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ABSTRACT

In the literature, mentoring relationships have been acknowledged as a significant element in the career development of professionals, including faculty and administrators in higher education. Antecedent research had not, however, described how mentoring relationships influence the faculty socialization process. The purpose of this study was to explore the link between mentoring relationships and faculty socialization.

The study participants, determined from a purposive sample, consisted of 27 full-time faculty members in the professions of business and nursing in two liberal arts colleges and one research university in the Midwest. Data were collected through interviews. Data were analyzed using an inductive approach.

A major outcome of the study was the identification of two models—focused and comprehensive—that characterized the mentoring relationships in the study. Both models provided guidance in many aspects of the faculty role; however, each model displayed distinct purposes, mentoring activities, and outcomes. The focused model of mentoring relationships, which centered on socializing the mentee in
the research/scholarship role, was most commonly represented by mentoring relationships in the research institution. The motivation for developing these relationships was intellectual stimulation and the desire to teach and conduct research. This model of mentoring relationships had a positive influence on the scholarly activity of the mentor.

Mentoring relationships illustrative of the comprehensive model were represented by alliances formed in both the liberal arts and research institutions. These relationships, formed for interpersonal as well as professional reasons, centered on socializing the mentee in the teaching role and promoted socialization to the organization. Within this model, mentors also refined their teaching role. In both models, mentoring relationships evolved to a collegial and friend relationship and had a tendency to fade in intensity. Relationships representative of the focused model remained open ended. Although geographically separated, mentors and mentees continued to collaborate in scholarly activities.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1960s many articles extolling the virtues of mentoring relationships have appeared both in professional journals and in popular magazines. Some of these, such as the article titled "Everyone who makes it has a mentor" by Collins and Scott (1978) specifically emphasize the perceived importance of mentoring in career success. Mentoring relationships have been promoted in many settings, including academia, where they have been advocated for the professional development of faculty (Wunsch, 1994a); as a vital ingredient in doctoral education (Davidhizar, 1988); as a means for developing leadership (Hamilton, 1981; McNeer, 1981, 1983; Merriam & Thomas, 1986; Moore, 1982); and as a strategy for increasing the number of minority faculty (Blackwell, 1989). Generally, higher education scholars agree that mentoring relationships are beneficial and an important influence in the career development of professionals. In fact, this positive view of mentoring has contributed to the establishment of formal or assigned mentoring programs in some organizations, including colleges and universities.
Although there is a lack of consensus about a specific definition of mentoring, there is agreement that mentoring is the process by which a more experienced or influential individual guides the development of a less experienced person. Mentors serve as role models, advisors, teachers, collaborators, confidants, and sponsors. Research suggests that mentoring relationships provide both career and psychosocial functions (Kram, 1980; Schockett & Haring-Hidore, 1985). Mentors offer organizational information and feedback on performance that assist in establishing the protégé's career. Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978), who have proposed a continuum of supportive/advisory relationships in organizations, identify mentoring as the most intense, exclusive, influential, and paternalistic of the relationships.

Mentoring, common in many professions, has been acknowledged as a significant element in business, nursing, and teaching. The business literature suggests that mentoring relationships are positively related to following a career plan (Roche, 1979); promotions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Whitely, Dougherty & Dreher, 1991); job satisfaction (Chao, Walz & Gardner, 1992); organizational socialization (Chao, Walz & Gardner, 1992); and perceived power in the organization (Fagenson, 1988).

The nursing profession attests to the value of mentoring relationships. The nursing literature indicates
that those who have been mentored report job satisfaction (Fagan & Fagan, 1983); an influence in career advancement (Price, Simms & Pfoutz, 1987); and more frequent involvement in research activities (Williams & Blackburn, 1988). Moreover, protégés report that mentors influence their career development in many ways, including sharing expertise and offering feedback on the protégé's performance (Boyle & James, 1990); serving as role models (Boyle & James, 1990; Hess, 1986; Holloran, 1989; Kinsey, 1990); providing advice (Hess, 1986); and giving scholarly stimulation (Kinsey, 1990).

Clearly, educational research corroborates the nursing studies. Higher education faculty and administrators report that mentors, in addition to providing career advice and sharing expertise, serve as role models and provide opportunities for networking, sponsorship, visibility, and collaboration (Bolton, 1986; McNeer, 1983; Merriam & Thomas, 1986; Moore, 1982; Rawl, 1989; Taylor, 1992). Studies also suggest that mentoring relationships enhance intellectual skills (Rawl, 1982; Spengler, 1992); promote scholarly activity (Butler, 1989; Queralt, 1981; Williams & Blackburn, 1988); increase self-confidence (Butler, 1989; Rawl, 1989); and provide opportunities for advancement (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988).

Research also suggests that mentor or sponsor relationships are positively related to scholarly
productivity of faculty and scientists (Cameron, 1978; Hunter & Kuh, 1985; Long, 1978; Queralt, 1981, 1982; Reskin, 1979; Williams & Blackburn, 1988). Hunter and Kuh's (1985) study of prolific scholars in higher education found that over half of the scholars had mentors who sponsored them for positions, provided networking and collaborative activities, and served as role models. In addition, Reskin (1979) found that training and collaborating with a productive sponsor during graduate school was associated with greater predoctoral scholarly productivity. Cameron (1978) determined that early career training in collaborative research projects was a strong predictor of future research success.

Moreover, studies indicate that faculty with mentors show higher performance in publication and grant and leadership records than faculty without mentors. Studies by Williams and Blackburn (1988) and Butler (1989) further support the connection between mentoring relationships and scholarly productivity. Mentor or sponsor relationships also have a great influence on initial faculty appointments (Long, 1978), which can strongly affect scholarly activity (Blackburn & Havighurst, 1979; Blackburn, Behymer & Hall, 1978; Cameron, 1978).
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The literature on faculty socialization and faculty career development, as it intersects with socialization, guides this study. In a general sense, socialization is a learning process through which persons acquire the skills, knowledge, norms, attitudes, and values associated with various roles in society (Bragg, 1976). Socialization consists of both affective and cognitive dimensions (Weidman & Stein, 1990). Faculty socialization can be viewed as the process through which individuals learn the knowledge, skills, values, behaviors, and norms associated with the faculty role. Faculty socialization is a cultural process influenced by the institution, the discipline, and the academic profession (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993).

Socialization occurs through various means, including interacting with colleagues and observing and imitating the behavior of role models (Bragg, 1976); education programs; and mentor-protégé relationships. Socialization occurs through methods that are formal and informal as well as implicit and explicit. Outcomes of socialization include the learning of skills and knowledge, and incorporating the values, attitudes, and norms of the role (Bragg, 1976).

Faculty socialization is an ongoing, reciprocal process that begins during graduate school, intensifies during the first faculty appointment, and continues throughout the
faculty career. Socialization can be viewed through stages (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Corcoran & Clark, 1984; Feldman, 1981; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Van Maanen, 1976). Anticipatory socialization is associated with the learning that occurs prior to one's organizational entry as a faculty member. This first phase includes graduate school experiences and recruitment activities. During the second stage, the entry phase of socialization, faculty are concerned with learning their role and understanding the culture of the institution, the discipline, and the academic profession. The third phase, role continuance, focuses on the continuing relationship between institution and member. It suggests role achievement in that members become "insiders" of the organization during this phase.

The initial faculty appointment is crucial to learning the values and norms associated with the academic profession and is significant in establishing a successful career (Baldwin, Chronister, Rivera & Bailey, 1993; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Thompson, 1993). These early years are also challenging for new faculty. Research indicates that new faculty experience intellectual isolation and decreased collegial support and companionship (Boice, 1991a, 1991b 1992; Fink, 1984; Mager & Myers, 1982; Reynolds, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991) and time constraints and heavy workloads (Fink, 1984; Mager & Myers, 1982; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992; Turner & Boice, 1987).
New faculty also report apprehension about teaching, scholarly productivity and achieving tenure (Sorcinelli, 1988; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Braskamp, Fowler & Ory, 1984), as well as finding their place in the college and its culture (Mager & Myers, 1982).

Novice faculty are faced with many challenges as they enter the higher education setting. They are expected to be capable teachers, active and productive scholars, advisors to students, and participants in service activities to the college, the discipline, the academic profession, and the community. Because faculty work within the culture of the academic profession, novices also are required to learn and embody the behaviors and values associated with autonomy, academic freedom, collegiality, and peer review. In addition, faculty work within an institutional culture that also must be deciphered.

Because the early years are an important period for faculty development and socialization to the academic role, many higher education scholars (Austin, 1992a; Boice, 1992; Jarvis, 1991; Sorcinelli, 1988; Sorcinelli & Billings, 1993; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Turner & Boice, 1987) advocate mentor-protégé relationships as a means of faculty development and socialization. Mentoring relationships are particularly significant for novice faculty during the initial faculty appointment, a period of intense socialization in the faculty role. In particular, Reohr
(1981) suggests that mentoring relationships may be instrumental in improving the work life and in influencing the success of the novice.

In addition to the importance of mentoring relationships for the novice, mentoring also may be significant to the socialization process of more experienced faculty. Research on adult development (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson & McKee, 1978) and on the career development of scientists (Dalton, Thompson & Price, 1977; Graves, Dalton & Thompson, 1980) and faculty (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Braskamp, Fowler & Ory, 1984) suggests that mentoring is important in various stages of a professional's career. Furthermore, Baldwin (1984) proposes that mentoring relationships can create growth opportunities for senior faculty. Mentoring also has been proposed as a method for employing the talents of senior faculty (Crawley, 1990).

Research suggests that mentoring relationships provide benefits for the mentor (Busch, 1985; Phillips, 1977; Keele & DelaMare-Schaefer 1994) as well as for the protégé. Kram (1980, 1988) views the mentoring relationship as a complementary one that benefits both mentor and protégé. Tierney and Rhoads (1993, p. 55) assert that mentoring can be "viewed as a commitment and desire to learn from the novice."

Studies of faculty socialization provide some preliminary knowledge about the effects of mentors and
sponsors on the socialization process. Research suggests that socialization patterns, which are influenced by sponsorship, can contribute to an accumulated advantage or disadvantage in women's faculty careers (Cameron, 1978; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Corcoran & Clark, 1984). In addition, research suggests that faculty socialization is enhanced through mentoring (Butler, 1989; Queralt, 1981, 1982).

Corcoran and Clark (1984), examining the socialization patterns of faculty women at one research university, found that for highly active or productive faculty women, research was prominent in their careers from anticipatory to role continuance stages of socialization; and sponsorship was vital for success in their academic career. Queralt's (1981, 1982) study, which examined the influence of mentoring on the career development of faculty and academic administrators in a state university system, found that mentors, acting as professional socialization agents, facilitated and enhanced the career development process of these individuals. Findings indicate that academics with mentors showed a higher performance than academics without mentors, in relation to publication, grant, and leadership records; academic rank; yearly gross income from professional activities; job satisfaction; and career development satisfaction. Queralt concluded that mentors contribute significantly to the advancement of academic careers.
These studies suggest that mentoring relationships influence the socialization process and contribute to career success. The research also implies that the mentor or sponsor relationship is important during anticipatory and entry phases of socialization in the faculty role.

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND NEED FOR THE STUDY

This study will add to the body of knowledge about faculty mentoring relationships and socialization in the faculty role. Although research on mentoring relationships is abundant, there are gaps in the literature this study seeks to fill. For example, information about the specific dynamics of the mentoring relationship is missing from the research. Because mentoring relationships are a significant means of faculty socialization, it is important to ascertain how and why mentoring relationships between faculty are initiated, maintained, and terminated. For what purposes do faculty enter these relationships? How does the college environment encourage or discourage establishing mentoring relationships?

The literature supports the view that mentoring relationships influence the novice's faculty performance. It seems equally important to understand the outcomes of the relationship for the faculty mentor; however, to date, the literature has implied, rather than described, how mentoring
relationships influence the mentor's career. Currently we do not know how these relationships contribute to the mentor's career success or why faculty mentors participate in these alliances. Do mentoring relationships enhance the mentor's career? Do these relationships contribute to the mentor's scholarship or teaching ability? Does the mentor benefit professionally from the relationship? The inclusion of the mentor's perspective will be an important contribution to the growing body of research on faculty mentoring relationships, because it may provide information on how these relationships influence senior faculty's performance and productivity.

Because the literature stresses the importance of socialization to career success, a need exists to study the socialization process of faculty. While previous research has focused on understanding the socialization process of novice faculty, this study makes a unique contribution to the literature by investigating the socialization process of experienced faculty. Knowledge of faculty socialization could benefit individual faculty, colleges, and universities.

The literature is significantly devoid of studies that explore and describe the link between mentoring relationships and faculty socialization. Although mentoring relationships have been advocated as a vehicle for the professional development and socialization of novice faculty in
the higher education setting (Austin, 1992; Boice, 1992; Jarvis, 1991; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993), studies that describe how faculty mentoring relationships influence the socialization process are missing from the higher education literature. How does the mentoring relationship influence the beginning years of faculty members? This question is an important area of inquiry for novice faculty and their institutions.

Additionally, although research suggests that mentoring provides networking, collaboration, sponsorship, and role modeling activities, the process through which this occurs is unknown. Currently, it is not known if mentoring relationships facilitate or inhibit the socialization process. Does a close association with another faculty member assist or restrict socialization? Additionally, how these relationships contribute to role performance or prepare faculty for the tenure and promotion process has not been explored. Most importantly, the question of how mentoring relationships influence teaching, research, and service has not been investigated.

Although the literature suggests that mentoring relationships create career development opportunities for experienced faculty, studies examining how mentoring relationships influence the socialization of experienced faculty are missing from the literature. Currently we do not know how mentoring relationships influence the career development and
advancement of senior faculty. How does the protégé influence the mentor's career development? Do mentoring relationships enhance or inhibit middle-and late-career development? Does collaborating and networking with the protégé also promote the mentor's career development?

As the first major qualitative study examining faculty mentoring relationships and their contribution to socialization in the faculty role, this research is likely to yield rich data related to faculty performance and career success. Using qualitative methods to describe mentoring relationships and how they influence faculty socialization should provide a deeper understanding of faculty development and, in turn, faculty careers.

Colleges and universities concerned with faculty development could benefit from this study. Since mentoring relationships are a significant means of socialization, administrators need to better understand the benefits and liabilities of these relationships and their connection to faculty performance, productivity, and work satisfaction. Understanding faculty mentoring relationships is important to colleges and universities that are considering, or have established, formal faculty mentoring programs. If colleges are committing resources to mentoring programs, then the outcomes of these relationships need to be better understood. Findings from this study could assist administrators
in weighing the benefits and liabilities of these relationships and, in turn, determining the value of formal mentoring programs for their institutions.

**FOCUS OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of how faculty mentoring relationships influence socialization in the faculty role. Specifically, the study described the relationship between faculty mentoring and socialization. I established two general questions to guide the research:

1. What characterizes the mentoring relationship between faculty?
2. How do mentoring relationships influence socialization in the faculty role?

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

The study used the following definitions:

- **Faculty Socialization**: the process through which individuals learn the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, norms, and behaviors associated with the faculty role.
• **Mentor:** an experienced faculty member who guides and facilitates the career development of a less experienced individual.

• **Protégé or Mentee:** a less experienced individual who is the recipient of the career guidance.

• **Mentor-Protégé Relationship or Mentoring Relationship:** an informal, long-term, reciprocal, professional relationship that is formed for the purpose of guiding the career development of the less experienced individual.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter, which presents and critiques the literatures on the mentor-protégé relationship and faculty socialization, is divided into two major sections. The first section is focused on mentoring relationships and presents a discussion of the relevant research on the mentor-protégé relationship in business, nursing and higher education. The second section presents the faculty socialization literature and begins with a brief overview of the literature on socialization. It then proceeds to a discussion of the relevant literature on faculty socialization and faculty careers.

I established some parameters for this literature review. A large segment of the literature on mentoring focuses on describing or evaluating mentoring programs for beginning teachers in primary and secondary school systems. I purposefully omitted this literature, because these relationships, which evolve from formal assigned relationships, are not the informal relationships I am studying. In
addition, the culture in the public schools differs vastly from that in higher education. Moreover, the roles, performance standards and careers of teachers in primary and secondary schools are distinct from those of higher education faculty, the focus of this study. Similarly, I elected to omit the literature focusing on mentoring relationships between undergraduate students and faculty, because these studies, which describe the outcomes of the relationship for the undergraduate student, do not provide knowledge about the faculty socialization process.

THE MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ RELATIONSHIP

The literature strongly supports mentoring for the career development, advancement, and socialization of professionals. Although there is a plethora of literature on the mentor-protégé relationship, much of the literature is anecdotal and descriptive, filled with opinions, beliefs and assumptions about the mentoring process. Articles advocating or describing formal mentoring programs are also abundant.

Much of the research on mentoring relationships has focused on two general areas. First, studies have described the mentor-protégé relationship, providing knowledge about the prevalence, nature, and benefits of the relationship in the context of various professions and settings. Second,
research has examined mentoring in relation to selected variables to determine measurable outcomes of the relationship.

Research on Mentoring Relationships in Business

Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978) are frequently credited with focusing attention on mentoring relationships through their study of the adult development of 40 men, including academic biologists. Based on interview data, the researchers concluded that mentoring was "one of the most complex and developmentally important relationships a man could have" in early adulthood (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 97), highlighting the importance of the mentor-protégé relationship in adult development. The mentoring relationship was noted to be an essential, yet uncommon, phenomenon.

The study provided the initial description of the mentor and the mentor-protégé relationship. The researchers found that mentors, typically male, 8 to 15 years older than their protégés, served as transitional figures for the younger person's movement through adult developmental stages. Moreover, the study identified the functions of the mentor, namely: counselor, teacher, sponsor, host and guide, exemplar, and supporter of the dream. The researchers found that mentoring relationships were short-lived, lasting an average of two to three years, and generally ended in conflict.
The study also suggested that the relationship was significant to both the protégé's and mentor's psychosocial development. The relationship encouraged the mentor to employ his knowledge and skills and provided him opportunities to achieve tasks associated with the developmental stage of generativity.

Although this research is often considered the path breaking work on the mentor-protégé relationship, generalization of the findings on the mentoring relationship are limited due to the small sample size and inclusion of only male participants. Additionally, the construction of a theory of adult development, rather than mentoring relationships, was the purpose of the study.

Through a national sample, Phillips (1977) studied the career development of 331 women managers and executives in business and industry through questionnaires and follow-up interviews with 50 participants. Phillips's study was important to the mentoring literature in several ways. It provided an initial and comprehensive view of the mentoring experiences of women who had been mostly excluded from previous studies, and it described the concept of career mentoring. The study provided the protégé's perspective of the relationship.

The findings suggested that two types of mentors, primary and secondary, provided assistance in the career development of participants. Primary mentors demonstrated a
stronger commitment to the protégé. They made sacrifices, took risks, and had a personal, as well as a professional, interest in the protégé (Phillips, 1977 p. 62-63). Secondary mentors, who were common in the protégé's career, lacked the closeness and intensity found with primary mentors.

Phillips' study indicated that mentoring was common; 61% of the participants reported they had one or more career mentors. The study also identified phases of the mentoring relationship, the motivation for mentoring, and problems encountered with mentoring. In addition, the study suggested that mentoring relationships were also beneficial to mentors. The study is limited by its female sample and the retrospective accounts of the subjects.

Roche (1979) provided an early study on the effects of mentoring relationships on career development. Describing mentors as persons who guide or sponsor others, Roche surveyed mostly male top business executives noted in the Wall Street Journal (n = 1250). His findings indicated that more than 60% of the participants had been mentored, a finding that refuted the suggestion by Levinson et al. (1978) that mentoring was a rare occurrence. Roche's study also found that mentoring relationships began early in the protégé's career and that mentors, who were managers, immediate supervisors, or department or division heads had substantial influence on the protégé's career. In contrast to the findings of Levinson et al. (1978), mentoring
relationships were long lasting; 40 percent of the rela­
tionships lasted 10 years or longer, while 30% continued 5
to 9 years. Moreover, Roche found that 60% of the mentoring
relationships ended amicably.

Another important finding was the determination of the
outcomes of mentoring. The study suggested that executives
with mentors earned more money at a younger age, were better
educated, and were more likely to follow a career plan and
sponsor more protégés than those without mentors. Although
a 31% return rate and the almost-exclusive male sample of
business executives limits generalization, the study
provided an initial view of some outcomes of mentoring
relationships in business.

Building on Phillips' work, Missirian (1980) surveyed
100 women business executives to determine the significance
of mentoring in their careers. Follow-up interviews were
conducted with 10 participants. The questionnaire, which
did not use the term mentor, requested subjects to determine
if there were key figures who most influenced their career
development at a critical juncture.

The study provided, from the protégé perspective, a de­
scription of the mentoring process, and it determined phases
of the mentoring relationship. The study's limitations
include the small sample of interviewed subjects (n = 10),
the exclusively female sample of managers at the highest corporate level, and the broad definition of mentoring provided.

Results of the study indicated that 85% of the respondents reported having had at least one relationship that influenced their career development, an appreciably higher percentage than Phillips' (1977) and Roche's (1979) studies. The average length of the relationship was 10 years. Mentoring relationships were initiated by the mentor and most commonly, the participants met on the job. The study also supported previous research suggesting that those mentored provide mentoring to others.

This study supported and refuted some of the previous studies. Supporting the studies of Levinson et al. (1978) and Roche (1979), Missirian's participants reported that their mentoring relationships were formed early in their careers. Her findings also supported the results of Levinson et al. that suggested the relationship is a strongly emotional one. Supporting Roche's findings, these mentoring relationships did not end unhappily; rather, they transformed into peer relationships.

Kram's (1980, 1983) study of the developmental relationships in organizations provided significant knowledge about mentoring relationships. Kram conducted intensive interviews with 18 protégé-mentor pairs in a public utility company. The study was unique in several
ways. The study provided the mentor's perspective, which had been missing in previous studies, and examined the relationship as it was occurring, rather than relying on participants' memories of the relationship. The sample of male and female subjects permitted generalization to a wider audience than previous research that studied men or women. The study was limited by the inclusion of subjects from only one organization.

Kram found that the relationships were responsive to the career and psychosocial development of both protégé and mentor, emphasizing a complementary relationships. The researcher also identified two general categories of mentoring functions, career and psychosocial, which contributed to the career advancement and personal development of participants. Career functions consisted of those activities that contributed to the mentees' career advancement and organizational socialization, including sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protecting, and providing challenging work assignments. Psychosocial functions, which resulted from the interpersonal relationship between mentor and protégé, contributed to the protégé's sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in the managerial role. Psychosocial functions included role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship.
Examining work relationships through a different perspective, Kram and Isabella (1985) studied developmental relationships in one industrial organization. The researchers interviewed 25 relationship pairs to examine how peer relationships contributed to the career development of colleagues. The researchers determined that peer relationships provided some of the same functions of the classic mentoring relationships: namely, career-enhancing and psychosocial functions. Career-enhancing functions included information sharing, career strategizing, and job-related feedback. Peer relationships also provided the psychosocial functions of emotional support, personal feedback, friendship, and confirmation. Moreover, the study suggested that peer relationships, which were more accessible and longer in duration than mentoring relationships, were characterized by mutuality.

Research in the business sector also has examined the outcomes of mentoring relationships to protégés. Research suggests that mentoring relationships are positively related to following a career plan (Roche, 1979); promotions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Whitely & Coetsier, 1993; Whitely, Dougherty & Dreher, 1991); job and career satisfaction (Chao, Walz & Gardener, 1992; Whitley & Coetsier, 1993); salary, (Chao, Walz & Gardener, 1992; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Whitley, Dougherty
& Dreher, 1991); organizational socialization (Chao, Walz & Gardner, 1992); and perceived power in the organization (Fagenson, 1988).

Other studies have examined the mentoring relationship in reference to individual and organizational factors. Two research studies suggest that gender is significantly related to the development of mentor-protégé relationships. Women working in organizations perceived male supervisors as exhibiting less mentoring behaviors toward them than toward men (Goh, 1991), and perceived more barriers to mentoring relationships than did men (Ragins & Cotton, 1991). In addition, research suggests that persons with previous experiences with mentoring relationships reported a greater willingness to mentor than those lacking mentoring experiences (Ragins & Cotton, 1993).

Klauss (1981) presented case studies related to formal mentoring programs in organizations in the public sector. Interviews with 36 mentors and protégés suggested that mentors provided career-strategy advising; individual-development counseling; sponsoring and mediating; and feedback and role modeling. The mentoring relationship benefited both mentors and protégés. Klauss concluded that mentoring relationships can be beneficial to mentors, protégés, and institutions.

In summary, many of the early studies of mentoring relationships, which were conducted in the business sector,
have provided knowledge about the prevalence and nature of mentoring relationships with managers and executives. These studies suggested that mentoring relationships provide important career development activities to protégés. Many of the research studies secured only the protégé's perspective of the relationship, and many were done through survey methodology, which sought retrospective accounts of the relationships. Finally, the variable under study, mentoring, has been defined in a different manner in each study, a fact that influences the validity of the studies as a whole, since it is possible that each study was examining a different concept.

Research on Mentoring Relationships in Nursing

Research on mentoring relationships in nursing has provided knowledge about the prevalence and nature of the relationship, and to a much lesser degree, the outcomes of the relationship. Studies have examined the mentoring relationships of nurse clinicians, executives, leaders, academicians, and academic administrators to determine the career development activities and benefits associated with these relationships. This section of the literature review discusses mentoring relationships with nurse clinicians, executives, and leaders. Studies on mentoring relationships of faculty and academic administrators are discussed in the section on mentoring in higher education.
Vance (1977; 1982) provided the earliest research that identified mentoring relationships as an important factor in the career development of nurses. Vance constructed a list of 71 identified leaders in nursing and surveyed the sources of influence and prevalence of mentoring relationships in their careers. The findings indicated that 83% of the respondents had been mentored, while 93% reported being mentors to others. Most commonly, mentors provided assistance in the form of career advice; guidance and promotion; career modeling; and intellectual and scholarly stimulation. Mentors also inspired protégés and provided emotional support.

Several studies explored the mentoring relationships of nurse clinicians. Fagan and Fagan (1983) surveyed nurses at one Midwestern hospital (n = 87) to determine the frequency and nature of mentoring compared to police officers (n = 70) and public school teachers (n = 107). The findings indicated that 52% of the nurses reported they had a mentor who was a senior colleague or supervisor. Mentors taught the technical aspects of the job, provided organizational information, stimulated confidence, encouraged creativity, and listened to protégés' ideas. The study indicated a strong relationship between having a mentor and job satisfaction.

Hamilton, Murray, Lindholm, and Myers (1989) investigated the effects of using mentors to help new
graduates in their transition to staff nurse. Graduates were placed in a group that received mentoring for 3 months (n = 7) or a control group (n = 16) that received mentoring for half that time period. Results suggested that mentoring was associated with significant differences in several areas of job satisfaction and in perceived leadership behaviors.

In a grounded theory study, Pyles and Stern (1983) interviewed 28 critical care nurses to determine their assessment and decision-making processes associated with early detection of cardiogenic shock. From the interview data, the researchers discovered a Theory of Nursing Gestalt that explained the cognitive processes used by nurses in making assessments and judgments about their nursing care. Moreover, the researchers discovered that nurses learned the nursing gestalt from a mentor. Those nurses who had the support and guidance of a mentor expressed feelings of greater self-actualization, more job satisfaction, better peer relationships, and less stress than those without mentors.

Using a qualitative methodology, Angelini (1992) explored the mentoring experiences of 37 staff nurses and 8 nurse managers in various hospitals. Data were collected through interviews and review of selected hospital documents. Angelini concluded that, for hospital nurses, mentoring is a multidimensional process involving events as well as mentoring influencials. Peers and nurse managers
served as primary influences for mentoring, and mentoring was demonstrated through positive and negative data. Staff nurses perceived mentoring as a large part of their career development.

Several studies also have explored mentoring relationships with nurse administrators. Holloran (1989) surveyed a national sample of nurse executives (n = 274) of medical centers to determine the existence and nature of mentoring and to identify the views of nurse executives who had not been mentored. She concluded that mentoring was an effective means used by senior nurse administrators to groom junior administrators. The majority of respondents (71%) reported they had been mentored. Eighty-six percent of the respondents indicated that mentoring relationships were important to their career development. Mentors assisted in the protégé’s career development by demonstrating confidence in the protégé, by encouraging independent decision making, and by role modeling. Reasons for non-mentoring related to the unavailability of mentors or problems in developing the relationships.

Larson (1986) examined the prevalence of mentoring relationships and their connection to job satisfaction and subsequent mentor relationships with nurse administrators in four hospitals (n = 116). Findings indicated that the majority of respondents had participated in a mentoring relationship; 61% had been mentored, and 58% had mentored
others. Nurses who were mentored reported higher job satisfaction scores than those who had not been mentored; however, the scores were not statistically significant. The job satisfaction scores were statistically significant when comparing those who mentored others to those who did not.

Several researchers (Kinsey, 1990; Slagle, 1986; Spengler, 1982) explored mentoring relationships with select groups of nursing leaders. Kinsey (1990) surveyed 42 nursing leaders to explore their mentoring relationships. Similar to Vance's findings, mentoring relationships were common in this select group of nurses. The findings also indicated that mentors commonly provided mentoring activities that influenced the nurses' career development, including career advice and guidance; intellectual and scholarly stimulation; professional career modeling; and inspiration and idealism. While half of the respondents could not identify any unfavorable incidents in the relationships, others related confrontation with mentors, feeling let down or over-pressured by mentors, and enduring physical separation from mentors.

Using a sample of 501 doctorally prepared nurses, Spengler (1982) examined the effects of mentoring relationships on career planning, career satisfaction, research productivity, and scholarly activities. The majority of nurses (57%) indicated they had been mentored. When compared with those who had not been mentored, those
mentored related that they had followed a more definite career plan, were more satisfied with their career progression, and had a greater sense of accomplishment related to career goals. However, no significant differences were noted between mentored and non-mentored groups concerning research and scholarship activities. Half of the mentored group, however, reported that mentors had involved them in developing and implementing research.

In summary, in the nursing literature, mentoring relationships have been explored from the perspectives of nurse clinicians, executives, and nursing leaders. This research suggests that mentoring relationships, which are common in this profession, provide important career development activities to protégés. A few studies examined the outcomes of the relationships and suggest that when compared with non-mentored groups, mentored nurses related higher levels of job satisfaction, leadership behaviors, satisfaction with career progression, and following a career plan.

Most research in nursing has focused on the experiences of the protégé. Although the studies have used various methodologies, many studies have used surveys that asked participants to recall past mentoring relationships. In addition, several studies were done in one institution, or with small samples, limiting the ability to generalize findings.
Research on Mentoring Relationships in Higher Education

Overview

In the higher education setting, mentoring relationships have been studied from the perspective of students, faculty, and administrators. Some research focused on defining and describing mentoring relationships and how they are enacted in the higher education setting (Busch, 1985; Cronan-Hillix, Gensheiner, Cronan-Hillix & Davidson, 1986; Knox & McGovern, 1988) and their contribution to career development of faculty and administrators (McNeer, 1981, 1983; Moore & Salimbene, 1981; Merriam and Thomas, 1986; Taylor, 1992). Other studies have examined mentoring in relation to selected variables, including gender (Atcherson & Jenny, 1983; Heinrich, 1990; Stonewater, Eveslage & Dingerson, 1990); race (Sands, Parson & Duane, 1992; Turner & Thompson, 1993); scholarly productivity (Butler, 1989; Rawl, 1989; Williams & Blackburn, 1988), collegial communication and support behavior (Hill, Bahniuk, & Dobos, 1989); and career development (Kremgold-Barrett, 1986; White, 1988). Many evaluative studies of faculty mentoring programs in higher education have also been undertaken (for example, Holmes, 1988; Wunsch, 1994a; Xu & Newman, 1987).

This section of the literature review begins with an examination of the research on mentoring relationships with
Mentoring Relationships with Graduate Students

Research indicates that mentoring is common during graduate studies (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Knox & McGovern, 1988; LeCluyse, Tollefson & Borgers, 1985; Simpson, 1984). Graduate students report that mentoring relationships provide various benefits, including psychological support, guidance, and professional development.

Several studies have explored the nature of mentoring relationships, including their frequency, characteristics, and mentoring activities. Using a stratified random sample (n = 177) of graduate students in departments of education in selected state-supported colleges and universities, Wilde and Schau (1991) explored mentoring relationships from the protégé's perspective. An identified weakness of the study is that the questionnaire requested participants to provide their perceptions as well as those of their mentors.

Findings indicated that mentoring relationships included both career and psychological components. These components, which occurred in differing degrees, were: psychological and professional support, comprehensiveness, mentee professional development, and collaborative research. Psychological and professional support was identified as a pervasive aspect in the mentoring relationships of the
graduate students, while professional development was identified in moderation. The comprehensiveness and collaborative research categories occurred infrequently in the mentoring relationships of these graduate students.

Additional findings indicated that with increasing age the importance of and need for the professional development activities were less. No differences were found in the mean scores in any components based on the student's sex, the sex of the mentor or the combination.

The prevalence and role of mentors in graduate training in psychology were examined by Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986). A convenience sample of 90 psychology graduate students from one large Midwestern university completed a questionnaire concerning their experiences with mentoring, characteristics and roles of mentors, and qualities associated with good and poor mentors.

The majority of participants (53%) reported having a mentor who most commonly was a full professor. Mentors, who were selected because of similar interests to those of the protégés and their teaching attributes, provided guidance and support. The data also suggested that students with mentors demonstrated higher levels of scholarly productivity.

The convenience sampling, size of the sample, and a low return rate of 55% limit the generalization of the results.
The study is also limited by the fact that the questionnaire provided no definition of mentor or mentoring, therefore, construct validity is questioned.

In their study of the mentoring experiences of female faculty and graduate students in the colleges of humanities and sciences at one university, Knox and McGovern (1988) determined that most participants reported having had a mentor, with the majority of the relationships occurring during graduate school. The participants identified a variety of characteristics deemed important in a mentor, including a willingness to share knowledge, honesty, competence, providing feedback, and willingness to let the protégé grow.

Simpson (1984) examined attitudes about mentoring relationships with 16 faculty and 60 doctoral students in psychology at one university. Findings indicated that both groups viewed mentoring relationships as valuable; and all faculty and over two-thirds of the students had participated in them. Faculty and students indicated that, most commonly, mentors entered mentoring relationships "to derive satisfaction," whereas protégés entered the alliances for the purpose of role modeling. Students and faculty agreed that the most influential factor affecting mentoring was the student/faculty ratio.

One study focused on determining outcomes of the mentoring relationship. LeCluyse, Tollefson and Borgers
(1985) investigated the differences in professional activities, GPA, and self-acceptance between mentored and non-mentored female graduate students randomly sampled from the schools of education and liberal arts and sciences at a large Midwestern university (n = 228). In the study, a mentor was defined as an individual who acted as a resource, sponsor, and transitional figure who helped the student reach major goals. Data were collected through self-report of GPA, professional activities and the Self-Acceptance Scale with established reliability and validity.

Results indicated that 76% of the participants reported having engaged in a mentor-protégé relationship with professors. Additionally, participants with mentors reported a significantly higher mean level of involvement in professional activities than those not mentored. There was no difference in mean GPA or self-acceptance scores between mentored and non-mentored participants.

Research on Mentoring Relationships of Faculty

Several studies of mentoring relationships of faculty have focused on describing or defining the mentoring relationship (Busch, 1985; Stein, 1981a, 1981b; Taylor, 1992), while other studies have investigated mentoring in relation to career development (Queralt, 1981, 1982) or scholarly activity (Butler, 1989; Williams and Blackburn, 1988). Similar to the findings of studies with graduate
students, research with faculty suggests that mentoring relationships are common with members of the academy.

Several studies have explored the frequency and general characteristics of mentoring relationships. Busch (1985) surveyed faculty in colleges and departments of education from 40 state supported colleges to examine mentoring relationship from the mentor's perspective. Results indicated that about 66% of faculty had been mentored in graduate school and those who were mentored tended to mentor others. Mentoring provided faculty opportunities to view the personal and professional growth of protégés. Mentors reported the relationships were beneficial to themselves as well as the protégés. Moreover, these relationships contributed to the mentor's career growth. Mentors identified time involvement and student dependency issues as negative effects of mentoring. Analysis also indicated that younger professor-mentors reported more depth in their relationships while older mentors described their relationships as broader.

Sands, Parson, and Duane (1991) examined the nature and extent of mentoring relationships between faculty at a public, research-oriented university through a questionnaire with tenure-track faculty (n = 557) from diverse disciplines. The majority of faculty reported having had a mentor, most commonly during graduate school. About a third of
the respondents reported participating in a mentoring relationship with a faculty member at their current university. The majority of participants mutually initiated the mentoring relationship. Relationships commonly were developed between assistant and full professors.

The researchers determined that mentoring was a "multidimensional" activity. Through factor analysis, the researchers identified several types of mentors: friend, career guide, information source, and intellectual guide. Factor one (friend) focused on psychological, social, and interpersonal variables; factor two (career guide) included collaboration, networking, promoting professional visibility activities, and professional advice about scholarly activities. Factor three (information source) focused on promotion, university policies, and committee work; and factor four (intellectual guide) included components of intellectual assistance and feedback.

Surveying faculty members in one university (n = 140), Kauth and Buch (1983) assessed the effects of personal characteristics on mentoring activity and type of mentoring provided. The response rate was 22%. Results suggested a significant difference in the frequency of mentoring by career stage; most mentors were in the mid- or late-career stages. Mentoring activities also varied by career stage.
Mentors in the early career stage provided more psychosocial support, while mentors in the mid-career stage offered both psychosocial and career functions.

Stein (1981a, 1981b) analyzed various aspects of mentoring and described the role expectations of career and doctoral mentors. Participants were faculty members in schools of education in one college and one university. Using factor analysis, the researcher determined that the expectations of doctoral mentors were to: educate protégés to the rules of the game, assist with dissertation research, provide support in seeking the first position, and include the protégé on research projects. Expectations of career mentors, which were similar, were identified as assistance in job seeking, research and publishing, learning the rules of the game, and offering moral support. Little differences were found between the expectations of college versus university faculty. Stein (1981b) found that male participants expected more friendship between mentor and protégé and greater job-seeking assistance than female participants.

Several studies have examined the effects of mentoring relationships on career development or scholarship. Through a survey, Taylor (1992) assessed the frequency, characteristics, and importance of mentor-protégé relationships among female instructors and assistant professors in university schools of nursing in the south (n = 477).
Findings indicated that the majority of faculty (60%) had at least one mentor, and over 75% of the participants were active in establishing the relationship.

Most commonly, mentors provided advice on professional situations, modeled the professional role, and offered opportunities for participation in professional activities. The findings also suggested that, although protégés and mentors often engaged in behaviors related to professional situations and practice, 56% of the respondents did not collaborate in research with mentors; almost 75% were not involved in joint publishing or presentations with mentors. A significant difference was found between the mentored and non-mentored participants related to number of publications. The findings suggested that mentoring relationships did not strongly influence the scholarly activity of the protégé.

Queralt (1981, 1982), who investigated the influence of mentoring on the career development of faculty and administrators in the state university system of Florida, had contrasting findings. A self-report questionnaire was administered to a random sample (n = 287) of participants from various disciplines to examine their career activities.

The study suggested that mentor relationships contributed significantly to the academic careers of faculty and academic administrators. Results indicated that, compared with academics without mentors, faculty and administrators with mentors showed significantly higher
levels of performance in publication and leadership records, academic rank, yearly gross income from professional activities, job satisfaction, and career development satisfaction.

Williams and Blackburn (1988), examining the relationship between mentoring and scholarly productivity, studied mentored and non-mentored nursing faculty (n = 183) in 8 of the top 20 schools of nursing. Findings indicated that close to two-thirds of those currently mentoring others had been mentored during graduate school.

Differences in productivity of junior faculty with mentors was not statistically greater than the productivity of those faculty without mentors. However, those with mentors had participated more frequently in research activities, edited a book, served as consultant, and participated in refereed forums.

Through factor analysis, the researchers identified four types of mentoring functions: role-specific modeling/teaching, encouraging the dream, organizational socialization, and advocate. Of the four mentoring functions identified, only the role-specific modeling/teaching was predictive of research productivity. This type of mentoring provided assistance with writing proposals, collaboration in research with mentor, assistance in finding funding, and conducting research.
Butler (1989) provided an additional study on the relationships between mentoring and scholarly productivity. Using an ex post facto correlational design, Butler examined the relationship between mentoring and scholarly productivity of a randomized national sample (n = 305) of doctorally prepared nursing faculty at schools offering a graduate nursing program.

Results indicated that the majority of participants were mentored for two or more of the three primary roles of teaching, research, and service. There was a statistically significant difference in the scholarly productivity of faculty who were mentored for the academic role from those who were not. Additionally, three characteristics of the mentoring relationship that influenced scholarly productivity were identified: length of relationship, when the relationship occurred, and types of support provided by the mentor. Scholarly productivity scores were higher among participants whose mentoring relationship occurred during the doctoral program or cut across two or more periods of career development, if the mentor provided a variety of supportive functions and if the relationship lasted more than two years. Mentoring was identified as significant to scholarly productivity. The strengths of the study include the random sampling and large sample. The study is limited by the female sample and self-report of scholarly activity.
The relationship between sponsorship in early-career and later-career success in research was examined by Cameron (1978), who surveyed 133 faculty members from nine universities. Career success was measured by publication rate, grants received, rate of professional collaboration, and professional network involvement. Results indicated that although women were as successful in collaboration and securing grants, they published less often than men and were not included in the networks that lead to publishing to the same extent as their male counterparts. Type of current employment and setting and the discipline played a more significant role on the career outcomes than did the sex of the faculty member.

Research on Mentoring Relationships of Academic Administrators

Although most studies suggested that mentoring is common with administrators in higher education settings (Eberspacher and Sisler, 1988; McNeer, 1981,1983; Merriam and Thomas, 1986; Rawl, 1989; White, 1988), several studies provided contrasting findings. Alexander's (1990) study of academic deans of baccalaureate nursing programs found more than half did not identify mentors, and Moore and Sagaria's (1979) survey of women administrators in Pennsylvania found that close to two-thirds of women in major academic positions indicated they had not been mentored.
Several studies examined the effects of mentoring relationships on the career development of administrators, particularly women administrators. In a qualitative study of nine women chief academic administrators, McNeer (1981, 1983) determined that mentoring was a significant factor in their career development. Six of the women (75%) identified a mentor who had significantly influenced their career through role socialization, networking and sponsoring activities, teaching job skills, career planning, and offering friendship. Mentoring relationships influenced careers at two different career points. Faculty advisors in graduate school were significant factors in socialization, job placement, and success as a faculty member. Other mentors influenced the executive’s move into administration.

Exploring the career and professional socialization patterns of top women administrators in Pennsylvania, Moore and Sagaria (1979) determined that only one-third of the respondents who held major academic position (vice-president for academic affairs, chief academic officer, or academic dean) believed that a mentor was important to their careers. The administrators of the other groups, middle academic (associate and assistant deans) and major support (student services positions) were divided evenly between those who had mentors and those who had not had mentors.

Moore and Salimbene (1981) provided knowledge about the development of and the benefits associated with the
mentoring relationship in academic and student personnel administrators. The interview data suggested that mentoring relationships developed from two major types of interactions: superior/subordinate and faculty/student. Most commonly, relationships developed between superiors and subordinates. In this interaction, the protégé often was being groomed to take the mentor's place in the institution. The other interaction that resulted in mentoring relationships, which was less common, was between faculty member and student.

The researchers found that mentors often tested and evaluated protégés; mentors pushed protégés into assignments and activities that provided a way for mentors to both test and expand the protégé's talent and abilities. The findings also suggested that mentors assisted the protégés through evaluating and correcting the protégés' performance, assisting in making contacts, and promoting visibility with colleagues. Moreover, mentors defended mentees from the criticism of others. Pressures of the relationship focused on conforming to the wishes of the mentor, particularly in relation to the job selection process. Moore and Salimbene (1981) concluded that mentoring was essential for the upward mobility of academic administrators, particularly female administrators.

White (1988) surveyed a national sample of academic administrators of baccalaureate nursing programs (n = 300)
to determine their perceptions of the role of the mentoring relationship in career development and success. This research indicated that 57% of the participants reported having mentors who provided career development activities. Eighty-five percent of the respondents indicated that the relationship was important or very important to both career development and success. Participants reported that mentors showed confidence in mentees, shared their knowledge, and encouraged intellectual development. Negative aspects of the relationship focused on the protégé's feelings of anxiety, an over-demand for loyalty, and over-manipulation on the part of the mentor. Bolton's (1986) survey of administrators in home economics supported McNeer's and White's findings that mentoring relationships enhanced professional status and provided opportunities for career development and advancement.

Rawl (1989) and Rawl and Peterson's (1992) study, which investigated the influence of mentoring on career development, provides additional support for the role of mentoring in the career development of nursing education administrators. Study participants were randomly selected from a national sample of nursing education administrators (n = 427).

Results of the study indicated that mentoring contributed significantly to the prediction level of career development. Other important variables were educational
preparation at the doctoral level early in one's career and work experiences. A significant difference was found between mentored and non-mentored participants on the total number of publications, grants funded, and number of competitive grants over $500,000. No significant differences were found in relation to the years served in national/international leadership positions, annual income, or academic rank.

Through interviews with 20 randomly selected male community college presidents, Merriam and Thomas (1986) examined the role of mentoring relationship in their career development. The research findings indicated that all presidents had more than one mentor. Mentors were identified as parents, persons in the graduate or work setting, as well as inanimate objects, such as books. The study determined that mentors performed four functions: modeling, facilitating (recommending, sponsoring, and advocating for the protégé), teaching, and encouraging. The majority of participants believed that mentoring was a significant factor in their career success.

Conclusions

Studies with graduate students, faculty, and administrators suggest that mentoring relationships are common in the higher education setting. Studies have consistently indicated that mentoring relationships influence the career development of faculty and administrators in higher
education. Mentoring relationships provide role modeling of professional behaviors, professional and emotional support, advocacy, information, and, on occasion, collaboration in scholarship. These studies also suggested that mentoring relationships contributed to socialization in the faculty role. In several studies, mentoring was linked to increased involvement in professional activities and scholarship; however, these findings are contradicted in other studies.

As evidenced in this section, many studies used survey methodology that provided the protégé's perspective. In addition, studies have not described how mentoring relationships contributed to socialization in the faculty role. Many studies were undertaken in a single setting (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Knox & McGovern, 1988; LeCluyse, Tollefson & Borgers, 1985; Sands, Parson & Duane, 1991; Simpson, 1984) or within a single discipline (Alexander, 1986, 1990; Bolton, 1986; Busch, 1985; Butler, 1989; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Elliot, Holmberg-Wright, 1983; Kremgold-Barrett, 1986; McNeer, 1981, 1983; Rawl & Peterson, 1989; Stein, 1981a, 1981b; Taylor, 1992; White, 1988; Wilde and Schau, 1991; Williams & Blackburn, 1988) which limits generalization of the findings.

Analysis of Research on Mentoring Relationships

This section of the literature review provides an analysis of the pertinent research on the mentor-protégé
relationship found in the business, nursing and education literature to further explicate the nature of the mentoring relationship.

**Length of the Mentoring Relationship**

Studies have not produced consistent findings regarding the length of the mentoring relationship. Levinson et al. (1978) found that relationships were short-termed, lasting from 2 to 3 years. Others found that mentoring relationships last between 3 and 10 years (LeCluyse, Tollefson & Borgers, 1985; Burke, McKeen & McKenna, 1993). Kram's (1980) study suggested that these alliances lasted an average of 5 years. Other studies suggest that mentoring relationships commonly are prolonged, lasting 5 years or longer (Alexander, 1986; Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Kram, 1980, 1988; Missirian, 1980; Rawl, 1989; Roche, 1979; Taylor, 1992; White, 1988). McNeer's (1983) sample of higher education administrators indicted that relationships can last up to 20 years.

**Outcomes of the Mentoring Relationship**

Although the mentoring relationship provides benefits to protégé and mentor, most research has focused on outcomes to the protégé. Mentoring relationships provided career advice and guidance; the specific career development activities offered depended upon the setting in which mentoring occurred.


Mentoring relationships also provided a variety of psychosocial functions. Commonly, mentors provided guidance, feedback, and moral support to mentees (Atcherson & Jenny, 1983; Burke, 1984; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Elliot & Holmberg-Wright, 1983; Howard-Vital & Morgan, 1993;

Outcomes of the relationship for the mentor have been studied to a lesser degree. Studies conducted in the business sector indicate that mentoring helps to meet organizational goals that could enhance the career of the mentor. Research also suggested that through mentoring relationships, mentors accomplished their own work (Phillips, 1977), controlled the work environment (Keele & DelaMare-Schaefer, 1984), and provided an additional perspective (Klauss, 1981). Mentoring also enhanced the career development of the mentor. Busch's (1985) and Keele & DelaMare-Schaefer's (1984) studies determined that mentoring facilitated mentors' career development. Williams and Blackburn (1988) indicated that two thirds of their faculty participants believed mentoring relationships enhanced their own scholarly productivity.

Mentors could also increase their prestige in the organization through these relationships (Garcia, 1993;
Phillips, 1977). Holmes's (1988) evaluation with faculty who had participated as mentors in a formalized college mentoring program for faculty found that mentoring increased networking opportunities and increased interest in aspects of their jobs.

Levinson et al. (1978) suggested that mentoring relationships contributed to the mentor's psychosocial development. From a psychosocial perspective, mentors gained a sense of pride, satisfaction, and enjoyment in participating in another's development or success, established friendships, and achieved vicariously through protégé's successes (Burke, 1984; Busch, 1985; Garcia, 1993; Keele & DelaMare-Schaefer 1984; Klauss,1981; Phillips, 1977).

**Negative Aspects of Mentoring**

Although not addressed in many studies, negative aspects of mentoring existed, and some general themes were identified from the literature. Power, authority and dependency issues are the most commonly identified negative aspects of mentoring (Holloran, 1989; Klaus, 1981; Moore & Salimbene, 1981; Rawl, 1989). On occasion, the mentor-protégé relationship also engendered negative feelings in protégés who reported anxiety, pressure, and feelings of being let down or manipulated in the relationship (Holloran, 1989; Kinsey, 1990; Moore & Salimbene, 1981; Phillips, 1977; White, 1988) or feeling they failed their mentor.
(Wilde & Schau, 1991). Mismatched expectations of mentor and protégé; professional, personal, and philosophical differences; and separation issues were additional negative effects.

Behaviors of the mentor also may negatively influence the relationship. Protégés reported that some mentors exhibited over-possessiveness or an over-demand for loyalty (Holloran, 1989; White, 1988). Some mentors misused their power with protégés, did not focus strongly enough on the protégé's needs or exploited the protégé (Holloran, 1989; Phillips, 1977; Sands, Parson & Duane, 1992).

Mentoring also can negatively impact the mentor. Garcia (1993), who examined mentoring in the federal sector, found that mentoring relationships can negatively influence one's reputation. Mentoring relationships also require time commitments from both mentor and protégé, which can be considered another negative aspect of mentoring (Bolton, 1986; Busch, 1985).

**The Development and Dynamics of the Mentor-Protégé Relationship**

The mentor-protégé relationship evolves through sequential phases (Kram, 1980, 1983; Missirian, 1980; Phillips, 1977) characterized by tasks, activities and affective experiences. Relationships were initiated in excitement and recognition of the mentor's talents, evolved through stages that focused on the mentoring activities, and ended with a separation or redefinition of the relationship. Kram (1980)
suggested that developmental factors of the mentor or protégé and organizational factors cause a relationship to move to a new phase.

Kram (1980, 1983, 1988) identified four phases of the mentoring relationship: initiation, cultivation, separation and redefinition. During the initiation phase, the participants meet, and the relationship becomes important to both mentor and protégé. The protégé views the mentor with admiration and respect; the mentor views the protégé as someone with potential. During the cultivation phase, the mentor and protégé test the expectations of each other. Mentoring functions peak during this phase, and a mutual exchange is evident. The separation phase, which occurs due to structural or psychological experiences, requires marked changes in the relationship. Commonly, feelings of turmoil, anxiety, and loss accompany this phase. A redefinition phase occurs for some relationships. In this phase, relationships ended or moved into peer friendships.

The dynamics associated with the establishment of the relationship are not clear. Most commonly, the mentor-protégé relationship is initiated by the mentor or is mutually initiated. Phillips' (1977) sample of business executives, as well as Butler's sample of nursing faculty, indicated that mentors had initiated the relationship in 41% of the group. Mentor-protégé relationships are also mutually initiated. Alexander's (1986) study of nurse
educators and nursing service administrators, and White's (1988) study of administrators of baccalaureate nursing programs, found that the majority of the participants related that their relationships were mutually initiated. Other research supports their findings (Kram, 1980; Taylor, 1992). Some studies suggested that relationships "evolved" or developed "spontaneously," suggesting a gradual, mutual initiation.

Less commonly, the mentoring relationship is initiated by the protégé. Queralt's (1981, 1982) study of faculty and administrators in the Florida state university system determined that 38% of this group indicated that, as protégés, they had initiated the relationship. Generally, less than one third of the participants of any sample indicated that the protégé had initiated the relationship.

Factors that contributed to the initiation of mentoring relationships are not well established in the literature. It is apparent that relationships form because of a proximity between mentor and protégé. Research has determined that, in the business sector, mentoring is provided by managers and supervisors (Burke, 1984; Burke, McKeen & McKenna, 1993; Kram, 1980; Phillips, 1977; Roche, 1979. In the higher education setting, mentoring occurs between faculty and administrators, (LeCluyse, Tollefson & Borgers, 1985; McNeer, 1983; Merriam, & Thomas, 1986; Moore, 1982; Price, Simms & Pfoutz, 1987; White, 1988).
Relationships are also initiated with other faculty members (Eberspacher & Sisler, 1988; Larson, 1986; Merriam & Thomas, 1986; Price, Simms & Pfoutz, 1987; Sands, Parson & Duane, 1991; Spengler, 1982; Vance, 1977, 1982).

Studies have suggested some additional factors that contribute to the establishment of the relationship. Alexander (1986) suggested that seeking the opinion of the mentor and frequent informal discussions between mentor and protégé contributed to the formation of the relationship. Kram (1988) found that senior managers were attracted to individuals with potential and to individuals they viewed as coachable. Other studies suggest that relationships are based on similar professional backgrounds, interests, or philosophies (Butler, 1989; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Kremgold-Barrett, 1986; Rawl, 1989; Slagle, 1986; Williams & Blackburn, 1988) or personal attributes of gender, race, ethnicity, social class, or socioeconomic and personal characteristics (Queralt, 1981; Rawl, 1989; Slagle, 1986; Williams & Blackburn, 1988). Protégés are attracted to mentors for various reasons, including knowledge, expertise or ability (Slagle, 1986; Taylor, 1992; White, 1988).

Although the research of Alexander (1986) and Slagle (1986) suggests that mentors are similar in personality to the protégés they mentor, Alleman and Newman (1984)
determined that mentoring pairs were no more similar in personality and background than control pairs of supervisors and subordinates.

Finally, although the study of Levinson et al. (1978) indicated that the relationship ended in conflict, other researchers (Kinsey, 1990; Missirian, 1980; Kram, 1980; White, 1988) provided a different perspective to this issue, suggesting the relationship ends positively. Hess's (1986) research determined that friendships with mentors expanded at the end of the relationship.

Summary

The research on mentoring relationships has provided some consistent findings. Mentor-protégé relationships are common within the business, teaching and nursing professions and are beneficial to the protégé, mentor and institution. The mentoring relationship is an evolutionary one, characterized by phases, with developmental tasks associated with each phase. Mentoring relationships provide various activities that promote the career development of the protégé.

The literature has left some unanswered questions about the mentoring relationships of faculty. Faculty mentoring relationships, which commonly have been studied through survey methodology, have not specifically addressed the issue of how mentoring contributes to the faculty socialization process. Critical faculty issues of career advancement,
promotion and tenure have not been addressed directly through previous mentoring studies. How mentoring relationships contribute to the process by which novice faculty learn the roles, values, and skills associated with the faculty role remains unanswered. Moreover, the advice that novice faculty request and receive from their mentors in relation to the teaching, research, and service role has not been described.

An additional void in the literature focuses on the mentor's perspective of the relationship. Most studies have investigated the relationship from the protégé's perspective; few studies have investigated the mentoring relationship from the mentor's viewpoint. Those few studies that have included the mentor's perspective have not investigated how mentoring contributes to the career development, advancement, and socialization of the mentor. It is equally important to understand the outcomes of the relationship for the faculty mentor. Currently, we do not know why faculty mentors participate in these alliances. Moreover, antecedent literature has not addressed how mentoring relationships contribute to the mentor's productivity.

The literature is significantly devoid of studies that describe the link between mentoring and faculty socialization. The literature stresses the importance of socialization to career success; however, antecedent literature
has not described how mentoring relationships contribute to the faculty socialization process of both mentee and mentor. In addition, questions such as how mentoring relationships influence the faculty member's beginning years remain unanswered.

FACULTY SOCIALIZATION

Overview of Socialization

Socialization is a learning process through which individuals acquire the knowledge, skills, norms, attitudes, and values associated with roles in society (Bragg, 1976; Hart & Naylor, 1992; Schein, 1968), or as Bess asserts (1978, p. 292), it is a process whereby one adopts values, norms and social roles. Socialization involves learning and internalizing norms, and it assists new members in adhering to the norms of a group (Clausen, 1968). Socialization begins in childhood; however, it continues throughout the life cycle as one is socialized to the roles of student, employee, spouse, and parent. Each major change of role requires some socialization.

The literature has identified elements of socialization. Socialization is a continuous, gradual, lifelong, and developmental process (Bess, 1978; Bragg, 1976; Brim, 1968; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Connolly, 1969; Van Maanen, 1976, 1984; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). It is a
reciprocal learning process in that changes occur both in the individual being socialized and the socializing agents (Bragg, 1976; Clausen, 1968; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). During professional socialization, one acquires special skills, attitudes, and values of a profession that result in a professional identity (Bragg, 1976).

Van Maanen, who has written extensively on socialization, views organizational socialization as "the process by which a person learns the values, norms, and required behaviors which permit him to participate as a member of the organization" (Van Maanen, 1976, p. 67). Organizational socialization can also be viewed as the process of learning "the ropes" of an organizational role (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Schein, 1988). Organizational socialization involves learning the culture, including what is considered important in an organization (Schein, 1988). Socialization ensues when individuals enter or cross boundaries within organizations, for example, during promotions or other role changes (Van Maanen, 1984). Therefore, socialization occurs frequently throughout one's career.

Scholarly literature suggests that socialization promotes learning in several areas, including organizational and group goals, norms, values, and culture (Feldman, 1981; Major, 1988) and work skills or tasks (Feldman, 1981; Major, 1988; Turner, 1981). During the organizational
socialization process, individuals learn the norms, organizational structures and processes, policies, power structures, history, and traditions of the setting. Appropriate role behaviors must also be learned. Socializing to group norms and values involves learning rules, informal networks, and customs associated with the group. Learning how to interact with colleagues and understanding group norms and processes is essential.

**Socialization Tactics**

Socialization occurs through a variety of methods, including education, training, orientation, and apprentice programs. Socialization also occurs through interactions with supervisors and colleagues, organizational literature, mentor-protégé relationships, professional organizations, observation of role models, and trial and error (Blackburn, 1985; Bragg, 1981; Hart & Naylor, 1992; Louis, Posner & Powell, 1983; Schein, 1988; Twale, Douvanis & Sekula, 1992). Socialization is also influenced by variables external to organizations and educational institutions. Weidman & Stein (1990) suggested society, professional organizations, and noneducational reference groups such as employer and family are also socializing forces. Socialization also builds on previous attitudes, values, and roles (Hart & Naylor, 1992; Van Maanen, 1984).

Colleagues play a significant role in socialization. Schein (1988) asserts that peers can influence the
socialization process by providing or withholding information until the newcomer is accepted. Several studies have highlighted the influence of colleagues in socialization. Research by Louis, Posner and Powell (1983) suggests that interactions with colleagues and supervisors strongly contribute to the socialization process. Surveying business school alumni from two colleges who were involved in their first full-time employment, the researchers determined the availability and effectiveness of socialization practices to newcomers, and their relationship to job satisfaction, commitment, and intention to stay with the company.

The researchers found that peers, senior co-workers, and supervisors were the most available and helpful socialization practices. Daily interaction with peers was the most important factor in helping newcomers feel effective in the organization. Interaction with peers was also available to more respondents and was significantly correlated with job satisfaction, commitment, and tenure intention.

Bragg's (1981) study also emphasized the importance of collegial interaction to the socialization process. Bragg, who studied the socialization of department heads at one university, noted that interaction with other administrators, and in particular, the pairing of more
experienced administrators with lesser experienced administra-
tors, was the most important means of learning the 
administrative role.

Outcomes of Socialization

The general outcomes of socialization relate to 
learning the behaviors, skills, knowledge, values, norms, 
and attitudes associated with a role. Weidman and Stein 
(1990) also proposed that aspirations, professional status, 
identity, and commitment are additional outcomes of the 
socialization process. Moreover, Feldman (1976; 1981) 
identified a number of behavioral and affective outcomes 
indicative of organizational socialization. These included: 
the ability to carry out roles adequately, remaining with 
the organization, the ability to innovate and cooperate to 
achieve organizational objectives, general satisfaction with 
work, internal work motivation, and a commitment to work.

The Socialization Process

Socialization can be viewed as a process, and several 
scholars (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Corcoran & Clark, 1984; 
Feldman, 1981; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Van Maanen, 1975, 
1976) have proposed frameworks to describe the stages of 
organizational or faculty socialization. Anticipatory 
socialization, the first stage of the socialization process, 
is associated with the learning experiences prior to entry 
into the organization or career. This stage includes choos-
ing an occupation and recruitment to organizations. It
generally begins during the formal education and training processes that occur prior to entry into organizations or careers. During anticipatory socialization, individuals develop expectations about the organization, occupation, or career, and begin to learn the norms, skills and behaviors associated with them. Graduate school is a potent socialization agent in the anticipatory phase of faculty socialization, because it is during graduate training that the values, behaviors, and attitudes associated with the faculty role are transmitted.

The second stage of socialization, known as the encounter (Van Maanen, 1975, 1976), accommodation (Feldman, 1976, 1981), or entry and induction (Corcoran & Clark, 1984) phase, focuses on entry into the organization or occupation. This stage is concerned with learning the roles associated with a position or occupation, establishing peer relationships, and understanding the organization and occupation. During this stage, newcomers enter the organization or occupation and confront any differences between anticipated and actual roles, which may result in a shifting of values, skills, and attitudes (Feldman, 1981). Van Maanen (1976) suggested that experiences during the entry stage are important in shaping the individual's orientation to the organization. Corcoran and Clark's (1984) research
suggests that this can be a difficult phase for faculty socialization, since performance expectations for faculty are not explicit or clear.

A number of factors mediate the entry and induction phase. Van Maanen (1976) has suggested that environmental and cultural factors (status of occupation within the organization), organizational factors (formality of setting, type of socialization), group factors (reference group input, availability of "coaches" to guide the socialization), task factors (decision-making, assigned technology tasks), and individual factors (personality and attitudes of the new employee) arbitrate this phase. Mentoring and sponsor relationships also have the potential to strongly influence this stage. Van Maanen (1976) determined that those who had a "coach" seemed to more quickly invest in the organization.

The final stage, termed metamorphosis (Van Maanen, 1975, 1976), role management (Feldman, 1976), or role continuance (Corcoran & Clark, 1984; Tierney & Rhoads, 1992) suggests adaptation to the organization and success in role achievement. During this stage, skills are mastered, roles are successfully performed, adjustment to work group values develops, and a commitment to the job is made (Corcoran & Clark, 1984; Feldman, 1981). Oblander's (1990) study of new student affairs professionals suggested that this stage was illustrated by individuals developing a professional
identity, settling in, demonstrating an interest in promoting change, and feeling a part of the organization.

As individuals progressed from newcomers to insiders and adapted to the culture of the organization, they began to share an insider's view of the organization. Frequently, symbolic transitional events, such as the awarding of tenure, verified this full membership in the organization (Schein, 1988). Role continuance socialization activities continue through faculty development activities, sabbaticals, and mentoring of younger colleagues.

Research on Faculty Socialization

Research focusing on the faculty socialization process is limited; however, the scholarly literature on new faculty and the faculty career process contributes to an understanding of faculty socialization. Most commonly, faculty socialization has been studied during the organizational entry phase of socialization, as new faculty enter the college or university.

Research on Novice Faculty

Research on new faculty provides knowledge about the entry and induction phases of faculty socialization. Studies suggest that the beginning years of the professorate are challenging ones for faculty. Research has determined that new faculty experienced intellectual isolation (Boice, 1991a, 1991b, 1992; Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli & Billings, 1993; Turner & Boice, 1987); decreased collegial support and
companionship (Boice, 1991a, 1991b, 1992; Fink, 1984; Mager &
Myers, 1982; Reynolds, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner &
Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991; Williamson, 1993); and time con­
straints and heavy workloads (Fink, 1984; Mager & Myers,
1982; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt,
1991). New faculty also reported anxiety and stress
(Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987); role ambiguity
(Williamson, 1993); apprehension about teaching, scholarly
productivity, and achieving tenure (Sorcinelli, 1988;
Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Braskamp, Fowler & Ory, 1984;
Williamson, 1993); relationships with colleagues (Mager &
Myers, 1982); and finding their place in the college and its
culture (Mager & Myers, 1982).

Whitt's (1988, 1991) study of the experiences of new
faculty in a school of education at a large Midwestern
research university provided knowledge about the entry and
induction stage of socialization. Data were collected via
serial interviews with new faculty (n = 6), single
interviews with selected administrators, observations, and
examination of selected college documents.

Whitt found that although collegiality was a high
priority for new faculty, a lack of collegiality was noted
by all respondents. New faculty felt isolated and had to
take the initiative in interactions with colleagues. Novice
faculty also felt a pressure to perform, confusion, and non-
support in the environment.
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Administrators expected new faculty to be socialized to the faculty role; to demonstrate research and teaching skills, and to embody the values, goals, and work habits of the professorate. Whitt concluded that faculty, upon assuming the initial appointment, were expected to "hit the ground running," as they entered the university.

Whitt also determined that the socialization experiences of new faculty were informal, individualized, and initiated by the newcomers. Faculty learned about the culture through the processes of listening, observing, and interacting with senior colleagues; department meetings and lunches were prime opportunities for socialization. Senior colleagues also were identified as influential in the socialization process. Although mentors were a significant socialization factor prior to the initial faculty appointment, they were not available to new faculty at the new institution.

Additional knowledge about the entry phase of faculty socialization was provided by Williamson (1993). Through qualitative methodology, Williamson examined the experiences of five female physical education teacher educators entering their first faculty positions at different research universities. Williamson found that, during their entry period, new faculty questioned their competence, felt pressured to write grants, and believed that teaching was
not valued despite their appointment in a teaching education program. Most experienced ambiguity regarding their role and tenure requirements.

Findings also suggested that collegial support was limited; feedback and evaluation was minimal; and the novices felt isolated. New faculty initially relied on their graduate school mentors for advice; however, this support decreased as collegial support was achieved. Mentoring at the new site was minimal. Williamson concluded that faculty learned about their role through a process of chance.

Several additional studies of novice faculty provide knowledge about the social support and collegiality provided to new faculty. Turner and Boice (1987), using qualitative methods of data collection, studied the first-year experiences of new faculty (n = 66) from various disciplines at a large state university. Their findings indicated that a low level of intellectual companionship existed between new and senior colleagues, and although new faculty desired interactions, they rarely sought advice from senior colleagues. The researchers concluded that relationships with colleagues were not as supportive or as stimulating as new faculty had hoped and suggested that the low levels of intellectual companionship deterred novice faculty's performance, morale, and professional development.
Additional studies support Turner and Boice's findings. A longitudinal study of new faculty from different disciplines at one large regional university (Boice, 1992) determined that new faculty found little collegiality and intellectual stimulation. New faculty viewed senior faculty as nonproductive, tired, and unable or unwilling to provide support to the novices. Sorcinelli's (1988) institutional study of the sources of satisfaction and concerns of new faculty determined that lack of time and gaps in one's knowledge base and skills were stressful to novice faculty. However, the lack of collegial support was reported as the most disappointing aspect of their first year.

Two studies provide knowledge about socialization in the teaching role. Fink (1984) studied 97 beginning geography teachers during their first year of teaching. Findings suggested that new faculty desired more support from colleagues and reported feelings of isolation, exhaustion, insecurity, and disappointment. New faculty felt overloaded and reported a lack of intellectual companionship and colleagueship from faculty, which they believed affected their teaching performance. New faculty were not aware of important knowledge related to the teaching role. Half of the new teachers had not received information on available teaching resources or the criteria by which their teaching would be evaluated.
Boice (1991b) also examined the problems and supports associated with the teaching role with new faculty, including inexperienced, returning, and experienced teachers, appointed at one comprehensive and one doctoral university. Data were collected through interviews and surveys with new faculty and teacher evaluations.

Findings indicated that new faculty experienced a lack of collegial support for teaching. In addition, they received little advice on teaching methods from senior colleagues. During the first semester of teaching, less than 5% of the participants could identify any social network for discussing teaching. Poor teaching ratings from students attested to the struggle experienced by faculty.

Although these studies with novice faculty highlighted concerns and problems, some positive aspects of this career stage also have been identified. Sorcinelli's (1988) study with 54 new faculty at a large research university found that new faculty cited their academic work, the positive atmosphere for scholarship and teaching, and support from colleagues as sources of satisfaction. Sorcinelli and Billings's (1993) institutional study determined that faculty reported satisfaction with the intrinsic rewards of the career, such as autonomy, opportunities for intellectual growth and sense of accomplishment.

In conclusion, the studies of new faculty have inherent strengths and weaknesses. The longitudinal focus of the
some studies (Boice, 1991a, 1991b, 1992; Fink, 1984; Whitt, 1991) and the multiples sources of data collection (Boice, 1991b; Fink, 1984; Turner and Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991; Williamson, 1993) are strengths of these investigations. However, limitations also exist. Some studies are limited by a single institution (Boice, 1992; Corcoran & Clark, 1984; Clark and Corcoran, 1986; Sorcinelli, 1988; Sorcinelli and Billings, 1992; Whitt, 1991) or single discipline (Fink, 1984; Mager & Myers, 1982, 1983; Williamson, 1993) focus. Small samples (Whitt, 1991; Williamson, 1993) can be viewed as both a strength and a limitation. Although small samples limit the breadth of the findings, intensive and repeated interviews with the participants can provide a depth to the study's findings.

Additional Research on Faculty Socialization

Several studies provide additional knowledge about faculty socialization. In an exploratory study, Corcoran and Clark (1984) examined faculty vitality and professional socialization with two samples of tenured women at one research university. One sample consisted of "highly productive and active" faculty members (n = 63) in selected physical and social science and humanities departments. The second sample, the representative group, was determined from a stratified sample (n = 66) of faculty from the same
departments. Participants were interviewed about their academic career, career socialization, and dimensions of productivity and success.

The researchers found that the highly active group had more research experiences during graduate study than did the representative group. In addition, the highly active group received more specific forms of sponsorship from their advisors in the form of obtaining subsequent positions, invitations to collaborate in research and writing, and support for grant applications. This sponsorship continued past graduation.

Peer contact for the highly active group also was distinguished from the representative group. While the representative group maintained social contacts with peers, the active group's relationships with peers were focused on professional activities, collaborative activities, invitations to speak, and support in obtaining employment. The study suggests that advisors and peers served as important socialization influences during the anticipatory stage of role development and that sponsoring relationships can positively influence the scholarly activity of faculty.

Additional knowledge about faculty socialization was provided through a study by Parson, Sands and Duane, (1992), who examined sources of career support of faculty at one research university. The researchers surveyed a stratified random sample of assistant, associate, and full professors
at one research university to determine sources of support for professional development and career advancement.

The findings suggested that guidance from former professors and graduate school peers declined over time. Conversely, the importance of networking with individuals in the same field increased with rank. In general, professors of higher rank, department chairs, and colleagues with the same research focus were high sources of support throughout the career.

Research on the Career Development of Faculty and Scientists

Studies that have investigated the career development of faculty and scientists also provide knowledge about faculty socialization. Two studies have investigated the career development of scientists (Dalton, Thompson & Price, 1977; Graves, Dalton & Thompson, 1980), including engineers, accountants, and professors at three universities. From the data the researchers constructed a model that describes four career stages characterized by tasks, relationships, and psychological adjustments. The model proposes that mentoring is inherent in the career of these professionals.

The model suggests that scientists begin their career under the close direction of a more experienced person. Thus, at stage one, scientists work under the guidance of mentors, with collaboration and dependence as norms. The career advances through stage two, which is characterized by independence and professional competence. During this
stage, scientists work more independently, and specialization is achieved. Peer relationships become important as individuals rely less on their mentors. The mentor stage follows, characterized by a period when scientists assume the roles of mentor, manager, or innovator of ideas. Some scientists progressed to a fourth stage, characterized by a focus on the organization. Individuals who achieve stage four are commonly managers who assist in the shaping of the organization and members in the organization. During this stage, relationships expand from inside the company to those outside the organization.

Research on academic careers has suggested that mentoring relationships are a part of the career development of professors. Using a purposive sample, Braskamp, Fowler and Ory (1984) interviewed faculty at all career stages (n = 48) from different departments at a large research university. Faculty were questioned about issues and concerns related to faculty and adult development, including sources of satisfaction, attitudes toward work, career goals, aspirations, and achievements.

From the data, the researchers constructed a conceptual framework in which the three professorial ranks represent the major changes of the professional life of faculty. Stage one (assistant professor) focuses on entering the profession and establishing and advancing the career. During this stage, faculty focused on becoming good teachers or
researchers, earning promotion and tenure, and succeeding in the profession. The associate professor stage focused on selecting a professional lifestyle and advancing in the profession. Goals focused on helping students or younger faculty and serving as mentor. The last stage, the professor stage, was distinguished by a branching out towards service to others. Characteristically, faculty served as mentors, provided service to the university and contributed to the discipline.

Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) examined faculty career development through the study of the careers of 106 randomly sampled male faculty members within specified disciplines from 12 liberal arts colleges in the Midwest. Faculty were interviewed about issues related to the faculty role, including goals, professional strengths and weaknesses, and critical career events.

Findings indicated that some faculty characteristics remained stable over time, some evolved consistently, and others fluctuated in a predictable manner during the career. Characteristics that remained stable throughout the career were the workload as a source of pressure, the importance of teaching, and the high value placed on research and scholarship. Faculty also agreed that the first few years of teaching and periods of new or added responsibilities were difficult career periods.
The study also suggested that certain faculty characteristics were common with faculty during the five stages of the academic career. In the assistant professor stage (in the first three years of teaching), faculty were idealistic, enthusiastic, and concerned about succeeding as teachers. Faculty were eager to engage in scholarship and were receptive to assistance from other colleagues. Assistant professors (with more than 3 years of teaching experience) felt more confident in their skills; however, they worried about their pending promotions. During this period, they questioned their futures in higher education and considered career alternatives.

During the associate professor stage, faculty enjoyed the peer recognition received in the promotion process and became more involved in college activities. Full professors (more than 5 years from retirement) were found to be at a turning point. Faculty in this stage related a reduced enthusiasm for teaching and research and sometimes questioned the value of their career. They extended their influence through consultation and professional organizations. Full professors (within 5 years of retirement) were contented with their career achievements. They began to withdraw from responsibilities and had limited goals for the remainder of their careers. They were commonly engaged in service to their departments or colleges and reported feeling isolated from younger colleagues.
Although these studies inform us of the faculty socialization process, the studies do exhibit limitations. Braskamp, Fowler and Ory's study was accomplished at one research university with a predominately male sample. Although Blackburn and Baldwin's study was composed of faculty from 12 different liberal arts institutions, it was composed of an all-male sample. Additionally, the samples of both studies are small. Since institution types, gender and disciplines can modify faculty career development, these findings are accepted with caution.

**Conclusion**

The studies presented in the literature review on faculty socialization suggest that socialization is an ongoing, crucial process for faculty, a process that is particularly significant during the anticipatory and entry and induction periods. Research suggests that the early academic career is a complex and frustrating period characterized by apprehension, uncertainty, and work overload. As new faculty struggle to learn and enact the faculty role, they perceive little assistance from colleagues.

Although the period of organizational entry is a crucial one for learning the faculty role, the literature suggests that little formal or explicit socialization activities are provided. Rather, socialization activities are initiated by the novice faculty member in a process that
Williamson (1993) refers to as "chance." How mentoring influences this initial socialization to the faculty role has not been addressed in the literature.

Research in faculty socialization most commonly has focused on the organizational entry period following the initial faculty appointment. Research focused on the continuing socialization process is sparse. How mentoring relationships influence the continuing socialization of faculty has not yet been described through research. Currently it is not known how mentoring relationships facilitate the mentor's socialization process. How does the protégé influence the mentor's career development? Does networking and collaborating with the protégé also promote the mentor's career development? These gaps in the literature warrant a study focused on exploring and describing how mentoring relationships influence socialization in the faculty role.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

As discussed in chapters 1 and 2, the antecedent research on faculty mentoring relationships has relied on various methodologies to address issues such as the frequency of mentoring relationships in various settings and what types of functions mentors serve for mentees. In many of these inquiries, survey methodology was used to obtain the mentee's view of the relationship. Although these studies produced important knowledge regarding what mentees gain from the relationships, they did not provide a description of how mentoring related to the faculty socialization process. The literature review left many questions unanswered. For example, for what purposes do faculty enter mentoring relationships? How do these alliances contribute to the mentee learning the research, teaching, and service roles? Do these relationships contribute to the mentor's career development? These unanswered questions contributed to my decision to focus this study on exploring the relationship between mentoring and socialization in the faculty role, and to establish the following research questions:
1. What characterizes the mentoring relationship between faculty?
2. How do mentoring relationships influence socialization in the faculty role?

As the research questions suggest, I wanted to study faculty mentoring relationships in a more comprehensive and holistic manner than antecedent literature. In this inquiry I sought to enhance understanding of the experiences and perspectives of those who have engaged in mentoring relationships as faculty members. The research questions called for a methodology that encouraged exploration, understanding, and a description of faculty mentoring relationships. Consequently, a qualitative methodology was an appropriate approach for this study.

Qualitative approaches are appropriate for studying issues in depth and detail (Patton, 1990); describing and understanding human experiences (Benoliel, 1984); discovering processes or relationships (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Marshall & Rossman, 1989); or generating theory of social process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Qualitative research is commonly used when little is known about a phenomenon (Marshall & Rossman, 1989); therefore, its methodology and philosophical underpinnings were appropriate for this study, which explored new theoretical areas.

Although there are various approaches in qualitative research, all share some elements that I viewed as
contributing strength to my study. These approaches include: holistic perspective; belief in multiple realities; emphasis on description; understanding and interpretation; flexible and emergent design; inductive approach; concern with process; interaction between researcher and participant; and emphasis on context and setting (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Patton, 1990; Streubert & Carpenter, 1995; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984).

THE PROCESS OF PARTICIPANT SELECTION

Sample

I selected participants using a purposive, non-random sampling plan. This is an approach that focuses on selecting individuals who provide a rich source of information about the problem (Patton, 1990). The purposive sampling helped me include participants of both sexes from different racial backgrounds, institutions, professions, and career stages, who provided both mentor and mentee perspectives.

Although I had originally planned to interview 30 faculty members, I ended the interviewing process when interviews yielded no new theoretical insights. My final sample consisted of 27 faculty members. This sample size is typical of qualitative inquiry in which samples are
characteristically small, and selected for the information that can be obtained from participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990).

The purposive sample consisted of faculty in the professions of nursing and business at two liberal arts colleges and one research university. I established the following criteria for the selection of participants: (a) employment as full-time, tenure-track faculty members at the selected research university or liberal arts college; and (b) appointments to a department, school, or college of business or nursing.

In the sample, I included individuals who had participated in mentoring relationships as well as those who had not participated in these alliances. I speculated that faculty who had not participated in mentoring relationships may have had different socialization experiences than those who had participated in these alliances. By including faculty who had not participated in these relationships, I anticipated providing a more comprehensive perspective of the faculty socialization process than antecedent literature and hoped to discover the influences of the mentoring relationships on those who had been directly associated with mentoring.

The business and nursing professions were selected for several reasons. The literature indicated that mentoring relationships were not unusual within these fields;
therefore, faculty who had engaged in a mentoring relationship doubtless could be located. Moreover, because both nursing and business are professional programs, the socialization processes may be more explicit and more easily described than disciplines that do not have an expected set of behaviors for applied contexts.

In the summer of 1995, following approval from The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Committee, I contacted the Chairpersons of the Departments of Nursing and Business at a liberal arts college and the Deans of the Colleges of Business and Nursing at a research university to request a list of full-time, tenure-track faculty in the selected program areas (Appendix A).

A faculty roster was provided by the Deans of the Colleges of Nursing and Business of the research institution in the summer of 1995. After a meeting and follow-up telephone call, I obtained a faculty roster from the Chairperson of the Nursing Department in the liberal arts college in the fall. Despite repeated attempts, I was unable to obtain the faculty roster for the Business Department at the liberal arts college. Because I wanted the perspectives of business faculty in a liberal arts institution reflected in this inquiry, I added another liberal arts college to the study. In the fall of 1995 I contacted the Chairperson of the
Business Department of the second liberal arts college. I requested, and promptly received, a faculty roster for this department.

Upon receiving each roster, I sent the following information to each faculty member: a letter providing information about the study and inviting participation (Appendix B), a response form, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The letter requested that faculty interested in participating in the study provide demographic data, which I then used to establish the purposive sample. Prospective participants also were asked to submit a curriculum vitae.

When faculty members returned the response sheet indicating they were interested in participating in the study, I telephoned them to schedule interviews. During the conversation, I determined their appropriateness for inclusion in the study; reiterated the purpose of the study and the method of data collection; and answered any questions.

Because no racial minority faculty had responded to the letter, and their perspectives were important to the study, a follow-up letter was sent to minority faculty at the research university. The response to my request was poor, with only one faculty member answering the letter. This individual was included in the sample.
Description of the Sample

The sample consisted of 27 faculty members; 18 faculty, or 67%, were from a research university, while 9, or 33%, represented the liberal arts colleges. Of the 27 participants, 14 (52%) faculty members taught in a College or Department of Business, while 13 (48%) faculty members taught in a College or Department of Nursing. Female faculty members outnumbered the male faculty members, with 17 women and 10 men participating in the study. This is not surprising, because the vast majority of faculty in nursing are women. Minorities were poorly represented in the study. Twenty-five of the 27 participants were Caucasian.

Rank was fairly evenly distributed among the participants. Eight faculty members held the rank of professor, while associate professors were represented by 11 faculty members. Eight assistant professors also participated in the study. Table 1 depicts the demographic and academic characteristics of the sample.

Setting

Initially, I selected two sites in the Midwest for the study: one research university and one liberal arts college. As described in the participant selection process, an additional liberal arts college was added later. I included faculty from two different types of higher education institutions so that I could describe more fully the faculty socialization process. By including faculty from
different institutions, I ensured that socialization in the three major roles of teacher, researcher, and provider of service would be represented in the study. The research institution that emphasizes scholarship and research activities would most likely provide knowledge about socialization in the research role. Conversely, socialization to the teacher role would most likely be provided by the liberal arts institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Research University</th>
<th>Libera l Arts Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Characteristics of the faculty participants
THE PROCESS OF DATA COLLECTION

Interview Process

Because I sought the participants' perspectives of their mentoring relationships and faculty socialization processes, I chose the naturalistic method of interviewing to collect data. In this study I was seeking knowledge about events and activities that I could not directly observe. Interviewing allowed me to elicit participants' viewpoints and descriptions of their mentoring relationships and to determine what participants thought and felt about these alliances.

I viewed the interview as a purposeful conversation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), an interaction between researcher and participant (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Therefore, I interviewed using a semi-structured, or interview-guide approach (Patton, 1990). With this method, I established a set of issues and topics to explore during the interview that guaranteed that I introduced all significant topics to each participant (Patton, 1990). However, I was careful not to adhere too closely to the order of the guide so that I would not restrict the interview process and inhibit participants' voicing their perspectives.

I based the interviews on the concepts of flexibility and progression. Because I wanted to respect and respond to each faculty member's story, interviews did not follow the
same format for all participants. I encouraged participants to share their perspectives in an open manner, and I followed their leads into new areas. Participants were invited to discuss additional issues related to the topic, and many participants did introduce issues unique to their mentoring relationships.

Completing the interview during the scheduled appointment time required some flexibility when participants had both mentor and mentee experiences to share. For a few faculty members, relating both perspectives taxed the scheduled hour interview time frame. During these interviews, I prioritized topics, deciding which topics to address and which questions could be condensed.

The interview process was progressive. In keeping with the tenets of qualitative inquiry, I focused on keeping the interview process emergent in design (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Patton, 1990). Data analysis was concurrent with data collection. During the early phase of data analysis, I identified themes that were incorporated into the interview guide, modifying it during the course of the 27 interviews.

Moving from one participant to another required some modification in my interviewing style. Some participants talked very freely, at times digressing from the topic. This required that I refocus on some areas. Other faculty needed more probes to gain a full description of their experiences.
I found that interviewing was a complex act (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 77), since several processes inherent in the interview process were occurring simultaneously. Although I used interview guides, each interview was unique and was based on participants' experiences. During interviews I had to consider which questions applied to each participant and how I would ask the questions.

Attentive listening also was essential. I carefully considered what participants were sharing and then made decisions about moving to a new topic or probing for more description or clarification, trying to avoid repetition. During the interview I was also considering meanings and associations that needed further description or clarification.

In addition, I was attentive to the demands of time. Faculty are busy individuals. I had negotiated a specific time frame with each faculty member, and I wanted to respect this commitment. Several interviews were interrupted by telephone calls or knocks at the door, which reminded me that time was a precious commodity for faculty.

Interviews began in September 1995 and continued through January 1996. I interviewed faculty at their college or university, natural settings in which faculty mentoring relationships take place. With one exception, I conducted all interviews in faculty offices. Most commonly,
interviews lasted between 1 and $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours. One interview lasted less than 1 hour, and another lasted for approximately 2 hours.

After seeking permission from the participants, all interviews were audiotape recorded (Appendix C). This permitted me to be more attentive to the faculty member and the interview process (Patton, 1990); produced an "unimpeachable data source" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985); and provided the opportunity to review the interview at a later time. Tape recordings provided a complete record of conversations and fostered a more accurate documentation of the data, which added to the trustworthiness of the study.

Following the interviews, I made notes about the sessions and reviewed the tape recordings. Tapes were transcribed in a timely manner following the interview. Interview Guides

I developed two interview guides from the research questions and literature review (Appendix D). One of these interview guides, which focused on mentoring relationships and the faculty socialization process, was used with faculty members who had participated in mentoring relationships. Specifically, this guide consisted of two categories of questions. One category focused on the development of mentoring relationships; mentoring activities; benefits and stresses associated with these relationships; and environmental influences on the relationships. Another
category of questions related to how mentoring relationships influenced learning the faculty role; the beginning years as a faculty member; and the development of and advancement in the faculty role.

The second of the interview guides, which focused on the faculty socialization process, was used with faculty members who had not participated in mentoring relationships. This guide centered on how faculty members learned the faculty role; the beginning faculty years; and influences on career development and advancement.

The interview guides consisted of attitudinal and behavioral questions that were formulated in an open-ended format to encourage participants to provide their perspectives and experiences. I used open-ended questions so participants could speak freely and at length on the topics. Questions were sequenced from general to specific, with later questions requesting reflection and analysis. Questions similar in content were grouped together (Dillman, 1978). At the beginning of the interview, I provided a definition of mentoring relationships and asked participants to respond to it. This provided the opportunity to discuss differences or similarities in our perceptions of the definition of mentoring relationships. Some faculty members added to the definition; however, most readily agreed that the definition coincided with their ideas about the concept.
**Preliminary Fieldwork**

Preliminary fieldwork, which I completed in May and June 1995, prepared me for gathering data for the study. The fieldwork consisted of interviewing four faculty at four different colleges located in the city where I live. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed.

This preliminary fieldwork permitted me to refine the research process. Through interviewing, I tested the wording of the questions on the interview guide. At the end of the interview, I asked participants for feedback on the questions. Following the fieldwork interviews, I altered several questions on the interview guide that previously had not been clearly stated.

The field testing also provided the opportunity to practice interviewing. Because the "quality of the information obtained during the interview is largely dependent on the interviewer" (Patton, 1990 p. 229), and the researcher is considered an instrument in qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990), I listened to the taped recordings of the interviews and critiqued my approach.

**THE PROCESS OF DATA ANALYSIS**

"Data analysis is a process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the mass of collected data"
The 27 interviews I conducted with faculty members yielded voluminous, detailed descriptions of mentoring relationships. During data analysis, I was challenged with taking the interview data and making sense of it.

In qualitative research, data analysis is an ongoing, inductive process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984), occurring concurrently with data collection. Data analysis consisted of two phases: analysis occurring during data collection, and the prolonged analysis occurring at the completion of the interviewing.

The first phase of data analysis began during the interviewing process. After interviewing a faculty member, I reviewed the audiotapes and transcripts, reflected on the interviews, and wrote memos to try to discover what knowledge had been offered to me during the sessions. During this phase, I considered the data as they were unfolding. As I listened to the interview tape recordings, I noted emerging themes. This early phase of data analysis informed the interview process. As the study progressed, I clarified these emerging themes with participants and added additional questions to the interview guide.

The second phase of data analysis occurred after all data had been collected. This was a prolonged and intense period of immersion in the data. The data analysis that
occurred at this time consisted of several interrelated processes: organizing data, searching for patterns, discovering what was important, synthesis, and determining what to report (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Interpretation was an inherent part of the data analysis process.

**Organizing Data and Searching for Patterns**

The organizing of the data and searching for themes and patterns, which began during the data collection phase, intensified during this phase. As I continued to read the interview transcripts I carefully considered the data and emerging themes. During these readings, I also highlighted quotes that I determined were representative of important aspects of mentoring relationships and faculty socialization. In addition, I also provided selected transcripts to a peer debriefer who read the interview data, identified, and verified some emerging themes.

The coding and searching for themes, which was an important component of the organization of the data, was predominately accomplished using *Martin* (Diekelmann, Lam and Schuster, 1990), a data management software program for qualitative research. *Martin* stores, sorts, and retrieves data; and its functions include attaching codes to segments of the data and searching for text segments according to codes.

Using the *Martin* program, data organization and beginning analysis progressed in the following manner. Once
interviews were transcribed, I transferred them to a *Martin* file. After reading and re-reading the interview data, I coded data segments onto a "card" on which I attached a written memo. As I continued coding, I added, refined, and collapsed codes. I continuously compared new codes with existing ones, determining if new data fit established codes. Some of the data fit more than one code; and with the *Martin* program, I was able to assign any number of codes to a data segment. As I worked through the data I transferred some coding cards to folders, establishing patterns and themes, thus constructing a theoretical understanding of the data. When I completed coding each interview transcript, I received a printout of all coded cards and folders, with accompanying narratives.

Coding was an evolutionary process of sorting and defining data. Initially, I used the interview questions as a basis for coding. Other themes and patterns emerged from the data inductively as I continued to search the data for meaningful themes and their relationship to one another.

I was concerned that, during the coding and analyzing of data into small units, I would lose sight of the big picture, the major themes in the interview data. To address this concern, I continued reading transcripts to maintain a connection with the whole and to consider data beyond the individual codes. A peer debriefer also helped me stay connected with the larger picture.
Discovering What Was Important and Synthesis

Searching for patterns and discovering what was important were intertwined processes that led to the synthesis of data. Uncovering themes was a creative process, as well as a frustrating and tedious one. As themes and patterns emerged, I carefully considered which were more significant to the study and how the themes related or connected with one another.

I established themes for phrases and ideas that seemed significant in the data. For example, the theme of balance appeared both explicitly and implicitly throughout the interviews and seemed integral to mentoring relationships. Upon discovering the theme, I went back to the transcripts to determine how pervasive and important the theme was and to look for supportive and contrary examples. I discovered that balance was significant in all relationships. Moreover, balance was exemplified in these mentoring relationships in many different ways. For example, mentoring relationships demonstrated the theme of reciprocity, which exemplified a balancing. Both mentors and mentees had related examples of how mentoring relationships contributed to their career advancement and how balance was demonstrated through their relationships. Mentors also advised mentees about how to balance the research, teaching, and service roles. When mentors and mentees collaborated, they often balanced one
another's strengths and weaknesses. Thus, I determined balancing was a significant theme in these relationships.

Typologies, classifications, or schemes also can be useful aids in identifying themes and explaining findings (Patton, 1990; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). I explored a variety of directions and possibilities before I decided that the typology of the models of mentoring relationships represented a significant finding of this study. The models of mentoring relationships emerged through the processes of analysis and synthesis.

Through analysis, I determined specific themes associated with the relationships. As I contemplated these themes—for example, mentoring activities or motivation for mentoring—I noted a divergence when contemplating the collective data. As I considered the emerging themes in the context of the data as a whole, two models—focused and comprehensive—emerged from the participants' stories of mentoring relationships.

Initially, I assumed that the models were related to the higher education settings in which faculty taught, with one model representing the liberal arts colleges and the other representing the research university. I evaluated this emerging hypothesis by returning to the data to search for cases that fit, broadened, or cast doubt on the
hypothesis (Patton, 1990). As I scrutinized the transcripts, I discovered that my working hypothesis was not supported by all relationships.

Re-examining the data, I considered another hypothesis: that the distinction between the two models was not related to the setting; rather the differences resided in the purposes and processes inherent in the mentoring relationships. Specifically, the two models of mentoring relationships represented different types of mentoring. This hypothesis was supported by the data. I determined that these models provided pertinent knowledge about the mentoring relationships represented in this study and decided to communicate the findings of the study through this framework.

Determining What to Report

The study data were extensive, and the findings could be presented in many different ways. As noted, I determined that the theme of balancing and the models of mentoring relationships were pivotal findings of the study and should therefore be highlighted in the report.

I had other considerations for the report. I wanted the findings to clearly present participants' experiences and feelings about their mentoring relationships. To ensure this, I embedded quotations throughout the findings.

I also wanted the collegial nature of these relationships to be prominent in the report. As I reviewed the
data, I realized that these relationships, although commonly
established between individuals in hierarchial roles, were
characterized by their egalitarian and collegial nature.
The term protégé, commonly used to depict the less experi­
enced member of the relationship, portrayed a relationship
that was unidirectional in advisement and hierarchial in
nature. I determined that the word mentee sounded more
egalitarian and better characterized the mentoring
relationship in this study.

In addition, I was cognizant of the need to avoid
generalizing in the narrative. When faculty perspectives
and experiences were reported, I indicated to what degree
they represented the entire sample. For example, when a
theme or idea represented the majority of participants, I
noted this as "most" faculty members' perspectives.
Conversely, when a statement or idea represented only two or
three participants, I indicated that as "a few" faculty.

TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

Enhancing the quality and credibility (Patton, 1990) or
trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of the data findings
is an important focus for researchers using qualitative
methods. I wanted my interpretations to be trustworthy so
that colleagues could use these findings to expand or inform
their own work (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).
The trustworthiness of qualitative research cannot be evaluated by the same criteria used to assess quantitative research. Patton (1990) suggests that credibility, in part, depends on rigorous techniques and methods for gathering high-quality data that is carefully analyzed, as well as on the credentials of the researcher. In this study, I established a variety of techniques and processes to enhance the trustworthiness of my data. These included member checks, using peer debriefers, limited triangulation, and alertness to my subjectivity (Patton, 1990).

**Member Checks**

In member checks, the data and interpretations are tested with groups who provided the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Some member checking occurred during the interviewing when I clarified concepts and ideas with participants. However, the official member checking occurred during data analysis when I selected several individuals to participate in follow-up interview sessions to share my interpretations and to determine if the findings represented their experiences.

I conducted the follow-up interviews with three study participants who had related rich descriptions of their mentoring and socialization experiences and who appeared committed to the study and agreed to participate in the follow-up session. Moreover, two faculty members' mentoring
represented the comprehensive model of mentoring relationships, while the other's represented the focused model of mentoring relationships.

Prior to the interview, I provided the participants with a written synopsis of the analysis, which included a summary of the models of mentoring relationships. During the sessions, I shared the major patterns and themes with participants. I requested their responses to the analyses and inquired about how accurately the themes reflected their mentoring relationship and socialization experiences. I asked them what their responses were to the two models of mentoring relationships and which model represented their mentoring relationship.

All faculty members supported the analysis and verified my interpretations. One faculty member commented that she agreed with everything that I had written. Faculty members identified which model was representative of their mentoring relationship, verifying my analysis. Two participants made suggestions regarding the models, which were incorporated into the written report of the findings.

Peer Debriefing

Peer debriefing was an ongoing part of the data analysis process, with several colleagues working with me during both phases of the analysis. Initially, a peer debriefer read transcripts to assist in the identification of themes and in general helped me process the data. During
our sessions we also discussed my thoughts, ideas, and frustrations associated with the study. The discussions helped me to crystallize patterns and working hypotheses.

Later in the analysis process, peer debriefers examined transcripts to verify or refute themes, particularly the general theme of balance and typology of models of mentoring relationships that I used as a framework for the discussion of my analysis. One peer debriefer who herself had engaged in a mentoring relationship provided valuable insights during this process.

Limited Triangulation

Triangulation, the combination of multiple methods in a study (Denzin, 1970), is essential in naturalistic studies (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Denzin (1970) identifies four types of triangulation: data, investigator, theory, and methods.

Triangulation of data sources was used in this study. Data triangulation, the inclusion of multiple sources of data within a study (Mitchell, 1986), is exemplified through theoretical sampling (Denzin, 1970). I used a variety of data sources, including faculty of different academic rank and gender from two distinct professions. In addition, interviewing faculty from different higher education settings helped me to examine what mentoring relationships have in common across settings.
Alertness to My Subjectivity

Because researchers are human instruments in qualitative inquiry, it was important that I remain cognizant of the perceptions and biases I brought to this study. Like many researchers, I had some preconceptions and biases as I entered the study. For example, upon entering this study I believed that mentoring relationships were very beneficial alliances. Because of this bias, early in the analysis I tended to focus on the positive aspects of the relationship and was inclined to overlook problems in the relationship. Through recognition of the bias and the suggestions of others, I also examined the problems and strains of the relationships.

I focused on my subjectivity in different ways. My thoughts, beliefs, and biases associated with the study were shared with peer debriefers.

During the study, at times I had a tendency to have tunnel vision in the analysis. Peer debriefers encouraged me to examine the analysis in a more comprehensive manner and cautioned me about premature closure with any theme or idea. I sought and received their ideas which helped keep me open to new theoretical possibilities.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical considerations of this study focused on informed consent and confidentiality. All participants were informed of the purpose and the voluntary nature of the
study through an introductory letter and follow-up telephone conversation. Prior to the interview, participants' rights were discussed, and faculty members had the opportunity to ask questions about the study. Before the interview, all participants signed an informed consent form that documented their willingness to participate in the study. This form described the purpose of the study, time commitments, data collection method, and my plan to tape record the interviews. A copy of this form was given to each participant. Tape recordings of the interviews occurred only after permission was obtained from participants.

I maintained participant confidentiality through several methods. Participant lists, audiotapes, transcripts of interviews, and consent forms were stored in a safe place in my home. No names were used in the transcripts or tape recordings. Tapes and transcripts were assigned a code number that was used to identify the participant. In the report, I used pseudonyms to present the case studies, and I presented quotations in a manner that did not identify participants.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992, p. 109) relate: "Ethical considerations are inseparable from your everyday interactions with your others and with your data." As a researcher, I endeavored to be forthright with participants regarding all aspects of the study. I broached many topics in the interview but did not probe into issues that seemed
institution-related and that did not specifically relate to the study's focus. I conducted myself professionally and, to the best of my knowledge, I maintained a strong ethical presence throughout this study.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations are consistent with social research (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). One limitation of this study relates to the generalization of the findings to other populations and settings. Transferability of the findings should be done with caution. As suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985), the degree to which insights gained in one context may be transferred to another context is limited by the extent to which the conditions are similar. This research evolved from the perspective that it is not the researcher's role to provide for transferability, rather the researcher provides a thick description that makes transferability a judgment on the part of the reader (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

This study also is limited by the sample in several ways. The sample is small in size and almost exclusively Caucasian; only a few minority faculty members participated in the study. Although I made a concerted effort to contact minority faculty members, the limited numbers included in the study precluded including their perspectives of mentoring. Minority faculty may have had different mentoring or socialization experiences that are not represented in this study.
In addition, women faculty members represented 63% of the sample. Although gender was not a central issue in this study's design there are obvious questions about the effects of gender on the study. How were faculty mentoring relationships influenced by gender? How did gender contribute to the development of these relationships?

Moreover, the sample included only faculty from two professional programs, business and nursing. These professions are not representative of many of the academic disciplines that comprise the academy. As indicated in Biglan's (1973) research, academic disciplines differ in their norms concerning commitment to teaching, research, and service, social connectedness among faculty members, and the scholarly output of faculty. Expanding the purposive sample and including faculty from different disciplines may have produced different narratives and diverse findings. For example, the business discipline represents a soft, applied non-life-discipline (Biglan, 1973). Including faculty from a hard, pure, and non-life-system discipline, for example, physics or chemistry, may have provided different mentoring and socialization experiences than those found in this study.

Many faculty recounted experiences that had occurred in the past, and at times, the distant past. These experiences
may be influenced by poor memories. All of these factors influence the ability to generalize the findings to other settings.

Role of the Researcher

The discussion of methodology is not complete without considering my role as researcher and how my educational and life experiences contributed to this study. My interest in mentoring relationships began early in my doctoral program when I learned of assigned "mentoring" programs for teachers in primary and secondary schools. I knew of mentoring relationships in business and was surprised to learn that the concept had transferred to the educational setting. I wondered if this concept of mentoring had transferred to the higher education setting, where academic freedom and autonomy were highly valued. With this question, I began examining the literature on mentoring relationships.

Several life experiences also contributed to my studying faculty mentoring relationships. My background is nursing, a profession that values supportive relationships. Many nurses are altruistic persons; therefore, faculty assisting other faculty is a natural occurrence. Moreover, I have been a faculty member in several institutions of higher education, where I have viewed many supportive relationships between more experienced faculty and less experienced faculty. My experiences indicated that these relationships were short-lived and evolved around course or
job-related issues, rather than around the broader scope of career development as suggested by the literature. I was unsure if these could be viewed as mentoring relationships. Because as a faculty member I had not experienced a mentoring relationship and in my doctoral studies did not see evidence of these relationships between faculty and students, I was interested in better understanding these relationship and their value to participants.

In this study, I have functioned in the roles of researcher, learner (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992), and crafter. As a researcher, I asked questions, collected data, studied details, and examined and analyzed materials in a rigorous manner. Most importantly, as researcher, I was an instrument, a part of the study. I drew on my own experiences as faculty member and nurse clinician and on my own knowledge and theoretical perspectives to guide the study and interpret data. I believe these factors contributed to the richness of the study.

As a learner, I was open and exploring. I attempted to set aside my own beliefs about mentoring relationships and be open to all that I could discover about these relationships. Glesne and Peshkin (1992, p. 37) suggest that data collection engenders feelings of uncertainty: “Expect to feel—all at the same time or in close sequence—that you are not learning enough . . . that you are not learning the right stuff.” During the interviews I endeavored to set
aside the literature's ideas and assumptions about mentoring relationships so that I could hear all the stories that were told, even though at times I struggled with that. For example, initially, as participants talked of their relationships, I evaluated their stories with my perceptions of the relationship. I questioned: Are these good data? Are the data correct? I turned to my qualitative research textbooks and determined that this feeling was not unique (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Remembering that qualitative data are contextual, I accepted the knowledge the participants were providing me.

Although previous professional experiences prepared me for some aspects of the research, as a learner in this study, I heightened some professional skills. For example, in a previous position as a mental health clinical nurse specialist, I commonly interviewed clients and families about health issues. Because I counseled persons, I was accustomed to hearing clients' stories and had developed good listening skills. These interviews with faculty participants were different from my other professional experiences. In some ways, the interviews associated with this study were more intense than those I had experienced in other professional settings. The study strengthened both my interview and interpretation skills.

I was a learner in other ways. My preparation for this study included literature reviews, taking research courses,
and reading avidly about qualitative methodology and mentoring relationships. Through the study, I learned qualitative methodology and the unique role of the qualitative researcher. I also obtained knowledge about the faculty role and how it is enacted in different settings. This will be very beneficial to my own development as a faculty member.

I also played the role of crafter. Taylor and Bogdan (1984) view qualitative research as a craft and the researcher as a craftsperson. Through this study, I crafted problem statements, research questions, and a literature review. Interviewing also required skill and precision. In this study, I was also creating. Data analysis and writing were activities that required insightfulness and creativity, essential attributes of a skilled craftsperson.

The researcher, learner, and craftsperson roles were important to this project; and during the course of defining and implementing this study, I was required to skillfully balance these roles. Because this was a research study, the researcher role needed to be prominent. But it could not impinge on the learner and craftsperson roles that added the richness and depth to the study.

Summary

This chapter presented the research design and methodology that I used to explore the relationship between mentoring relationships and faculty socialization. Using a
purposive sample, I interviewed 27 faculty members who taught in the professions of business and nursing in two liberal arts and one research university. Data analysis was accomplished through a process of organizing data, searching for patterns, discovering what is important, and synthesis. In this chapter I also presented my role of researcher and outlined procedures I employed to establish the trustworthiness of my findings.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The faculty mentoring relationships represented in this study were complex. Inasmuch as they strongly focused on professional and intellectual issues, they also extended beyond that. Descriptions of the relationships ranged from pragmatic (one faculty member noted: "A mentoring relationship is how you gain an understanding of the unwritten rules and assumptions about your job") to ethereal (another faculty member explained: "Mentoring is about helping another grow and find their way"). The focus of mentoring—career development—encompassed both day-to-day job-related concerns as well as broader future-oriented career issues. In essence, faculty mentoring helped another person learn some of the expectations of being a member of the academy.

Mentoring relationships in the current study began with a professional and purposeful connection but clearly evolved to a friendship. All mentors and mentees discussed their relationships in positive terms, and the pleasure associated with these alliances was evident. Comments such as the
following suggested the relationship was characterized by a strong emotional attachment:

- I really liked him.
- I love her.
- The relationship is wonderful for both parties.

Mentors and mentees related feelings of happiness, delight, comfort, and enjoyment when discussing the relationships; they enjoyed one another and enjoyed working together. For example, a mentee in business described his mentor as a friend, philosopher, and guide.

Early in the interview process, I realized that mentoring was beneficial to both mentees and mentors. As I continued to talk with faculty members, I recognized that balance was a pervasive element of the relationships. Examining The Oxford English Dictionary (1989), I found that balance reflects equilibrium, general stability between forces within a system, or harmony between parts. Balance can also be viewed as pondering or estimating aspects or sides, or a weighing or considering of things.

Balance is a relevant symbol and theme for mentoring relationships that promoted harmony within the faculty roles and stability within careers. Mentoring relationships guided the career development of the less experienced faculty member and in doing so, they attempted to bring into harmony the many activities that comprised the faculty role.
Two models characterized the mentoring relationships in this study. Mentoring relationships in both models demonstrated a balancing in professional, interpersonal, and institutional dimensions; the extent and manner in which mentoring relationships balanced these dimensions differed in the two models. On a professional level, mentoring relationships promoted stability within the careers of both mentees and mentors. These alliances enhanced the careers of both participants. At the interpersonal level, balance was demonstrated through the development of the relationship and the balancing of the risks and benefits associated with the alliance. Mentoring relationships also helped balance the institutional environment. Serving as counterbalances, mentors helped mentees manage the institutional environment. Mentors commonly sponsored mentees, provided assistance in the promotion process, and facilitated the mentee's organizational entry, which placed the mentee in a position to be successful in the setting.

Using the general theme of balance, this chapter addresses the research questions that guided the study:

1. What characterizes the mentoring relationships between faculty?

2. How do mentoring relationships influence socialization in the faculty role?
MODELS OF FACULTY MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

Each mentoring relationship was distinctive in terms of its development, dynamics, duration, and outcomes. As I examined the themes and characteristics of these mentoring relationships, two principal models emerged. These two models--focused and comprehensive--represented the collective stories of faculty socialization (Richardson, 1990, p. 26) of most of the participants. Each model displayed different purposes, activities, outcomes, and to a lesser extent, diverse dynamics and processes. Although distinctive, the two models were not exclusive. Elements of one model, such as promoting scholarship, were found to some extent in the other model. However, each model represented unique characteristics of the relationship and a distinctive method of mentoring.

The vast majority of the relationships can be categorized as focused or comprehensive. These two models of mentoring relationships could be compared to two types of camera lenses. When taking a picture, one can choose to capture an image broadly with a wide angle lens, or narrowly with a telephoto or zoom lens. Different lenses produce different, but perhaps equally satisfying, results. In a meadow, for example, one could use a telephoto lens to focus on one flower, providing an intense and focused photograph.
with one sharp image in the forefront. Other images are present in the background, but the single flower is the focus of the picture.

Conversely, if one were to use a wide-angle lens in the same meadow, one could obtain a comprehensive view of all the flowers in the meadow with no particular flower becoming the focus.

The telephoto or zoom lens represents the focused model of mentoring relationships. These relationships focus intently on one area of career development and socialization. The wide-angle lens represents the comprehensive model of mentoring relationships. These relationships have a wide focus and encompass many aspects of faculty socialization. The focused and comprehensive models of mentoring relationships are depicted in Table 2 and are discussed more fully in the following sections.

Three mentoring relationships representative of the focused model evolved into a third or merged model. In this merged model, elements of both focused and comprehensive mentoring relationships were evident. Although the relationships evolved into alliances that provided many of the mentoring activities found in the comprehensive model, scholarship remained the focus of the relationship. Because the vast majority of mentoring relationship in this study represented the focused and comprehensive models, the findings center on these two models.
### Table 2. Characteristics of the focused and comprehensive models of mentoring relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focused Model</th>
<th>Comprehensive Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentee's Professional Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mentee's Professional Dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization in faculty role with emphasis on research role</td>
<td>Organizational Socialization; Socialization in faculty role with emphasis on teaching role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Activities that benefit mentee: advisement, sponsorship, guiding the research role</td>
<td>Mentoring activities that benefit mentee: advisement, guiding the teaching role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks for Mentee: Establishing own scholarly identity; living up to mentor's standards</td>
<td>Risks for Mentee: Being viewed as insecure or dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor's Professional Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mentor's Professional Dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refining research role</td>
<td>Refining teaching role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits for Mentor:</strong> Collaboration; provides new opportunities; psychosocial benefits</td>
<td><strong>Benefits for Mentor:</strong> Expanding the faculty role; psychosocial and political benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks for Mentor: Risk to reputation if chooses a mentee who does not perform well</td>
<td>Risks for Mentor: Feeling accountable for mentee's performance and behavior; tarnishing own reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most commonly, relationship initiated between student-teacher, advisor-advisee</td>
<td>Relationship initiated between faculty colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for mentoring: conduct and teach research; intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>Motivation for Mentoring: professional and interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor examines mentee's intellectual skills and research potential</td>
<td>Mentor examines mentee's personal qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship progresses to colleagues and friends; Relationship fades, but collaboration continues</td>
<td>Relationship progresses to colleagues and friends; Relationship fades with minimal contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Institutional Dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal influence on entry into new organization; promotion and tenure process; protecting and sponsoring mentee in institution</td>
<td>Significant influence on entry into organization; promotion and tenure process; sponsoring and protecting mentee in institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FOCUSED MODEL OF FACULTY MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

The focused model of mentoring relationships typically was found in the research university. This model concentrated on socializing the mentee to one aspect of the faculty role, the research/scholarship role. Although this model describes relationships that provided guidance related to multiple dimensions of the faculty role, it was the scholarship that attracted and linked the mentor and mentee. In this model, mentors functioned as teachers, role models, sponsors, and collaborators of research/scholarship.

Illustrations of the Focused Model

Susan's Mentoring Relationship

Susan was a graduate student in nursing when she first met her mentor, a professor. They met through courses, and Susan eventually became a research assistant and advisee of her mentor. Susan related that after knowing her mentor through classes she "leapt at the opportunity" to obtain a research position with her and noted that the research assistantship "really . . . accelerated the [mentoring] process, made it more concrete. It bound us together for future endeavors."

Susan and her mentor were together 5 to 10 hours per week in these research activities. This frequent contact

---

1 All names are pseudonyms
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afforded Susan many opportunities, including observing the
research process in action and understanding what it takes
to keep a research program going. Susan described:

I realized how to continue on a program, how to
keep a program going . . . write abstracts when
the time came up. When they [abstracts] are
accepted, how to write the papers. How to go
through all the stages of the research process and
how to continue beyond the ending of one project
onto the other . . . . I did so many research
things with her, abstracts, designed a project
from beginning, many times we did research
together. We got at least five separate projects
together. I learned that by doing it with her and
writing with her. Having ongoing research
projects was really helpful . . . . They are
skills you don't often learn when you are writing
a dissertation. You have to learn these skills
from getting in and having access to a project
. . . . I felt really prepared and really
confident to pursue independent research.

Susan's collaboration with her mentor strongly
influenced her socialization in the research role. Her
mentor, who modeled the role of researcher, was the
definitive source for learning the research process. These
collaborative activities provided the means for Susan's
mentor to assess and refine Susan's intellectual and
research skills. In time, the mentor shaped other
professional opportunities for Susan, including recommending
her for presentations at conferences and appointments to
national committees.

Susan has left the institution where her mentor
teaches. However, the research collaboration continues.
Susan and her mentor are partners in scholarly endeavors. Susan recounted:

We are a sounding board for each other. She [mentor] now often asks me to review things that I am not an author on. She respects my opinions on things, policies and research design . . . .

Susan also has influenced her mentor's scholarly productivity. Through Susan's initiation, they have secured additional grants and have presented their research at yearly professional meetings.

Susan believes the skills learned from her mentor in the research process enhanced her confidence to successfully enact a variety of faculty roles, including teaching and providing service to professional organizations.

**Frank's Mentoring Relationship**

Frank, a faculty member in business, described his relationship as an "extremely important, intellectual and emotional" one. He began his mentoring relationship when he assumed his first faculty position. His mentor was a member of the search committee that hired him, and Frank was attracted to his scholarly abilities. As Frank remarked, "We connected intellectually."

Frank and his mentor simultaneously initiated the relationship. Both individuals were interested in an intellectual partner. Frank believed that his graduate program had not prepared him for independent scholarly work, and he was looking for a mentor who would assist him in his intellectual development. He related:
I think I needed him because I was asking questions that I thought he could help me answer. I think he needed me because he was asking the same questions and he thought I could help him answer them. There was a lot of intellectual respect back and forth.

Much of what occurred in the relationship focused on intellectual activities such as debating and discussing theories and ideas. Frank joined his mentor in giving presentations and educational programs and in providing consultations to businesses. They have collaborated in publishing and have sponsored one another for conferences and other scholarly opportunities.

Frank has mentored others, with relationships generally beginning while mentees are doctoral students. He commonly has served on mentees' graduate committees, and his mentees have served as his research assistants. He carefully assessed his mentees' abilities prior to establishing relationships. Frank views mentoring relationships as opportunities to prepare scholars and, conversely, for bright individuals to intellectually stimulate him. He has involved mentees in consulting and teaching opportunities outside the university. His relationships have continued after graduation, with a focus on scholarship.
BALANCING THE MENTEE'S PROFESSIONAL DIMENSION: PROMOTING STABILITY IN THE MENTEE'S CAREER

"She pushed me beyond what I thought I could do." -- Mentee

Relationships within both models helped to balance mentees' careers. The processes through which this was done differed between models. In the focused model, mentors helped to stabilize the mentees' career through advisement, sponsorship, and guiding the development of the core faculty roles.

Balancing the Career Through Advisement

Advisement was a prominent activity in the mentoring relationships represented in both models. Since mentoring relationships provided guidance about "how to conduct oneself as a professional," the advice ranged from providing contacts for publication to deliberating a career move. In the focused model, advisement tended to center on broad issues, such as scholarly activity, securing a faculty position, and establishing visibility as a professional.

Much of the guidance focused on scholarship. Mentors, as seasoned scholars, had publication experience and technical knowledge that benefited mentees. Mentors knew how to write grants and how to connect with experts in the field who could support their research. They advised
mentees on many aspects of their scholarship, including grant and abstract writing, and the logistics of obtaining letters of support for research.

Because relationships were established prior to or while mentees were seeking first faculty positions, advice also centered on interviewing and securing faculty appointments. Mentors knew the reputations of college departments and their faculty as well as the strengths and weaknesses of various programs, and offered advice about schools that would be "a good fit" for mentees. One mentor coached his mentees on the interview process and the presentation of research that accompanied it. Once the appointment was secured, mentors offered advice about how to succeed at these colleges. Mentors also advised mentees on subsequent faculty appointments.

Some mentors also offered advice about how to obtain visibility in the profession. Mentors were knowledgeable about how service activities could advance or inhibit mentees' career advancement. They provided advice about the types of articles mentees should be writing to secure tenure and which national committees could promote scholarship and visibility.

Stabilizing the Career Through Sponsorship

Within the university, some mentors sponsored mentees for assistantships, funding, and research grants. However, in this model, mentors commonly sponsored mentees in
activities that promoted visibility in the larger professional community. Mentors helped mentees make the right connections with different groups. Many mentors also invited mentees to participate in meetings and conferences and sponsored them for national committee appointments, journal editing, task forces, consulting jobs, and publishing opportunities. A mentor in business provided an example of external sponsorship that occurred through mentoring:

A big name asked me to write a chapter in their book and I said I was busy and gave it to [this] junior faculty person. And in essence, I was certifying this person could do a good job.

Sponsorship also occurred through collaboration with mentors. Collaborating with the mentor in research, publishing, and presentations enhanced the mentee's reputation beyond the university, thus promoting the mentee's career outside of the college. These collaborative activities often contributed to additional professional opportunities.

Some mentors also provided sponsorship for initial and subsequent faculty appointments, as noted by a mentee in business:

He [mentor] was very successful in helping me get my first position because he wrote the letter of recommendation. He contacted the school. He made sure that I had a defensible proposal to talk about. He let me know what the interview process was going to be like and he contacted schools . . . and was a very strong supporter in my behalf . . . . He played a very active role in my career development.
Promoting Harmony in the Core Faculty Roles

To be successful in academia, faculty members must learn and skillfully balance the teaching, research and service roles and the myriad activities associated with these roles. Mentoring relationships provide a means through which mentees determine the relative importance of each role and establish harmony among the many facets of the faculty role. A mentee in nursing noted this balancing when she related:

She [mentor] tried to put things in the right perspective and [encouraged me] not to get too wrapped up in any one thing to the exclusion of other aspects of academic life.

In the focused model, relationships primarily centered on the research/scholarship role, and mentors provided support for learning the research process in several ways. Many mentees and mentors collaborated on research projects that provided mentees the opportunity to learn research from an established researcher. When collaborating, mentees received intensive instruction in the research process and had opportunities to observe all aspects of a research study. In a few situations, mentees served as project directors, learning the day-to-day activities associated with a research study. The collaborative work allowed mentors to recognize and develop the mentees' knowledge and
skills. This often resulted in sponsorship for other scholarly activity, such as nominations for presentations and faculty positions.

Mentors brought unique perspectives to mentees' scholarly projects that also helped to develop the mentees' scholarship role. Based on their knowledge and experience as scholars, mentors provided critical feedback to mentees' projects and provided different ways of viewing the scholarship. The feedback often broadened the mentees' ways of examining the issue or research question, expanding their research perspective. This expanding of the scholarship perspective was important to increasing the mentee's productivity and the numbers of publications resulting from research. A mentee related this example:

From the dissertation I ended up with four manuscripts and one of them was something she [mentor] thought of. The idea of just changing, pulling this data and putting it in here to address a recent article that had been put out which I hadn't thought of in that respect. I had collected all the data. I had done the analysis, but I hadn't thought about putting it together quite like that and it was a good data-based article . . . .

Another mentee in business provided an additional example of how his mentor's perspective enhanced his projects:

He could contribute substantially to them with his perspectives on the issues . . . his input was always helpful . . . . What he would do would be to take whatever I was working on and bend it one way that I hadn't thought about. He had a different way of looking at problems that's just
different from the way I looked at them. And he was always able to contribute something substantial because he was illuminating something I had never thought of before.

Mentors also strengthened the mentees' research role by providing access to data sets; advising on writing abstracts and grants; critiquing manuscripts and grant applications; and recommending journals for article submission.

Some mentors strongly supported and guided the mentee's publishing process, keeping the mentee "on track." Mentors commonly encouraged article submission and followed up on the revision of articles. They provided an expectation to do research, to present it, and to get it published.

Although the research/scholarship role was a strong focus of the relationship, mentors also balanced the teaching role to a much lesser degree. Several mentees related that they had received little guidance related to the teaching role. However, a few mentors guided the teaching role through observing the mentees' teaching, while one mentor helped the mentee view the role realistically—something that can be problematic for new faculty. A mentee in nursing related the following about her mentor:

She has given me advice and perspectives on teaching. As a new teacher you get totally immersed and wrapped up into this whole idea of being a perfect teacher and making sure every lecture has every bit of knowledge the person will ever need. And I had a very hard time with that. I struggled at the beginning trying to figure out about what to teach students, what to include . . . how much energy to expend on these lectures . . . . She helped me gain perspective on that.
Because several mentees had taken courses from their mentors, they had observed the teaching style of the mentors, which also provided socialization in the teaching role.

The guidance offered about the faculty service role was minimal. Advice related to institutional service centered on limiting service commitments so that time and energy could be committed to scholarly activity. One mentee noted that the mentor "gave advice on what to avoid, good committees and bad committees, which [committees] to stay off of because they would kill you with work." Mentors also suggested that mentees focus on key committees valued by colleagues. A few mentors also advised mentees on providing service to professional organizations that could support the mentee's scholarship and promote visibility nationally.

BALANCING THE MENTOR'S PROFESSIONAL DIMENSION: PROMOTING HARMONY IN THE MENTOR'S CAREER

"I thought if I worked with him he could do a lot for me. And I thought I fit a place in his life where he needed a younger more ambitious guy who was willing to put up with all the headaches a big project takes."

-- Mentee

The mentoring relationships represented in the focused and comprehensive models were characterized by reciprocity. Mentoring relationships afforded benefits for both parties and promoted harmony in the careers of mentors as well as
mentees. These alliances provided positive professional and personal outcomes for the mentor, supporting a balanced view of the relationship, as noted by a mentee: "I brought some things they didn't know about and they brought a lot of things I didn't know about." Mentoring relationships enhanced mentors' careers through the refining of the scholarship/research role, providing new opportunities, and offering psychosocial benefits.

Refining the Mentor's Research Role

Reciprocity was especially prominent in the focused model, where collaboration with mentees influenced the scholarly activity of the mentor, further refining the mentor's research/scholarship role. Many mentors benefited from working with young scholars who helped generate research ideas. Mentees provided different theoretical perspectives and ideas and broadened the mentor's way of looking at questions. In some cases, the theoretical insights were stimulating to mentors, encouraging them to view accepted ideas through a new perspective. A mentor in business related:

Actually the best stimulation I have gotten around research issues has not been from mentors but from mentees . . . who have come to this field with very, very different perspectives and produced some really exciting ideas.

Another mentor noted that mentees provided new theoretical insights that helped his research:

It's a benefit to have young people coming up interested in the research in my area because it
helps keep me current. It helps me generate research and research ideas . . . . I think it makes the mentor more productive.

Many mentoring relationships provided collaborators for mentors' scholarship, which enhanced productivity and advanced their research programs. Some mentees provided much of the day-to-day work on projects, freeing the mentor for other scholarly opportunities. In time, the mentee became a trusted and skilled research colleague, a capable partner for collaboration. A mentor in business highlighted the importance of having an intellectual partner:

We benefit from talking through something and then going and working through it and then coming back again and talking through it again . . . . We both benefited from having somebody intellectually involved in the issue to talk to.

Successful collaboration in scholarly activities was due, in part, to a balancing of the strengths and weaknesses of mentors and mentees. Many mentors and mentees commented on how collaboration was balanced by the strengths of each participant. This balancing process was highlighted by comments such as:

• I think I was more rigorous . . . he was more intuitive.
• I'm usually an idea person.
• I put in the creative spark, he puts in the rigor.

One mentee perceived the mentor as less creative than he was, which underscored the strengths he brought to the relationship. A mentee in nursing noted:
I am more detail oriented while she [mentor] was very good at more conceptual [work] and kind of getting the flow going. I'm good at kind of filling in the gaps and making contacts with people . . . . I'm better at certain things than she is. Like I can really manage budgets well and details and handle that part of a grant . . . there's certain parts I do well and certain parts she does well and then we kind of look at the final product.

A few mentees also complemented the mentor's research skills. On occasion, mentees brought a special skill to the research process. A mentor in business discussed a mentee's research skill:

[He used] an analytical technique that I was not familiar with and that resulted in a very nice relationship . . . . [he] could bring skills to our relationship that contributed independently of what I was able to contribute.

Susan, whose relationship typified the focused model was skilled in statistical analyses. She noted:

In our relationship, I am the statistics person. That involves writing and analyzing data but also some design issues from the beginning when we are developing projects.

When mentors and mentees collaborated in research, the mentor benefited from having a colleague who understood and appreciated the research focus. A mentee remarked that her mentor stated: "It's so nice to talk to someone who understands what I'm doing." Sharing a research area also provided validity to the research perspective.

Some mentors sought advice from mentees on papers, research projects, and grant sources. Mentees served as
knowledgeable peer reviewers and provided support for the mentor's grant writing process. Susan indicated that in her relationship:

We are a sounding board for each other. She [mentor] now often asks me to review things I am not an author on. She respects my view on things, policies and research design.

Providing New Opportunities for Mentors

A few mentoring relationships created occasions for mentors to explore new opportunities, which further balanced the senior faculty members' careers. Susan encouraged her mentor to submit abstracts for yearly conferences on an ongoing research project. She also introduced her mentor to new projects, noting that together they had written grants they probably wouldn't have submitted without Susan's influence.

Networking, which also promoted the mentor's career, was often mutual, with mentees introducing mentors to their resources. Some mentees also involved their mentors in professional organizations. A mentee in nursing noted: "There have been meetings that we've gone to that she helped me network. I've helped her in that aspect too . . . that's gone both ways."

Mentoring relationships that represented both focused and comprehensive models provided psychosocial benefits to mentors. Many mentors described feelings of pleasure associated with the relationship. A few mentors felt valued
and grateful for participating in the relationship. One mentor in business noted:

When people come to me and ask me for advice or guidance or want to talk about what's going on or whatever I'm flattered by that. I feel my opinions or ideas or whatever I have to give . . . [are] valued . . . . I think to a certain extent that we bask a little in each other's successes and that's got some value to it. When somebody calls and says I need your help or assistance, that somebody has said you're not just an academic figurehead. You have some personal value to me . . . . I get a sense of appreciation when somebody asks me for that kind of thing.

Mentors representing the focused model related feelings of satisfaction, gratification, pride, and pleasure in the progress of mentees. Admiration and respect were inherent in the relationships. Mentees also supported mentors, as illustrated by a mentee who related: "I think I offer them (mentors) affirmation for who they are, and I think I've been an effective listener . . . support them when they feel very isolated."

In summary, mentoring relationships promoted harmony in the careers of both mentee and mentor, providing benefits to both participants. Mentees' careers were balanced through advisement, sponsorship and guiding the faculty roles, particularly the research role. In the focused model relationships provided socialization in the research role for both mentor and mentee. Mentors also expanded their faculty role and experienced psychosocial benefits.
Mentoring relationships representative of both the focused and comprehensive models evolved informally and gradually. Developmentally, relationships were characterized by processes of kindling, expanding, and fading. Kindling was the process of initiating the relationship and included how mentors and mentees met and the motivation for mentoring. As a part of kindling the relationship, mentees and mentors scrutinized each other. This process, termed examining, helped mentors and mentees decide whether to pursue the relationship. Relationships in both models evolved to becoming colleagues and friends, and many were characterized by a process of fading, where relationships slowly receded.

This section presents the development and progression of the mentoring relationships that represented the focused model. It also discusses the balancing of trust and risk inherent in the relationships.

Development of the Relationship: Kindling

Relationships in the focused model evolved unceremoniously, without events that signaled the beginning or transition points. Although faculty members easily identified when they first met their mentors or mentees, the point at which they realized they had engaged in the
mentoring relationship was obscure. Many participants were unable to identify a beginning point of the relationship.

Relationships formed through events that can be described as part happenstance and part planning. The university structure and school events brought the mentor and mentee together, but relationships were developed intentionally. As illustrated in Susan's situation, most relationships in the focused model were established when the mentee was a graduate student. Most mentors and mentees met through courses, advisor-advisee relationships, or research projects. However, three relationships representing the focused model were initiated during the first faculty appointment. Commonly, mentors began guiding the development of the scholarly role in graduate school through serving on mentees' generals or dissertation committees; frequently mentees assisted in mentors' research.

The motivation for mentoring in the focused model most commonly centered on the mentor's desire to conduct research, promote scholarly activity, and teach research to others. Mentors were committed scholars with active research programs. They valued research and wanted to train other scholars who would contribute to scholarship in their field. Mentors were interested in associating with others who shared their research interests or could contribute to their research. For example, Frank, who illustrated this model, related: "I engage in those activities that benefit
my work or my ability to contribute to the field." Often, mentors and mentees shared similar research interests and ideologies.

Intellectual stimulation also motivated mentors to enter relationships. Mentoring relationships offered mentors the opportunity to discuss and debate theoretical perspectives and ponder research questions. Frank viewed mentoring as a means of fostering the intellectual rigor of doctoral students. His purpose for establishing mentoring relationships was:

To create a scene where younger scholars can sort of learn the craft of how to position ideas and papers so they are acceptable to the reviewers . . . . That's probably 80% of the story.

Relationships were also initiated because mentees desired to learn from a skilled researcher. In the three situations when relationships began with the mentee's first faculty appointment, mentees sought a research mentor. For example, Frank determined that his scholarship abilities needed to be strengthened, and he sought a mentor to enhance them. Joseph, a mentee in business, accepted his first faculty appointment at a research university and met his mentor during the recruitment process. Joseph and his mentor mutually initiated the relationship for scholarly purposes. Joseph's mentor needed a younger, ambitious person to run the day-to-day tasks associated with a
research project, and Joseph was eager to comply. He recounted:

I let him [mentor] know from the beginning that I wanted to do [type of] research. That's an area that really interested me. I thought that was a key to my future. I knew he did a lot of that thing, he had the contacts, and if the two of us put our heads together we could probably be a pretty good team. So I think I generated it, I sparked it, but I knew this was a thing he did. We could do this together.

Examining

A period of examining occurred in most relationships that illustrated the focused model. During the process of examining, mentors and mentees determined the other individual's motivation, qualifications, skills, and talents. In general, mentors were looking for individuals who were serious about research and had the motivation and potential to be good researchers. For some participants, the process of assessment helped mentors and mentees decide if the other individual was an appropriate research collaborator and if they should commit to the relationship.

The examining commonly focused on the mentee's intellectual abilities and research potential and interest, such as "a strong ability to conduct research." Because research skill is a desired outcome of this model, mentors scrutinized the mentees' intellectual abilities and research potential early in the relationships. A mentor in business who has established several mentoring relationships with
doctoral students provided an example of what he considered during the examining process:

Does the student have the ability and the motivation and the skills to do the job, to make it worth my while to mentor the student? Because the way I view the mentoring [the mentee] should actually be coming out like the faculty member that's the mentor . . . . So if they don't have my values and interests or if they don't have the potential in my view then I wouldn't be very interested in mentoring them . . . . The student has to have the skills . . . . [to] be a productive and demanding researcher, and the student has to be in an area that's compatible with my research interests.

Susan provided an example of the examining that occurred in her relationship, noting that her mentor had indicated that she "checks on things before she spends too much energy on students." Both Susan and Frank believed that their mentors had consulted with colleagues about their abilities early in their relationships.

The process of examining was reciprocal. Mentees also engaged in a process of scrutinizing the skills, qualifications, and research interests of potential mentors. During graduate school mentees accomplished this through taking courses, serving as research assistants, or being advised by the mentor. These activities permitted mentees to examine mentors' careers, scholarship abilities, and personal attributes. Angela, a mentee in nursing, related that she was attracted to her mentor's methodological, organized manner and self-confidence. After working as a
research assistant with her mentor, Angela determined that the mentor "could guide me well." Angela then asked her mentor to be her academic advisor.

The examining process helped to control some of the risks associated with participating in the relationship. Mentors and mentees made tremendous commitments of time and energy, and often became professionally linked with one another through collaborative scholarship. To some extent, mentees represented mentors. For example, a mentor in business explained that mentees were indicative of his ability to train doctoral students. Therefore, testing and scrutinizing the potential partner was essential to minimize risk to one's reputation or to avoid investing time in someone who would not be successful in scholarship.

Expanding: Progression of the Relationship

Mentoring relationships representative of the focused model were intellectual partnerships, yet they also were emotional alliances characterized by friendships. The balancing of the professional relationship and friendship began early in the alliance. Some faculty were unable to separate the friendship from the professional relationship, as exemplified by a business faculty member who commented: "You can be a good mentor only if you're a good friend at the same time," and by the mentee who indicated that she and her mentor "were good friends in a professional setting."
The sharing of intellectual ideas and collaboration fostered the relationship's evolution from a unilateral situation of mentor advising mentee, to a bilateral interaction of advising of each other. Although most relationships of the focused model were established between individuals in hierarchial roles—teachers and students, and advisors and advisees—the alliances evolved into relationships characterized by collegiality and friendship. For some mentees, this feeling of collegiality occurred early in the relationship. A nursing mentee reflecting on the progression of her relationship noted that her mentor "was always very much into being colleagues even when I was a student and she was [a] faculty [member]." Another mentee noted: "I think that there is a respect for you as a colleague that is there very much... from the beginning."

Despite the fact that their mentors publicly endorsed collegiality in their relationships, a few mentees had difficulty accepting their roles as colleagues. Early in their relationships, a few mentees viewed themselves as persons taking from, rather than giving to the relationship. A mentee noted that although her mentor was always conscious of "not doing the hierarchy thing," it took years for her to feel that she had contributed to the relationship. A mentee, talking of her mentoring during graduate school, discussed her perceptions of the shift to a collegial relationship:
[It] probably had to do with other peoples' acceptance of my abilities separate from hers. When I had articles published [of which] I was the first author, maybe she was an author on it, but I knew that I had written all of it. Or when someone really asked me to speak and didn't go to her first . . . it was external evidence that I did have something to offer that relationship . . . . It took me a while to think that I did have something to offer this relationship.

All mentoring relationships in the focused model evolved into friendships that provided psychological support as well as support for the other participant's work. Mentors and mentees were friends, and many shared social activities. For some relationships, the friendship occurred slowly as the relationship developed. Frank, who developed his relationship during his first faculty appointment, viewed the friendship developing early in the relationship. The friendship served as a buffer for the critique of each other's work. Frank related:

I think they're at first friendships. I think that's really important . . . You have friendships so that you can have very tough intellectual debates. I got a letter once from one of these people I worked with and my wife read it and said boy it sounds like he doesn't like you. Oh no, [I said] this is what we do. And we can do that because we feel comfortable with each other.

Fading

In three of the relationships representing the focused model, mentors and mentees remained at the same institution, and the relationships remained intense. In the other situations, mentor and mentee had geographically separated.
Most of these relationships did not demonstrate an official closure. Rather, they remained ongoing and open-ended, fading in intensity. Fading occurred for several reasons. Commonly, it resulted because of the physical separation of mentor and mentee, a change in scholarship interests, or a lack of need on the part of one or both participants for the relationship.

Commonly, when mentors and mentees were at the same institution, they had daily or weekly contact with one another. Physical separation decreased this contact, which contributed to a decreased intensity in the relationship. Susan's relationship demonstrated fading. When Susan and her mentor were in the same institution, they had daily or weekly communication; contact during research projects was 5-10 hours per week. Susan's contact with her mentor dramatically decreased after her appointment to another university. They now have personal contact only several times a year and talk by phone several times a month.

Although relationships faded, they remained open-ended. The open-ended nature of these relationships was significant, since it facilitated the continued collaboration in scholarly activity. Although many mentors and mentees had relocated to different institutions, they continued to meet at conferences, nominate one another for faculty or other professional appointments, contact one another for advice, engage in collaborative scholarly activity, and offer
invitations for presentations. A mentor in business
related:

I don't think they're [relationships] terminated
in the sense of thanks I don't want to hear from
you again . . . [or] a door slamming. I think
it's more of a fading kind of thing. The faculty
member goes off, develops his/her own research
program, research interests and you interact at
conferences and things like that as friends and
colleagues . . . the mentoring aspect slowly fades
and . . . colleague and friend . . . builds up.
It's nothing sudden.

Although relationships tended to attenuate, mentors and
mentees continued to describe the alliances as supportive.
A mentee in business noted that his relationship with his
mentor continued to be good, despite the fact that the
mentor had retired, and they rarely saw one another.
Mentees knew they could call for support if needed. A
mentor in business related: "I feel like I could pick up
the phone at any point or get an e-mail and almost start
where it left off, even though there may not have been any
contact for several years."

Balancing Trust and Risk in the Relationship

Establishing and maintaining mentoring relationships
required a balancing of trust, commitment, and risk. Trust
was an essential element in a relationship that had as its
purpose the guiding of another's career, and the theme of
trust echoed throughout the interviews in comments such as
these:

• The people who are advising you have your best
interests in mind. If you don't trust that
there's no reason for you to be in this relationship.

• [Mentors are] trusted resources to review my ideas, work and to provide advice and direction on how I might proceed.

• There's trust . . . which is the only way [mentoring] relationships can happen.

• Any advice I've been given I have trusted because of the nature of the relationship that has developed.

Trust was exemplified in how mentees viewed the relationship, as a safe and supportive alliance for exploring issues and venting concerns. Mentoring relationships provided a secure environment for exploring ideas and options related to the faculty role and the career. Mentors and mentees became confidants in the professional realm, and at times, in the personal realm.

Relationships demonstrated an openness in style and attitude that is indicative of trust. Openness encouraged discussion of important career issues as well as, on occasion, concerns of a personal nature. Susan exemplified this openness in her relationship when she noted that she could "ask her mentor anything, at any time." Mentors were forthright when providing guidance and sharing "inside information" with the mentee. Conversely, mentees were open and receptive to feedback, sought input, and asked questions.

Trust and commitment were exemplified by Teresa's story. Teresa and her mentor live in different states.
Recently, Teresa was preparing a presentation and desired feedback from her mentor. Knowing that her mentor was committed to her career development, and trusting that her mentor would assist her, Teresa felt free to send her paper to her mentor without seeking permission to do so. She noted:

And I called her [mentor]. . . . and I really didn't ask her if she would review a draft of it. But I have enough confidence and faith in her that I called her home and she wasn't there. I said [to her husband] just tell her that I'm forwarding this copy. I know she's probably got a really busy schedule but if she has a chance to look at it and send it back to me . . . . We had a series of faxes and actually never spoke . . . .

Risks were also inherent in the relationship. For the mentee, risks were related to establishing one's own scholarship record and living up to the mentor's standards. Although generally a benefit of mentoring relationships, collaboration with mentors demonstrated a potential risk for several mentees. While collaboration with mentors provided opportunities to learn research and publish, it could also impede the novices' abilities to establish their own professional identities and scholarship records. Four mentees who had frequently collaborated with their mentors in research and publishing acknowledged that collaboration was a risk as well as an advantage. One mentee related:

Some people who don't clearly know each of us as individuals might have difficulty separating us. So I think that's something we try to emphasize . . . this is my line of work and this is [mentor's] line of work.
The movement to independent scholarship played out differently in each situation. Believing that mentees would not be seen as individual scholars, two mentors advised the novice faculty members to "carve their own path" and establish their own research records. Frank, a mentee of a prominent scholar, initiated the relationship during his first faculty appointment. After collaborating with the mentor in educational programs and consultations, he intentionally established his own scholarship record, noting:

I didn't want to go through my entire career known as [x's] student... so while we asked a lot of similar questions, it was important for me to develop my independent identity.

One mentee had frequently researched and published with his mentor during and after his doctoral studies. During his fourth-year review process, the committee noted that most of the mentee's work had been coauthored with his mentor and advised him to establish his own scholarly record. He heeded the advice and published alone for several years to demonstrate his independent scholarship. After this time, he and his mentor resumed their collaborative activities.

Living up to the mentor's standards was another risk for mentees. Prolific scholars have high standards for themselves and others. This demand for quality transferred to the mentee, and living up to these standards was
stressful for a few mentees. One mentee related the feeling that her work had disappointed the mentor, another believed her choice of institutions frustrated her mentor, which placed stress on the relationship. A mentor in business, who had engaged in the mentoring relationship during the doctoral program, felt discouraged when his early work was not accepted by journals, believing he had disappointed his mentor. He related that:

[I] let him down by not publishing and being as good as he thought I was. The first couple of years I had some problems and I didn't get published and my papers were returning back from the journals and all that stuff. And I remember a day when I told my wife I think [x] made a mistake and he mistook a good student for a good researcher.

Mentors also placed themselves at some risk when they initiated a relationship. Mentors and mentees can become linked in name, and sometimes, reputation. Choosing a mentee who was not successful or not acceptable to colleagues could tarnish the mentor's reputation. Although only one mentor described a problem in this area, Linda's story provided a classic example of this concern. Linda, a mentor in business, had a relationship with a controversial scholar that had a negative consequence. She recounted:

I did one thing once that was real stupid as a mentor. There was a junior faculty person . . . I was putting together a panel [for a national association meeting] and the people who were putting it together . . . didn't like [x's] work. They thought it was too political and radical. It was a very conservative group . . . and then I
offered to put [x's] name with mine on the work because [x] was up for tenure and needed it on the vitae. That kind of blew up in my face. Since then our names have always been hooked together.

In summary, the mentoring relationships that typified the focused model were intellectual and emotional alliances that evolved to collegial and friend relationships. These alliances were initiated for scholarly purposes and both participants examined the intellectual abilities of the other prior to establishing them. Relationships had a tendency to fade but remained open-ended to support collaborative activities. These alliances demonstrated both risks and benefits for the participants.

BALANCING THE INSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION

Faculty new to an institution face a formidable task. Appointment to a faculty position entails developing and teaching new courses, establishing a scholarship record, and unraveling the complexities of the institutional culture. Within several years of initial appointment, tenure decisions determine if faculty members will have the option to remain at the institution.

Although tenure decisions are based on the faculty member's individual record of achievements, a variety of institutional factors influence the faculty member's success
in the promotion process. These factors include colleagues as well as the politics, norms, and values of the department and college.

After graduation, most mentees accepted faculty positions at different colleges. Therefore, mentoring relationships representative of the focused model commonly did not influence the mentee's organizational socialization in the new institution. Typically, mentees had to determine, without the mentor's assistance, the institutional culture, with its implicit norms, hierarchies, and political agendas.

There were exceptions to this. In three situations, mentees accepted faculty appointments at the college where they had done their doctoral work. In these situations, mentors assisted with the mentees' organizational entry, providing information on colleagues and the politics associated with the department and college. Additionally, when relationships were initiated during mentees' first faculty appointments, mentors also supported the mentees' organizational entry. The mentors' assistance during this period is similar to that provided by colleague mentors in the comprehensive model, which is discussed in a later section.

**Tipping the Balance: The Promotion Process**

Prior to the promotion and tenure decision, the mentee's career "hangs in the balance." Only a few mentees
who participated in mentoring relationship representative of
the focused model received assistance with the tenure
process from their mentors, who were at other institutions.
This assistance related to advisement on who to contact for
letters of support.

Those mentees whose relationships represented the
merged model received support for the promotion process.
Mentors guided the preparation of promotion materials, and
on occasion advocated for the mentee. Joseph's mentoring
relationship was established during his first faculty
appointment, and his mentor strongly influenced Joseph's
tenure review process. Joseph described:

He [mentor] was a member of the [tenure]
committee. He was very supportive of the work I
conducted. He could have taken a lot more credit
for himself than he did . . . . He probably said I
did more than I did. He was always telling people
how good I was . . . . He was always bragging on
me, saying this guy is great. Telling me you can
do that, even though I couldn't. Talking me up.
It helped.

In summary, although the focused model of mentoring
relationships socialized the mentee in many aspects of the
faculty role, it centered on the research role. Mentees
learned research through the advisement, role modeling, and
collaboration provided by the mentor. The mentor's
scholarship role was also refined through working with the
mentee. This model of mentoring relationships did not
significantly influence socialization to the new
institution.
"There are some written and some unwritten rules and behaviors and it's those unwritten rules that I especially feel it's up to the mentor to point out."

--- Mentor

The second model that emerged from the mentoring relationships was broader in scope and more inclusive in nature. Contrary to the singular emphasis of the focused model, through the comprehensive model, mentors provided assistance in a variety of activities and roles. Mentors played a strong role in the organizational socialization of the mentee. Some mentors had unique knowledge about the organization; they were shrewd sources of information, providing valuable knowledge about department procedures, cultural norms, and political agendas. Mentors assisted the mentee in navigating the system; they "clued" the mentee into what was pertinent to the institution.

Mentors also played a strong role in the promotion and tenure process of the mentee. Many mentors helped mentees prepare for the promotion and tenure review by providing formal and informal information associated with this process. Some mentors also advocated for the mentee within the promotion process.

Teaching and course-related issues also were a focus in the comprehensive model. Mentors commonly advised mentees
about student issues, shared course materials, informed mentees about instructional resources, and observed mentees' teaching.

Scholarly activity, in a subtler form than in the focused model, was also incorporated into this model. Mentors supported, rather than taught, the research process. Assuming that mentees had learned the research skills in their graduate program, mentors supported and advised, rather than guided, the research process. Because mentors and mentees were studying different topics, they did not commonly collaborate on projects. Rather, mentors were consultants to the mentee's scholarly activity, critiquing papers and providing advice on grant sources and publishing opportunities.

The comprehensive model, which represented the majority of mentoring relationships, was found at both research and liberal arts institutions. Moreover, over half of the mentoring relationships representative of the comprehensive model were found in the research university. Mentors served in the roles of confidant or peer counselor, information provider, advocate, and adviser to scholarly activity. Relationships in this model were broader in nature; focused on specific, rather than general, career advice; and tended to center on current career-related issues.
Illustrations of the Comprehensive Model

Roberta's Mentoring Relationship

Roberta did not have a mentor during the early years of her first faculty appointment at a research university. Not having anyone in particular to help her interpret the environment and the faculty role, she relied on printed materials distributed by the college and imprecise advice from colleagues. Based on official but incomplete information, she concluded that teaching, service, and research were equally important, and focused her time and energy equally among these areas during these initial years. Believing she would be valued by the department if she taught several courses, she volunteered to teach a new course each term. She joined committees, believing that service was an important criterion for career advancement. The preparation for and teaching of new courses, along with the service activities, cut into her available time for research.

She later discovered that another faculty member's research record had resulted in his being offered the single tenure-track appointment in her department. Because she had devoted time to teaching and service, she did not have the research she needed. She also had received poor advice from colleagues and had not collected teaching evaluations to document her teaching achievements.
Based on these experiences during her entry years, Roberta felt a responsibility to mentor new faculty in her department. She considered mentoring a collegial responsibility:

I don't know how you can be a faculty member without being a mentor. That is a part of being a faculty member . . . when a new person joins your organization you are helpful. A lot of people don't do that . . . . I am amazed when people don't.

Roberta viewed mentoring as "taking colleagues under the wing and telling the true story." She was an advocate and advisor who explained the "bottom line," the implicit rules of the department and institution. She provided essential information about role responsibilities in the department and college:

I told [x] no matter what anybody tells you, use the teaching evaluations . . . don't do any heavy service at all for the first few years. The important thing here was to do research.

Her relationships with mentees have evolved to collegial ones that provide reciprocal psychological support and scholarship assistance. In Roberta's view, mentoring relationships are valuable also for the positive relationships they engender with colleagues. Roberta noted that she has "a group of people that help and support each other." Her mentoring relationships have produced allies in her department.
Martin's Mentoring Relationship

Martin, a professor in business, has mentored several new faculty. He strongly supports mentoring, believing it to be "the proper way to treat the newcomer" and viewing it as a way to foster a sense of community within the department. He enjoys the interactions and the opportunities to learn from his colleagues.

Martin has been associated with the university for over 20 years; he knows the institution and "how the key people in the college think." Martin views his mentor role as helping another "read the political currents and undercurrents" in the department and college. He shares this organizational knowledge with mentees, assisting them in making a successful entry into the college.

Guiding the development of the teaching role is another crucial focus of Martin's mentoring relationships. He offers advice on course materials and counsels mentees on student issues. On occasion he attends mentees' classes and shares his observations. At the end of the semester he meets with them to discuss and interpret student evaluations:

So I'll talk about whether the evaluation results were good, bad, indifferent, fair, unfair to get their perception of what these results are saying . . . . I think it is useful to have someone else, a senior professor, look at them.

Importantly, Martin socializes mentees to the teacher role in this institution. He advises them of the importance
placed on the teaching role: "If you don't think teaching is very important . . . you are not going to be happy here." He offers suggestions on generating exams and reading assignments appropriate for this institution.

Martin's relationships generally last throughout the promotion and tenure decision and are limited to the period that mentees were at this institution. Mentoring provides Martin opportunities to discuss and influence teaching and keeps him from "falling into a rut."

BALANCING THE MENTEE'S PROFESSIONAL DIMENSION: PROMOTING STABILITY IN THE MENTEE'S CAREER

In both models, mentoring relationships guided the career development of the less experienced faculty member, and in doing so, they attempted to bring into balance the many activities that comprise the faculty role. The guidance provided in the comprehensive model of mentoring relationships was multidimensional, ranging from advising a colleague on professional dress to offering suggestions on a manuscript. Within this model, mentors helped stabilize the mentee's career through providing advisement and resource information and guiding the development of the core faculty roles.

Balancing the Career Through Advisement

Like the focused model, mentoring relationships represented by the comprehensive model provided advice and
information. Mentors were resources persons, sounding boards, and confidants to mentees. Most commonly, advisement focused on teaching issues and organization information.

Mentors who represented the comprehensive model were experienced faculty members at the college or university and were in positions to offer guidance to mentees on what to expect in the faculty role at the institution. As seasoned faculty members, they had knowledge of the challenges that faced the mentee and could provide "forewarning advice" to mentees as related by a mentor:

[Mentoring is] trying to provide people with information so that hopefully they know it ahead of time instead of finding out after the fact [what] they were supposed to do.

A mentor in nursing echoed this thought on the forewarning role, relating that her role was "keeping them [mentees] from getting stuck on the same problems on which you got stuck."

Mentors played a strong role in introducing mentees to resources within the institution, particularly resources that would assist mentees in developing the teaching role. However, advisement included issues that ranged from where to park to how to secure another faculty appointment.

Promoting Harmony in the Core Faculty Roles

All faculty must successfully balance the teaching, research, and service expectations of the institution.
Mentoring relationships representative of the comprehensive model assisted in this process, helping mentees establish and balance their careers and bring harmony among the many facets of the faculty role.

Guiding the teaching role was significant in the mentoring relationships that represented the comprehensive model. Mentors guided mentees in the teaching role through assisting with course development and planning. Mentors shared teaching strategies and on occasion observed and provided feedback on mentees' teaching. Mentors also discussed pedagogical issues; problem solved student concerns; and, importantly, shared their teaching experiences. Several mentors also guided the progress of the mentees' teaching. Two mentors reviewed their mentees' teaching evaluations quarterly. A mentor in nursing underscored the importance of preparing mentees for the teaching role:

In all the years I've been in academia it seems like there's this whole atmosphere of people supposedly knowing what's going on by osmosis without anybody telling them. Well that doesn't happen and people need information and they need lots of information and they need support in learning to do what is involved in teaching.

Teaching in a way that is in harmony with the institution is a concern for many new faculty. One mentor informed mentees of the importance of teaching in the college and how teaching would influence their promotions.
He noted:

This is a teaching institution that also requires increasingly a lot of scholarship . . . but I tell people that I'm mentoring . . . this criteria of teaching is first, scholarship is 28 and community service is about 40. So they're not 1, 2, 3. You can't be an OK teacher, a great scholar and do wonderful community service. You have to be very, very good as a teacher. And if teaching isn't important to you or if you can't do it very well, you're not going to last . . . . Your status on this campus is how effective one is as a teacher.

Novice faculty who have held teaching assistant positions at large institutions have to mold their teaching to the institutional norms when appointed to a smaller college. Several mentors guided the mentees in adapting their teaching styles and course content to the institutional norms, as noted by a mentor:

Each school kind of develops its own environment, the way professors teach and what students expect. And so for those who have been at other universities, you have to kind of inculcate the norms and values of the place. Oftentimes, for example, somebody will come from a big state school or a school that has large classes and in our . . . classes there's no more than 24. There's no reason to give a multiple choice test with 24 students . . . . You could do that and make your workload very light, but I think people would kind of look askance at that.

Contrary to the strong emphasis placed on research in the focused model, comprehensive mentoring relationships supported the research role in a subtler manner, and several relationships did not address the research/scholarship role. Support for the research role was provided in different ways. Some mentors supported and guided the research role
by reading mentees' papers, providing articles that were related to the mentees' research and suggesting journals that would publish mentees' work.

Collaboration in scholarship occurred in only a few relationships, and when it was present, it was not a prominent focus. One mentor collaborated with his mentee in providing educational programs and in publishing, and another mentoring pair collaborated on an article. When collaboration did occur, it provided a unique opportunity for two accomplished scholars to combine two unique perspectives in a project, as noted by a mentor in business, who related:

I was able to do things with the data set that I had never done before because of her insights. Probably the second best article I ever wrote was with her. From a theoretical standpoint it may have been the best. It was mostly because of the theoretical framework that she brought to the project.

The reduced focus on the research role was due to several factors. In a few mentoring relationships, the mentor was a generation older than the mentee and had been appointed at a time when research was not a requirement of the faculty role. Because mentors were not productive researchers, their contribution to the development of the mentee's research role was minimal. Mentors and mentees also had diverse research interests that did not contribute to collaborative scholarship. In addition, many of the
relationships in the comprehensive model occurred in liberal arts colleges that emphasized teaching rather than the research role.

Similar to the focused model, the guidance offered on the faculty service role was minimal and commonly focused on advising mentees to initially limit service activities. Mentors recognized the need for service activities to balance promotion and tenure requirements, but advised mentees about too much committee involvement. One mentor suggested that mentees join college committees to better understand the college environment, while another advised that mentees serve on prestigious committees.

BALANCING THE MENTOR'S PROFESSIONAL DIMENSION: PROMOTING HARMONY IN THE MENTOR'S CAREER

Similar to the focused model, mentoring relationships represented by the comprehensive model also were characterized by reciprocity. Mentoring relationships provided positive professional and personal outcomes for the mentor, influencing the mentor's career. Mentoring relationships representing the comprehensive model promoted harmony in the mentors' careers by expanding the faculty role and career and by providing psychosocial and political benefits.
Expanding the Faculty Role and Career

Mentoring relationships provided mentors with opportunities to learn from mentees, and several mentors acknowledged that these relationships influenced their professional growth. These alliances encouraged mentors to reflect on their own careers and the faculty role, which for some resulted in a refining or expanding of the faculty role. Mentoring relationships also promoted personal growth; as a mentor in nursing related, with each relationship, she learned more about herself as a professional and as a teacher. A business mentor noted that mentoring encouraged evaluation of oneself and one's teaching. For a few faculty members, mentoring renewed an enthusiasm for teaching or clarified one's philosophy of education.

Mentoring relationships also permitted some mentors to draw on the mentees' talents, knowledge, and expertise, which contributed to expanding the mentors' faculty role. Some mentors who observed mentees' teaching were impressed by the mentees' skills. These observations encouraged several mentors to reflect on their own teaching style and skills and make changes in these areas. Some mentors became more attentive to their teaching preparations and presentations. A few mentors related that they borrowed teaching ideas from mentees, and one mentor commented, "I
always get some good ideas from the junior people." One
mentor, who observed her mentee's teaching described it this
way:

Her approach to teaching was very efficient . . .
everything was very goal-directed and focused. I
think it helped me to improve my own teaching, to
be more focused. What I saw her teaching I
thought was very effective. I thought part of
this can transfer [to my own teaching].

Typically, mentors who were 10 to 15 years older than
the mentee benefited from the mentee's research knowledge
and skills. One mentor indicated that her mentee, who had
received more extensive research training than she had, was
well prepared in grant writing. Viewing her mentee's
success in acquiring funding, the mentor was motivated to
apply for her own mid-career award. Working on the mentee's
postdoctoral grant stimulated the mentor to apply for her
own award.

Mentoring relationships also encouraged mentors to
appreciate different perspectives on issues and to re-
examine their own philosophies and perspectives. Some
mentees shared current ideas and theories with their
mentors, perspectives that proved intellectually stimulating
for mentors. This was an important benefit for senior
faculty members not teaching in a graduate program. A
mentor in business noted:

One of the good things about junior colleagues is
that you can get into discussion about what has
gone on in grad school. What's the latest research and topics and that's one thing that they can bring you up to date.

Mentoring relationships also created opportunities for mentors to explore new opportunities, thus balancing the senior faculty members' careers. A few mentors described occasions when mentees engaged them in new projects or activities. Joseph, a mentor in business, joined his mentee in facilitating educational programs she had developed. He related: "I would have never done that without her . . . . I learned from her."

**Psychosocial and Political Benefits**

Mentoring relationships benefited mentors psychosocially and politically, which also contributed to harmonious careers. Mentoring other faculty aided in building friendships and a sense of community in a department; and, as a mentor noted: "Mentoring endears you to others."

Mentoring relationships can coalesce a department, providing a more harmonious workplace. For several mentors, these alliances promoted collegiality, groups supporting one another, and working together. As a mentor noted: "I think I have a good friendship with those I have mentored."

Mentoring relationships also provided other psychosocial benefits to mentors. Similar to the mentors who represented the focused model, mentors typifying the comprehensive model described feelings of satisfaction,
belonging, gratification, and pleasure associated with the relationship. Several mentors related their enjoyment in seeing the achievements of the mentee. Joseph, a mentor in business, commented how pleased he was to "bring along an assistant professor . . . . [he] could take credit for hiring." Another mentor in nursing related: "It was delightful to see [x] progress and be so successful and I got a lot of pleasure out of that and still do today."

Mentors also reaped political benefits from these relationships. Through mentoring, some mentors created allies in the department who assisted in advancing their careers. A mentor in business related that when vying for chairperson position "she [mentee] supported me . . . I had a campaign manager."

In summary, comprehensive mentoring relationships provided personal and professional benefits to both mentor and mentee, influencing both careers. Mentors provided advice and influenced the socialization of the mentee in the teaching role. The mentors' career was also influenced by mentoring relationships. Mentors refined their teaching role and experienced both psychosocial and political benefits.
Developing the Relationship: Kindling

Similar to the focused model, relationships were characterized by the processes of kindling, expanding, and fading. These relationships also evolved in a steady, natural, and informal manner. Most participants were unable to identify a beginning point of the relationship, as noted by Roberta, a mentor in business:

I don't think there was a particular point [at] which it was initiated . . . . I don't think either of us initiated it, it just evolved. It was not formal at all, it was totally informal.

Relationships that represented this model commonly developed during the mentee's first faculty appointment to the college or university. Mentors were colleagues in the institution, and in many situations, were at the assistant or associate professor rank.

Like the focused model, professional development was the motivation for initiating these relationships. However, in the comprehensive model, interpersonal factors also served as catalysts for initiating the relationship. These included: personal attraction, mutual interests, and altruism, including a feeling of responsibility to mentor others.

Personal attraction, which often occurred during the interview process, was a catalyst for establishing many
mentoring relationships and was commonly identified by the following types of statements:

- There was a personal chemistry.
- I liked her immediately.
- We hit it off at the interpersonal level.
- I liked this person's style.
- There was a mutual spark.

Mutual interests also contributed to establishing some mentoring relationships. Mentors and mentees shared disciplines, departments, and, in some cases, courses that provided opportunities for interaction. Commonly, mentors and mentees shared similar values of teaching or service, philosophies of the profession, faculty role, and teaching; they saw many issues the same way. A mentor in nursing noted: “We seemed to be in agreement from the very beginning about the faculty role.”

Mentoring relationships also were initiated for altruistic reasons. Many mentors identified the mentees' need for mentoring and responded to it. Some mentors recalled the confusion, isolation, and insecurity they had experienced during their initial faculty appointment, and this motivated them to assist mentees. They saw mentees as capable individuals and wanted them to succeed. Thus, in this model, mentoring relationships were also motivated by a desire to lessen the struggle and lighten the load.
Ruth exemplified this altruistic motivation for mentoring. Having taught over 20 years, she has one of the longest tenures in her department. Novices commonly gravitated to her because of her vast educational experiences and knowledge of the department. She felt a responsibility to mentor others because of her experience and knowledge. Ruth explained:

I took on that responsibility [of mentoring] without being asked because of my first experience [as faculty]. I had somebody do that for me . . . and I think it just helps everybody . . . working together to help the new people figure out what are their expectations. What are their responsibilities. And there always seems to be more responsibilities than what they thought there would be. It just helps everybody to work together if people can be clear about what is expected from individuals.

The responsibility to mentor others was represented in different ways. In a few relationships, mentors who had participated in the recruitment of the mentee to the institution felt a responsibility to assist new faculty members. Roberta was the chair of the search committee when her mentee was appointed to the university. She noted:

He was the first new faculty hired after I was hired. I just felt it was my responsibility. I knew no one else would do it. So I decided to sit down with him at the very beginning and talk about the important things he needed to do and pay attention to.

Some faculty felt a responsibility to mentor underrepresented groups. Because women were underrepresented in
Sarah chose to mentor two women in her department. Sarah commented:

Men have so many more opportunities to get that mentoring here than the women do. The women in the college recognize themselves as a distinctive group and we, I guess sort of expect ourselves and expect each other to try and help the more junior women within our department.

Most of these mentoring relationships were initiated by the mentor. Joseph's decision to enter into a mentoring relationship was made during early contacts with his mentee. Joseph was chair of the recruitment committee that hired his mentee. He was attracted to the mentee's ambition, toughness, and talents, and believed her addition would benefit the department. He liked the mentee immediately, "battled" for her appointment, and offered her assistance. He related:

I was instrumental in her being hired. I wanted her to come here. She had a lot to offer us . . . I told her you take this job and I'll help you. I told her I would do everything I could do to help her. And I did.

The volunteering of help occurred through the open pledge of support as noted above, or a more subtle process of volunteering assistance and self. Clare is an experienced faculty member who has established many relationships that focused on the teaching role. Since she had a reputation for being an expert teacher, novice faculty commonly sought her advice. Clare volunteered her assistance to novice faculty in subtle ways:
We had this informal conversation and she [new faculty] said how overwhelmed she was. I was telling her some of the tricks of the trade so to speak and that's how that [mentoring relationship] got started . . . . I told her anytime you want to come over [to my office] do so.

In most situations, mentors approached mentees, believing that mentees would be hesitant to approach senior faculty. Mentors approached mentees in informal and subtle ways, sending e-mail messages, stopping by offices, or inviting new faculty to lunch. A mentor in nursing recounted that she began relationships in a slow, nonthreatening manner. She provided materials to mentees and informed them about what had been helpful in her teaching. Mentors commonly sent a message of availability. A few mentees noted their mentors had an open-door policy that communicated the message: "I'm here any time you need me."

Mentees also made themselves candidates for these relationships. One mentor explained he saw the initiation of the relationships as a reciprocal process of the mentor offering help and the mentee later following up on the offer. Another mentor, who as chairperson guided many careers of new faculty appointed to her department, recounted how her mentee kindled the relationship. The mentee created opportunities to talk to the chairperson about her work, courting the relationship:

[She] would drop by and ask if I had a minute to talk, and share her concerns . . . . So she often
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created the informal opportunities to talk about how work was going and what she was doing.

Another mentor provided an example of the mutual initiation of the relationship:

I have developed over the years a reputation for being a good teacher. So people will come to me and say: how do you do this? What is your secret about this? I am happy to share this [information] and my materials.

Examining

The rigorous assessing and testing of the mentee's intellectual abilities that occurred in the focused model was not present in this model. However, some examining of the mentee occurred. Mentors looked for qualities they deemed important, such as the ability to hold their own, get their work done, and be accountable. These qualities suggested that mentors were looking for individuals who were capable of successfully enacting the faculty role. In the comprehensive model, however, mentors also offered mentoring for purely altruistic purposes, without consideration of the mentee's abilities. As one mentor noted, she desired to know mentees as people rather than colleagues.

During the early part of the relationship, some mentors also scrutinized the mentee's attitude and willingness to enter the relationship. Several mentors determined the mentees' openness to the relationship, their willingness to accept guidance, and their awareness of where they needed assistance.
Similar to relationships in the focused model, the process of examining was reciprocal in the alliances representing the comprehensive model. Mentees also engaged in a process of examination, scrutinizing the skills, attitudes, and interests of potential mentors.

Expanding: Progression of the Relationship

In the comprehensive model, mentors were more experienced colleagues of the novice. Therefore, hierarchial concerns were less evident. Many mentors and mentees considered one another colleagues from the beginning of the relationship. One mentor highlighted this perspective by noting that mentoring relationships with faculty were more equal than the relationships with doctoral students and were more of a partnership.

These faculty mentoring relationships evolved from a unilateral process of mentor advising mentee to a bilateral process of advising of each other. The relationship progressed from one of dependence to one of interdependence. As one business mentor noted: "We might consider it mentoring each other." A nursing mentor related:

In time you become more and more equal . . . so that the two of you are no longer the one person seeking assistance from the other. It's a mutual kind of thing . . . you look to each other for information and knowledge and support . . . it's like the person being mentored . . . is no longer being mentored. You could say you are mentoring each other and so if this relationship can go on for a period of time you become colleagues in the true sense of the term. It's a mutual kind of relationship that goes on for years.

173
Two mentors reinforced the idea that mentoring relationships were noncontrolling alliances focused on the mentee, not the mentor. Some mentors commented that they shared advice and information with mentees with the perspective that mentees were free to accept or not accept the advice.

Like the focused mentoring relationships, the alliances that represented the comprehensive model also evolved toward a friendship. However, it is not clear at what point the friendship begins, or at what point the friendship overshadows the collegial activities. A mentor in nursing noted: "Somewhere in the process, our relationship changed to more of a friendship, where work was not that central."

Fading

In several of the relationships that depicted the comprehensive model, mentors and mentees still considered themselves a part of the relationship. In several other situations, mentors and mentees had disconnected because of retirement or geographical separation. In those relationships, contact was infrequent and occurred very sporadically. Most commonly, when contact was made, it was focused on social issues, with a lesser emphasis on professional concerns.

Balancing Trust and Risk

Like the focused model, these relationships were characterized by trust and a commitment. Mentors and
mentees trusted one another and the guidance offered. These relationships also demonstrated risks for both mentees and mentors.

Seeking advice placed mentees at risk of being considered dependent or insecure. New faculty were expected to come to their faculty appointments capable of enacting the faculty role competently and autonomously. Seeking assistance from other faculty members may suggest that the novice faculty member is not capable of successfully enacting the faculty role. New faculty, who were aware that faculty colleagues would be voting on their record in a few years, could not afford to present an image of uncertainty, dependency, or incompetence. Therefore, for the mentee, the risk factor was significant.

Mentors also placed themselves at risk. Mentors and mentees became linked in name, and sometimes, reputation. Choosing a mentee who was unsuccessful in the faculty role could tarnish the mentor's reputation. If the mentee did not perform well, the mentor could also lose prestige or influence with colleagues.

For some mentors, association with mentees also suggested accountability for them. This can be risky if mentees do not perform satisfactorily or responsibly. Linda, a mentor, was advising and supporting her mentee who, due to personal issues, was deciding whether to leave the college. She advocated for him and secured a leave to
provide him time to resolve his problems. He ended up resigning too late for the college to do a national search for his position. Linda felt that her colleagues held her responsible for the situation:

If they [mentees] screw up you do pay the price among your colleagues . . . . There was some stress from the administration when [x] left the department high and dry. They said wasn't there something we could do, and of course they are looking to those folks who have the closest contact with them to do something . . . so that puts you in an awkward situation if things go wrong. . . . then they're sitting there saying why did you let that happen? . . . . I argued for [him] . . . and then [he] . . . left and so I used all my political clout to make it good for [him].

Sarah experienced a similar fallout from her mentees' decisions to leave the college. She had strongly lobbied for the appointments of two mentees who later resigned their positions. Sarah related:

I jokingly said after this second [person] quit that I was never going to serve on a recruitment committee again because I was batting zero. I had the influence on two hires and both . . . had left and I do wonder to what extent one uses up one's chips, one's credibility . . . . I know I alienated people on that second recruitment committee by insisting that this was the way we were going to do [it] and I'm sure that comes back to haunt me daily. But I just don't know exactly how.

In summary, mentoring relationships representative of the comprehensive model evolved similarly to those representing the focused model. The relationships were formed for professional reasons, however, the motivation for
developing the relationships were interpersonal as well as professional. Although professional issues were central to the relationship, these alliances also evolved to a collegial and friend relationship. When mentors or mentees left the institution, the relationship faded. Benefits and risks were associated with this model.

BALANCING THE INSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION

Balancing Environmental Factors

All faculty are faced with challenges associated with their faculty role, including developing and teaching new courses, establishing a scholarly record, and unraveling the complexities of the institutional culture. Novice faculty may have had some socialization experiences in research and teaching, but each institution presented a unique culture that had to be learned. Mentoring relationships representative of the comprehensive model assisted with organizational socialization and provided a counterbalance to some institutional forces facing novice faculty. Thus, for novice faculty who were expected to "hit the ground running," a mentor was an important resource for learning the culture of the department or college.

Mentoring relationships in the comprehensive model counterbalanced environmental factors by providing support for the mentee and influencing the promotion process in a
positive manner. Mentoring relationships provided guidance on negotiating and managing the system, dealing with colleagues in the environment, and supporting cultural norms. All mentors interpreted the environment, providing informal information about how to get along in the department and college and how to get ahead. Mentors taught "tricks of the trade" within the system, or as one mentor stated: "Read the political currents and undercurrents."

Mentors also provided perspectives on colleagues within the environment. They provided information on the backgrounds of colleagues and advised mentees on "whose good side to stay on, and who to worry about." A mentor in business noted: "I try to point out the players and who is a jerk . . . and who you should not ignore." Some mentors provided knowledge about the expectations of the chairperson, dean, or provost. A mentor reflecting on the role he played in explaining cultural norms noted:

As I think back over how I think I've been useful to people it's been less reading papers that they've written and giving them professional critique . . . it's more . . . their career per se . . . How will what they wrote . . . be perceived by people . . . in the advisory level . . . How will the document be read and responded to by the provost, a colleague of mine? I know what he thinks. Or I have some insight at least of what will set him off. What he will respond positively to . . . it's much more political advice.

Mentors helped balance institutional factors by acting as buffers and playing a protective role for mentees. On
occasion, mentors ran interference, keeping mentees from making mistakes that could injure their reputation or irritate peers. A mentee noted that her mentor "made sure I was not making mistakes that could harm me in the long run." Another mentee noted that her mentor: "Helped me cover when I made a major blunder and felt responsible . . . she minimized my part of this issue and helped to smooth that over with the powers."

Many mentors also provided background information on political situations within the environment. A mentee in nursing related that her mentor shared:

What sort of is a trigger for some person and what isn't for another person . . . . If you need to be a little bit cautious about talking about this with one person or kind of like there's certain groups and this group doesn't get along with this group.

The mentors' knowledge of the departments and colleges positioned them to provide advice on cultural norms and to intervene when norms were violated. A mentor in business recounted how she intervened with a mentee who unknowingly was violating norms:

At the college they never say you have so much money. I can use my computer all I want. I can use the telephone all I want . . . . There's no limits really but if you start to stand out . . . . The secretary will call me and say did you see [x's] phone bill. It was $300 last month. I go to [x] and say are all these phone calls necessary? You are starting to stand out. Maybe you should tone it down a little . . . those kinds of things [become]. . . a little burr and [others may] be annoyed for the next four years and [the mentee will] never know why.
At times, mentors counterbalanced the negative influences in the environment. A few mentors heard criticism about mentees and guided the mentees in counterbalancing it. At times mentors defended the mentee. A mentor described her responses when she heard criticism of the mentee: "I find myself sometimes defending her and telling others I don't think you have the full picture here. My experiences have been this . . . ."

Supporting and Sponsoring the Mentee: The Delicate Balance

Mentors, who have influence and respect within a department or college, served as important balancing factors by using their power and influence to support the mentee's career development and advancement. Mentors who were respected by colleagues gained support for mentees and convinced colleagues of mentees' abilities. Mentors put a stamp of approval on mentees and, on occasion, defended their work or reputation, as exemplified in the following statement:

My mentor helped me pave my way through the rest of the college . . . . He [mentor] convinced the rest of the college of my worth as a faculty member . . . . In this department . . . . we don't do the same type of research that the rest of the college does. I was very suspect because of that. He had a lot of credibility with administrators and he was able to convince them that the work I did was good.

Mentors supported mentees in various ways. One mentor orchestrated opportunities for a mentee to advise graduate
students, which enhanced the mentee's collaboration opportunities. Advocacy and loyalty were inherent in many mentoring relationships. A mentee in business related that the mentor "battled for me . . . he stuck his neck out. I'm convinced that's why I have tenure." Another mentee in business described his mentor's loyalty to him in noting that: "It was always pretty clear that when push came to shove he was in your corner whether you deserved it or not."

Although sponsorship was an important element in these relationships, it incurred both benefits and costs. Sponsorship had to be cautiously balanced, since too much of it can be detrimental to the mentee's career. For example, Sarah had been the recipient of several awards that she believed resulted from her mentor's influence. Although the awards enhanced her career, there was an implied feeling among her colleagues that she did not deserve them. She related:

If you're seen as being the recipient of things because you have a friend in high places there is always the suspicion on the part of people who don't get that stuff that you don't deserve it . . . . You're trading on a relationship and then that creates enemies who are going to make your life miserable.

Sarah advised against promoting mentees too strongly, noting that: "Colleagues will dismiss a mentee as one who can't make it without the mentor."
Tipping the Balance: The Promotion Process

Mentoring relationships can be significant influences in tipping the balance in the tenure decision toward a successful outcome. For relationships typified by the comprehensive model, the mentor's role in the tenure review was varied. While a few mentors provided little guidance in the promotion process, others directed the preparation of promotion materials and on occasion advocated for the mentee's promotion.

Several mentors reviewed promotion materials to ensure that the requirements were being met satisfactorily. Some mentors reviewed teaching evaluations, and as one mentor related, they made a point of determining "what kind of research [the mentee] was doing and who she was doing it with." A mentee described the assistance the mentor had provided regarding the tenure process in this way:

I just did my fourth year [review], and [x] was making sure I had the different aspects covered well. Making sure I had lots of student evaluations, teacher feedback. Just starting this file early so that I had all the data organized and ready to just slot it in and again probably saying that this is not an overwhelming thing. You've done this all along and you can now put it together. Trying to minimize it and not making it bigger than it really was but being aware early on what kinds of things I need to be collecting.

Mentors also acted as advocates in the promotion process. The mentor and mentee often become allies who strategized for the mentee's advancement. One mentor, whose mentee had substantial funding success early in her career,
strategized to counterbalance any ambivalent feelings colleagues might have regarding the mentee's research success. Together the mentor and mentee established teaching assignments for the mentee to create a package that reflected the mentee's success in both teaching and research. The mentor described:

From my point of view it was a strategic plotting out so that when she [mentee] came up for tenure she had evidence of having skills with the graduate and undergraduate level . . . . She and I deliberately created some teaching assignments for her [mentee] that were the pits, but would put her in good stead with her colleagues . . . What I set out to do . . . was demonstrate that she [mentee] was an excellent researcher, a great teacher at the graduate level and highly successful at the undergraduate level . . . so here we were creating a package of good teacher and great researcher. It makes it awfully hard to find something wrong with that record.

Mentors also advocated for mentees. One mentor stacked the deck in the mentee's favor: "I picked her tenure committee. She would have gotten it anyway, but we engineered it and I did everything I possibly could."
Antecedent literature suggests that mentoring relationships are a significant influence in the career development of faculty and administrators in higher education. Previous studies, however, had not described how these relationships influence the faculty socialization process. This inquiry provided knowledge about mentoring relationships in academia and their influence on the faculty role and academic career.

In the previous chapter, I presented the findings of the study. The narratives of faculty participants suggested that mentoring relationships helped balance faculty careers. These alliances promoted a harmony within the faculty role, assisting mentees in balancing the myriad activities associated with successfully implementing the faculty role. In addition, these alliances often offered a counterbalance to the indifferent and demanding academic environment that greeted the novice faculty member.

In this chapter, I provide a summary of the study. Then I present some implications and recommendations for the
practice of higher education. Moreover, I offer recommendations for research that could improve the practice of higher education.

Summary of the Study

This study explored mentoring relationships between faculty and the influence of these relationships to socialization in the faculty role. Because I wanted to study mentoring relationships in a more comprehensive and holistic manner than antecedent literature, I employed a qualitative approach. Determined through a purposive sampling plan, 27 full-time, tenure-track faculty participants, teaching in the departments of nursing and business in two liberal arts colleges and one research university, were identified. Twenty-four of the faculty members had participated in a mentoring relationship. I also interviewed three individuals who had not participated in a faculty mentoring relationship to gain the perspectives on faculty socialization from those members of the academy who had not been mentored.

I collected data through interviews that explored mentoring relationships and the faculty socialization process. Data collection was concurrent with data analysis. Using an inductive approach, I analyzed data to discover themes that represented these mentoring relationships. Trustworthiness of the data analysis was supported through peer debriefing, member checks, limited triangulation, and
attention to my subjective feelings and biases. A summary of the major findings of this study is presented through the research questions that guided the study.

**What characterizes the mentoring relationships between faculty?**

Mentoring relationships, which developed informally, were established for the purpose of career development. They evolved, however, into collegial alliances and friendships. Mentors were role models, resource persons, career counselors, and confidants to professional, and sometimes, personal issues. These alliances provided support, knowledge, sponsorship, and advisement in the faculty role. Clearly, mentoring relationships provided professional benefits for both mentors and mentees.

A major outcome of this inquiry was the identification of two models—focused and comprehensive—that characterized the mentoring relationships in this study. Each model displayed distinct purposes, mentoring activities, and outcomes, and to a lesser degree, different dynamics.

Mentoring relationships representative of the focused model centered on promoting the mentee's research and scholarship role. The motivation for mentoring in the focused model was intellectual stimulation and the teaching of research. Relationships were often mutually initiated, because both mentor and mentee were motivated to promote the scholarship/research role in the mentee.
The focused model of mentoring relationships provided benefits to both participants. Mentees received advisement on scholarship, securing a faculty position, and establishing visibility as a professional. Mentors guided the development of the mentees' research/scholarship role and sponsored the mentee in the professional community. Collaboration with the mentor in scholarly activity provided unique opportunities for mentees to participate in all aspects of the research process. Commonly, collaborative research resulted in joint presentations and publications.

Professionally, mentors also benefited from these relationships. Mentees positively influenced the scholarly activity of the mentor, further refining the mentor's research/scholarship role. Collaboration with mentees provided mentors with new perspectives about their scholarship, increased the mentor's publication record, and expanded their research programs.

Mentoring relationships that represented the focused model commonly were initiated during graduate school between faculty and students or advisors and advisees. However, three relationships were initiated between faculty colleagues during the initial faculty appointment. In the early stage of development, mentors engaged in a process of examining in which they scrutinized the intellectual and research skills of the mentee. Motivation for these relationships was the mentor's desire to conduct and teach
research to the mentee. Mentoring relationships representative of the focused model did not demonstrate an official closure. Rather, they commonly remained open-ended, but faded in intensity. Although geographically separated, mentors and mentees continued to collaborate in scholarly activity and sponsor one another for presentations and professional appointments.

The focused model of mentoring relationships also provided some risks. As mentees assumed faculty appointments, they were expected to establish their own identities as scholars. When collaboration in scholarly activity between mentor and mentee was prominent there was the risk of the mentee's research record and scholarship identity becoming merged with the mentor's. Colleagues, then, questioned the ability of the mentee to provide independent scholarship.

The relationships representative of the focused model illustrate some aspects of the classic or conventional mentoring relationships presented in the literature and represented by Kram's study (1980) of mentoring relationships of managers in a business organization. In these conventional relationships, mentors, as more senior members of an organization, sponsor and coach less experienced protégés. Kram found that those mentoring relationship between senior and junior managers provided both career and psychosocial functions. The career
functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments helped to advance the protégé in the organization. Psychosocial functions enhanced the protégé's sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in the managerial role.

In this current study, mentors, who were professors of the mentee, offered many of the same mentoring functions that the senior business managers provided. These included sponsorship, exposure and visibility, and coaching. There are, however, some important distinctions between Kram's study and this one. Kram suggested that the career mentoring functions were provided to advance the protégé's career in the organization. Thus, she viewed the relationships as a vehicle for promotion within organizations. In this study, faculty mentors' guidance was focused broadly on the career as a whole, rather than promoting the career within an individual organization. Thus, faculty mentors representative of the focused model did not support the organizational socialization that was so prominent in Kram's findings.

Another important distinction between Kram's study and this one is the issue of complementarity. Kram suggested that the mentoring relationships of the senior and junior managers were complementary: the relationships were simultaneously responsive to the developmental tasks of both managers (Kram, 1980, p. 30); however, career enhancing
functions were unilateral. In this current study, relationships were reciprocal, rather than complementary. Mentoring relationships, particularly in the focused model, demonstrated a reciprocity in that mentor and mentee both benefited professionally from the alliances.

The second model of mentoring relationships that emerged from the data was the comprehensive model. This model represented the majority of mentoring relationships and was found equally in the research and liberal arts institutions. Mentoring relationship that illustrated the comprehensive model were initiated between faculty colleagues during the mentee's first academic appointment and were initiated for both professional and interpersonal reasons. Mentors frequently felt a responsibility to assist new faculty in enacting the faculty role. These relationships also progressed to friendships and had a tendency to fade in intensity when the mentee or mentor left the institution.

Mentors representing the comprehensive model offered advisement in several areas. Commonly, they supported the development of the mentees' teaching role and the adaptation of that role to the institution. To a lesser extent, mentors advised the research/scholarship and service roles. Moreover, mentors supported the organizational entry of the mentee, providing knowledge about colleagues, department
procedures, cultural norms and political agendas. Mentors sponsored the mentee within the institution and supported mentees in the promotion and tenure process.

The mentor also benefited from these relationships. Working with mentees encouraged some mentors to examine elements of their own careers, refining their teaching or scholarship role. Mentors also benefited politically from the relationship. Mentoring other faculty built friendships and a sense of community within the department and, at times, created alliances that benefited the mentor.

Risks also existed for both mentor and mentee. Because new faculty were expected to come to their initial academic appointments capable of enacting the faculty role autonomously and competently, mentees risked being judged as insecure or dependent when they sought advice. Mentors risked being linked in name and reputation with the mentee, which could negatively influence the mentor's career if the mentee did not perform well in the faculty role.

The mentoring relationships representative of the comprehensive model reflect the work relationships identified in Kram and Isabella's (1985) study of peer relationships between managers in an industrial organization. Kram and Isabella's (1985) study suggested that in the business setting, peer relationships, which provided both psychosocial and career functions, offered a viable alternative to the classic mentoring relationships in
terms of career development. Moreover, peer relationships offered a range of career-enhancing mentoring functions similar to those found in conventional mentoring relationships, including information sharing, career strategizing, and job-related feedback.

Kram and Isabella (1985) also noted that in peer relationships there were little differences in hierarchy or age status. In addition, the researchers also found that the peer relationships were characterized by a mutuality; both participants of the relationship provided and received the career enhancing mentoring functions. This contrasted with the conventional mentoring relationships where mentoring activities or functions were unilateral, with mentors guiding and sponsoring the mentee.

The findings of this study support Kram and Isabella's (1985) study in several areas. Faculty mentoring relationships representative of the comprehensive model were initiated by faculty colleagues of similar ages and at times the same rank. In several situations, mentors were younger or the same age as mentees. Faculty mentoring relationships also provided the benefits reported in Kram and Isabella's study: information sharing, career strategizing, and job-related feedback, as well as psychosocial functions. Moreover, these faculty relationships were also characterized by a reciprocity; the careers of both mentors and mentees benefited from the relationship.
An important difference between the two studies also exists. Kram and Isabella (1985) suggested that certain mentoring functions, such as sponsorship, coaching, protecting, and exposure and visibility, did not occur within the peer relationships of managers. This study contradicts those findings. Many of the mentors who represented the comprehensive model sponsored the mentee within the institution. Moreover, mentors provided coaching, protection, and exposure and visibility to mentees, which were particularly evident during the promotion and tenure process.

This study extends our knowledge about mentoring relationships in general and about mentoring relationships in academia in particular. This study supports Kram's (1980; 1988) findings that mentoring relationships provide both career and psychosocial functions. As noted, this study indicated that mentors provide a variety of career functions to mentees. Moreover, psychosocial mentoring functions were prominent in both the focused and comprehensive models.

The findings from this study both support and contradict Sands, Parson, and Duane's (1991) study, which suggested that faculty-faculty mentoring relationships exemplified different types of mentors: friend, career guide, information source and intellectual guide. According to the researchers, the friend mentor provided advice on
colleagues, gave emotional support, and assisted with personal problems, whereas the career guide mentor promoted the development of the mentee's scholarship, networking with colleagues, and professional visibility. The information source mentor provided organizational and professional information, including tenure, promotion and committee work information and publication sources. The intellectual guide collaborated and provided feedback on the mentee's scholarship.

The findings of this current study suggest that mentors functioned in a comprehensive manner, employing a combination of mentoring roles. Mentors within the focused model functioned as friend, career guide, and intellectual guide mentor. Mentors within the comprehensive model performed as friend and information source mentor and, to a lesser degree, intellectual guide mentor.

McNeer (1981, 1983), who studied women administrators in higher education institutions, suggested that different mentors appear at different stages in the academic career. "Graduate school" mentors guided the socialization of the novice faculty member, while other mentors provided assistance later in the administrator's career. This study suggests that mentoring relationships remained open ended. Particularly in the focused model, faculty continued to consult, network, and collaborate with their mentors beyond the doctoral program and initial faculty appointment.
This study also supports the antecedent research that suggested that mentoring relationships contributed to the scholarly productivity of the mentor (Williams & Blackburn, 1988) or the mentee (Rawl & Peterson, 1992; Queralt, 1981, 1982). Particularly in the focused model, mentors advanced their research programs and publication rate through contact and collaborating with mentees. In addition, mentees provided different perspectives that broadened the mentor's perspective of research problems.

Moreover, this study provides knowledge on the professional outcomes of the mentoring relationship for mentors that had been missing in antecedent research. The findings indicated that mentors readily identified benefits of the relationship to their careers. In the focused model, mentoring relationships provided intellectual stimulation and enhanced the mentor's scholarship. These alliances also provided networking opportunities and on several occasions mentees introduced mentors to new projects. In the comprehensive model, mentoring relationships refined the mentor's teaching. Supporting previous studies, mentors also identified positive psychosocial benefits of the relationship.

**How do mentoring relationships influence socialization in the faculty role?**

The extent to which mentoring relationships influenced faculty socialization was underscored when I considered the socialization experiences of faculty who had not been
mentored. Six individuals who had not been mentored as novice faculty members provided distinct perspectives of the faculty socialization process. Their experiences helped to further explicate the influence of mentoring relationships on socialization in the faculty role. In this section I further clarify how mentoring relationships influence faculty socialization by comparing the socialization experiences occurring with those faculty who had participated in mentoring relationship with those who had not.

Faculty members who participated in mentoring relationships as mentees were advised on myriad career issues and were offered guidance related to the teaching, research, and service roles. Mentors guided research projects, advised on the writing of grants, and read mentees' papers. They also assisted mentees in refining the teaching role, assisting mentees with course development and planning and advising on pedagogical issues.

Mentoring relationships also offered guidance in the service role. Mentors advised mentees on which service activities would promote the mentees' visibility externally in the professional community or internally in the college community. Mentors recommended which prestigious committees to join and which labor-intensive committees to avoid.

Collaboration with mentors also contributed to the socialization process. Mentors and mentees collaborated on
research, publications, and presentations, particularly in the focused model of mentoring relationships. Collaboration provided opportunities for the mentee to work with an experienced researcher.

Importantly, mentoring relationships also facilitated the mentees' organizational socialization. Mentors whose relationships represented the comprehensive model provided essential knowledge about faculty colleagues, informal rules, and political influences of the department and college. Mentors were valuable resources for providing "inside information."

Frequent contact with mentors provided countless opportunities for mentees to observe more experienced faculty members successfully enacting the faculty role. Weekly and sometimes daily contact provided numerous occasions for mentees to engage in frequent informal conversations that explicated the faculty role. Mentees observed mentors prioritizing their teaching, research, and service responsibilities. Two mentees described how they learned aspects of the faculty role from their mentors:

I think it is being in contact and having some idea of day to day requirements of a faculty member that helps you. Just seeing it and talking with someone who is going through all those faculty things, and the emphasis placed on certain aspects. How they organize their time, how she prioritized things. I would see her teach and do her research and I would see her go off to all these meetings ... having really close contact on a day to day basis. I could see what she was doing and what emphasis she placed on things.
Another mentee noted:

I guess I was able to observe her as I was a student all these years. I could see how she was pretty much balancing all the different roles that you need to assume. So that was sort of a modeling effect. I wasn't as ... keenly aware but know how important it was to sort of divide things out ... balancing was something she did ... I could see how she was organizing.

Socialization Experiences of Non-Mentored Faculty

Those faculty without mentors to guide their socialization process had different experiences. While mentors were primary socialization agents for mentees, faculty without mentors often had to learn the role by using different strategies and at times “fending for themselves.” The socialization process for faculty without mentors was often self-initiated. Typically, non-mentored faculty indicated that they figured things out on their own, as one faculty member stated: “It's every man for himself.” In general, the socialization of non-mentored faculty was characterized by the strategies of observing, seeking information and making mistakes.

Faculty members without mentors commonly learned the faculty role through looking and listening. One faculty member noted that, during her initial faculty appointment, she heeded the advice of her doctoral advisor: “For the first year keep your mouth shut and your eyes open.” Many faculty members related that to make sense of things they watched faculty and events in the environment. Observation
of colleagues served two purposes. It provided knowledge about how colleagues enacted the faculty role at the particular institution and helped faculty members decide who to approach for information.

To learn the faculty role, non-mentored faculty sought information from a variety of sources, including colleagues, documents, professional journals, and professional development programs and organizations. A few faculty who had not yet earned their doctoral degree also enrolled in graduate courses to better determine how to teach and/or research.

Faculty members who were mentees consulted with their mentors, who were trusted and often definitive sources for career and faculty role information. In contrast, novice faculty without mentors sought guidance from a variety of individuals. Prior to seeking information or advice from colleagues, new faculty had to determine the knowledgeable and reliable sources of information. Non-mentored faculty observed colleagues' knowledge and abilities through committee work and course contact. For example, one faculty member indicated that she identified a colleague who was knowledgeable about personal policies and then sought her advice on the tenure process. Co-teaching courses with more experienced colleagues provided frequent opportunities for new faculty members to seek information and verify perspectives.
In many mentoring relationships, mentors provided socialization to the organization. Mentors were information sources who introduced mentees to the values, norms, and behaviors required of the organization. In addition, mentors informed mentees of the policies, traditions, and political innuendos of the department and expectations of promotion and tenure process. On occasion, mentors played a protective role, keeping the mentor from violating cultural norms and interceding when norms were violated. Mentors often became vocal supporters of mentees and, on occasion, advocated for the mentees' promotion.

New faculty without mentors had to decipher the cultural norms and values, political agendas, and expectation of the faculty role without guidance. Some faculty consulted official documents to ascertain this information, while others observed the setting. Other novice faculty learned organizational information through trial and error.

Trial and error was identified as a common socialization strategy by many non-mentored faculty members. Some related they "stumbled through" some aspects of the faculty role. As one faculty member noted: "I floundered and bounced around and made lots of errors . . . I used to call them the boo boo of the day." New faculty who used trial and error as a strategy for learning the faculty role often violated cultural norms or overlooked important
policies or procedures associated with the faculty role. For example, a faculty member explained that she was halfway through the second year of her contract when she learned she should have been documenting her activities for her promotion folder.

The narratives of the socialization experiences of faculty without mentors support Whitt's findings in her study of new faculty in a school of education in a research university. Whitt's (1991) study indicated that new faculty members' socialization experiences were informal and relied on the initiative of the new faculty member. Similar to Whitt's study, this inquiry suggested that new faculty commonly learned about the culture of the organization through listening, observing, interacting, and interpreting the actions of others.

**Implications for the Practice of Higher Education**

This study has implications for individual faculty members and colleges and universities. The findings of this study are important to both junior and senior faculty members. The study indicated that mentoring relationships are a significant means of socialization in the faculty role and are particularly pertinent in the entry and induction phase of faculty socialization. Through advisement, role modeling, and collaboration, new faculty were socialized in the research, teaching, and service roles. Moreover, faculty were socialized in the organizational culture, with
its implicit norms, values, and politics. Socialization is extremely important to new faculty entering academia, because this is a pivotal period for learning the faculty role. The early years of employment also provide a basis for tenure decisions and are critical to the individual's success and satisfaction with the academic role (Sorcinelli, 1988). Moreover, research suggests that role conflict and ambiguity have a significant effect on retention and job satisfaction (Cavenar, Dill & Bethune, 1987).

Faculty mentoring relationships, critical vehicles for faculty socialization, are important for the retention of qualified faculty. The research on new faculty suggests that faculty are overburdened during their initial years of faculty appointment and desire increased interaction from colleagues. Although new faculty may be qualified and talented individuals, the overwhelming pressures coupled with informal, often haphazard socialization practices can impede their success in gaining promotion and tenure. As indicated in this study, mentoring relationships can significantly influence the promotion and tenure process. Denial of tenure can be an institutional as well as a personal loss, since great costs are accrued when denial of promotion and tenure necessitates replacing faculty. Thus, faculty mentoring relationships can be viewed as investments that can contribute to a long term relationship between faculty and the college or university. As colleges and
universities experience limited resources, mentoring relationships as a means of retention may become even more significant in academia.

Mentoring relationships also were shown to be significant to the continued socialization of senior faculty. As indicated in this study, mentoring relationships influenced the teaching and scholarship roles of senior faculty. These alliances often introduced experienced faculty to new scholarship projects and networking opportunities and stimulated the mentor's personal and professional growth.

These ongoing socialization experiences offered through mentoring relationships are important to senior faculty in particular and to academia in general. Current demographics of faculty in higher education suggest a trend toward an "aging professorate" on many campuses, which highlights a need for ongoing socialization activities that revitalize careers. This research suggests that mentors engaged in collaborative activities with protégés that benefited their careers. Mentoring relationships were a means for continuing socialization for senior faculty members and provided a method that promoted faculty productivity and vitality.

Institutions also have much to gain from mentoring relationships. This study indicated that, in the focused model of mentoring relationships, which commonly occurred in
the research university, mentoring contributed to the scholarship productivity of both mentor and mentee. Collaboration between mentor and mentee can increase the scholarly productivity for both participants. This productivity can translate into increased funding for the college and enhanced reputation for the department and college. These are significant outcomes for research universities with missions to generate and disseminate knowledge. Conversely, the mentoring relationships that promoted the teaching role, which commonly occurred in the liberal arts colleges, also strengthened the teaching of both mentor and mentee, promoting the mission of these institutions.

Moreover, this study suggested that mentoring relationships can influence the academic environment. Several mentors related that increased collegiality and cohesiveness within the department were benefits of these relationships. Mentoring promoted collegiality and contributed to a more pleasant work environment, benefiting both faculty and the institution.

A major outcome of this study was the discovery that different models of mentoring relationships existed in academia. The literature commonly has described conventional mentoring relationships established between older and younger individuals, where the more senior person sponsors and guides the career development within an
organization. In academia, this conventional model has been
demonstrated between professors and graduate students, with
senior professors facilitating students' successful entry
into academia and professional circles. An important
finding of this study was the identification of another
model of mentoring relationship, the comprehensive model,
that significantly contributed to the career development and
advancement of novice faculty. Mentoring relationships
representative of this model commonly were developed with
faculty colleagues during the first faculty appointment
and provided many of the mentoring functions found in the
conventional academic model.

This model of mentoring relationships was especially
important in the organizational socialization of faculty.
Mentors in the comprehensive model provided essential
institution and department information, which contributed to
successful integration of the mentee into the institution's
culture. Moreover, mentors supported and sponsored mentees
during a critical period in the academic career: the
promotion and tenure process. An important implication of
this finding is that novice faculty members seeking support
in their first faculty appointments can turn to colleagues
who can guide the faculty socialization process. This
finding supports Parson, Sands and Duane's (1992) study,
which suggested that department and colleagues become important sources for professional development and career advancement.

Recommendations for Practice

The implications of the study suggest several recommendation for practice in the higher education setting. The first recommendation relates to promoting an academic environment that is conducive to developing mentoring relationships. Wunsch (1994b, p. 11) relates that "the third party in mentoring relationships is the academic organization." Wunsch's statement implies that the environment plays a pivotal role in the development of mentoring relationships. The development of mentoring relationships is related, in part, to their support in the environment. Therefore, increasing the frequency and importance of mentoring relationships between faculty requires support and commitment from administrators and faculty in each department. According to most participants of this study this commitment to mentoring relationships was not evident in their academic environments.

The majority of faculty members who participated in this study noted that their academic environments did not support mentoring relationships. A few faculty members believed that the environment was neutral to these
relationships, neither "helping or hurting," as one faculty member stated. But others concluded that the environment hindered the development of the relationships.

Mentoring relationships were not valued by most peers. One faculty member noted: "I don't think anyone knows I'm doing this [mentoring]. Those kind of things are not highly valued here. Even if I said I was doing this, people would say so what." Several faculty members believed that the department and college made little attempt to encourage mentoring relationships between faculty and put forth minimal or no effort to promote situations that encouraged mentoring. One faculty member believed mentoring relationships were valued by the department only to the extent that they contributed to research and funding. This faculty member reported:

Let's say somebody mentors another faculty member and they both come up with a dazzling research idea. Of course that's going to be rewarded but it's because it's a dazzling research idea . . . it's not really the mentoring at all. It's the research.

A few faculty described the department's promotion of mentoring relationships as "lip service"; it supported the idea of mentoring but did not noticeably promote the relationships. Departments did not provide any visible means of support for these relationships. Mentors received no compensation, and the time and energy invested in the
relationship was neither recognized as a community service nor did it factor into the formula for a merit raise or promotion.

Because this study found that mentoring relationships made a significant contribution to faculty socialization, I recommend that administrators and senior faculty colleagues revisit the issue of mentoring relationships between faculty. I propose that administrators and faculty facilitate an environment that promotes collegiality and collaboration between more senior and novice faculty, one that encourages mentoring relationships between faculty. Jarvis (1991 p. 40) suggests that the most important single element in faculty development is collegiality. Research with new faculty supports that assertion, clearly indicating that new faculty desired more interaction and collegiality.

In addition, I recommend that faculty and administrators examine factors that either promote or inhibit mentoring relationships in their environments. Are workloads established in a way that discourages collegiality? Is autonomy so highly regarded that it interferes with the collegiality that is essential to establishing mentoring relationships?

Another recommendation relates to recognizing and rewarding mentors for their mentoring activities. This study noted that mentoring relationships are a great time commitment to both parties, as well as an emotional
investment. The time, energy, and commitment that is funneled into mentoring relationships should be rewarded within the department and college. Mentors could be recognized through awards or commendations. Faculty who participate in mentoring relationships could also be rewarded through reduction of committee work or teaching load. In the academic reward system, mentoring relationships could be viewed as what they rightfully are: service to the department, college, and profession.

Sensitizing doctoral students to the benefits of mentoring relationships and their link to the faculty socialization process is another recommendation. As Schuster (1990, p. 78) has suggested, graduate schools make a substantial contribution in preparation of the next generation of teachers and scholars. Introducing the issue of faculty mentoring relationships and the different models associated with these alliances during graduate school can increase future professors' knowledge about these alliances. As indicated in this study, graduate schools are not the only sanctuary for the development of mentoring relationships. Mentors, in the form of faculty colleagues, may be available in all institutions. This knowledge is particularly important for those individuals considering faculty appointments in liberal arts colleges. The
comprehensive model of mentoring relationships strongly influenced socialization in the teaching role, an essential function in liberal arts colleges.

**Implications for Research**

Results of this study suggest many areas for further investigation. In general, there is a need for more naturalistic studies that explore and describe faculty mentoring relationships.

This study examined the relationships of faculty in two professions, business and nursing. Faculty mentoring relationships in other disciplines also need to be explored. For example, do the mentoring relationships of faculty members in the sciences or humanities typify the focused and comprehensive models? Would different models emerge from faculty mentoring relationships in other higher education institutions?

Women faculty members represented 63% of the sample. Gender was not a central issue in this study's design, however, the effects of gender on mentoring relationships warrants further study. How did gender contribute to the development of faculty mentoring relationships? How did gender contribute to the socialization process of faculty?

In addition, a study that explores administrators' experiences with mentoring relationships and their perceptions of the influence of mentoring on the socialization of novice faculty would provide additional
knowledge about these alliances. Promoting mentoring relationships in academia necessitates both determining administrators' views of mentoring relationships and securing their support. How do administrators perceive mentoring relationships as influencing the goals of the department and mission of the college or university? How do administrators view mentoring relationships as influencing the faculty socialization process?

Several faculty members identified constraints to mentoring relationships, including the time commitment, autonomous faculty role, and lack of collegiality within departments. These constraints may represent only a few of the factors that restrict the development of mentoring relationships between faculty. Hunt and Michael (1983) suggest that the work setting and organizational characteristics influence the development of mentoring relationships. Thus, there is a need to determine what other factors influence the development of mentoring relationships between faculty. For example, what institutional factors restrain or promote the development of mentoring relationships between faculty? What role-related factors inhibit the development of mentoring relationships between faculty? How is mentoring influenced by different organizational factors? How does the organization influence the outcomes of the mentoring relationship?
The mentoring relationships representative of the comprehensive model that developed between colleagues during faculty members' first faculty appointments needs further study. As indicated in Kram and Isabella's (1985) inquiry and this study, peer relationships, which are more accessible, contribute substantially to the socialization process. This model of mentoring relationship need further exploration. Although the literature suggests that mentoring is common with faculty, Sands, Parson and Duane (1991) suggest that only a small percentage of faculty are mentored by colleagues in the institution. How common is the comprehensive model of mentoring relationships? What further benefits can be explicated from this model for the mentee, mentor, and institution?

The socialization that occurs in the mentor through the mentoring relationship also requires further inquiry. This study suggests that mentoring relationships facilitated a continued socialization in the faculty role in relationship to the research/scholarship and teaching roles. However, several questions remained unanswered. Do mentoring relationships contribute to the promotion process of the mentor? How do mentoring relationships contribute to the work productivity of the mentor? This study has described some advantages of mentoring relationship for faculty mentors. What additional benefits can be identified and described? This area warrants further investigation.
There is consistent and strong evidence that mentoring relationships have significant positive influences on the career development of faculty. This study adds to that evidence, suggesting that mentoring relationships are important to the academic career. These alliances help junior faculty make professional connections; introduce them to the institutional structure, resources, and culture; acquaint them with the promotion and tenure process; and provides support for learning the teaching, scholarship, and service roles. As one mentee noted: "I think it [mentoring relationship] was the single thing that helped me see what it takes [to succeed] and helped me realize that I have what it takes and I know what to do to progress."

As this study suggests, mentoring relationships also contribute to the continued socialization of senior faculty. The careers of senior faculty members were also influenced positively by these relationships. A mentor described the benefits and reciprocity inherent in the mentoring relationship:

Where I think I've gained a lot from her was that she seemed to appreciate and value my strengths and created opportunities for me . . . to be involved in something that was interesting and in my line of work. While I was looking for opportunities for her to get involved in things, she seemed to reciprocate. . .
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Dear Dr. X:

We are writing to seek the participation of faculty in the Department of Nursing in a study on faculty mentoring relationships. Specifically, we are seeking the perspectives of faculty members in nursing from both a research university and a liberal arts college and wish to include faculty from this department to represent liberal arts colleges. We are requesting a roster of full-time, tenure-track faculty in the Department of Nursing along with their office addresses and phone numbers. Additionally, we are seeking a letter indicating a willingness on your part to include faculty from this department in the study.

You may be assured that the names of all potential participants will be treated confidentially. Enclosed you will find a copy of materials, including an assurance of confidentiality, that we plan to send to prospective study participants.

This study is a part of a dissertation that is being conducted under the direction of Mary Ann Sagaria, Associate Professor, Educational Policy and Leadership, The Ohio State University. The study was approved by The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Committee on June 30, 1995. Please let us know if we are required to submit any or all materials to [college name] Human Subjects Review Board.

Please forward the requested materials to Kathleen Lennon's home address: 4747 Olentangy Boulevard, Columbus, OH 43214. If you desire additional information or would prefer to discuss the study further, please call Ms. Lennon at 263-6557, or Professor Sagaria at 292-7703. Thank you for your assistance. We look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Sagaria
Associate Professor
292-7703

Kathleen Lennon
Doctoral Candidate
263-6557
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS
Dear Dr. X:

We are writing to invite your participation in a dissertation study on mentoring relationships among faculty members. Specifically, we are interested in extended, informal professional relationships formed when more experienced faculty guide the career development of those with less experience and how such relationships influence the faculty role.

Because Kathleen Lennon will be talking to both faculty members who have participated in such mentoring relationships and those who have not, your experiences will indeed be important to this study. Your participation will involve taking part in an hour to an hour and a half interview exploring two areas: how individuals learn and change in the faculty role and mentoring relationships. All interviews will take place this fall, the specific time and location will be determined at your convenience when Ms. Lennon contacts you. Additionally, you may be asked to participate in a one hour follow-up interview. Your identity and responses will be treated confidentially. With your permission, interviews will be audiotaped. These tapes will be locked in a cabinet in Ms. Lennon's home during the study and will be destroyed upon completion of the study. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time.

If your desire additional information about this study please call Ms. Lennon at 263-6557, or contact the dissertation committee chairperson, Professor Mary Ann Sagaria, Educational Policy and Leadership, The Ohio State University at 292-7703.

If you agree to participate in this study, please complete and return the attached response sheet and a copy of your curriculum vitae in the enclosed prepaid envelope to: 4747 Olentangy Boulevard, Columbus, OH 43214. We would be most grateful for your assistance and look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Sagaria  Kathleen Lennon
Associate Professor  Doctoral Candidate
RESPONSE SHEET

Please complete and return this form if you are willing to participate in the study

Dear Kathleen,

I am interested in participating in your study. Please call me to schedule an interview.

Name: ____________________________________________________
Department:  _______________________________________________
College/University: _________________________________________
Year of Appointment: ________________________________________
I can be reached at these numbers: ____________________________
The best time to call me is: ________________________________

Please provide the following demographic data:

Academic Rank _______ Year Appointed to this Rank _______
Discipline __________ Gender __________
Race ________________
Indicate Yes or No:
Tenure-track _______ Full-Time Appointment _______

Check all that apply:
Current Participation in a Mentoring Relationship as Mentor ____
as Protégé_____
Past Participation in a Mentoring Relationship as Mentor _____
as Protégé_____
No participation in a Mentoring Relationship _____

Please return this response sheet in the prepaid envelope to:
Kathleen Lennon
4747 Olentangy Boulevard
Columbus, OH 43214
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I consent to participate in the research titled: The Influence of Mentoring Relationships on Socialization in the Faculty Role. This research is being conducted by Kathleen Lennon, a doctoral candidate, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree, under the direction of Dr. Mary Ann Sagaria, Associate Professor, Educational Policy and Leadership, The Ohio State University.

Ms. Lennon has explained the purpose of the research and time commitment of this study. I realize that my participation in this research will consist of taking part in an interview which will be tape recorded. Additionally, I understand that I may be requested to participate in a follow-up interview.

I acknowledge that I have had an opportunity to obtain additional information regarding this study and my questions have been answered to my full satisfaction.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and I may withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice to me. I understand that segments of this interview may be quoted in written documents reporting this study, however, my name will not be included in any written presentations of the data. Audio tapes of this interview will be destroyed upon completion of this study.

I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand this consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ______________________

Signed: ____________________
(Participant)

Signed: ____________________ Signed: _______________
(Co-Investigator) (Principal Investigator)
Doctoral Candidate Associate Professor
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDES
Thank you for participating in my study. As indicated in my letter, I am interested in understanding mentoring relationships between faculty members and how these relationships influence learning and changing in the faculty role. However, I am also interested in understanding why some faculty do not participate in mentoring relationships and how this influences their learning the faculty role. During this interview first we'll talk about mentoring relationships and then about the faculty role. Please provide as much information or as many examples as you have about these questions. Although many of these questions are structured, please feel free to discuss areas that I may not be covering.

I want you to assure you that confidentiality will be maintained during this study. All tapes will be assigned a code number and no names will be associated with these tapes, interview notes or transcripts. When presenting the data and conclusions, quotes or descriptions will be attributed to fictitious faculty names and your name will not be used. Personal identifying characteristics will be altered to prevent your identification. Before we begin the interview I would like your permission to tape record this interview.

Do I have your permission to tape record this interview?

Do you have any questions about the study or this interview?

START RECORDING

Today's date is __________

This is participant # ___
INTERVIEW WITH FACULTY WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

Code __________  Rank _____
College ________  Gender ___
Discipline ______  Race ___

******************************************************************************

THE MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

1. People describe mentoring in many different ways. One description of a mentoring relationship is an informal, long-term, professional relationship that is formed when more experienced faculty guide the career development of those with less experience. How does this description compare to your view of mentoring? Would you add anything to that description?

2. You indicated in your response sheet that you have participated in a mentoring relationship as a faculty member. Have you participated as mentor or protégé or both? If you have been both mentor and protégé, first let's talk about your experiences as protégé and then we will focus on your role as mentor. If you have been a mentor or protégé more than once, for purposes of this discussion, let's focus on your most significant experience as mentor or protégé. Let's focus on your experiences as a protégé first.

PROTÉGÉ PERSPECTIVE
3. I'm interested in how this relationship began, progressed and ended, if it has. Let's start with the how the relationship began.

   What attracted you to the mentor?

   How did you meet?

   What were your first impressions?

   Stage in your career; stage in mentor's career

   Who initiated the relationship?

4. What occurred during the relationship?

   How much time was spent together?

   What did you receive from the relationship?
5. From the protégé's perspective, would you provide an example of an experience that you consider a good illustration of the mentoring relationship?

6. Describe the progression of the relationship.

7. What is the status of this relationship today?

   How long did the relationship continue?

   If relationship has ended: when and how did this occur?

   Who initiated the ending of the relationship?

   How would you describe the relationship between you two today?

8. How are/were you similar and how are/were you different from your mentor?

   Attributes: gender, race, age, personality,

   Career events: issues or patterns, ideological perspectives,

   Research interests or methods, teaching areas

9. How does/did the college environment encourage or discourage establishing mentoring relationships between faculty?

   Administrative, department and collegial support

FACULTY SOCIALIZATION

Another purpose of this study is to better understand how persons learn and change as faculty; how faculty learn the values, attitudes, skills and knowledge associated with the faculty role. Some believe that this is a process that begins during graduate school and continues throughout the career.

10. The faculty role is often described as having three components: teaching, research and service. I'm wondering, as protégé, how did the mentoring relationship contribute to your learning these roles?

    Teaching: course preparation, organizing courses
Research and grant writing and other scholarship
Service to college community; faculty governance,
Service to profession, external community
Participation in college activities

11. I understand that for some faculty the beginning years are characterized by minimal collegial support and concern about one's competence as a faculty member. What were your feelings as a new faculty member?

Feelings of isolation?

12. How did your mentoring relationship influence these beginning years?

13. From the protégé's perspective, how did the mentoring relationship contribute to your learning the faculty role?

What methods were used?

Issues of collegiality, autonomy, academic freedom, peer review

14. From the protégé's perspective, how does/did the mentoring relationship influence your career development in the beginning, middle and where you are now?

Networking, collaboration, publishing, bringing in research funding

15. From the protégé's perspective how does/did the mentoring relationship influence your career advancement?

How did the relationship contribute to the promotion process?

How did mentor help you to become aware of what you needed to do to become tenured?

16. As you reflect on your mentoring relationship, what do you identify as the benefits of the relationship for you as the protégé?

Assistance received/provided

Ally in department, co-writer, supporter, research associate?
17. As you reflect on your mentoring relationship from the protégé perspective, what do you identify as the stresses or liabilities of this relationship?

Negative aspects or problems

MENTOR PERSPECTIVE

18. I'm interested in how this mentoring relationship began, progressed and ended, if it has. Let's start with the how the relationship began.

What attracted you to the protégé?

What were your first impressions?

How did you meet?

Stage in your career; stage in protégé's career?

Who initiated the relationship?

19. What occurred during the relationship: what are the things you do/did as mentor?

How much time was spent together?

Activities you provided in the relationship

What did you receive from the relationship?

20. Would you provide an example of an experience that you consider a good illustration of the mentoring relationship?

Examples of career advice

Did advice extend beyond career advice

21. Describe the progression of the relationship

22. What is the status of the relationship today?

How long did the relationship continue?

Process through which relationship ended or evolved

If relationship has ended: when and how did this occur?

Who initiated ending of the relationship?
How would you describe the relationship between the two of you today?

23. How are/were you similar and how are/were you different from your mentor?
   
   Attributes: gender, race, age, personality
   
   Career events, issues or patterns, ideological perspectives
   
   Research interests or methods, teaching areas

24. How does/did the college environment encourage or discourage establishing mentoring relationships between faculty?

   Administrative, department and collegial support

FACULTY SOCIALIZATION

Another purpose of this study is to better understand how persons learn and change as faculty; how faculty learn the values, attitudes, skills and knowledge associated with the faculty role. Some believe that this is a process that begins during graduate school and continues throughout the career.

25. The faculty role is often described as having three components: teaching, research, and service. I'm wondering how your mentoring relationship contributed to your refining these activities.

   Teaching
   
   Research: grant writing and other scholarship activities
   
   Service to college community; faculty governance, committees
   
   Service to profession or external community

26. From the mentor's perspective, how does/did the mentoring relationship influence your career development in the beginning, middle and where you are now?

   Networking, collaboration, publishing, bringing in research funding
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27. From the mentor's perspective, how did the mentoring relationship influence your career advancement?

   How did the relationship contribute to the promotion process?

   Specific examples

28. As you reflect on your mentoring relationship what do you identify as the benefits of the relationship for you as the mentor?

   Assistance received/provided

   Ally in department, co-writer, supporter, research associate, sponsor?

29. As you reflect on the mentoring relationship from the mentor's perspective, what do you identify as the stresses or liabilities of your relationship?

   Negative aspects or problems

30. What advice would you give to a faculty mentor?

31. What advice would you give to a faculty protégé?

32. Are there other areas about your mentoring relationship or learning and changing in the faculty role that we haven't discussed that you would like to talk about?

Thank you for your interest in my study and the time you have given me for this interview. Your contribution to this study is greatly appreciated.

I will be selecting several individuals from this college to participate in a follow-up interview session. This session will provide participants the opportunity to review and react to my data analysis. The follow-up session will last approximately one hour. Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up session?
INTERVIEW WITH FACULTY WHO HAVE NOT PARTICIPATED IN A MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

Code # ______________  Rank ____________
College ______________  Gender ____________
Department ____________  Race ____________

**********************************************************************************

MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS
1. One purpose of this study is to understand mentoring relationships between faculty: what they are, what they do, and why people participate or do not participate in them. You indicated to me in your response letter that you have not participated in a mentoring relationship as a faculty member. Would you please talk about that?

What factors contributed to that situation?

2. Have you observed mentoring relationships between faculty members?

Were these in your department?

Are mentoring relationships common in this department?

3. What do you see as the benefits and what do you see as the stresses or liabilities associated with these faculty mentoring relationships?

4. How does this college environment encourage or discourage establishing mentoring relationships between faculty?

Administrative, collegial and department support

FACULTY SOCIALIZATION

5. Another purpose of this study is to better understand how persons learn and change in the faculty role; how individuals learn the values, attitudes, skills and knowledge associated with the faculty role. Some believe that this is a process that begins during graduate school and continues throughout one's career. How did you learn the faculty role?

Focus on the initial faculty appointment
Issues of collegiality, autonomy, academic freedom, peer review

Who assisted you in this process?

6. The faculty role is often described as having three components: teaching, research and service. I'm wondering how you learned to perform these roles.

   Teaching: course preparation; organizing courses
   Research and grant-writing, other scholarship
   Service to college community; faculty governance, committees; service to profession, service to external community
   Participation in college activities

7. I understand that for some faculty the beginning years are characterized by minimal collegial support and concern about one's competence as a faculty member. What were your feelings as a new faculty member?

   Feelings of isolation?

8. Who helped you during this time?

9. Through these years as a faculty member who has influenced your career development?

   Relationship to participant?

   How was this done?

10. How did you learn about what you needed to do for the promotion and tenure process?

11. What advice would you give about learning and changing in the faculty role?

12. Are there other areas about learning the faculty role that we haven't discussed that you would like to talk about?
Thank you for your interest in my study and the time you have given me during this interview. Your contribution to this study is greatly appreciated.

I will be selecting several individuals from this college to participate in a follow-up interview session. This session will provide participants the opportunity to react to my data analysis. The follow-up session will last approximately one hour. Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up session?