and to their growth and development, and that the "example must start with me". Scott said that to his critics he would respond, "My colleague, my friend, my mentee happens to be someone that I’m intellectually compatible with, and also happens to be Black". But he also added that "symbolically it will be interesting when the book comes out that a fairly traditional White male and a younger, bright African American male wrote a book together."
The relationship between Scott and David is an example of a different kind of faculty-to-faculty mentoring. David was being mentored for mid-career advancement, he was being mentored by another senior faculty member who was also a university executive, and it was a cross-race mentoring relationship which Scott could use as a model to address the issue of increasing diversity in a predominantly White institution. As an experienced faculty member, David understood the competitive and political nature of the academy. For David, the power and position of his mentor, not the race of the mentor was the issue in his relationship with Scott. He understood that in Scott, he had access to a mentor who could help him to establish himself as a competitor in a field where few African Americans are afforded such an opportunity. It is not that David dismissed the issue of race in the academy or that he felt it could not apply to him. He simply did not perceive race as an issue in his relationship with Scott. Perhaps David realized that in a profession where there are very few African Americans, he had few options for developing mentoring relationships. And perhaps David realized that not only did African Americans need mentors, but they also needed mentors who had power. Since David did mainstream scholarship—his scholarship was not race based—he did not need a mentor to defend his work. And David was not looking for psychosocial support from Scott. Emotional support, role modeling, counseling, and personal/cultural support were not primary issues in his relationship with Scott.

But cross-race mentoring is a significant theme in this relationship, particularly since the relationship was initiated by a very visible university executive.
It could be argued that the success of such a relationship could be used to establish credibility with the African American scholarly community in University A. In a university where the administration has been pressured by both African American faculty and students to increase the number of African American faculty and to address other issues related to diversity, the success of this relationship would be an important symbol of change.

Several questions could be asked about the possible political implications of such a relationship. First, would Scott have mentored David if the university administration had not been pressured by African American faculty and students. Scott told me that he was mentoring David because he was a capable scholar and because the relationship would be mutually beneficial to both of them. While Scott seemed to have a sincere commitment to mentoring minority faculty and promoting diversity in the university, the university could use this relationship to respond to those who had been critical of its commitment to increasing diversity. And did Scott offer to mentor David because he hoped that the relationship would be perceived as a commitment on the part of University A to maximizing the success of African American faculty.

While David seemed to take a realistic/business approach to the issue of cross-race mentoring, Scott was somewhat defensive on this subject. While I could speculate that, to some extent, the issue of race was a factor in Scott’s decision to mentor David, I was unable to confirm this during my interview with Scott. In fact, whenever I approached the subject of race in his relationship with David, Scott
became evasive, and at times also became somewhat impatient with me. It was clear that Scott was not willing to engage in an intense discussion on this subject. The following dialogue between Scott and me is illustrative of his attempts to dispel any notion on my part that race was an issue in his relationship with David.

Linda: You said that David was your mentee, not because he is Black but because of your similar interests. But does having a protégé of a different race affect your relationship, or how you view specific issues that affect African Americans?

Scott: Let me underscore this so I can make sure we understand each other. I did not seek out David because he was a Black faculty member. I sought him out because of the fact that he and I were intellectually attuned to each other in an area of personal interest. The fact that he is an African American and takes that seriously in terms of his own role within the academic community...so I value that and the fact that a partnership has been formed where one of us is White and one of us is Black, and where he has done far and away the vast amount of the intellectual activity, I think has been a real value. I am not doing him a favor.

Linda: Even though you have a very busy schedule, do you attempt to be more attuned to what the African American community would like to see in terms of this book? How do you make sure you have some knowledge of this?

Scott: Well, first of all, I believe that one of the burning issues of the day in an American university is this issue of how we provide opportunities for growth and development of all members of our community—be they Black, be they Asian, be they White, be they Hispanic. And obviously the growth and opportunity for women is enormously important to me. You carry a double burden as an African American woman. And so in my role as a university executive, I am very committed to the advancement issues that surround those communities. And so I think that any time I have an opportunity to work with someone who can bring information to me,
who can ask interesting questions, who can provide insight into some of these issues, and themselves act as a role model for others, then that obviously is all part of this package we’re dealing with.

Linda: Would you have preferred to have had a protégé of the same race?

Scott: No. Heavens no. As I said I think there is value added.

Linda: So it would not have made any difference to you about the race of the protégé as long as the basics were there in terms of writing the book?

Scott: First of all, we entered into this relationship because of our interests. As I said, and again, let me reiterate that. The fact that David is an African American male has been a real value added to our relationship because I’ve learned a good deal from him. I think it also has been a learning experience for him. I think symbolically that it will be interesting when the book comes out that a fairly traditional White male and a younger, bright African American male wrote a book together.

Linda: How has your mentoring relationship with David contributed to increasing the diversity both in the scholarly community at University A and in your professional community?

Scott: I would hope in three ways. One, keeping him here and happy. Part of my job is to make sure that when we hire capable minority faculty members is that they stay with us and do not get enticed to go somewhere else, and I hope that our relationship is keeping him here and involved and happily engaged at the university. Secondly, I think that the opportunity to see the two of us working together and happily so will act as a beacon on the hill both inside and outside (the university). And third, I think that it provides an opportunity to have access to people and activities that he otherwise wouldn’t have and I think that all of those things are part of the activity that we see right now.
Scott did not admit that there were other underlying motives for mentoring with David, but some his comments do suggest that not only would David benefit from the relationship, but that Scott and the university would also benefit from this relationship. It is not clear whether Scott was attempting to assure me that as a university executive he had a commitment to mentoring African American faculty members. Or perhaps he felt that given his position, he needed to emphasize the commitment of the university to helping all faculty members to become successful. But his comment about the symbolic nature of his relationship with David and his hope that their relationship would be a beacon both inside and outside of the university, suggests that Scott was aware that individuals in the university community, but particularly African Americans were watching the relationship.
In the next three cases junior faculty members are being mentored specifically to gain promotion and tenure. Each junior faculty member in University B is assigned a three person tenure review committee. All of the protégés in this study except one identified one person from that committee as their primary mentor. All of the protégés in these case studies came to this institution as a result of an aggressive plan to recruit talented women and minority scholars to University B.

Terry: Race Matters

Terry is an African American male who is an assistant professor of education at University B. Terry came to this institution on a post-doctoral fellowship and began teaching the following year. He began his faculty career after several years of public school teaching and administrative experience. When I met Terry, he was already beginning to establish himself as a recognized scholar in his field as well as in a new and controversial area of thought, and was co-authoring a book with a colleague in the same department. Terry had other offers from major research universities, but chose this institution because he would have an opportunity to spend a year developing his line of research. He told me that he does "critical versus functional scholarship--that is, scholarship which makes no attempt to function within the confines of the status quo".

Terry considers himself to be a problem solver rather than being part of the problem in his field. Terry said that he always knew that he would question and be a critic of the status quo as it applies to education. Terry feels that a person must have "a lot of guts to be in the academy because it is a very conforming place"--that is, one
can easily become a part of the status quo instead of challenging it. Terry also told me that he is on a mission "to develop a scholarly perspective that takes into consideration the politics of education as it relates to African Americans—an integration of policy research and the culture of African Americans".

Terry has been mentored by Charles, an African American faculty member, since accepting his position at University B. The mentor-protégé relationship between Terry and Charles was initiated when Terry requested that Charles become a member of his three person tenure review committee. Charles is a full professor, and has been a faculty member at this institution for almost twenty years. Charles is a widely recognized scholar in his field and has an extensive publication record. Charles told me that to be successful in the academy, a faculty member must "first learn what the rules of the game are and then decide whether he/she wants to play that game". And Charles said that the rules of the game in the academy are to publish, be a good teacher, and be a good departmental citizen. He said that Terry understands these rules.

Terry’s story is unique in this study because of the emphasis on same-race match in the mentoring relationship. For Terry, race is the predictor of the success of the relationship. While his mentor downplayed the issue of race in his mentoring relationship, same-race mentoring was very important to Terry. Terry told me that because his scholarship challenged the status quo in education, he knew that this could be problematic for White faculty members. Terry preferred to have a mentor who would be more likely to understand his research rather than a mentor to whom he
would have to explain/justify his scholarship. For Terry this meant that his mentor would be African American. Herr (1994) has reported that there is no evidence to suggest that same-race mentoring is any more effective than cross-race mentoring, but for Terry having a White mentor was not an option he would consider.

Another related issue in Terry's story is his perception of assigned mentoring. While Terry was assigned a tenure review committee, the assignment of the committee itself was unimportant to him. Terry preferred to choose his own mentors and structure the mentoring relationship to meet his own needs. As a graduate student, Terry said he was fortunate to have had a successful mentor-protégé relationship with his advisor, an African American male. As a result of his previous experience as a protégé, Terry knew what he wanted in his faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships. Terry wanted a mentor who would provide him with a very systematic, focused type of mentoring. And Terry told me that it was important that his mentor be "likeminded". Thus, for Terry the assignment of a mentor or committee of mentors was not as important as whether he and his mentors were epistemologically aligned. Terry seemed to rule out the possibility that a White scholar would understand and/or accept his scholarship. It seemed that for Terry only another African American who was "a student of the Black experience" could mentor him and identify with him professionally and culturally.

Terry's definition of the term mentor was reflective of what he expected from his mentoring relationship. He defined the term in the following statement:

A strategist. Someone who can provide a very good strategy. I guess I got that from my major professor because we would always strategize
how we would meet some goal that he and I might have whether it was my dissertation or giving a paper or whatever. I think your mentor is someone who you can strategize plans with whether it’s your tenure, whether it’s guest editing a journal, whether it’s a piece in this journal or that journal. What you do is to sit down and they help you with strategy to make things happen.

When I asked Terry how he would define the term mentoring, his response included a criticism of his own institution’s formal mentoring program.

Well the noun mentor in the context of this institution doesn’t mean anything. The word mentoring means a person is setting strategy with you. In other words I’m saying you can be assigned mentors, but they don’t do anything. The people who are mentoring you are helping you to strategize. And I have mentors assigned to me who haven’t helped me do anything. But I also have people who are mentoring me and have done a lot. I think that mentor is a term used by institutions probably where mentoring is what we really have going on, the action, and so I think that’s the only difference. You have to be careful when someone says that they are your mentor.

Terry said that there were three things a mentor should do for a protégé. He explained:

I think it’s extremely important to have people help you pose problems that you want to solve for yourself and that’s part of the strategy issue and to also be around to observe your problem solving and how you are addressing the problems that you have posed, and to help you within the context of your environment to persuade other people that what you’ve done is the right thing. I think mentors really have to do all three of those things. They help you pose your problems that you’re trying to solve, they watch you problem solve and then they help persuade other people that you’ve done the right thing. Those three things are very important.

The idea that mentoring is synonymous with plotting a strategy is indicative of Terry’s desire to have a relationship that was directed toward helping him to accomplish his goals. He was plotting strategy that would lead him to a successful career. Several
times during my interviews with Terry he used the words strategy and strategize to
describe the process of mentoring and how he and his mentor interacted.

Terry could be considered a self starter. He was confident, highly motivated,
disciplined, and very focused on accomplishing his goals. He already had numerous
publications, was a consultant on at least two large research projects, was
coauthoring a book, and regularly gave presentations at major conferences. But
Terry credited his mentor, Charles, for being willing to provide him with
opportunities that would help in advancing his career. When I asked Terry how
Charles had helped him, he replied:

The game of writing a journal article or a chapter in a book or even
gaining access to writing a book chapter or having access to journal
editors is quite different...and it's really a process that one has to be, in
my opinion, shepherded through by others who have had that
experience. I think very few people are able to negotiate that by
themselves. And it's not an issue of ability or talent, it's an issue of
access and information and so how does one do that. I think what one
does is work hard, but also one has to have someone to help them
access this type of information. All of these are real issues in terms of
getting through and penetrating the publishing process. At the same
time you may have to educate people you are working with who may
not understand what you're writing about, and that's a very delicate
thing to negotiate because you want to exercise your freedom as a
scholar to write about what you want to write about and not have
anyone tell you that you can't. And so my colleague (Charles) has
provided me with the ability to do that, and that is important. And he
is also on my tenure review committee so he can educate the people
who are making decisions about my tenure.

Since the purpose of the assigned mentoring program at University B is to
prepare the junior faculty members for promotion and tenure, I asked Terry to discuss
with me how Charles had mentored him specifically in the areas of teaching, research,
and service. Terry said that during his first two years as a faculty member, he and
Charles had talked about teaching at the university level, putting together a good syllabus, and that he had given guest lectures in Charles’ classes on several occasions. Terry said that Charles had helped him to develop his research agenda so that he could incorporate his teaching area with his work in policy research as well as the critical aspect of his work. Terry said that he understood that "faculty members must have a theoretical framework that allows them to formulate a research agenda because in the university it’s about a chain of inquiry". He said Charles helped him to strategize how he would include all of the aspects that were important to the work he does and this had helped him to begin to establish the kind of publication record he would need for promotion and tenure.

One of the most important ways in which the mentor-protégé relationship had helped to advance Terry’s career was the role that Charles had played in introducing him to other professionals who were able to further his career. Charles is on the editorial board of a major refereed journal and it was because of Charles’ influence that Terry was asked to submit an article for a special edition of this journal. Charles introduced Terry to the editor of the journal who asked him to contribute the article. Terry told me that since "this journal was a good outlet for my work," the article was very well received and that he had received numerous phone calls and letters from other scholars seeking his advice about the issues he discussed in the article. And Terry had also received requests to write other articles and invitations to speak at major conferences.
Terry felt that because his work dealt with race, it would be difficult for him to have a White mentor. He said "the nature of my scholarship is problematic for most people who are outside the African American experience". While Terry said that he would consider having a White mentor to advise him about university policies and procedures, he was doubtful that another White scholar could assist him with epistemological issues. Terry wanted an African American mentor who could help him develop a strategy to present his non-traditional, critical scholarship. He elaborated on this point in the following statement:

In fact, probably because my work deals with race and is so intertwined with the issue of race, it would probably be extremely difficult to have a White mentor. In fact, that’s not something I would seek out. I might seek out a White person in terms of negotiating the system, but I would always separate my scholarship from that because, frankly, I don’t think that many people can understand the experiences that I’ve had, nor the experiences of others (African Americans) unless they become true students of the African American experience. And not many people are really students of our experiences. So unless I was quite sure that a person had really become a student of our experiences, I would be less apt to work with them in a mentorship relationship about my scholarship. And I think that should be made clear. I think having a same-race mentor has really been a factor in my relationship with Charles.

Terry said that while he might talk to other colleagues about his work, these conversations would not be at the same level of intensity, candor, or respect.

The same-race match and the critical nature of Terry’s scholarship were linked together. He emphasized that he did critical versus functional scholarship, and that he knew this could be a problem for most Whites. And perhaps Terry also understood that in an institution like University B he needed someone like Charles who would be an advocate for him. Charles’ status in the department and in the university could
help Terry gain acceptance as a scholar. It was clear that Terry was not willing to compromise his area of scholarship. When I asked Terry and Charles if there had ever been occasions when Charles had defended Terry’s work, Charles said no, but Terry said he did not need anyone to defend his work—he preferred to defend his work himself. Maybe Terry anticipated that Whites would view his scholarship as confrontational and to some extent, relied on Charles to advise him about how his scholarship should be presented in an institution where there might be resistance to a different perspective.

In contrast to Terry, a same-race match in a mentoring relationship was not a requirement for Charles. When I asked him if having a protégé of the same race was an advantage in his mentoring relationship, he told me that race was not an issue. He referred to himself as an "equal opportunity mentor" and told me that he would be willing to help any junior faculty member. And Charles also seemed reluctant to discuss race in the relationship or in the academy. While Charles said that he realized that racism existed to some degree, he said he preferred not dwell on this. Charles told me that since he had been the only African American in his department for almost twenty years, he was "just happy to have another African American to talk to". He said that as African American males, he and Terry had a great deal in common and could talk about many issues that affected African Americans inside and outside of the academy.

It seems that Terry and Charles had different perspectives about the importance of a same race-mentor-protégé relationships. For Terry it was a requirement, but
for Charles it did not seem to matter. And my questions to Charles about
problems/challenges that African Americans might encounter in predominantly White
institutions were all dismissed as unimportant. Perhaps this was because of his
philosophy about knowing the rules of the game. And perhaps Charles downplayed
the issue of race because he felt if a faculty member knew how to play the game, it
did not matter what race he/she was or the nature of his/her scholarship. When I
asked Charles how he had advised Terry to present his scholarship, he replied as
follows:

Part of what I think you have to do, a person who’s doing research, is
keep the power of your conviction...and to be scholarly in what you do
so you can talk about it, because you know about it based upon the
evidence that you have found, you know it is solid. You can’t sell
yourself out in this process. And what he (Terry) is doing is good
scholarship, and that’s the test.

I asked Terry if he felt that the mentoring program in his institution was an
effective one. He told me that the mentoring program was a valuable one, but he also
said it was up to the protégé to make the mentoring relationship work for him/her.
Terry said that because most committee members were usually very busy, it would be
easy for them to perform only a cursory review of a candidate’s work. While Terry
told me that he did not have this problem with Charles, he also said that during his
first year he had encountered problems with other members of his committee. Terry
told me he disbanded his first tenure review committee and formed another one
because he felt that his committee was not mentoring him, was not supportive of him,
and committee members were waiting for him to fail. Terry did not elaborate on why
he felt this way, nor did he cite any specific instances when members of his first
committee did not support him. But it was at this point that he asked the department chairperson to remove two of his committee members, and he formed a new tenure review committee. Charles was the only faculty member who remained on the committee. Terry said that in situations of this type, the faculty member must take the initiative and do whatever is necessary to make sure all of the committee members are working in his/her best interest.

I asked Terry how all of this related to his statement, "The noun mentor means nothing in the context of this institution". Terry replied that while one could be assigned a mentor, this did not necessarily mean that the relationship would work. That is, the assignment of a mentor did not automatically lead to mentoring. He added that the protégé should always consider what it best for him/her. Terry said that his problems with his committee were disciplinary in nature. His scholarship was different from the objective type of scholarship which traditionally dominated his department and his discipline. Since Terry had commented that some members of the committee were not supportive of him and were waiting for him to fail, perhaps he quickly realized that he would have to form a committee of persons who would be supportive of him. After all, the members of the committee do evaluate the candidate’s scholarship and make recommendations for promotion and tenure to the personnel committee.

Given his feelings about assigned mentoring, I asked Terry if African American faculty should be assigned mentors. Terry said that he was skeptical about the assignment of a mentor without some consideration being given to the needs of the
protégé. He told me that African Americans might have to be willing to change mentors if the relationship was not successful. He added that in some cases, this could cause problems between the protégé and the mentor, but that this was just another aspect of being able to negotiate the structure. While Terry felt that all faculty members should tell their mentors when they were not satisfied with their performance, he said that it was particularly important for African Americans. Terry said that since there are so few African Americans in predominantly White institutions, an unsuccessful mentoring relationship could affect the promotion and tenure decision. Terry said that he was able to change the composition of his tenure review committee to one that was satisfactory to him "because I was willing to take immediate action when I observed a pattern in the behavior of some of my committee members"—a pattern of behavior which could have negatively affected his career. He emphasized that it was up to the protégé to do whatever was necessary to make the assigned mentoring process work for him/her.

The assignment of a mentor was a secondary issue for Terry. Perhaps this was because in Terry's case, his mentor was someone with whom he was compatible professionally, personally, and culturally. But it could also be that Terry purposely structured his mentoring relationship so that it would be beneficial to him.
Joann: Mentoring, A Very Personal Thing

Joann is an African American female sixth year assistant professor in the humanities department at University B. Joann came to the university with several years of university teaching and administrative experience and she currently holds joint appointments in two departments. Joann has degrees in three different disciplines, and combines her expertise in these areas in her research which deals with the issues of race and gender at the national and international level. Joann is a single mother and has a busy schedule which includes caring for her child and meeting the demands of her professional life. Like Terry, Joann came to University B on a post-doctoral fellowship and spent her first year developing her research.

According to Joann, the academy needs to be transformed. She feels that one of the problems in the academy is that African American females are "invisible" and that the academy must "make room for them" as well as African American males. When I met Joann she was preparing to take a one year leave of absence from her faculty position at the university and to assume a similar position at an out of state university. Joann told me that her mentors, and particularly her primary mentor, had advised her to take another position since it was questionable whether she would be granted promotion and tenure at University B. When I asked Joann how she felt about the move, she told me she was sure that she had made the right decision and she trusted the judgement of her mentors.

Joann has been in a mentoring relationship with two female faculty members who are both full professors since coming to University B six years ago. She met
both of her mentors when she was interviewed for her present position. Marcia, who
is Latin American, is Joann’s primary mentor. Marcia is a widely recognized scholar
in her field and specializes in race and gender issues at the international level. In
addition to having similar research interests as Joann, she too must balance family and
professional responsibilities. When I met Marcia, she had just mailed the final draft
of her second book to her publisher. Marcia told me that she feels a connection to
Joann because they both are concerned about similar issues regarding race and gender.

Nancy is an African American and is Joann’s secondary mentor. She has over
twenty years of university teaching experience, most of them at University B. Like
Marcia, she also shares similar professional and personal interests with Joann. Nancy
has faculty appointments in two departments and is a highly regarded scholar in both
areas. She is also regarded as the senior African American female scholar on the
campus and she told me that she willingly takes responsibility for mentoring not only
Joann, but all African American female faculty members who come to University B.
While Nancy says that it is Marcia who "is more directly responsible for mentoring
Joann", she admits that she will miss Joann when she leaves because she considers her
to be her "soulmate".

An important theme in Joann’s story is the commitment of the mentor to the
protégé. Even when Joann’s primary mentor did not fully agree with some of Joann’s
decisions regarding the direction of her scholarship, she continued to be committed to
Joann personally and professionally. Because Joann’s primary mentor was committed
to helping her reach her potential as a scholar, she helped Joann to turn what could
have been a negative factor in her career into a positive.

Another theme in Joann’s story is the emphasis on same-gender mentor-protégé
match. Both of Joann’s mentors were committed to mentoring female faculty
members, thus gender proved to be a bond in their relationships. And Joann could
share her concern about African American females in the academy with both of her
mentors.

Marcia’s commitment to mentoring Joann was consistent with her definitions
of the terms mentor and mentoring. Marcia defined a mentor as "one who is further
along on a road and can, by strength of example and by strength of personal and
intellectual connection, help someone to move along that road". Marcia told me
mentoring "involves, first and foremost, a personal relationship". Marcia also said
that whether mentoring was institutionalized or not, it was "only as good as the
commitment of the two people involved." For Marcia, a personality fit was more
important since for her there had to be a balance between "seeing the intellectual work
in the same way and getting along".

Marcia compared a mentoring relationship with a faculty member with the kind
of relationships she had with her graduate students,

[Al]though it’s at a different level. It’s a relationship with somebody
who already has a sense of what they want to do so it isn’t like I’m
telling them what to do. And it’s a personal relationship because I need
to be close enough and open enough to be able to hear what the other
person in the relationship wants and needs. Because if I’m a mentor in
the relationship, I know that I need to be a guide of some kind, but I
don't define what the road is going to be. My role is essentially one of gentle guidance. My role is to facilitate the personal growth that is already in progress.

For Marcia her relationship with Joann was personal as well as professional. She told me that she "pushed hard" for Joann and had tried to be emotionally supportive and cheer her on with regard to her work. Marcia felt that it was her role and her obligation to "push Joann in terms of her research--in a supportive way--making her aware of the challenges she will have to face."

Nancy referred to her own mentoring of African American females when she defined the terms mentor and mentoring. For Nancy, the mentor's job was to help younger scholars advance their work to the stage where it is acceptable and could be published. She said that this was the role that Marcia played as Joann's mentor. Nancy discussed her own mentoring of Joann and other African American females in the following statement:

My own mentoring of Black women on this campus has been more a mentoring friendship, and hopefully that is how I will be seen by these people in general. I am someone whose door is always open, whose telephone line is always there, whose ear is always ready, who will support them in what they want to do and help them through the bad times and the good times. Even if I don't understand their work, I can still be the mentor friend. When there are problems for instance of just knowing how to handle certain issues or what to do when their department chairs say things that make them unhappy and they want to respond. How do they go about making the response in the kind of way that will not cause a department chair to dislike them and use what they say against them. Those are other kinds of ways in which I think those of us who are older have opportunities to mentor younger faculty.

Joann told me that her mentors had different personalities and different skills which allowed them to assist her in different ways. Marcia worked closely with her
by reading her manuscript drafts, giving her constructive criticism and feedback, and helping her to plot strategy for the promotion and tenure process. She said her relationship with Marcia was, at times, more formal than her relationship with Nancy because she and Marcia usually scheduled meetings to discuss the specifics of her progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service. While Nancy did not work directly with Joann on preparing her dossier for promotion and tenure, she was able to assist her in other ways. Because Nancy was a well-known scholar in two disciplines, she had introduced Joann to influential scholars who could possibly help her career. And Nancy had also helped Joann to make decisions about whom she might ask to serve as external reviewers for her promotion and tenure review. But Joann said that she usually interacted with Nancy more informally—her office was across the hall from Nancy’s—they could talk anytime.

Joann began to talk about her new life—a life without her mentors—and told me that she had no idea what she would do without them when she left. She said that each of them, in their own way, fought for her and that their support had been important to her career development. They had given her encouragement, were always available for her to share ideas with, and had been real friends to her. They also had interceded on her behalf to the people who would be making decisions about her promotion and tenure.

Since Joann was preparing to take a leave of absence from her position at the university, I asked her to discuss with me the reasons why she was leaving, how her mentors had helped her to make this decision, and how this would impact her career—
and particularly her chances for promotion and tenure. She said that both of her mentors, but particularly Marcia, were very involved in helping her to make the decision to leave. During a meeting with Marcia to discuss her tenure case, Marcia advised Joann to look for another faculty position. Joann explained:

Marcia and I sat down and plotted out the fact that I should go on the market last year and this year because we looked at my tenure case...Marcia has always been very clear with me, up front with me, regarding whether my work was good, bad or whatever. And what we decided was that tenure was going to be a long shot because it took me these extra two years to get where I needed to be. The work is coming, but I'm not progressing at the speed that probably they (the tenure review committee) would like. Which is fine. I made a choice when I decided to be in the academy on my own terms. And as I talked with Marcia and thought about it, and I don't know that she realizes this or that she did anything directly about it, but one of the things that I decided was that I had to make my own choices. I was not going to allow myself to be put in a position where I didn't have any other alternatives and where this university could choose whether I was going to come or go. I know that this is kind of unorthodox, but I wanted to be in a position where the choice was mine and where I knew that I was going to always have a job. I have a child to raise and I wanted to be sure that I was in a good place to do that. So I talked to Marcia and to Nancy too and they both agreed that this was what I should do. They were both very supportive and wrote letters of recommendation for me and also told me about positions that they knew about.

Joann told me that she had always received good teaching evaluations from her students and from the tenure review committee. But she knew that she was not as strong in the research area. Marcia agreed that Joann's problem was her research focus and her weak publication record. She felt that it was important for Joann to look elsewhere "given the choices she had made about where she would put her energies in terms of publications." Because of some of the decisions Joann had made, Marcia was not sure that she would be successful in getting promotion and tenure.
But Marcia said that as her mentor and her friend, it was difficult but necessary, for her to advise Joann to seek other employment. She explained:

And so I think now she’s in a very good position, because she has another job to which she can go next year. As her mentor this was precisely the kind of decision I needed to encourage her to reach. But as her friend, I had a very hard time, because I knew that if she was successful at what I was advising her to do, she would leave. So there I felt that the two relationships conflicted. But ultimately, if I am really her friend, then what I want for her is the best for her and for her career. So having her in a close situation where her tenure might be insecure is also not what a real friend would choose.

Marcia and Joann regularly discussed the criteria for being granted tenure, the procedural aspects of the tenure review process, and the makeup of the divisional committee that operated as the primary tenure granting body. Marcia said that she and Joann had several lengthy discussions about whether the work Joann had done so far matched what the committee would be looking for, and what Joann would still need to do. Marcia said, "In terms of tenure, what is absolutely crucial in the academy as it is presently defined, is publication--first and foremost." Marcia was also an advocate for Joann and had explained to the departmental tenure review committee why Joann’s scholarship might not be understood or appreciated in the university as a whole. Marcia said that she was not always successful in her efforts because on more than one occasion, members of that committee had told her, "But you’re not objective because you’re her mentor, so obviously you’re going to be her advocate, so we really can’t believe what you’re saying." It seems that the members of the tenure review committee were aware of Marcia’s commitment to Joann as a friend and as a mentor. Perhaps they were aware that Marcia could not separate the
two—for her they were one in the same. Indeed for Marcia, she could only be Joann's mentor if she was her friend. She could not, in other words, separate the personal from the professional.

Marcia also talked to Joann about where she was putting her efforts for promotion and tenure. Joann had organized a conference on race and feminism which was held at the university and Marcia said she pointed out to Joann why the university might not appreciate the importance of this conference. Marcia said that as her mentor she felt she had a responsibility to assist Joann in the logistics of planning the conference—where she could get funding, scholars that she could contact, etc. But she also felt she needed to make Joann aware that the energy she was putting into planning and organizing the conference would not immediately be translated into a publication. Marcia said, "While the conference would be considered a service to the Black feminist community, with service to the student and feminist community more broadly, it was service of a sisterly type and would not readily translate into career advancement." Marcia said she felt very strongly that it was her role to make that clear to Joann. She elaborated further:

We’re on the road toward the big T [tenure]. What is this going to give you that’s going to push you along that road and what is this going to give you that’s not directly going to push you along that road. Now whether or not I agree that the signposts on that road are the correct ones, it’s a reality. That was part of what we discussed. Not only me, but also Nancy, who I think is very much a mentor for Joann. Nancy and I both agreed on this. We also had a couple of conversations just about how there were aspects of this that would not be recognized as her own personal work. Even choosing to do a co-edited volume would give less personal credit, even though the book has done incredibly well. It’s already on its second printing.
So while Marcia was supportive of Joann, she also knew that Joann was jeopardizing her chances for achieving promotion and tenure. Once again Marcia seemed to merge her roles as friend and mentor. As Joann’s friend she encouraged her and agreed with the ideological reasons for organizing the conference and co-editing the book. But as her mentor she knew she had a responsibility to make Joann aware of the possible consequences of her decisions.

Nancy told me that her institution did not hire people that they did not intend to tenure. So I asked Nancy why she felt Joann was in danger of being denied promotion and tenure if this was the case. She told me that in the case of Joann, she was not as strong in the research area as the tenure review committee wanted her to be. But she also said that since the university was in the process of downsizing, and one technique was to cut faculty, it was now more difficult to achieve promotion and tenure. Like Marcia, Nancy had talked with Joann about the requirements for promotion and tenure, and especially the publication requirements. While she said that the tenure review committee did not stipulate a specific number of publications, she had always advised Joann to submit more publications than she thought were necessary.

I asked Marcia if she agreed with Nancy that there could be other factors involved in Joann’s case. Marcia replied that there were other factors, but she talked about a different set of factors than Nancy did. She explained:

I think that as time has gone on there’s been a backlash on the campus, on issues of diversity, and particularly among faculty. For generational, racial, and gender reasons, hostility and prejudice toward younger faculty of color, and particularly toward young women of
color, has sometimes made the competition for tenure more unpredictable. I've been very open and frank with Joann and with the people who are going to be putting together her tenure case. I've shared my fears, and we've even joked about how she is a conservative's worst nightmare: A Black woman whose research is about Black women and who is a Black feminist.

When I asked Marcia if she felt there were a different set of standards for women and minorities, and particularly African Americans, she replied:

And the issues involved in evaluating and facilitating faculty progress have also changed. They changed when women were admitted. They change when people of color are admitted, because often the scholarship being done is different. It follows a different calendar in terms of productivity and in terms of issues addressed, and in terms of the kinds of publications in which the material is published. Often it is hard to reach a consensus on how to evaluate work fairly when it is different. The issues are very, very thorny. The criteria that are often still being used are the criteria that have applied to mainstream scholarship, and now there are lots of people--White women, women of color, or more generally people of color, who are doing other kinds of scholarship. Which is not to say that there aren't people of color who do mainstream scholarship, there's plenty, well not plenty, but there are some. But for those of us who don't do mainstream scholarship, the issues of evaluation are extremely complex.

Marcia said that scholars like Joann who were trying to "develop an alternative approach to how people think about power--people who were trying to de-center perspectives--would probably face a tightening of the criteria for tenure and a different set of rules for how the university defines scholarly excellence."

Joann told me the academy needed to make room for African American females. And it appears that she was pushing to be an influence in the academy and have the academy make room for her in terms of the nature of her scholarship. And perhaps even though Joann understood that she was risking her career by doing so,
she felt that her work would make a contribution to other African American female scholars, as well as the academy.

Had Joann had different mentors, it is possible she would not have received the same kind of positive mentoring that she received from Marcia and Nancy. Marcia understood the culture of an institution where "hostility and prejudice toward younger faculty of color, and particularly young women of color" was very real. And she understood how the rules for evaluation of scholarship are sometimes different for women and minorities. For this reason, Marcia identified with and was sympathetic to Joann’s struggle to be included. As her mentor, it seemed that Marcia was somewhat torn between advising Joann not to compromise her scholarship and her values, and conforming to the rules so that she would be granted promotion and tenure. But because of her commitment to Joann and because of her belief in her capabilities as a scholar, she continued to give her advice that would help her to be successful. It could be argued that Marcia herself was taking a risk. She chose to mentor someone who she did not always agree with in terms of her scholarly emphasis. Marcia risked her reputation as a faculty member, risked taking the time to mentor an African American feminist scholar, and she risked giving Joann the wrong advice. But it appeared that Marcia was willing to take these risks--Joann was her friend first, her protégé second. She was committed to Joann as her friend. She had an obligation to Joann as her mentor.

The bond between Joann and her mentors was, to a great extent, based on race and gender. Joann and Marcia talked very openly and very candidly about issues
involved in cross-race mentoring. I asked Joann if and how having a mentor of a
different race affected her mentor-protégé relationship. She replied that she was not
naive and "would never make the claim that she did not see color." But she told me
that she felt that it had been good for both she and Marcia to recognize that their
identity was based on who they were--that she was a Black woman and Marcia was a
Latin American (White) woman. She said this recognition of their racial and cultural
differences had allowed them to share events that had happened to them in "their
unique capacities".

Joann said that even though Marcia was a White woman, a great deal of her
research was on women of color, and that she was one of the few White women that
she knew who had worked hard to try to understand "what is going on with women of
color". Joann said that Marcia was not only knowledgeable about issues concerning
women of color, but she could also empathize with the challenges that African
American women often faced in the academy. Joann told me that when her
relationship with Marcia first began she had what she termed "the usual kind of
reticence that occurs when White women deal with Black women--the Black woman is
not sure where the White woman is coming from and if she can relate to you". Joann
said she and Marcia were able to resolve these kinds of issues as their relationship
developed over time.

But Joann turned to Nancy for cultural support. Joann told me that she
enjoyed her relationship with Nancy because "it has been wonderful to have another
African American woman to talk to." Joann said, "Nancy has always been right there
swinging for me, I think from the first moment I came to the interview". She said when she came for the interview, she was able to meet with Nancy away from the interview setting and talk to her about what it was like to be an African American woman at University B. She told me that Nancy had also called her after she returned home to ask her if she was considering taking the position. When she did take the job, Nancy gave her a present—a framed picture of the woman for whom her post-doctoral fellowship was named.

Same gender match was an important factor in Joann’s relationship with Marcia and Nancy. I asked Marcia what she brought to the relationship as a female. She said that as a female who had more experience in the academy than Joann, she could talk to her openly about the kinds of issues female academics face that male academics do not. She also said that since they were both parents, she understood the limitations on Joann’s time and "the choices women make because they want to be good parents and raise children who can do a good job of surviving in this very complicated world." Marcia said that she could also relate to Joann’s experience of being the only female, and particularly the only African American female, in a faculty meeting, and she had talked to Joann about her own "sense of feeling invisible in these situations". From Marcia’s perspective, Joann had also brought a great deal to the relationship as an African American woman. As they interacted, discussions about the differences between Black feminism and White feminism were inevitable. For Marcia, the issue of feminism was never a simple one, and she said Joann had
educated her about these differences and had made her aware that mainstream feminism "is not the only game in town."

When I asked Nancy about her same race/gender mentor-protégé relationship, she replied:

I would think that having a protégé of the same gender and of the same race has a lot to do with how one's relationship with that person develops. That there's a lot more identification. Joann and I for instance are in fact feminists. We share certain ideas even though we don't know enough or even know nothing about each other's published work or intellectual work. But we share the same political ideologies and that gives us lots of room for conversations in which we know we have common ideas. Particularly around issues of race and issues of gender.

When I asked Nancy what she brought to the mentor-protégé relationship as another African American female she replied:

Well, I think for one thing the possibilities of success. The real live person who struggles everyday. It's extremely difficult sometimes and I don't keep that to myself, so that other people who are also struggling will know that it's not just their problem, it's a problem of all of us who struggle with the kinds of work that we do that is very hard. But if you're willing to stick with it, then in fact you succeed. So you don't have to be the smartest person in the world to be successful, you have to be a person who's willing to stick with it. And that's what going to get you through.

The literature suggests that since female mentors do not usually have power in the academy, female protégés usually have more successful mentoring relationships with men (Alexander, 1992). But in Joann's case both of her mentors were full professors, and they knew the culture and the expectations of the academy. Both of her mentors had also had similar experiences as Joann (acceptance of their scholarship, the issue of race and gender, etc.). Their collective knowledge and their
experiences as a White female and as an African American female in a predominantly White institution allowed them to assist Joann. They could make her aware of the potential barriers and could advise her how to overcome them. While Joann did not always take their advice, her mentors made her aware of the possible consequences of some of her decisions.

**Epilogue to Joann’s Story**

Several months after completing my interviews with Joann, I received a letter from her informing me that she had been granted promotion and tenure at her former institution. Joann was now in a position to negotiate with two universities, but she had not yet made any decisions about her future.
Beverly: The Case of the Absentee Mentor

Beverly is an African American female fourth year assistant professor of education at University B. She came to this university with several years of university teaching and administrative experience. When I met Beverly, she was working on several writing projects which included several articles, a book chapter, and a book which she was co-authoring with another colleague. And her first book had just recently been published. Beverly considers herself to "be one of a new generation of scholars who have come to the academy on their own terms and who want to re-shape the academy". She is also a community activist and is involved in a number of community based projects which relate to her research interests.

University B has a women’s mentoring program for female faculty members who are in their probationary period. Female faculty members are contacted by mail and are encouraged to sign up for the program by returning an interest form and a mentor preference card to the women’s mentoring office. They are assigned a mentor based on their preference for professional, personal, and cultural similarities. There is an attempt to assign a mentor from the same department, but because of the small number of women in most departments at University B, mentors are sometimes assigned from other departments and/or disciplines. Beverly also has a three person tenure review committee, but she identified her mentor from the women’s mentoring program for this study. When I asked Beverly if she had a mentor, she identified the person whom she considered to be her assigned mentor. While I was unable to confirm this, it is possible that the term/label mentor for Beverly meant the person she
had requested. Beverly told me that she had a supportive tenure review committee, but it seems that she did not consider any of these persons to be her mentor.

Elizabeth, the person identified by Beverly as her mentor, is White and is a full professor in the college of education. Elizabeth has both teaching and administrative duties, but says her "passion is research and writing." Elizabeth believes that faculty members should always have two articles in press, two articles in review, and two articles in progress. Her own publication record is evidence of this belief. Elizabeth is also passionate about the challenges that women in the academy face. She believes that the requirements for women are different than they are for men, and that women must always work harder to succeed in a culture which has traditionally been dominated by White males. Elizabeth’s own career is a reflection of what can happen when one puts those beliefs into action. She was granted promotion and tenure in two years, and was promoted to full professor two years later.

The most important issue in this story is the non-existent relationship between Beverly and her mentor. When I met with Beverly to conduct our interview, I learned that she and her mentor had never met to initiate the relationship. Beverly and Elizabeth had talked briefly at university functions, but they had never met formally or informally to discuss how Elizabeth could be of assistance to Beverly. Given this, another related issue in this story is the effectiveness of assigned mentoring programs. The literature suggests that assigned mentoring programs may be necessary for women because of the challenges they face and because it is harder for women to find mentors (Boice, 1993; Herr, 1994; Johnsrud, 1994). But in
Beverly’s case, the assignment of a mentor did not lead to a relationship in which the mentor performed functions for the protégé or where the protégé sought the advice/assistance of the mentor.

When Elizabeth was assigned as Beverly’s mentor, she called Beverly to arrange to meet with her. But both Elizabeth and Beverly were too busy and could not adjust their schedules to meet. I asked Beverly to discuss with me why she and her mentor had never engaged in any mentoring activities. Beverly told me that although they had tried on several occasions to find the time to meet, their schedules had prevented them from doing so. When I asked Beverly how she felt about this, she told me that since she also had a very supportive three person tenure review committee this was not a problem for her. She explained:

Elizabeth and I are both such workaholics that I don’t think we have time to mentor each other. I think we both tried to get together, but we’ve never been able to and I haven’t felt the need in the same way because I’ve had good support within the department. So I signed up for it, but I haven’t taken advantage of it.

While Elizabeth volunteered to be a mentor in the women’s mentoring program so that she could help other female faculty members, she admitted that she did not do this for Beverly. Elizabeth described her efforts to schedule a meeting with Beverly in the following statement:

So at which point I naturally tried to contact Beverly. And I think, we made two or three attempts at it and nothing ever worked because I think both of our schedules were really hairy.

Elizabeth agreed that she and Beverly were just too busy to meet. But Elizabeth told me that she would have made time to meet with Beverly if she felt that
Beverly really needed her help. But she said that Beverly was very talented and already a well established scholar. Elizabeth added that Beverly understood the rules of the game and she was sure that she would achieve promotion and tenure without her help. Elizabeth was almost apologetic about her failure to mentor Beverly and told me that she did regret that she had not done more to assist Beverly. But she told me that she had nominated Beverly for two important university level committee assignments. These committee assignments would not only help Beverly meet the service requirements for promotion and tenure, but they would also promote her professional visibility. It seemed that Elizabeth had made an assumption about Beverly’s need for professional assistance. Since she had never asked Beverly if there were any areas where she needed assistance, it is not clear why she concluded that Beverly did not need her help.

But Elizabeth’s assumption was not totally incorrect. Beverly did not sign up for the women’s mentoring program primarily for professional support. Since Beverly was already fairly well established in her own discipline, was a much sought after writer, speaker and consultant, she did not feel the need for a great deal of career guidance. But perhaps what Beverly did want was an emotionally and culturally supportive relationship with another female faculty member. The cultural support seemed to be important to Beverly—she had requested a "Black woman with children," indicating her preference for a same-race mentor. Beverly said that Elizabeth was "probably not the best match for me" and named other female faculty members at University B who would have been better mentors for her. Beverly told me that she
accepted the fact that she and her assigned mentor were not compatible. So she sought emotional and cultural support from other female colleagues inside and outside of the university.

Both Beverly and Elizabeth told me that the women’s mentoring program was loosely structured. It is up to the mentor and the protégé to meet, determine the protégé’s needs and goals, and decide how the mentor can assist the protégé. It is suggested that the mentor and the protégé make a sincere commitment to set aside time to meet because structure is critical to the success of the relationship. It is also suggested the mentor and the protégé establish some mutually agreed upon ground rules for the relationship. But because every junior faculty member also has a tenure review committee, there seemed to be an assumption inherent in the women’s mentoring program that if the mentor-protégé relationship failed, a faculty member had the option of calling on her tenure review committee.

According to Beverly, the women’s mentoring program could be a valuable one, but it needed more structure. She told me that the program could be improved if there was a requirement that the mentor and the protégé meet at least once to determine if they were compatible and/or if they would be able to work together. And Beverly said that it was up to the mentor to take the lead in the relationship—that is, the mentor should make time to meet with the protégé. Beverly told me the departmental tenure review committee system was more effective because there were scheduled meetings and periodic evaluations of the faculty member’s progress. Beverly felt that the women’s mentoring program was probably more helpful to
female faculty members who did not feel that they had departmental support. Beverly said that she was not "dependent on the women’s mentoring program," thus she had not pursued the relationship with Elizabeth or requested another mentor. When I asked Beverly if she felt she could have called on Elizabeth for assistance if she need to, she replied, "I think I would have been able to do it. The question is really, would I have done it."

When I asked Elizabeth if she and Beverly had ever discussed by phone how Elizabeth could help Beverly, she said, "We said hello once or twice, and then I finally met her in person at a meeting." Like Beverly, Elizabeth felt that there should be some method of facilitating a meeting between the mentor and the protégé. She added that her relationship with Beverly might have worked out differently if someone had "helped them to make the connection." She said that mentoring programs at her institution were important because the university had a "poor record for tenuring women and minorities", and she added that while the climate was improving, there were still individuals on the campus who did not recognize different voices. Elizabeth also said that mentoring programs were helpful because they "eliminated the problem of telling faculty members they are doing fine and then at the tenure vote, making excuses for why the faculty member was not told the expectations."

The results might have been different for Beverly if she had not been a very confident scholar, did not have departmental support, and had not formed an informal support network with other females inside and outside of the university. Since the purpose of the women’s mentoring program is to provide support for female faculty
members, perhaps more attention should be given to matching the protégé and the mentor and providing alternatives when the mentor and the protégé decide that they are not compatible. In addition, Beverly did request a mentor, which indicates that she wanted some type of guidance from a senior female faculty member. While her preferences seemed to be based on a cultural need, inherent in that need for cultural support could also have been the desire to have an association with another African American female who could talk to Beverly about being African American and female in a predominantly White institution. Perhaps there were no other African American females who volunteered to be mentors, and as a consequence she was assigned Elizabeth.

On the other hand, perhaps Beverly signed up for the women’s mentoring program because she felt that as a new faculty member it was the appropriate thing to do. Since she admitted that she had not taken advantage of the program, perhaps she really did not consider the program to be relevant to her own needs. And it is not clear why Elizabeth did not make more of an effort to meet with Beverly. While she said she had volunteered to be a mentor to help other women, her actions were not consistent with this statement. And perhaps Beverly felt that it was not worth the effort to request another mentor. But Beverly’s case does suggest that even when institutions implement programs designed to meet the needs of women and minorities, the success or failure of the relationship is, to some extent, dependent on the individuals--the mentor and the protégé.
Discussion

The purpose of this chapter was to look at what was idiosyncratic in each case and to highlight themes in the cases which may be applicable to African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. In the last part of this chapter, I will discuss four themes that cut across the six cases.

Formal Versus Informal Mentoring

Rosemary’s case is an argument for assigned mentoring for junior faculty members as soon as they are hired. And this argument could be particularly applicable to African American junior faculty members in predominantly White institutions. Although Rosemary completed her doctoral work at another predominantly White institution, the doctoral program at this university was still in its infancy, and Rosemary did not receive the kind of training which would prepare her for the demands of a faculty career in University A. It could be argued that because Rosemary felt that she was prepared for a career in academia she did not realize that she needed someone to help her to make the adjustment to academic life. Adjusting to the role of a new faculty member is a learning experience. One of the most critical lessons Rosemary needed to learn was what the expectations were in terms of promotion and tenure in University A. A structured series of mentoring experiences could have helped to socialize her to University A, helped her to set goals, and helped her to develop a timetable for achieving those goals. While James did help Rosemary to focus her research, she probably would not have been facing a negative tenure decision if she had been assigned a mentor when she first became a faculty member.
In a culture where one’s success is measured by the number of publications he/she has, and the amount of public recognition he/she receives, perhaps Rosemary did not want to admit that she had not measured up to these standards.

The literature suggests that formal mentoring programs may be particularly beneficial to women and minorities. However, Beverly’s case challenges this argument. Beverly requested and was assigned a mentor from the women’s mentoring program at University B. But she and her mentor never met to discuss Beverly’s needs and how the mentor could assist her. While they had a relationship on paper, Elizabeth had never mentored Beverly, and Beverly never asked Elizabeth for help. Thus, in Beverly’s case the mere assignment of a mentor did not lead to mentoring. The women’s mentoring program was established to provide support and assistance to female junior faculty members, particularly for promotion and tenure. But Beverly received no such support from Elizabeth. Beverly’s story could be an isolated case. Without further investigation, I could not determine if what had happened to her had also happened to other protégés in the women’s mentoring program. But Beverly’s case does suggest that more attention should be given to monitoring the mentor and the protégé in formal programs. Even when special effort is made to match the mentor and the protégé, it is likely that there will occasionally be mismatches. Thus, those persons responsible for assigning mentors should contact the mentor and the protégé to determine if they feel that they are compatible and if the relationship is working.
Unlike Rosemary, Beverly apparently did not need a mentor for professional support. She was already a well regarded scholar with an impressive publication record, including her first book. When it came to her career, Beverly took charge of her own professional growth and development. Rather it seemed that she signed up for the women’s mentoring program because she wanted the emotional and cultural support of another female faculty member. Based on the findings in this study, it appears that the assignment of a mentor does not guarantee a successful relationship. In large part, this is determined by how the mentor and the protégé perceive their roles. Assigned mentoring could be particularly beneficial to the faculty members who come to the academy without an established research agenda, while it might be less significant for those who come to the academy with a research agenda and a publication record.

Race and Gender Match in Mentor-Protégé Relationships

Race as an issue for African Americans in mentoring relationships in higher education is a subtle one. The issue may become exacerbated when protégés pursue scholarship which is judged to be critical of the status quo. Bourguignon et al. (1987) report that adverse reactions to scholarship which is critical of the status quo or that is intended to be applied toward social change, intervention, evaluation, and policy change is criticized as nonsignificant or non-academic. Terry knew that the critical nature of his scholarship did challenge the status quo in higher education and he
anticipated such adverse reactions. Thus, it was more important to him that his mentor be "likeminded" and supportive of him given the somewhat controversial nature of his research.

Terry re-defined mentoring to fit his own needs. For him the race of the mentor was the predictor of the success of the relationship. Terry and Beverly were selective about who would mentor them. And in the case of Joann, while she did not choose her mentors, the assignment was beneficial for her because of the gender match in the case of Marcia, and the gender and race match in the case of Nancy. The commitment of Joann’s mentors to her was, to some degree, based on gender issues because both of her mentors were committed to mentoring female faculty members.

While the literature suggests that African Americans may experience difficulty finding other African American scholars to serve as mentors, this was not the case in this study. Three of the protégés did have African American mentors and their relationships were formed by traditional methods. In the remaining seven cases, cross-race mentoring was not perceived to be a major problem by the mentors and protégés. Same-race match seemed to be more of an issue to protégés who were seeking personal/cultural support from their mentors.

Idiosyncracies in the Cases

The six cases showed the variation in the sample. They illustrate that the mentoring process is idiosyncratic in and of itself. These cases suggest that protégés and mentors form these relationships for a variety of reasons, have different
perceptions of the value and/or importance of mentoring, and may have mentoring experiences different from those described in the literature. Three of the cases are particularly noteworthy.

The conflicting messages of the academy may have influenced Rosemary’s perception of the importance of mentoring. On one hand scholars are encouraged to be independent thinkers, while on the other hand they are encouraged to be collaborative. Perhaps Rosemary had been socialized to the concept of individualism, and it was easier for her to take this approach when it came to mentoring. It is clear that Rosemary did not know how to be a protégé.

Gary is an interesting contrast to Rosemary because to a great extent, his graduate school mentoring relationships shaped his perceptions about the importance of mentoring for faculty members. Gary had what his mentors termed "good social and professional skills". He was highly motivated, self disciplined, and goal oriented. In other words, not only did Gary learn how to be a protégé, he also learned the importance of mentoring because of the example set by his mentors. Unlike Rosemary, Gary had been taught that there are few rules which are cast in stone regarding the requirements for teaching, research, and service—and particularly research. Like Terry and Beverly, Gary left nothing to chance when it came to his career as a faculty member. While he also took responsibility for his own career, unlike Rosemary he also understood the value of mentoring relationships.

David’s and Scott’s relationship did not take the form of the traditional mentor-protégé relationship. While by definition the traditional association implies a junior-
senior relationship, both of these individuals were senior scholars and well established in their careers. They came together for the specific purpose of co-authoring a textbook. In this manner, the relationship was a business venture—the protégé would become a recognized scholar in his new field and the mentor would form a collaborative relationship which would perhaps be viewed as a symbol of his commitment to maximizing the success of minority faculty in University A.

These three cases illustrate the dynamic nature of mentoring. As discussed above the relationships may have different meanings to each protégé and mentor. These meanings can vary depending upon the experiences and expectations of each participant.

**Benefits to the Mentor**

The benefits to the mentor is a theme which is not covered extensively in the literature. While discussions of how mentoring relationships benefit the mentor are prominent in the literature on corporate mentoring, this is not the case in the literature on faculty-to-faculty mentoring. But the literature does suggest that sponsoring protégés can enhance the mentor’s reputation, especially when the protégés become well known. In addition, mentoring is regarded as a leadership ability by others in the field, and that the protégé helps extend the mentor’s sphere of influence.

David’s mentor benefitted because he could use his relationship with David to promote diversity in the university community. Thus Scott was able to extend the personal benefits to him to the institution. As David told me, few African Americans would have the opportunity to be mentored by a university executive. So not only is
the exposure beneficial to David, but Scott would have numerous opportunities to use
the relationship as a model in the academic community. During the process of
promoting the book, David would also be able to promote his protégé and their
relationship.

In the cases of Gary and Terry, the benefits to the mentors were fairly
obvious. Gary’s primary mentor realized early that he would be successful, thus he
could point to Gary as evidence of his own commitment to a protégé’s professional
growth and development and his commitment to helping to increase diversity in the
department. In addition he gained the personal satisfaction of having selected a
winner. Terry’s mentor also benefitted because although Terry’s scholarship was
controversial, he was a confident and goal oriented protégé. Terry’s mentor knew
that Terry was willing to work hard, understood the expectations of the academy, had
anticipated opposition to his scholarship, and had strategized how he would present his
work so that it would be acceptable. Thus his mentor was willing to make a
commitment to him because he knew that he would be successful and this success
would be a positive reflection of his efforts. Charles would also benefit from the
relationship because he would gain expertise in a new area of scholarship.

The benefits to the mentor were not as obvious in the cases of Joann and
Rosemary. In the case of Joann, her mentors benefitted because they were able to
assist another female faculty member. When Joann was in jeopardy of being denied
promotion and tenure, the mentors took pride in the fact that they were able to
influence her decisions about her future. Joann had gained recognition as a scholar in
her field and much of this recognition had come about as a result of the mentoring she received from Marcia and Nancy. Both of them had helped her to develop her research agenda and to improve writing skills. Thus, while the essence of their mentoring relationship seemed to be helping Joann to secure another position, the six-year relationship had resulted in Joann achieving promotion and tenure. In this case, the benefits to the mentors were of a more personal nature— it was the pride that her mentors took in watching another female faculty member successfully negotiate the academic structure. The benefits to the mentor in Rosemary’s case are also not as clear. Rosemary’s mentor told me that he would benefit from the relationship if Rosemary was granted promotion and tenure. Since their relationship was focused on helping her to get promotion and tenure, James would have been credited with helping Rosemary turn a negative situation into a positive one. James told me that he knew that Rosemary and the department chairperson had placed their trust in him. While he was concerned about whether he would be successful in helping Rosemary, he was worried that it might be too late. It is not clear whether James felt that he would benefit in other ways, rather he emphasized that both he and Rosemary would benefit if she was granted promotion and tenure. Rosemary was knowledgeable about the contributions of African Americans to the field of journalism and could share this knowledge with James. While James was a respected scholar in his field, he admitted that it was Rosemary who had taught him much of what he knew about the minority influence in the field of journalism.
These case illustrate that not only do mentors benefit from mentoring relationships, but that they benefit in ways which are not often discussed in the literature.
CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to investigate the mentoring experiences of African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. The literature on mentoring generally does not address faculty-to-faculty mentoring for African Americans. Rather, the majority of the literature is a discussion of mentoring and mentoring relationships in which both the mentor and the protégé are White. Thus our understanding of the mentoring process is based on a Eurocentric model which may have limited applicability to African Americans. Moreover, this traditional mentoring model may be particularly problematic for African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. In this study, I have attempted to add to our knowledge of the concept of faculty-to-faculty mentoring by presenting an analysis of ten selected mentor-protégé relationships in which the protégés were African Americans.

Summary of Findings

The findings in this study suggest that African American faculty can find both same-race and cross-race mentors in predominantly White institutions. While the literature suggests that it may be particularly difficult to find African American senior scholars to serve as mentors, three protégés in this study did form same-race mentoring relationships. In this study, seven of the protégés had cross-race mentoring
relationships, but race-match was not a significant factor in the success of those relationships. While some protégés appeared to separate their professional relationship from their personal/cultural relationship with their mentors, protégés and mentors did not perceive race to be a factor which negatively affected the relationship.

There were no consistent findings in this study which would allow me to assess the effectiveness of formal (assigned) mentoring. Contextual variables (formal versus informal) did not appear to significantly affect the mentoring relationships in this study. While the formal mentoring program was specifically designed to provide the protégés with planned mentoring experiences, there was no significant difference in the number of career and psychosocial functions performed by mentors in either context. In addition, there seemed to be little relationship between the number of career and psychosocial functions which were performed by mentors and the development of the protégé’s career. The extent to which the protégé’s career progressed varied depending on a variety of factors which included the commitment of the mentor and the protégé to the relationship, the perceived importance of the relationship to the protégé, and the purpose for forming the mentoring relationship. The literature suggests that planned mentoring can be especially beneficial to women and minorities, two groups for whom mentoring usually does not occur. However, the findings in this study indicate that the extent to which formal programs are effective in meeting the particular needs of African Americans and women is somewhat dependent on the individual characteristics of the participants.
Mentors and protégés in this study did not describe their relationships in terms of a discrete series of phases with defined beginnings and endings. While some of the relationships developed in a manner which closely resembled Kram’s (1985) stages, there were other mentor-relationships for which Kram’s theory did not apply. While this theory may be applicable to the corporate model of mentoring, further research is needed to determine if the theory can be applied to African American faculty who are protégés in predominantly White institutions.

African American protégés in this study indicated that they experienced feelings of isolation in their institutions. While the literature is virtually silent on this issue, the findings in this study indicate that although African Americans experience career success in predominantly White institutions, this is, at least somewhat related to their ability to adapt to a culture which traditionally has not welcomed minorities and where the effort to increase diversity is still very much in the developmental stages.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Mentoring is important for all junior faculty members. But mentoring may be especially important for African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. Mentoring can be used as a mechanism to maximize the productivity and success of African American scholars in predominantly White institutions. Currently, African Americans are an underrepresented group in these institutions, and mentoring can be an effective mechanism for increasing the numbers of African Americans who assume faculty positions, and who are then are promoted and tenured. Therefore, institutions should consider implementing formal mentoring programs which will include planned
experiences that will not only help African American faculty to grow and develop professionally, but will help them to adjust emotionally, culturally, and socially to institutions in which they often face alienation and isolation.

It is important that African Americans who want faculty careers in predominantly White research institutions engage in mentoring relationships while they are in graduate school. The findings in this study indicate that the majority of the protégés who had mentors as graduate students were more productive in their faculty careers than those protégés who did not have mentors as graduate students. Thus, predominantly White institutions should implement graduate level mentoring programs which would allow African Americans to cultivate relationships which would be beneficial to them over an extended period of time. In addition, mentoring African American graduate students can be used as a method to increase the diversity of the faculty. Mentoring programs can be used to socialize African American graduate students to the culture of the institution, and to build a pool of African Americans who are available to be hired as faculty members.

At the faculty level, institutions should give serious consideration to implementing some form of assigned mentoring and African American faculty should be encouraged to participate in planned mentoring experiences. While the institutional commitment to, and general guidelines for providing assistance to African American scholars may need to be articulated at the executive level, the planning and implementation of a mentoring program may need to be implemented at the departmental level. When planning the mentoring experience, department
chairpersons may need to consider whether the assignment of the mentor will be a voluntary one, how the meeting between the mentor and the protégé will be facilitated, how the relationship will be monitored, what alternatives are available to the protégé and the mentor if the match is an unsuccessful one, and what type of planned activities will best meet the needs of the protégé given the expectations of the department.

Another important consideration is how the mentor will be compensated for mentoring the junior faculty member. Given the fact that mentoring over a five to six year period takes a great deal of time, department chairpersons should provide incentives to the mentor faculty member which could include a reduced teaching load, graduate assistants, release time from regular faculty duties, and/or monetary stipends.

Collins (1990) has argued that "the first principle of mentoring is to accept the fact that the minority is unlike the majority". While the literature suggests that mentoring programs may be necessary for minorities, there is no specific reference to mentoring programs for African Americans. But the findings in this study indicate that such programs may be necessary either within or across institutions. Several of the protégés in this study turned to other African Americans inside and outside of their institution to provide them with psychosocial functions, especially emotional, social, and cultural support. Institutions should consider implementing programs which provide African American faculty with mentors in other academic departments, in administrative positions, and/or in other universities to increase the number of African Americans who are available to serve as mentors. Those persons who are charged
with planning and implementing formal mentoring programs should consider that African Americans may experience the academy differently than other groups do and that they may need to form relationships with other African Americans at both the professional and personal level.

Suggestions for Further Research

The study is limited by the small N, but because the topic is one which is underinvestigated, I chose to do an in-depth study of the mentoring experiences of a select group of African American protégés in predominantly White institutions. Because of the small N, these findings cannot be generalized to other African American protégés in similar institutions. However, the thick, rich description necessary for the reader to judge the transferability to a given situation was provided in this report. The research is intended to present a qualitative study of a small number of participants who have had a "lived experience" in a mentoring relationship.

This study was not conducted over an extended period time. While I did conduct in-depth interviews, the progression of these relationships and the dynamics of the day-to-day interactions between the mentors and protégés were not investigated. In addition, as an outsider my role as the researcher in this short-term study did not allow the establishment of a trusting relationship with the participants. Further research is needed to identify the extent to which these cases are typical of mentoring relationships in similar institutions and to address questions which may have implications for mentoring for African Americans in higher education. For example, are African American protégés in predominantly White institutions who have same-
race mentors more or less productive than African American protégés who have cross-race mentors? The findings in this study seem to suggest that at least to some extent, there are cultural factors which are inherent in same-race mentoring relationships which may contribute to the success of the relationship and therefore the success of the protégé. Further research would identify if there is a culturally distinct model of mentoring and if that model is one which can and should be taught.

Other questions which were generated as a result of this study include: to what extent are protégés’ perceptions of the importance of mentoring for African Americans determined by their years of experience as a faculty member and/or their previous experiences as protégés, what are the dynamics of cross-race/cross-gender mentoring relationships, are African American faculty members in predominantly White institutions who had mentors in graduate school more productive than African Americans faculty members who did not have mentors in graduate school, and do African Americans in predominantly White institutions benefit from formal mentoring programs which are specifically designed to meet the particular needs of minorities.

The findings from this study indicate that there is much more that we can learn about mentoring for African Americans in predominantly White institutions. Further research about these and other important questions can make significant contributions to the field.
NOTES

*Pseudonyms have been used throughout the study, both for the participants and the institutions where the study was conducted.
APPENDIX A

PROTEGE PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM
Protégé Participant Information Form

1. Name of participant ________________________________

2. Age of participant ________________________________

3. Gender of participant ______________________________

4. Name of institution ________________________________

5. Faculty rank ________________________________

6. Tenured Yes___ No____

7. Number of years at this institution ____________________

8. Number of years of university teaching experience ________

9. Academic area/subject ______________________________

10. Name of primary or assigned mentor __________________

11. Faculty rank/title of mentor __________________________

12. Race of mentor ______________________________

13. Gender of mentor ______________________________

14. How long in this relationship ________________________

15. Are there any other persons who mentor you professionally and/or personally? If so, please provide the following information:

*Name ______________________________

Institution ______________________________

Faculty rank ___________________ Academic area ________________

Race __________________________ Gender ____________________
APPENDIX B

MENTOR PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM
Mentor Participant Information Form

1. Name of participant__________________________________________

2. Age of participant__________________________________________

3. Gender of participant________________________________________

4. Name of institution__________________________________________

5. Faculty Rank or title________________________________________

6. Tenured Yes____ No____

7. Number of years at this institution____________________________

8. Number of years of university teaching experience_______________

9. Academic area/subjects_______________________________________

10. Name of protégé____________________________________________
APPENDIX C

PROTEGE/MENTOR GENERAL INTERVIEW GUIDE
INFORMAL MENTORING - UNIVERSITY A
1. Tell me about your experiences in higher education.
   - career history
   - influences of family background on your academic and career choices

   *Probe for examples

2. Tell me how a person like you becomes successful in higher education.
   - what are the things that you need to know, characteristics you need to possess/develop to become successful
   - how do you/did you learn the things you needed to know

   *Probe for examples

3. What are the most important sources of your professional and personal support?
   - family members
   - former peers and colleagues
   - current departmental colleagues
   - senior faculty in present department
   - students

   *Probe for examples

4. How would you define the term mentor?
   - what is a mentor
   - what qualities (personal and professional) are most important to you

5. How would you define the term mentoring?
   - what does it mean to you personally
   - what responsibilities are involved

   *Probe for examples
6. Did you have a mentor as a graduate student?
   - if so, how did that relationship facilitate your entry into academia as a junior faculty member
   - how did that relationship begin (formally or informally)
   - what were the advantages of having a mentoring relationship as a graduate student

*Probe for examples

7. What is the nature of your mentoring relationship with your mentor (protégé) as a faculty member?
   - same gender/race, different gender/race, etc.
   - collegial or hierarchial

8. How was this relationship initiated?
   - formally or informally
   - under what circumstances

9. What are the major characteristics of your mentoring relationship? What is most important?
   - what does your protégé (mentor) do
   - what do you do

*Probe for examples

10. The following functions/activities may be performed by mentors. Please tell me how your mentor’s (how your involvement) in these functions/activities has facilitated your (your protégé’s) professional development.
    - friendship
    - intellectual guidance/sharing
    - collaboration in research and/or publications
    - advice about publication outlets
    - constructive criticism and feedback
    - information source about university policies and procedures
    - emotional support
    - assistance obtaining employment
Protégé/Mentor General Interview Guide (Informal Mentoring)

- acquisition of grant money
- preparation for advancement (information regarding promotion and tenure/salary negotiations)
- socialization into the academic culture
- informal advice about people
- introductions to persons who could further your career
- informal advice about social norms
- belief in your capabilities
- nominations for awards
- networking in professional organizations
- opportunities for speaking engagements
- social activities (social/cultural events, eating out)
- defense from criticism by others
- help with teaching
- informal advice about committee work
- fostering your professional visibility
- encouragement and coaching
- serving as a role model
- review of drafts and papers

*Probe for examples

11. Does your mentor help you (have you helped your protégé) to overcome any obstacles/barriers

- professional
- academic climate
- emotional

*Probe for examples

12. How accessible is your mentor (are you to your protégé) to you?

- socially
- professionally

*Probe for examples
Protégé/Mentor General Interview Guide (Informal Mentoring)

13. Does having a mentor (protégé) of the same/different race/gender affect the mentoring relationship? How?
   - can the mentor articulate (can you articulate that you) he/she recognizes your cultural needs
   - how does he/she (how do you) meet those needs

*Probe for examples

14. Would you have preferred to have had a mentor (protégé) of a different/same race/gender? Why?

*Probe for examples

15. How does the academic culture in this institution affect your mentoring relationship?
   - organizational attitudes (positive/negative)
   - individual attitudes (positive/negative)
   - feeling of support
   - sense of collegiality
   - perception of discrimination

*Probe for examples--why do any of these factors affect the relationship

16. What is most meaningful to you in the mentoring relationship? Why?

*Probe for examples

17. How has your mentoring relationship contributed to building diversity in the scholarly community?

*Probe for examples

18. What, if anything have you found to be uncomfortable or stressful in the mentoring relationship?

*Probe for examples
Protégé/Mentor General Interview Guide (Informal Mentoring)

19. Why is it important to have a mentor as a new or junior faculty member?

*Probe for Examples

20. Why is it important for African American faculty members to have a mentor?

21. How have you benefitted from the mentoring relationship?

*Probe for examples

22. Do you have other mentors?

- how many
- who are they
- where are they
- how did you meet/who initiated the relationship
- tell me about this/these relationship(s)
  - why is he/she a mentor
- race/gender issue
- how has he/she mentored you
  - effects on your career -- kinds of support
- how is this relationship/are these relationships different from or similar to your primary mentoring relationship -- do they serve the same or different purposes

*Probe for examples
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PROTEGE/MENTOR GENERAL INTERVIEW GUIDE
FORMAL MENTORING - UNIVERSITY B
1. Tell me about your experiences in higher education.
   - career history
   - influences of family background on your academic and career choices

   *Probe for examples

2. Tell me how a person like you becomes successful in higher education.
   - what are the things that you need to know, characteristics you need to possess/develop to become successful
   - how do you/did you learn the things you needed to know

   *Probe for examples

3. What are the most important sources of your professional and personal support?
   - family members
   - former peers and colleagues
   - current departmental colleagues
   - senior faculty in present department
   - students

   *Probe for examples

4. How would you define the term mentor?
   - what is a mentor
   - what qualities (personal and professional) are most important to you

5. How would you define the term mentoring?
   - what does it mean to you personally
   - what responsibilities are involved

   *Probe for examples
Protégé/Mentor General Interview Guide (Formal Mentoring)

6. Did you have a mentor as a graduate student?
   - if so, how did that relationship facilitate your entry into academia as a junior faculty member
   - how did that relationship begin (formally or informally)
   - what were the advantages of having a mentoring relationship as a graduate student
   *Probe for examples

7. Tell me about the mentoring program at University B.
   - what is the process
   - who assigns the mentors
   - can you pick your own mentor
   - did you meet your mentor/protégé before he/she was officially assigned to you
   - who initiates the contact
   - do you have the option to change mentors/terminate the relationship
   - is there a written agreement
   - how often do you meet
   - how long is the assignment
   - are there written evaluations/reports, how often

8. What are your impressions of the formal mentoring program?
   - is it effective
   - what improvements would you like to see in the program

9. What is the nature of your mentoring relationship with your mentor (protégé) as a faculty member?
   - same gender/race, different gender/race, etc.
   - collegial or hierarchical

10. How was this relationship initiated?
    - formally or informally
    - under what circumstances
11. What are the major characteristics of your mentoring relationship? What is most important?
   - what does your protégé (mentor) do
   - what do you do

*Probe for examples

12. The following functions/activities may be performed by mentors. Please tell me how your mentor’s (how your involvement) in these functions/activities has facilitated your (your protégé’s) professional development.
   - friendship
   - intellectual guidance/sharing
   - collaboration in research and/or publications
   - advice about publication outlets
   - constructive criticism and feedback
   - information source about university policies and procedures
   - emotional support
   - assistance obtaining employment
   - acquisition of grant money
   - preparation for advancement (information regarding promotion and tenure/salary negotiations)
   - socialization into the academic culture
   - informal advice about people
   - introductions to persons who could further your career
   - informal advice about social norms
   - belief in your capabilities
   - nominations for awards
   - networking in professional organizations
   - opportunities for speaking engagements
   - social activities (social, cultural events, eating out)
   - defense from criticism by others
   - help with teaching
   - informal advice about committee work
   - fostering your professional visibility
   - encouragement and coaching
   - serving as a role model
   - review of drafts and papers

*Probe for examples
Protégé/Mentor General Interview Guide (Formal Mentoring)

13. Does your mentor help you (have you helped your protégé) to overcome any obstacles/barriers
   - professional
   - academic climate
   - emotional

*Probe for examples

14. How accessible is your mentor (are you to your protégé) to you?
   - socially
   - professionally

*Probe for examples

15. Does having a mentor (protégé) of the same/different race/gender affect the mentoring relationship? How?
   - can the mentor articulate (can you articulate that you recognize) he/she recognizes your cultural needs
   - how does he/she (how do you) meet them

*Probe for examples

16. Would you have preferred to have had a mentor (protégé) of the different/same race/gender? Why?

*Probe for examples

17. How does the academic culture in this institution affect your mentoring relationship?
   - organizational attitudes (positive/negative)
   - individual attitudes (positive/negative)
   - feeling of support
   - sense of collegiality
   - perception of discrimination

*Probe for examples--why do any of these factors affect the relationship
Protégé/Mentor General Interview Guide (Formal Mentoring)

18. What is most meaningful to you in the mentoring relationship? Why?
   *Probe for examples

19. How has your mentoring relationship contributed to building diversity in the scholarly community?
   *Probe for examples

20. What, if anything have you found to be uncomfortable or stressful in the mentoring relationship?
   *Probe for examples

21. Why is it important to have a mentor as a new or junior faculty member?
   *Probe for Examples

22. Why is it important for African American faculty members to have a mentor?

23. How have you benefitted from the mentoring relationship?
   *Probe for examples

24. Do you have other mentors?

   - how many
   - who are they
   - where are they
   - how did you meet/who initiated the relationship
   - tell me about this/these relationship(s)
     why is he/she a mentor
   - race/gender issue
   - how has he/she mentored you
     effects on your career -- kinds of support
   - how are these relationships different from or similar to your primary mentoring relationship--do they serve the same or different purposes

   *Probe for examples
APPENDIX E

LETTER OF REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION
Dr. John Jones  
Assistant Professor  
Education Department  
A Major Research University  
123 Education Building  
456 Education Drive  
Anytown, USA

Dear Dr. Jones:

I am a doctoral student at The Ohio State University and will be conducting research for my dissertation on the experiences of African American faculty members in predominantly White research institutions. A major focus of my research is an examination of the mentoring experiences of African American faculty members who are involved in both formal and informal mentoring relationships.

I would be pleased if you would consent to being a participant in my proposed research. Since you are now involved in a mentoring relationship, your perspective on this phenomenon would be a valuable contribution to my research. As a participant, I would ask you to be interviewed on at least two occasions. In addition, it is possible that I will need to ask you some additional follow-up questions. The unstructured interview format will be used as the primary method of data collection since the purpose of the research is to gain the participant’s perspective of their experiences with regard to their mentoring relationships in higher education. Each interview will be taped and each participant will be given a copy of the interview transcript for review.

I look forward to hearing from you, and I hope that your schedule will permit to you be a participant in this research. If you should have any questions, I can be reached at the address printed at the top of this letter.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Tillman  
Graduate Student  
Educational Administration
APPENDIX F

LETTER OF CONFIRMATION
Dear Dr. Jones:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my dissertation research. I look forward to working with you and to gaining insights into the experiences of African American faculty members in a predominantly White research institution.

As agreed upon in our conversation of (Date), I will be conducting the first interview with you on (Date and Time). I will also need a Personal Information Form from you which will be used as a part of my research (copy enclosed). If possible, please return this form to me before the date of the first interview.

Please mail this form to:

Miss Linda C. Tillman
The Ohio State University
Department of Educational Policy & Leadership
301 Ramseyer Hall
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

If you should have any questions, or if you should need to change the time and/or date of the interview, I can be reached at (Phone numbers).

Again, thank you for your willingness to be a participant in this research.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Tillman
Graduate Student
Educational Administration

Enclosure
APPENDIX G

TABLE 1: UNIVERSITY A - INFORMAL MENTOR-Protégé PAIRS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protégé</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Rosemary</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American female</td>
<td>White male professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Tenured associate professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Howard (primary mentor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American male</td>
<td>White male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn (secondary mentor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American male</td>
<td>White male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American female</td>
<td>White female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Tenured associate professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American male</td>
<td>White male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured associate professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School</td>
<td>University executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All names are pseudonyms*
APPENDIX H

TABLE 2: UNIVERSITY B - FORMAL MENTOR-PROTEGE PAIRS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protégé</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joann</td>
<td>Marcia (primary mentor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American female</td>
<td>Latin American female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy (secondary mentor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American male</td>
<td>African American male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American male</td>
<td>White male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Kenneth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American male</td>
<td>White male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American female</td>
<td>White female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured assistant professor</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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