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Contexts and the Mentoring Research Phenomenon

Mentoring is not a new phenomenon. Although, as mentioned in the introductory chapter, it is most often associated with Greek mythology, the term “mentor” did not formally become visible in common usage until it appeared in titles of books aimed at helping young people during the 18th and 19th centuries (Woodd 1997). Consequently, mentors have often been conceptualized as those who draw upon a deep knowledge base to teach and guide others (Swap, Leonard, Shields, and Abrams 2001). Work organizations, public educational institutions, postsecondary educational institutions, professional associations, community-based organizations, and publicly and privately funded programs represent some of the contexts where mentoring occurs for a diverse array of individuals from adolescents to adults (Cohen and Galbraith 1995; Dansky 1996; Russell and Adams 1997).

Researchers have argued that promotions, early career advancement, higher income, greater job satisfaction, and reduced turnover among protégés can be attributed to mentoring (Chao, Walz, and Gardner 1992; Chao 1997; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, and Amendola 1997; Hill and Bahniuk 1998; Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000; Roche 1979). Further, mentoring can enhance organizational socialization and assimilation; convey organizational knowledge about values, norms, and routines (Swap, Leonard, Shields, and Abrams 2001); and reduce stress (Sosik and Godshalk 2000). Mentoring can also assist with faculty development; the development of women, minorities, and high-potential employees; and succession planning (Douglas and McCauley 1999; Goodwin, Stevens, and Bellamy 1998). In addition to the benefits of mentoring for protégés and the organization, mentors may experience career revitalization, social recognition, and personal satisfaction (Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs 1997; Burke, McKeen, and McKenna 1994; Jacobi 1991; Scandura, Tejeda, Werther, and Lankau 1996).

Within the past decade, several trends have generated considerable interest in mentoring in work organizations and educational institutions. Higgins and Kram (2001) identify four broad areas of change that have implications for mentoring: the new employment contract, the rapid pace of technology, changing organizational structures and forms, and diverse organizational memberships. Individuals, now characterized as knowledge workers, are assuming more responsibility for their learning and development because continuous learning as a core competency is being advocated as a way to remain competitive in job markets that no longer offer lifelong employment. The rapid pace of technology also requires employees to be technologically knowledgeable. Consequently, mentoring is now considered an important workplace learning strategy (Darwin 2000; Dymock 1999).
Changes in organizational structures and the nature of work influence who provides mentoring support and how it is provided. Downsizing, delayering, and team-based organizations may limit or alter access to traditional mentors. Individuals may have to seek such developmental support from peers or colleagues or externally through professional associations. In learning-oriented organizations, managers and leaders may be challenged to assume more developmental roles and become mentors to their employees (Ellinger and Bostrom 1999). In virtual organizations, or for those who telecommute, mentoring may be facilitated by technology. (See the next chapter for further discussion of technology and mentoring.) The composition of the work force is also dramatically changing. Since women now comprise one half of the work force and racial minorities one-third, they have become the focus of mentoring programs to help them overcome organizational barriers for advancement (Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000; Russell and Adams 1997; Van Collie 1998).

Within public educational institutions, mentoring for teachers and students has also become increasingly important, given the high attrition rates of new teachers and at-risk youth (Boreen and Niday 2000; Gratch 1998). More than 30 states have implemented some form of mentoring for new teachers at the elementary and secondary levels (Evertson and Smithey 2000; Gratch 1998). Some states have also enacted legislation that requires elementary and secondary education teachers to intern with a mentor teacher prior to obtaining their license to teach (Cunningham 1999). Within colleges and universities, planned mentoring is being used to improve retention and graduation rates among demographically underrepresented students, faculty, and administrators (Redman 1990; Ross-Thomas and Bryant 1994; Shultz, Colton, and Colton 2001). Mentoring among undergraduate and graduate students is also being encouraged to improve students’ levels of academic achievements, assist at-risk students, and promote growth in graduate programs and the professoriate (Jacobi 1991; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, and Kearney 1997). Such trends and legislation will likely influence the practice of mentoring and future mentoring research.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of current mentoring research within work organizations and educational institutions. This chapter begins by distinguishing between mentoring terminology and types of mentoring. Next, a brief review of recent research literature is presented with some implications for improving mentoring practice. Finally, the future direction of mentoring research within these different contexts is explored.

**Mentoring Terminology and Types**

Various definitions of mentoring exist, causing conceptual confusion from research and evaluation perspectives (Appelbaum, Ritchie, and Shapiro, 1994; Aryee, Chay, and Chew 1996; Barton-Arwood, Jolivette, and Massey 2000; Darwin 2000; Hansman 2001; Hegstad 1999). Mentors are traditionally defined as individuals who possess advanced experience and knowledge and are committed to providing developmental assistance to their less experienced protégés (Hegstad 1999; Mullen 1998; Ragins 1997b). Career development and psychosocial assistance are the two primary functions mentors provide (Kram in Ragins 1997b). Career-related behaviors typically include sponsorship, expo-
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sure, visibility, coaching, and challenging assignments (Chao, Walz, and Gardner 1992). Psychosocial behaviors include role modeling, confirmation, counseling, and friendship (ibid.). Scandura (1992) has suggested that role modeling represents a third function performed by mentors.

Traditional forms include informal and formal mentoring (Chao, Walz, and Gardner 1992). Informal mentorships, or natural mentorships (Feist-Price 1994), occur spontaneously and are not managed or structured by organizations. In contrast, formal mentorships, or planned mentorships (Redman 1990), are those that are sponsored and sanctioned by the organization. Formal mentoring relationships may be the result of requirements to participate in such programs and pairing may occur randomly or by assignment or selection. Formal mentoring may be akin to “blind dates” or “arranged marriages” in some cases (Chao, Walz, and Gardner 1992). Additional distinctions between informal and formal mentoring may also include the purpose, structure, and duration of the relationship and the frequency of interaction (Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000).

Formal and informal mentoring can also be internal or external. Mentors within the same organization as the protégés are considered internal mentors and those employed outside of the organization are external mentors. Internal mentors may be more physically accessible and may be able to buffer and protect protégés (Ragins 1997b). External mentors, on the other hand, may be better poised to provide long-range career assistance and lateral career transitions (ibid.).

Recent Research on Mentoring in the Workplace

Scholarly attention has been devoted to the subject of mentoring for well over 3 decades, yet most of the empirical work has been done during the past decade (Chao, Walz, and Gardner 1992; Higgins and Kram 2001; Russell and Adams 1997). Mentoring research in the workplace has been focused on the types of mentoring and effectiveness of informal and formal mentoring; the characteristics of mentors and protégés; the process, functions, outcomes, and antecedents of mentoring; diversified mentoring; and marginal mentoring relationships (Chao, Walz, and Gardner 192; Hill and Bahnuiik 1998; Ragins 1997a; Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000; Russell and Adams 1997; Young and Perrewe 2000).

Types of Mentorships

Recent research on the prevalence of mentoring in Fortune 1000 organizations has suggested that respondents who acknowledged having a mentor had been mentored informally (Simonetti, Ariss, and Martinez 1999). Comparisons of mentored individuals with nonmentored individuals generally suggest that informal mentoring is largely beneficial to protégés. Although scholars generally agree that mentoring in general is beneficial to protégés, informal mentorships may be more beneficial than formal mentoring programs because informal mentorships generally develop naturally and voluntarily between
mentors and protégés as a result of a mutual desire to engage in a mentoring relationship (Chao, Walz, and Gardner 1992; Lee, Dougherty, and Turban 2000).

Ragins and Cotton (1999) found that individuals with informal mentors received higher compensation and promotions than nonmentored employees and higher compensation than formally mentored employees. Another major finding of their research was that protégés with formal mentors did not gain any career advantages over nonmentored individuals. Gender-based differences were also identified. Mentorships with male partners received the most compensation, followed by female protégés with male mentors, male protégés with female mentors, and female protégés with female mentors. However, more recent research by Ragins, Cotton, and Miller (2000) has suggested that comparing informal and formal mentoring without controlling for quality or satisfaction with the mentoring relationship may present a simplistic and erroneous picture. They contend that mentoring occurs on a continuum and the level of satisfaction in the relationship is a key variable in determining type of mentoring effectiveness.

Although informal mentorships may appear to be more prevalent and beneficial to protégés, formal mentoring is an emerging trend (Douglas and McCauley 1999; Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000; Van Collie 1998). Formal mentoring programs have existed since the late 1970s and 1980s and have been linked to affirmative action (Van Collie 1998). However, as organizations have become more sensitive to the influx of women and minorities in the workplace, there has been considerable growth of such programs within the last decade (Gunn 1995; Jossi 1997). In a 1993 joint survey for the Society for Human Resource Management and Commerce Clearing House (Gunn 1995), more than one in five respondents indicated that their workplaces had mentoring programs targeted for minorities and many rated such programs as necessary.

In a survey by Human Resource Executive Magazine (Jossi 1997), the number of businesses planning mentoring programs more than doubled from 17 percent to 36 percent between 1995 and 1996. Now over one-third of major U.S. corporations have established mentoring programs (Nemanick 2000; Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000). Some organizations with mentoring programs include AT&T, Merrill Lynch, Federal Express, General Motors, J.C. Penney, Bell Labs, DuPont, Sun Microsystems, Charles Schwab, BellSouth Corporation, Barnett Bank, Nations Bank, Texas Commerce Bank, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Jewel Companies, Trevira, and General Electric (Hegstad 1999; Jossi 1997; Van Collie 1998).

Despite the growth of formal mentoring programs, few empirical studies have examined them (Lee, Dougherty, and Turban 2000; Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000). Recent research by Viator (1999) indicates that protégés who had input into the matching process viewed their mentorship experience differently than those who did not. In terms of comparing type of relationships, protégés reported being more satisfied with informal mentors than formal mentors. Orpen’s (1997) research on formal mentoring programs confirms the importance of the quality of the mentoring relationship and suggests that formal mentoring programs can lead to better work motivation and greater organizational commitment if protégés perceive they have good relationships with their mentors.
In research designed to examine the effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes, Ragins et al. (2000) found that specific design features of formal mentoring programs had limited impacts on attitudes and degree of satisfaction with the mentoring relationship.

Many scholars suggest that formal mentoring programs should emulate informal mentoring relationships, but this is often difficult to achieve in practice (Chao 1997; Hill and Bahniuk 1998). The implications of some of the earlier mentoring research suggest that to enhance satisfaction with formal programs, mentors and protégés should have input into the pairing process; thus, providing informal opportunities for prospective mentors and protégés to interact may facilitate more natural pairings as opposed to forced assignment of dyads. However, contrasting findings by Ragins et al. (2000) suggest that programs that allowed participation in the pairing process did not yield more positive attitudes and were not viewed as more effective than programs that made assignments of dyads.

In terms of practical application, one area that Ragins et al. identified that may have an impact on design and practice is using mentors from departments that differ from the protégés. Most important, Ragins et al. contend that design features may be overshadowed by the degree of satisfaction with the mentoring relationship. In other words, a well-designed program still may not compensate for marginal mentors. Therefore, ascertaining mentors’ motivation to mentor may yield insights into mentor recruitment and selection processes that may be more important than design features.

**Characteristics and Personality Traits**

Researchers have also examined the personal dispositions that distinguish protégés from nonprotégés and the characteristics and personality traits that influence the selection process for protégés and mentors (Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs 1997; Allen, Poteet, Russell, and Dobbins 1997; Aryee, Chay, and Chew 1996; Scandura 1992). These studies suggest that protégés tend to have higher needs for achievement and power than nonprotégés (Fagenson 1992). Research has suggested that mentors’ intentions to mentor have been associated with mentors’ internal locus of control and upward striving (Allen, Poteet, Russell, and Dobbins 1997). Aryee, Chay, and Chew (1996) also reported that managerial employees’ motivation to mentor may be predicted by individual characteristics such as altruism, positive affectivity, situational characteristics that include an organizational reward system emphasizing employee development, and opportunities to interact on the job. The literature also suggests that the motivation to mentor may be related to the intangible rewards of mentoring, described by Erikson as generativity, which involves an element of selflessness (Jacobi 1991).

Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs (1997) have identified two overall factors that explain why mentors choose to become mentors: “other-focused” and “self-focused.” Within these two factors, 13 dimensions were identified. The dimensions associated with “other-focused” included the desire to pass on information to others, to build a competent workforce, to help others, to help others succeed, to help the organization, and to help mi-
norities and women move through the organizational ranks. For the mentors themselves, the “self-focused” dimensions included gratification at seeing others grow, free time for other pursuits, a personal desire to work with others, increased personal learning, pride, a desire to have influence on others, and respect from others.

From a pragmatic perspective, the research on characteristics and personality traits suggests specific attributes that may be influential in forming mentoring relationships, such as open communication, expertise, interests, and expectations within the organization for prospective mentors and protégés. However, the findings on why mentors choose to become mentors may be most useful in recruiting and selecting mentors. Identifying mentors who are committed to mentoring may improve the satisfaction within mentoring relationships that may ultimately have an impact on the practice of mentoring in the workplace.

Several factors have been identified that influence a mentor’s selection of a protégé (Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs 1997): Some mentors considered the protégé a reflection of themselves. Personality indicators, such as good interpersonal skills, confidence, and dependability were among those mentors reported that influenced the selection process. Other indicators included how motivated and competent the protégé appeared to be and whether mentors felt they could help the protégé. Finally, a learning orientation that included protégés’ willingness to learn and accept constructive feedback was considered important. More recent research by Allen, Poteet, and Russell (2000) on the characteristics deemed most influential by mentors in selecting protégés suggests that mentors are more likely to choose a protégé based upon perceptions regarding the protégé’s potential and ability as opposed to the perceptions of the protégé’s need for help. Mullen’s (1998) research confirms that perceptions of protégés’ competence influence the commitment of time and effort made by mentors. Research conducted by Green and Bauer (1995) within an academic setting also lends empirical evidence that mentoring functions are more likely to be available to the most capable newcomers within an organizational setting.

Similar values shared by mentors and protégés have also been influential to mentor-protégé dyads (Lee, Dougherty, and Turban 2000). Research by Kalb fleisch (2000) suggests that gender also affects the selection process. Same-sex mentoring relationships occur more frequently than cross-gender relationships, and the sex of the mentor or protégé was the best predictor of the sex of the corresponding partner (Kalbfleisch 2000). Hurley and Fagenson-Eland (1996) also concur that male mentor/female protégé relationships exist, but these relationships are infrequent due to perceptions and actual experiences of sexuality and intimacy. Women often fear that the male mentor or others will construe approaching a male mentor as a sexual advance within the organization. The actual or perceived power of a male mentor over a female protégé may also create concern about the potential for sexual harassment (Hurley and Fagenson-Eland 1996).

In addition to sexuality, intimacy, and sexual harassment issues, Feist-Price (1994) elaborates on Kram’s (1985) categories of cross-gender complexities to suggest that cross-gender relationships are often subject to public scrutiny and suspicion, peer resentment, and the potential lack of appropriate role modeling. Further, collusion in assuming stereo-
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typical roles is another complexity of cross-gender mentorships. In addition to cross-
gender mentorships, Thomas (2001) acknowledges that a significant amount of research
suggests that cross-race mentorships suffer from public scrutiny, peer resentment, lack of
identification and role modeling, and skepticism about intimacy. All of these issues affect
the formation of mentoring relationships.

Organizations need to pay attention to gender, cross-gender, and cross-race effects on
mentoring. Hurley and Fagenson-Eland (1996) suggest that establishing formal
mentoring programs may help to legitimize cross-gender mentoring relationships by
alleviating rumors and speculation that may otherwise occur as a result of such relation-
ships. Further, they advocate that all mentors and protégés should receive training about
the dangers of sexualizing the mentoring relationship and sexual harassment. In terms of
cross-race mentorships, Thomas (2001) advocates that organizations teach mentors and
protégés about identifying and surmounting various race-related difficulties. Another
important task for mentors in cross-race relationships is to help the protégé build a large
and diverse network of relationships. Further in-depth discussion of cross-gender and
cross-race mentor relationships occurs in the next two chapters.

Hierarchical, Nonhierarchical, and
Alternative Mentoring Relationships

Most mentoring studies focus on mentors who are not direct supervisors to their protégés
(Hill and Bahniuk 1998). However, a recent stream of research examining hierarchical
mentoring relationships has focused on supervisors or bosses who serve as mentors to
their protégés (Booth 1996). Findings suggest that mentors perform more career develop-
ment and psychosocial mentoring functions when they directly supervise the protégé
(Burke and McKeen 1997; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, and Amendola 1997). Mentor-
supervisors are also perceived to communicate more with protégés. Fagenson-Eland et
al.’s research also confirms an earlier research finding by Ragins and McFarlin (1990)
that protégés perceive that supervisory mentors provide more mentoring than
nonsupervisory mentors do. Booth’s (1996) research suggests that mentor-managers and
protégés perceive a difference between traditional managerial/employee relationships and
supervisory mentoring because of the degree of commitment, caring, and trust that is
involved in a mentoring relationship.

Despite the findings that suggest more mentoring functions are provided by mentors who
are in direct supervision of their protégés, these mentoring relationships should be moni-
tored by the organization, mentor, and protégé. The potential for abuse of power by the
supervisor may exist, which could result in sexual harassment, denial of promotions, or
the instigation of unfavorable work conditions (Hurley and Fagenson-Eland 1996).

Peer mentoring, or lateral mentoring, has also emerged as an alternative form of
mentoring. However, this type of mentoring has been the focus of limited research
(Russell and Adams 1997) and may be appropriate for organizations that are “flatter,
more participative” (Eby 1997, p. 127). Recent research by McDougall and Beattie
(1997) examined peer mentoring using a sample of students engaged in postgraduate
management programs, who considered it more of a two-way process. Benefits of peer mentoring identified by McDougall and Beattie were support, confidence building, mutual learning, different perspectives on issues, and the development of friendships. The main organizational benefit was that peer mentoring offered the opportunity for synergy and cross-fertilization of ideas and experience, the notion that “two heads are better than one” (McDougall and Beattie, p. 433). Their research also suggested that peer mentoring bridged organizational chasms and contributed to teamwork and improved performance. Additional research is needed to better assess the organizational impact of peer mentoring, the potential disadvantages of peer mentoring, and peer mentoring that may be formal or informal.

Overall, the implications from research on hierarchical, nonhierarchical, and alternative mentoring relationships for practice suggests that managers, bosses, supervisors, peers, and colleagues can be invaluable mentoring resources. To promote mentoring behavior, particularly for managers and bosses, development of subordinates should be incorporated into appraisal systems and be linked to broader reward systems within the organization as a role requirement of managers (Aryee, Chay, and Chew 1996). Providing organizational support for employee learning and development is critical. Therefore, scholars have stressed the importance of educating protégés and mentors about the roles, functions, expectations, and benefits of mentoring (Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs 1997; Lee, Dougherty, and Turban 2000). Providing appropriate training for mentors on how to develop and sustain mentoring relationships has also been advocated as a strategy to enhance mentoring programs (Eby 1997; Sosik and Godshalk 2000). Research on mentor preparation in educational settings has yielded successful results that could improve practice in the workplace.

**Benefits and Drawbacks of Mentoring for Mentors**

Discussion concerning mentoring frequently focuses on its benefits for protégés, but more recently, outcomes for mentors have been an area of study. Perceived benefits to the mentors identified by Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs (1997) included the development of a support network, satisfaction in seeing others grow, job-related benefits that help the mentor to do his/her job or increase his/her knowledge, and increased visibility and recognition within the organization. Mentors also reported the notion of passing on knowledge and building a competent work force that represented benefits extending beyond themselves. Allen et al.’s findings also reinforce some of the benefits to mentors identified by Young and Perrewé’s (2000) research that include career revitalization, social recognition, and personal satisfaction. Dymock (1999) also suggests that mentors learn from the mentoring process and experience work-related and personal benefits.

Despite some of the positive benefits that have been linked to mentoring, some research has found that mentoring can have negative consequences including jealousy, overdependence, and unwanted romantic or sexual involvement (Darwin 2000). Some negative consequences of mentoring for mentors identified by Allen et al. include the time required for mentoring, perceived favoritism to the protégé, potential abuse of the relationship by the protégé, and feelings of failure. Further, Ervin (1995) found that,
among some of the women participating in her study who were serving in dual roles as mentors and protégés, mentors were unwilling to share their knowledge, were unsupportive emotionally, and were unwilling or unable to give feedback. Communicating the positive benefits of mentoring within organizations may encourage more potential mentors and protégés to seek mentoring within the workplace; recognizing that such relationships require vigilance to prevent potential abuses is also critical.

**Mentoring in Educational Institutions**

A growing base of research in educational settings has also examined the benefits of mentoring (Russell and Adams 1997). Mentoring has been examined in general, special, and higher education (Campbell and Campbell 2000). Some research has explored mentoring and at-risk students, peer mentoring in secondary education, student teachers (Boreen and Niday 2000; Hawkey 1997), beginning teachers (Ballantyne, Hansford, and Packer 1995; Everson and Smither 2000; Gratch 1998), faculty and students (Campbell and Campbell 2000; Cullen and Luna 1993; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, and Kearney 1997), and faculty (Goodwin, Stevens and Bellamy 1998). Prior studies have provided overviews of mentoring and examined forms and consequences of mentoring, particularly at the elementary and secondary education levels (Campbell and Campbell 2000; Cunningham 1999; Hawkey 1997).

Similar to mentoring within work organizations, formal programs exist in educational settings that assign students to mentors. Conversely, some mentorship relationships develop naturally without any formal structure or support (Campbell and Campbell 2000). In contrast, at least at the elementary and secondary level, mentoring relationships that are more structured and organized within classroom settings tend to be more successful (Barton-Arwood, Jolivette, and Massey 2000). The sections that follow present a brief overview of current research on mentoring within various educational settings.

**Student and Beginning Teachers**

Despite projections by the U.S. Department of Education that suggest that new teachers will be entering U.S. schools in record numbers over the next 10 years due to retirement and class size restrictions, statistics indicate that teachers leave the profession at a rate of 50 percent after 5 years and 80 percent after 10 years (Boreen and Niday 2000). In particular, education scholars have acknowledged that the initial year of teaching is very challenging for beginning teachers and that novice teachers often face isolation (Boreen and Niday 2000; Gratch 1998). Consequently, many colleges and universities provide student teaching opportunities, and a growing number of educational institutions have implemented mentoring programs to assist new teachers. Four approaches to research into mentoring of student teachers have been found in the literature (Hawkey 1997): (1) a focus on roles and responsibilities of those involved in training student teachers; (2) an analysis of the stages of development that student teachers experience and corresponding models of mentoring to meet those stages of development; (3) the stages of mentoring and interpersonal aspects of learning to teach; and (4) the notion that mentors bring their own values and perspectives to the mentoring task.
Some research suggests that student teachers experience different roles and outcomes from their mentors and academic supervisors who partner to provide mentoring to them. The classroom teacher often focuses on craft knowledge, whereas academic supervisors generally provide more teaching process and learning theory guidance. However, questions remain about how student teachers integrate this knowledge and if they learn what is intended through their interactions with classroom teachers and academic supervisors (Bennett and Dunne in Hawkey 1997). Other research on student teachers has focused on levels of teacher development and stages of development that have been used to inform the mentoring process, the different roles and functions that mentors provide, and the perspectives about the mentoring relationship from the protégés’ viewpoints (Hawkey 1997).

Evertson and Smithey (2000) examined the effects of support provided by trained mentors on the classroom practices of their entry-year protégés. Their findings suggest that preparing mentors does enable them to be more successful in supporting protégés’ success. Specifically, protégés of trained mentors showed increased evidence of developing and sustaining more workable classroom routines, managing instruction more smoothly, and gaining student cooperation in academic tasks. Evertson and Smithey concluded that the presence of a mentor is not sufficient; the skills and knowledge of the mentor are critical to the relationship. Research from the National Center for Research on Teaching and Learning at Michigan State University (Gratch 1998) also suggests that mentors do not guarantee that novice teachers will become more skilled at teaching.

In related research, Ballantyne, Hansford, and Packer (1995) explored the process and outcomes of buddy mentoring in which beginning teachers were paired with an experienced teacher. The mentoring functions provided by buddy mentors included personal support, task-related assistance and support, problem-related assistance and advice, and critical reflection and feedback on practice. Although experienced buddy teachers were able to offer valuable support, Ballantyne et al. suggest that there are limitations to the relationship. Buddy mentors may be unreceptive to progressive teaching techniques, may not be good role models themselves, and may be unwilling to render criticism. They suggest that a broad range of mentoring resources be used that includes specialist or consultant teachers, principals, or preservice institutional support. Research by Boreen and Niday (2000) describes a project that linked preservice teachers with veteran and peer teachers and incorporated use of the Internet for electronic mentoring exchanges. The integration of technology is another approach to facilitate a network of mentors.

**Faculty/Staff Mentors and College Students**

Research on faculty-to-student mentoring is incomplete, and Goodwin, Stevens, and Bellamy (1998) suggest that only a few articles and books exist that have explored this phenomenon. Although mentoring among graduate students tends to be more common than at the undergraduate level, mentoring research in academic settings has largely excluded graduate student/faculty mentoring experiences (Cullen and Luna 1993; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, and Kearney 1997). In an attempt to extend this line of inquiry, Waldeck et al. surveyed mentored graduate students to obtain a profile of the graduate
student/faculty mentoring relationship, identification and selection strategies, evaluations of strategies, mentoring functions, and satisfaction with the mentoring relationship. One striking finding from this research was the perception of difficulty among students at initiating mentoring relationships with faculty members. The authors suggest that increased sensitivity toward legal issues such as sexual harassment and ramifications of inappropriate relationships with students may discourage faculty from mentoring graduate students. Overall, however, students generally received more psychosocial mentoring functions and were satisfied with their mentoring experiences. However, Waldeck et al. acknowledge that the effectiveness of mentoring relationships among graduate students and faculty must be examined longitudinally.

In contrast, a related study by Ervin (1995) examines the experiences of women as both mentors and protégés; study participants acknowledged that their academic mentors were unsupportive emotionally, unwilling or unable to give them feedback, and unwilling to share their knowledge. Findings from another study conducted by Bowman, Bowman, and Hatley (1995) on the issue of dual relationships between full-time faculty and graduate students suggest that more research is needed on the ethics of faculty-student relationships and that students should have more input on such relationships since mentoring, friendship, and social interaction affect the graduate student experience.

Campbell and Campbell (2000) conducted a survey study within a large West Coast university. In this program, faculty volunteer to mentor students and are paired based upon their shared academic interests. Findings suggest that students tend to assess the value of the mentoring relationship in terms of getting assistance from their mentors with academic matters. Faculty mentors, however, were more sensitive to the social benefits of mentoring students and developing a personal bond and friendships with their students. The differences in perceived benefits suggest that further research is needed to explore what motivates faculty and students to participate in mentoring programs. In a similar study examining mentoring functions and protégé potential in graduate supervisory mentoring relationships, Green and Bauer (1995) found that faculty serving as graduate thesis or dissertation advisers provided more mentoring functions to those prospective students perceived to be talented and capable. In other words, protégé potential predicted the amount of mentoring functions provided by the supervisory mentor. However, the impact of mentoring functions on student performance needs to be further researched.

**Faculty Mentoring Other Faculty**

Within academic settings, limited empirical research has examined faculty-to-faculty mentoring in schools, colleges and departments of education (Cunningham 1999; Goodwin, Stevens, and Bellamy 1998; St. Clair 1994). To address this gap, Goodwin et al. conducted a survey among 13 schools, colleges, and departments of education in Colorado to examine faculty members’ attitudes, perceptions, and experiences about faculty mentoring relationships. In general, relationships were often voluntary and informal, characterized by attributes such as mutual respect, compatibility, and caring. There were significant differences in terms of institutional type, with doctoral-degree granting
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institutions placing greater value and importance on mentoring. Mentoring in such institutions also emphasized research and scholarship, teaching, and professional socialization. However, research on faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships needs to be considerably extended, and in particular, issues of gender and power need to be explored (Cullen and Luna 1993; Olson and Ashton-Jones 1992; St. Clair 1994)

Conclusions and Future Research Needs

This chapter provides an overview of current mentoring research within the workplace and educational settings. Most evident is that these research literature bases have been growing, often in parallel ways. Consequently, tremendous opportunities to enhance the knowledge base on mentoring exist if future research efforts can be focused on integrating and linking findings from work and educational settings (Burke and McKeen 1997; Russell and Adams 1997).

Much of the research to date has focused on a traditional conception of mentoring as a single dyadic relationship. However, scholars suggest that definitions of mentoring need to be broadened and alternative forms of mentoring should be explored and researched. Higgins (2000) and Higgins and Kram (2001), for instance, have conceived of mentoring as multiple developmental relationships, or relationship constellations. This suggests that alternative forms of mentoring need to be explored to determine if types of mentorships and outcomes differ for mentors and protégés (Eby 1997; Hegstad 1999; Russell and Adams 1997; Young and Perrewe 2000). Examining the perspectives of mentors and protégés and the characteristics that affect the relationship is equally important, as well as mentor quality and the supervisory-subordinate mentoring dyad (Chao 1997; Goodwin, Stevens, and Bellamy 1998; Gratch 1998; Hawkey 1997; McManus and Russell 1997; Megginson 2000).

The longitudinal effects of mentoring on mentors, protégés, and institutions or organizations also need to be explored (Evertson and Smithey 2000; Young and Perrewe 2000). Dysfunctional mentoring, the linkage between emotional intelligence and mentoring, and the impact of technology on mentoring are areas that require future research (Megginson 2000). (The next chapter in this volume explores telementoring, an electronic form of mentoring.) Another extremely important research agenda is to continue to examine gender, ethnic, and cultural differences including cross-gender, cross-racial, cross-cultural mentorship relationships (Megginson 2000; Ragins 1997b; Ragins, Cotton, and Miller 2000). Finally, research about relationships of power and knowledge in mentoring relationships need further explication (Darwin 2000; Hansman 2001).