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ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a model designed to encourage and facilitate the formation of mentoring relationships between professors and students in graduate psychology training programs. Previous research indicates approximately one in two graduate students had a mentor, those that did not were unaware of the potential benefits. Professors frequently reported insufficient motivation to mentor. Recently the call was made to provide mentoring to all psychology graduate students because mentoring is associated with personal and professional development. Aspects of mentoring relationships, including stages, benefits, selection criteria and strategies, and
functions provided by mentors, have received attention. However, the formation of mentoring relationships received little direct investigation. Perspectives on motivation to initiate mentoring relationships have been offered but the practical process has been overlooked. The model has three major elements. First, graduate psychology training programs must embrace and support mentoring. Educating professors and students concerning the various aspects of mentoring, positive and negative, represents the second major element. Third, it is recommended that programs provide a structured selection process, as demonstrated in Research Vertical Teams (RVTs) system. The model provides professors and students with an opportunity to form mentoring relationships with greater awareness and preparation, enhancing the probability of effective and successful mentoring relationships. Recommendations for evaluating the efficacy of the model are included.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Do you have a mentor? Have you had a mentor? You should find a mentor. Everyone should have a mentor! These questions and suggestions are increasingly common. Involvement in a mentoring relationship is associated with career advancement whether in business, academia, or organizations. Although the belief in the value of mentoring has become increasingly prominent in the literature in the past 20 years, mentoring is not a new concept.

Mentoring as a relational phenomenon has occurred throughout the ages. Homer first used the term as a name for the wise and trusted counselor to whom the hero Odysseus entrusted his son Telemachus. In the centuries since the introduction of the term, innumerable protégés have engaged with mentors whom they believed had knowledge, power, or resources which could benefit them. As novice laborers or craftsman were prepared to function independently they received training and supervision from others more knowledgeable and experienced. At times such
relationships have involved the dissemination of values and beliefs.

In this chapter the definition and conceptualization of mentoring will be examined, followed by a review of the literature on mentoring relationships. This will include discussion of the personality factors associated with mentoring relationships, the functions and tasks involved, outcomes of mentoring, the dangers and ethical issues inherent in such relationships, and, most important for the purposes of the current dissertation, factors involved in the formation of mentor-protégé relationships.

Definition and Conceptualization of Mentoring

While most people might say that they know what mentoring is, the literature offers numerous descriptions. Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee (1978) do not offer a specific definition but suggest that "the term 'mentor' is generally used in a much narrower sense, to mean teacher, adviser or sponsor" (p. 97). Others use words such as guru, counselor, advisor, role model, etc. However, Levinson et al. concluded that there are no words currently in use that truly capture the essence of the term and believe that a mentor is many things. Moreover, such
descriptions focus more on the tasks or functions of the mentor, and Levinson et al. insisted the focus of understanding mentoring relationships should include the relationship between the mentor and the protégé. The closest Levinson et al. came to a specific definition is the characterization of the mentor as "a good father and a friend."

Early reviewers (Bogat & Redner, 1985; Merriam, 1983; Speizer, 1981) expressed frustration with the lack of definitional clarity. Merriam (1983) concluded that without a clear conception the result would be confusion making it difficult to know exactly what was being evaluated and what to make of the results. In her review of the literature to clarify the concepts of role models, mentors, and sponsors, Speizer (1981) found no substantial evidence of adequate definitions of mentoring relationships.

Jacobi (1991) reviewed the literature to date and found no less than 15 definitions. She agreed with Merriam (1983) that the definitions differed according to the field with which the authors were associated. Jacobi (1991) concluded:

[D]escriptions of mentoring programs are so diverse that one wonders if they have anything at all in common beyond a sincere desire to help students succeed. The result of this definitional vagueness is a continued lack of clarity about
the antecedents, outcomes, characteristics, and mediators of mentoring relationships despite a growing body of empirical research. (p. 505)

In reviewing the various definitions of mentoring offered in the literature, there appears to be a wide range. Several authors have identified this heterogeneity and have suggested that the range of definitions indicate a continuum (Baum, 1992; Carden, 1990). Specifically, mentoring definitions vary on a continuum from instrumental to personal. Hardy (1994) suggested that mentoring is not synonymous with advising which is typically considered instrumental. Baum (1992) suggested that "effective mentoring requires an intense, emotional relationship, in which the protégé is not only interested in learning about work but also willing to become a new person" (p. 225). This more intimate relationship is more complicated, risky, and fulfilling (Baum; Levinson et al., 1978).

For some, the definition of a mentor is found in what the mentor does or provides for the protégé. Kram (1983) identifies career and psychosocial functions as the two broad categories of functions provided by the mentor to the protégé. These categories seem to reflect the instrumental and personal continuum identified above. The relationship between the mentor and the protégé can provide an opportunity to integrate the
career/instrumental and psychosocial functions to succeed at work (O'Neil, 1981).

Though a definition that all can agree upon seems elusive, Jacobi (1991) identified several components common to most good definitions of mentoring. She offered five components which "may not in themselves be a sufficient definition" (p. 513) but appear foundational.

1. Mentoring relationships are helping relationships usually focused on achievement.

2. Mentoring includes any or all of three broad components: (a) emotional and psychological support, (b) direct assistance with career and professional development, and (c) role modeling.

3. Mentoring relationships are reciprocal.

4. Mentoring relationships are personal.

5. Relative to their protégés, mentors show greater experience, influence, and achievement within a particular organization or environment. (p. 513)

The three middle components suggest that the personalities of the individuals involved might play a key role in the formation and success of the mentoring relationship.
Personality Characteristics

For potential protégés, the task of locating and securing a mentor with enough of the critical traits for good mentoring may be a substantial challenge. What is this elusive sponsor actually going to be like? Mentors face similar concerns. In some cases the setting dictates what is most desirable in a mentor or protégé. The literature provides some information regarding personality characteristics and matching issues.

Protégés have also been encouraged to find mentors with certain characteristics. Good mentors have been identified as willing to share knowledge and understanding and to offer sound advice and counseling (Roche, 1979). Protégés often seek out mentors who know the organization and the people in it, have an advanced rank, are respected by peers, and are knowledgeable about and able to use power (Roche). Burke (1984) stated that mentors in his study were "an interesting blend of work commitment (industrious, hard working) coupled with being approachable and open, sensitive and empathic, supportive and helpful" (p. 367).

Various mentor attributes have been identified as contributing to successful mentoring: altruistic (Aryee, Chay, & Chew, 1996); ethical (Kitchener, 1992); and a strong role
model (Gilbert, 1985). For women, Gilbert suggested that they would be well served to seek mentors who can effectively role model the balance between professional and personal life. Also, women are likely to seek mentors who embody feminist values of equity, reciprocity, and cooperation (Richey, Gambrill, & Blythe, 1988). For ethnic minority students, the most effective mentors are sensitive to cultural issues (Blackwell, 1989). Wilde and Schau (1991) found that effective mentors looked beyond gender and ethnicity, focusing on the needs of the protégés.

Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) studied the prevalence and role of mentors in psychology graduate students. They found that personality characteristics ranked second in protégés description of good mentors and first in the description of bad mentors. Good mentors were characterized as having a good sense of humor, honest, dedicated, empathetic, compassionate, genuine, patient, nonsexist, flexible and loyal. Conversely, bad mentors were described, as rigid, critical, egocentric, prejudiced, pathological, rushed, overextended, disorganized, dishonest, and untrustworthy. Similarly, in another study, protégés listed the following adjectives found in good mentors: knowledgeable, intelligent, and caring; as opposed to lazy, cold, and careless,
which were adjectives that described characteristics most unlike mentors (Swerdlik & Bardon, 1988).

Mentors reportedly look for protégés who are intelligent, ambitious, loyal, committed to the organization, able to establish alliances, have both desire and ability to accept power and risk, the ability to perform the mentor's job, similar perceptions of work and organization, organizational savvy, and positive evaluation by others in the organization (Zey, 1984). Hardy (1994) encourages protégés to be active in the mentoring relationship, conscientious in their efforts to develop themselves and others, open-minded and objective, non-defensive in attitude, and insightful about personal and professional issues. Hardy humorously concluded that protégés should be able to do everything short of being a superhero. Similarly, Jacobi (1991) opined that given these abilities and talents, prospective protégés would probably be successful without mentors. Not surprisingly, Green and Bauer (1995) found that doctoral students identified with high potential prior to participating in mentoring had more effective mentoring relationships.

Earlier research on personality factors did not find any individual level variables to consistently discriminate protégés from non-protégés (Bowen, 1986; Fagenson, 1989; Noe, 1988b).
However, Turban and Dougherty (1994) concluded that individual personality characteristics of internal locus of control, high self-monitoring, and high emotional stability, contributed to protégés initiation of mentoring relationships and the mentoring they received. Specific personality characteristics of mentors have not been found to be discriminative (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newman, 1984). The research is typically conceptually and methodologically inferior (Jacobi, 1991). However, mentoring relationships are likely to be influenced by personality factors, and it seems that matching styles and complementary characteristics is advisable (Richey et al., 1988). Namely, personality influences the way mentors and protégés successfully perform the various roles, functions and tasks of mentoring relationships.

O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) listed correlates of mentoring and their behavioral descriptions. The correlates could serve as a summary of the characteristics mentors and protégés have that make the mentoring relationship successful. The correlates identified by O'Neil and Wrightsman included three functional correlates (interpersonal respect, professionalism-collegiality, and role fulfillment) and three dysfunctional correlates (power, control, and competition). The critical components in their approach are flexibility in roles and self-awareness in both
Mentor and protégé. Baum (1992) stated that maturity is required to have successful mentoring relationships. However, Alleman et al. (1984) found in their study that mentors and protégés did not differ from non-mentors and non-protégés on personality characteristics though they did differ in their behavior. This led Alleman et al. to conclude "no set of personality characteristics distinguished either mentors or protégés from the control group" (p. 331). This latter finding may help protégés and mentors from misguided searches for the perfect counterpart by encouraging them to focus on their roles in the mentoring relationship.

Functions/Tasks

The functions that mentors serve in mentoring relationships are described throughout the literature. Kram (1985) categorized the functions as clustering within two domains, the career and psychosocial. Career functions are typically focused on job-related activities, particularly career advancement. In this way mentors assist protégés by providing sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Psychosocial functions enhance the protégé's sense of competence, identity, and work-role effectiveness. These
functions include serving as a role model, providing acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. This distinction in functions has received considerable empirical support (Burke, 1984; Noe, 1988b; Roche, 1979; Schockett & Haring-Hidore, 1985; Wilde & Schau, 1991). Levinson et al. (1978) also indicated similar functions adding that the mentor's key function is to support and facilitate the realization of the protégé's dream. Numerous other authors have provided similar lists of functions that typically fall into Kram's two primary categories (Blackwell, 1989; Bruce, 1995; Burke, 1984; Swerdlik & Bardon, 1988).

In graduate education, Atkinson, Neville, and Casas (1991) observed that student participants seemed to describe mentors along two lines. Professorial mentors performed as students' advocates, skill developers, and research facilitators. Collegial mentors provided professional networking, organizational structure, and professional visibility. Richey et al. (1988), writing from a feminist perspective, believe the relationship is reciprocal and list several "resources" that mentors and protégés exchange.

O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981), along with other authors (Bolton, 1980; Kram, 1983), theorized that the mentoring relationship, like other intimate relationships, develops
through several phases. O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) describe six critical activities that define the working relationship: (a) critical decision and entry, (b) building of mutual trust, (c) taking risks, (d) teaching of skills, (e) learning of professional standards, and (f) dissolution or change of the relationship. During a particular phase the tasks required of the effective mentor may vary. The effective mentor remains flexible and adjusts to changing expectations and situations. Kram (1983) stated that the cultivation phase is the time when the mentor is required to perform the largest number of functions. O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) theorized that the protégé also has functions to perform to ensure success, like being a good student, engaging in the learning, and respecting the mentor.

Mentoring relationships require mentors and protégés to engage in an exchange (Gehrke, 1988; Richey et al., 1988). Mentors share their wisdom and protégés strive to absorb it. Each performs specific functions and the relationship should progress as certain tasks are performed in collaboration. Successful mentoring relationships, those with positive outcomes for both participants, require the mutual participation of both participants. However, as in all relationships, positive outcomes are not guaranteed.
Outcomes

The belief that protégés benefit from mentoring is widely held, yet only recently has empirical evidence been provided to support this belief. Even as late as 1991, some were not convinced that the many hypothesized benefits of mentoring were realistic (Jacobi, 1991). However, early claims that mentoring would increase the protégé's experience of becoming an adult and of progressing developmentally (Levinson et al., 1981) and the promises of increased career satisfaction and professional skills and competencies (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981) have been demonstrated repeatedly (Atkinson et al., 1991; Burke, 1984; Busch, 1985; Collins, 1994; Fagenson, 1989; Riley & Wrench, 1985; Roche, 1979;). Wilde and Schau (1991) asked students in graduate schools of education who had mentors about the benefits. The respondents identified the relationships as very important to their overall personal and professional development.

Unfortunately the research in this domain lacks methodological sophistication and the results are not always generalizable. Experimental design was typically cross-sectional and used self-report measures. Intervening and confounding variables also received little attention. For example, Green and
Bauer (1995) found that student potential (measured by positive work attitudes and student ability to perform as a researcher and scholar), prior to receiving mentoring, accounted for the level of productivity of doctoral students. This suggests that bright students may succeed even without mentoring.

The key mentor functions listed in the previous section are typically linked to outcomes described by protégés. Namely, protégés have indicated increased knowledge, experience, confidence and expansion of their professional network (Newby & Heide, 1992). Students with mentors typically were more productive in scholarship as indicated by publications and conference papers (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986).

Several authors have expressed concern about the lack of availability of mentoring to women (Bogat & Redner, 1985) and ethnic minorities (Blackwell, 1989). Research to date suggested that women were as likely to receive mentoring, though in certain fields and organizations it is difficult to find women mentors, and that women reported levels of satisfaction similar to men (Alleman et al., 1984; Atkinson, Casas, & Neville, 1994; Bowen, 1985; Bowen, 1986; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Fagenson, 1989; Green & Bauer, 1995; Noe, 1988b; Wilde & Schau, 1991). In fact, Noe (1988b) found that protégés in cross-gender relationships demonstrated more effective use of
their mentors, measured by time spent together and the quality of the relationship from the mentors’ perspective.

As for the fear that ethnic minorities would not have access to mentoring, Atkinson et al. (1991) found that ethnic minority protégés reported similar outcomes whether the mentor was European American or ethnically similar. As a follow up to this study, Atkinson et al. (1994) evaluated the ethnic minority mentors and found that they were quite active in mentoring ethnic minority protégés as well as European Americans with the same level of satisfaction and successful outcome.

The positive benefits of mentoring are not limited to protégés. Several studies have found that mentors also benefit (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Busch, 1985). Mentors report that their own professional career develops, that they accomplish more, that their competence and confidence grow (Newby & Heide, 1992), and that they feel increasingly positive about building into the lives of others (Wright & Wright, 1987). Roche (1979) and Busch (1985) found that mentors were more likely to have been protégés. Organizations are also reported to benefit (Burke, 1984; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Roche, 1979). Protégés are prepared for advancement within the organization making them more likely to stay with the organization (Roche, 1979).
Ethical Considerations

As with any interpersonal relationship there is the possibility that one or both of the participants in a mentor-protégé relationship will have ulterior motives. These may be conscious or unconscious but they can, and often do, impede the development of an effective mentoring relationship. Mehlman and Glickauf-Hughes (1994) suggested that some students seek mentors to fulfill unmet archaic needs. Protégés, and even mentors, may also have unmet narcissistic needs (Baum, 1992). Levinson et al. (1978) wrote that "there is plenty of room for exploitation, undercutting, envy, smothering and oppressive control on the part of the mentor, and for greedy demanding, clinging admiration, self-denying gratitude and arrogant ingratitude on the part of the recipient" (p. 334). Problematically, the range of wrong reasons to enter a mentoring relationship may be as extensive as the list of good reasons.

One obvious ethical issue involves cross-gender relationships. Kram (1985) devoted an entire chapter to the topic and Noe (1988a) listed several barriers to such mentoring relationships. Although the mentor and the protégé may have no intention of the relationship sexualizing, the intimacy of the relationship and the effects of sex-role socialization can
quickly cloud the judgment of both participants, particularly the mentor, who always holds ultimate responsibility for such relationships. Gilbert (1987) encouraged male mentors to be aware of dependency needs and of sex-role socialization in which intimacy is associated with sexuality. Writing from a sociobiological perspective, Bushardt, Fretwell, and Holdnak (1991) believed that sex-role behavior is inherent in all relationships but warn that male mentors with female protégés are especially susceptible to acting out. "The gender of the mentor and the protégé may influence the types, amount, and combination of resources or supports requested, offered, or accepted" (Richey et al., 1988, p. 38). Many mentors may never realize the dissimilar treatment of male and female protégés. Moreover, unchallenged "doubts and fears regarding cross-gender mentoring may stifle or prohibit professional relationships" (Bruce, 1995, p. 148).

Mentoring relationships are characterized by Levinson et al. (1978) as "love relationships." Such relationships typically involve a myriad of ambivalent feelings. Prospective mentors and protégés are often unaware of the emotional attraction and connection, which characterize mentoring relationships (Baum, 1992; Gilbert, 1987). This may ultimately contribute to conflict in the mentoring relationship. At least one author has
recommended informed consent concerning the positive and
negative aspects of mentoring relationships at their outset
(Cardena, 1990). Ideally, mentoring relationships will promote
strong self-awareness on the part of both the protégé and mentor
(O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). When organizations and programs
support mentoring they should do so with the knowledge that the
relationship is inherently at risk of conflict secondary to its
intimate nature (Baum, 1992).

Mentoring relationships in graduate psychology programs are
also likely to create dual relationships for faculty and
students. Kitchener (1992) emphasized that psychology professors
have a special responsibility to model ethical behavior as well
as to teach it. The ability to navigate in the gray areas of
dual relationships between students and faculty may require
following a set of explicit guidelines (Biaggio, Paget, &
Chenoweth, 1997). Brown and Krager (1985) offer a set of five
principles for professors in graduate education: autonomy,
nonmaleficence, beneficence, justice, and fidelity. By bearing
these principles in mind and striving to follow them, mentors
may increase the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship,
while simultaneously reducing the risk of undesirable outcomes
or ethical violations.
Because of the complexity of mentoring relationships, there appears to be strong sentiment in the literature that they cannot be mass-produced (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). Assigned mentoring relationships, including graduate school advisor-advisee relationships, and formal mentor programs have received mixed reviews (cf. Carden, 1990; Jacobi, 1991). Noe (1988b) found that protégés in assigned relationships had dissimilar benefits. Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) and Merriam (1983) recognized that attraction and choice are critical variables in successful relationships.

Several studies have examined how mentoring relationships began. Participants in a study by Burke (1984) reported that the relationship "emerged", developed without forethought or intention, 59% of the time. Other studies indicate that mentors and protégés split responsibility for initiating the relationship (e.g. Blackburn et al., 1981). Some authors suggest that professors and other prospective mentors should initiate the relationship and offer recommendations to accomplish this (Blackwell, 1989; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Wright & Wright, 1987). Interestingly, Stafford and Robbins (1991) found in their study of mentoring that in graduate social work training when
mentors initiated the relationship they tended to select younger protégés. Conversely, other authors encourage students and other prospective protégés to be proactive and to seek out suitable mentors (Bushardt, Moore, & Debnath, 1982; Richey et al., 1988).

Critical to the formation of a mentoring relationship is the ability for the mentor and protégé to have regular contact. Even in assigned relationships, Noe (1988b) found that access to the mentor contributed to the perceived benefits for the protégé. Similarly, Busch (1985) found diminished benefits for protégés whose mentors did not have enough time for them.

Several models have been offered to increase the availability and benefit of mentoring. Hunt and Michael (1983) described a program designed to help organizations maximize their potential. Tentoni (1995) offered a proposed mentoring paradigm (adapted from Anderson & Shannon, 1988) for counseling students, however, he failed to describe how these relationships are initiated.

Kram (1983) offered some insight as to the process wherein mentoring relationships are established. Her model included four successive phases through which the mentoring relationship moves. The first, or formative, phase is Initiation. In this phase the mentor and protégé interact based on fantasy. Each identifies in the other some potential to meet certain needs.
The protégé is typically looking for support and respect by mentor, while the mentor sees the protégé as someone who can inherit values and perspectives. "The events of the first year serve to transform initial fantasies into concrete positive expectations" (Kram, 1983, p. 615).

O'Neil (1981) suggested that "the advisor-advisee relationship is an ideal situation for mentoring relationships to develop" (p. 4). O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981), like Kram (1983), suggested that mentoring relationships are constantly changing, as must the tasks in the relationship. The initial task is labeled "critical decision and entry." The mentor and protégé must first ask themselves if there is potential for an effective relationship. Since little has been written on this topic, O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) draw on principles such as attraction from social psychology. Attraction is key to the assessment of "potential." Basic personal characteristics "such as physical attractiveness, intelligence, sense of humor, and extraversion--found to be related to attraction, generally,--are certainly relevant to the mentoring relationship" (O'Neil & Wrightsman, p. 215).

Assignment to advising roles may be enough to start eventual mentoring relationships, but mismatches are also likely to occur. Some schools allow students to participate in
selection of an advisor; however, this creates additional problems (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). There does not seem to be a clearly preferable way to locate and secure a mentor, but "students entering graduate programs in psychology need to recognize the importance of having a mentor to aid in their personal and professional development" (O'Neil & Wrightsman, p. 4).

How the mentor and protégé come to work together can be "direct or indirect, tentative, and guarded" (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981, p. 20). Typically, in the advisor-advisee relationship, the interactions are formal and based on the role relationship. The discussion is usually focused on being a graduate student and adjusting to its demands.

Although the hypothesized functions provided by the mentor are largely speculative at this point, it appears advisable for both the mentor and protégé to identify and express their expectations of the relationship at the outset (Alleman et al., 1984; Richey et al., 1988). Monaghan and Lunt (1992) suggested that this negotiation of expectations and roles will help establish the objectives of the mentoring relationship. Newby and Heide (1992) suggested three guidelines for creating mentoring relationships: (a) establish a clear set of goals and objectives; (b) orient the participants to the purpose, needs,
benefits, and expectations of the relationship; and (c) evaluate and match mentor personal characteristics, skills, and goals with the characteristics and needs of the protégés.

Rationale

Even though most protégés attest to the benefits of mentoring, personal and professional development, mentoring is not as common as might be expected. Only half of those asked to participate in studies of mentoring reported having had a mentor. Within the field of psychology, particularly in graduate education, the call for availability of mentors is increasing. There is a call for greater emphasis on student-faculty relationships in doctoral programs (Hazler & Carney, 1993) and that mentoring become a part of the American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation process (Ellis, 1992).

Ellis (1992), in his award address to the APA in 1991, stated "I am convinced that the success of graduate education depends on a student-faculty relationship based on integrity, trust, and support. I believe that quality graduate programs have some sort of faculty mentor system, in which students can obtain advice, counseling, and helpful direction in their training" (p. 575). More recently, Jill N. Reich, Ph.D. (in..."
Murray, 1997, May, p. 50) warned, "psychology students will need strong mentoring support from graduate programs to guarantee their future employability." Beyond career benefits are the benefits of a close relationship with an experienced and knowledgeable person. In fact, the personal relationship between mentor and protégé may be the most powerful "educational" tool in the training of psychologists.

Typically, respondents in the research cited above indicated that only around 50% previously or currently had mentors. In the Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) study, 47% of the students returning questionnaires denied ever having a mentor. Of this group, 68% indicated that they had been unable to find a satisfactory mentor, 46% indicated that their program did not encourage mentoring, 19% said that they had not been in their program long enough, and 17% reported no need for a mentor. Implications of this finding are that these students were not aware of the benefits of mentoring and were not encouraged to find a mentor. "Our system of higher education, though officially committed to fostering intellectual and personal development of students, provides mentoring that is generally limited in quantity and poor in quality. Educational institutions...can do much more to assist the development of students..." (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 334).
Theories of mentoring relationships offer only cursory descriptions of the factors involved in the formation of these relationships. Research on mentoring also does not specifically address this topic. Several studies considered who initiated the relationship, but none attempted to elucidate the factors involved in the formation of effective mentoring relationships. It would seem that the initial stage or phase is foundational to the development of a beneficial mentoring relationship. If mentoring relationships are as critical to graduate psychology students' success, as indicated above, then it is crucial that a model for the formation of mentoring relationships is developed.

Because the functions provided by mentors appear to result in the positive outcomes of protégés' personal and professional development, graduate psychology programs need to (a) make available professors who can serve as mentors, and (b) encourage students to take advantage of the opportunity. The purpose of this dissertation is to propose a model for mentor-protégé relationship formation. It is expected that this model may well facilitate more informed and frequent mentor relationship formation during graduate training. It may, additionally, enhance the efficacy of such relationships.

Chapter 2 will consist of a comprehensive review of the literature on the formation of mentoring relationships in
graduate psychology programs. Literature covering proposed and operational mentoring programs will be reviewed and critiqued. Chapter 3 will present a model for mentoring relationship formation for graduate psychology programs. Chapter 4 will provide an agenda for research arising from this model.
The previous chapter explored the breadth of the literature pertaining to mentoring. It was concluded that mentoring is generally beneficial for both participants and the overarching organization. Various authors suggested that mentoring for graduate psychology students is critical for both their professional and personal development (e.g. Ellis, 1992; Hardy, 1994). Before presenting a model to encourage and facilitate the formation of mentoring relationships in graduate psychology programs, it is necessary to review the extant literature regarding factors associated with the formation of mentoring relationships. First, the theoretical aspects of mentoring relationship formation are explored, followed by a review of the practical suggestions offered for establishing such relationships. Finally, research concerned with mentor relationship formation is examined.
Self-Psychology

Mehlman and Glickauf-Hughes (1994) described the formation of mentoring relationships between professors and college students in terms of Kohut's contemporary self-psychology theory. Mehlman and Glickauf-Hughes theorized that these relationships involve the students' unconscious use of the professors as a self-object to (a) fulfill unmet archaic needs, and (b) achieve greater personal and professional maturity. According to Kohut's (1971, 1977) theory, children seek to satisfy narcissistic needs in three types of self-object relationships. They attempt to find strength and values by idealizing their parents; self-esteem by being confirmed, admired, and understood by their parents; and a sense of community through relating to peers similar to themselves. Failure to find these leads to narcissistic psychopathology. Consequently, they look to others to meet these needs.

There are three common transference phenomena that develop to meet these needs and function in both normal and pathological ways. The idealizing transference involves the search for a mentor who can embody the values, attributes, and personal qualities missing but desired in one's parents. Depending on the
severity of the needs, the relationship may or may not succeed in satisfying the search. Obviously, the "perfect" mentor is just as difficult to find as the "perfect" parent is. Mentoring relationships are prone to be less than fully satisfying. Mentors who cannot or will not live up to the idealizations of the students may be devalued. Eventually, students' self-esteem may be lowered by unsuccessful mentoring relationships, and they may also fail to develop their own values and ideals.

In the mirroring transference, the student is in search of a mentor who can confirm the student's worth, greatness, or perfection. The goal is to be seen as special. However, the student's own understanding of what makes him or her special may elude the professor. The student, though encouraged and supported, continues to feel inadequate because her or his standards for success are unreasonable. At times students are so engrossed in receiving feedback affirming their specialness that they forget that the professor has many other students to work with and that the professor has a life off campus.

Students also desire to believe they are similar to their mentors, and to the extent this is so, students may develop twinship transferences. "When forming a twinship transference, a student may choose a professor who is perceived as similar to the student in a number of important qualities because the
experience of essential 'alikeness' is reassuring to the student, and consequently bolsters self-esteem" (Mehlman & Glickauf-Hughes, 1994, p. 49). The sharing of values and personal qualities may satisfy the needs of the individuals at first, but eventually the relationship demands greater intimacy. The communication required to develop intimacy gradually brings to light previously unsuspected and unwanted differences. Students are also striving to become individuals with separate ideals and values during early adulthood. This may conflict with a mentor’s preference to bask in perceived similarities.

Some students will come with unmet archaic needs and will likely engage with professors whom they believe can help satisfy the needs. Ideally, the student finds someone who meets all three self-object needs to varying degrees. Optimally, the self-object transference is transient, and the relationship is able to move past archaic needs and on to more mature ways of relating because the self-concept of the student is enhanced by the transference (Mehlman & Glickauf-Hughes, 1994, p.51). This process of internalization is key to the students maturation process and assumes the professor is able to tolerate the student’s immaturity until the student has progressed.

Mehlman and Glickauf-Hughes (1994) focused on the potential pathology of protégés in mentoring relationships. They
suggested, based on Kohut’s self-psychology, that protégés may be unconsciously using mentors to meet unmet needs. They did not recommend that the professors providing mentoring take on the role of helping the student work through this but encourage the students to seek therapy. However, it seems that awareness by professors/mentors of the potential for such a dynamic in students/protégés would positively influence the outcome.

Social Learning

Social learning theory has also been applied to the study of mentoring. Specifically, the role of identification in mentoring relationships has been explained and explored (Bowen, 1986). Identification has been specified as a crucial variable. It is believed that identification plays a critical role in the initiation of the relationship and that it explains the mentor's continuing influence on the protégé throughout the course of the relationship (Bowen). Interestingly, Bowen's research into the role of identification did not support this perspective.

"A basic tenet of psychological theories is that people emulate models who are perceived to be similar to themselves in terms of personality characteristics, background, race, and sex" (Erkut & Mokros, 1984, p. 400). Blackwell (1989) echoed this and
suggested that the selection of protégés by mentors is primarily influenced by these similarity factors.

Social learning theory indicates that protégés are attempting to identify with a person who is an expert or at least is more advanced in knowledge and experience. Modeling by the mentor can be a rich influence on the development of the protégé. Finding someone to imitate can assist the protégé’s personal and professional development.

**Biological Dimorphism**

Bushardt et al. (1991) presented a description of mentoring relationships within the context of biological dimorphism with sex roles reflecting different reproductive strategies that evolved by natural selection. According to this theory, the roles enacted by mentors and protégés mimic the male and female mating roles in humans; however, these roles are poorly understood which may contribute to conflicts in mentoring relationships. “The central theme...is that mentors, regardless of their gender, utilize predominately masculine sex-role behavior, and protégés, regardless of their gender, utilize predominately feminine sex-role behavior” (Bushardt et al., p. 620). The authors perceived the significant similarities between the mentoring process and the mating process, including a number of
sexual themes. The most salient similarities between the two processes were discussed in terms of selection criteria, acquisition strategies, and demographics.

According to Bushardt et al. (1991) the mentor assumes the masculine sex role, and the protégé assumes the feminine sex role. The protégé, functioning in the female sex role, is looking for a mate who can provide the resources that will translate into power, status, and influence. The protégé must be careful in selecting the right mentor. The mentor, functioning in the masculine sex role, is less discriminate in the selection process. Mentors may have several protégés and the consequences, for the mentor, of selecting one or two incorrectly are minor. Males of most species secure their lineage by mating extensively but may still require fidelity on the part of the females. In mentoring, a similar pattern may occur if mentors demonstrate jealousy when protégés have more than one mentor.

The acquisition of a mating partner also differs according to gender. Females and protégés tend to be proactive, to declare their receptiveness. Males and mentors are typically the initiators of the relationship. At least, they have the last word on whether or not a relationship will be formed.

Certain demographic similarities also are apparent. Males and mentors tend to be older, more established, and of higher
socioeconomic background. Females and protégés tend to be younger, less established, and of a lower socioeconomic background.

Bushardt et al. (1991) concluded that the sociobiological perspective is helpful for understanding mentoring relationships because the presence of sex role behavior leads to latent and manifest sexual themes that shape the interaction. Male-mentor and female-protégé relationships are particularly susceptible to the enacting of these sex role behaviors because the roles are congruent with societal norms for sex roles and gender.

This theoretical perspective provides a helpful understanding of sex roles and their impact on mentoring relationships. Sex role behaviors are both innate and learned. Whatever the origin they influence the development and continuity of relationships. Unfortunately, people are not typically aware of their behavior in these terms. The central theme of the article is that sex role behaviors influence the interactions between mentors and protégés. Regardless of the gender match, the dynamics are present. Undeniably, gender impacts the ability to conform to sex roles. Thus, certain sex role behaviors may be difficult to perform for some mentors and protégés, especially in cross-gender mentoring relationships.
Interpersonal Attraction

Principles of interpersonal attraction and close relationships are highly relevant to the formation of mentoring relationships. People have a need for affiliation, to establish and maintain meaningful relationships with others (Wong & Csikzentmihalyi, 1991). People also need intimacy, found in close and affectionate relationships where personal information is exchanged (McAdams, 1982). Models of interpersonal attraction typically focus on the rewards provided to the participants (Byrne, 1971; Byrne & Clore, 1970; Heider, 1958; Newcomb, 1961). Relationships that involve rewards for both participants are considered balanced and increase the attraction. As the balance changes so does the level of attraction.

However, not everyone has the social skills or resources required for establishing or maintaining close personal relationships. For some, the problem is loneliness, the psychological state that occurs when a person perceives an inadequacy in her or his relationships--a discrepancy between what the relationship is and what is thought the relationship should be (Peplau & Perlman, 1982). For others, social anxiety is experienced because they anticipate and expect negative encounters with others (Leary, 1983a, 1983b). These two states
can significantly impair the development of close personal relationships such as mentoring.

Attachment styles also can affect the development of close relationships. Patterns of attachment--attachment styles--develop in early childhood experiences and, according to attachment theory, govern the ways an individual forms and maintains close relationships in adulthood. Three attachment styles have been identified: secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant (Shaver, Hazan, & Bradshaw, 1988).

Components of interpersonal attraction include physical proximity, similarity, physical attractiveness, and reciprocity or mutuality. Physical proximity is critical to the formation of relationships because familiarity and the opportunity for interaction are critical in the beginning stages of relationships (Festinger, Schachter, & Back, 1959).

Similarity--in attitudes and beliefs, interests, personality, and even physical appearance--has been shown to strongly influence the likelihood of interpersonal attraction (Byrne & Nelson, 1965; Hill, 1987). In close relationships, like mentoring, the desire for similarity is present. In mentoring relationships, both participants stand to gain from the similarities shared. Through the process of social comparison individuals evaluate others and gain confidence when attitudes,
and so forth are shared (Hill, 1987). Initial identification of similarity is insufficient to sustain the relationship, the individuals continue to evaluate the relationship in terms of similarities over time (Byrne, Clore, & Smeaton, 1986).

Physical attractiveness may seem relatively unimportant to mentoring relationships per se, but the physical attractiveness bias is an undeniable force in interpersonal attraction (Buss, 1994). Physical attraction, for some, is the primary determinant of whether or not a relationship is pursued, making it a critical component (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani, & Longo, 1991).

Reciprocity or mutuality has a straightforward implication for close relationships; one tends to get as one gives (Stapleton, Nacci, & Tedeschi, 1973). This is true particularly in the area of self-disclosure, which is important for the development of relationships. Without the exchange of personal information, the relationship is limited in the level of intimacy that can be achieved (Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969).

This review suggests that the formation of mentoring relationships, like other close or intimate relationships, is considerably influenced by the dynamics of interpersonal attraction. Regular, if not frequent contact, between potential mentors and protégés is important. Likewise, shared values, interests, and backgrounds between mentors and protégés
influences the level of attraction. Physical attractiveness may be in the eye of the beholder, but it may also include personal hygiene, dress, and presentation, and so both mentors and protégés should acknowledge this. Further, a willingness to share personal thoughts, feelings, and experiences may also contribute to attraction. All of these contribute in some way to the formation of close relationships, including mentoring.

Observations and Suggestions for Establishing Mentoring Relationships

The literature also provides descriptions of practical approaches to forming mentoring relationships. Several of the authors cited below based their recommendations on observations during the course of researching mentoring (Kram, 1983, 1985; Phillips-Jones, 1982; Zey, 1984). Other authors have built their recommendations on their understanding of various psychological principles (Bushardt et al., 1982; Healy & Welchert, 1990; Newby & Heide, 1992; O’Neil, 1981; O’Neil & Wrightsman, 1981).

In her research on mentoring, Kram (1983,1985) identified phases within mentoring relationships. The first phase, Initiation, is a period of six months to one year during which the relationship begins and increases in importance to the
participants. Both participants have fantasies of who the other is and how the other can help. For the protégé, the fantasy involves admiration and respect of competence and ability to provide support and guidance. The mentor sees potential in the protégé for "coachability." Gradually, during this period, the participants begin to have their expectations met. The fantasies give way to realities. Key to this phase is the number of interactions between mentor and protégé. Too few will likely lead to disenchantment and frustration.

Kram (1985) described the elements prior to the formation as perception of the other as (a) enjoyable, which leads to (b) mutual attraction, which in turn leads to (c) positive expectations, causing the participants to (d) seek out and nurture the new relationship. She did not describe any factors that might specifically interrupt this progression but did provide a thorough description of how life and career stages can affect mentoring relationships. "Any two individuals involved in a relationship bring a unique set of needs and concerns that are shaped by their respective life histories" (p. 15). She also identified organizational contexts and dynamics that can affect mentoring relationships, either negatively or positively. Specifically, the organization's "culture, the reward system, task design, and performance management systems, affect
relationships by shaping individuals behavior" (p.15-16). She contended that it is important to understand how all these factors contribute to mentoring relationship formation.

Phillips-Jones (1982), in her research, also identified phases in mentoring relationships in her research. She labeled the first phase Mutual Admiration, and likened it to falling in love. Each person puts forward their best face all the while experiencing a degree of uncertainty and fear of rejection or disappointment. Levinson et al. (1978) likewise described mentoring relationships as similar to love relationships, in their development, course, and termination. In cross-gender mentoring relationships, the mutual liking and admiration leads to an increase in intimacy and, not infrequently, sexual tension (Kram, 1985).

Zey (1984) provided a comprehensive description of recommendations for establishing a mentoring relationship, dedicating a whole chapter to the topic. He provided nine factors for the protégé to bear in mind when selecting a mentor: (a) Is the mentor good at what he or she does? (b) Is the mentor getting support? (c) How does the organization judge the mentor? (d) Is the mentor a good teacher? (e) Is the mentor a good motivator? (f) What are the protégé's needs and goals? (g) What are the needs and goals of the prospective mentor? (h) How
powerful is the mentor? And, (i) Is the mentor secure in his or her own position? These questions are critical as identified by the respondents in the research who clearly believed that all mentors are not created equal.

Zey (1984) also asked respondents if personality fit and chemistry were crucial to successful mentoring relationships. Respondents indicated that close personal relationships had not developed with their mentors. Rather it was more important that mentor and protégé were able to work together effectively. This ability requires a complex interaction "involving the broad elements of mutual trust, respect, and a belief in each other's ability to perform competently" (p. 173). This does not mean that personality plays only a minimal role because it is part of the initial attraction that each feels for the other. It is not, however, sufficient to ensure the success of the relationship.

Eight strategies are offered to protégés to attract a mentor: (a) possessing and demonstrating competence, (b) achieving visibility, (c) getting key assignments, (d) showing a desire to learn, (e) taking advantage of key interfaces, (f) showing a willingness to help the potential mentor accomplish his or her goals, (g) taking the initiative, and (h) making self accessible. Respondents clearly articulated the belief that
searching for a mentor was better than waiting to be discovered by a mentor in search of a protégé.

What is it that mentors look for in prospective protégés? According to Zey's (1984) research, mentors expressed their desire to find protégés with most of the following 10 characteristics: (a) intelligence, (b) ambition, (c) desire and ability to accept power and risk, (d) ability to perform the mentor's job, (e) loyalty, (f) similar perceptions of work and organization, (g) commitment to organization, (h) organizational savvy, (i) positive perception of the protégé by the organization, and (j) ability to establish alliances. Possession of these characteristics by the protégé attracts the mentor and enhances the possibility of forming in a mentoring relationship.

Bushardt et al. (1982) offered four criteria for selecting a mentor. First, determine if the potential mentor can help with advancing in the organization and career. Second, verify that the mentor can hold the protégés confidence: is the mentor trustworthy? Will the mentor share truthfully including providing constructive criticism? Third, establish that the mentor can benefit from having a relationship with the protégé. Last, confirm that the mentor has a successful track record.

Once the best mentor has been determined, Bushardt et al. (1982) suggested a five-part strategy for cultivating a
relationship with that person. They recommended increasing visibility, demonstrating competence, proving indispensable, being interesting, and looking and acting upwardly mobile.

Newby and Heide (1992) provided helpful recommendations regarding ways to approach the development of mentoring relationships. They suggested that prospective protégés spend time identifying personal and career goals before initiating mentoring relationships. They suggested that protégés with a sense of who they are and where they would like to go would be more attractive to mentors than individuals who appear lacking in self-knowledge and direction. Commonalities between the needs of the protégé and the experiences of the mentor may bring the two together; however, in most cases an outside selection process, in which a third party matches mentor and protégé, would help to ensure the optimal matching.

Early in the formation of the mentoring relationship it is critical for the mentor and protégé to learn their respective roles, the parameters of those roles, and the process and activities of the partnership. The two must also spend time discussing their expectations, evaluating their individual levels of commitment, and their specific motives. Avoiding this step could easily lead to unmet expectations, over-commitment,
and abuse in the relationship, resulting in unsatisfying results for both parties.

In summary, Kram’s (1983, 1985) conclusions about the initial formation of mentoring relationships seem to follow the social psychology principles of similarity, proximity, and reciprocity. She acknowledges that there is a danger that increased intimacy will result in the sexualization of the mentoring relationship, especially in male mentor/female protégé relationships. Zey (1984) offered a multitude of pragmatic suggestions for identifying a mentor and establishing oneself as a high potential protégé. He also offered information on what mentors are looking for in protégés so that protégés might groom themselves to be attractive. Bushardt et al. (1982) offered a similar pragmatic perspective. Finally, Newby and Heide (1992) offered guidelines to increase the value of mentoring relationships.

Each of these theoretical-pragmatic frameworks offers insight into the dynamics and issues present in mentoring relationships. Certainly protégés may be looking for “perfect” parents but mentors also come with histories, including unmet needs. Identification with an expert, or at least a more experienced and knowledgeable person, is critical to development—both personally and professionally. Sex roles
influence mentoring relationships and may complicate them enormously. Close relationships are critical to people’s satisfactions and enjoyment in life, and attraction plays an important role in the establishment of close relationships. True mentoring relationships probably qualify as close relationships. Considering all this it is clear that both mentors and protégés are engaging in a simultaneously rewarding and threatening relationship.

Research

Research on the formation of mentoring relationships provides support for some of the recommendations made above. However, the research does not typically support the theoretical material reviewed above. Research has provided some indication of how mentoring relationships get started, primarily by asking participants who initiated the relationship. Exploration of attraction is also present. Finally, the factors that enhance the protégés reception of mentoring are found in two studies.

Burke (1984) sampled 80 men and women representing almost as many organizations and nearly every function within an organization. All were in the early stages of their careers and were university graduates. The data was collected using
questionnaires. Questions related to the formation of respondents mentoring relationships were included, and 59% of the respondents described the relationship as emerging from their interpersonal interactions without awareness or purposeful intention. Twenty-eight percent reported that the mentor sought them out, while only 12% of the protégés said they initiated the relationship. Most mentoring relationships arose in naturally occurring hierarchical relationships.

Hardcastle (1988) explored protégés recollections of significant mentoring relationships. The participants (n=14) agreed that the mentoring relationships were mutual and comprehensive satisfactorily meeting the criteria for "significant." The participants identified 17 significant mentoring relationships. Eight began while the protégé was in graduate school, four during undergraduate education, two as new faculty members, one each involved teacher/principal, secretary/boss, and student/principal. Hardcastle individually interviewed each protégé, the responses were reviewed, and the author identified patterns. Protégés in Hardcastle's research cited the importance of the mentor's role in the early stage of formation. These mentors were described as perceptive and responsive to the needs or special abilities of their protégés. Hardcastle also found that mentoring relationships occurred
coincidentally in a portion of her sample. Three other situations seemed prominent: (a) the mentor sought out the protégé, (b) the protégés were in need and the mentors came along side to help them, and (c) the protégés were looking for a mentor who could serve as a "parent." The respondents also indicated that they were initially attracted to individuals who they perceived as wise, caring, committed, having high expectations, a sense of humor, and the ability to act as a catalyst in the protégé’s life.

Olian, Carroll, Giannantonio, and Feren (1988) reported three separate but related experiments. The purpose of their research was to explore several hypotheses regarding the attraction between mentors and protégés. The authors used scripts of interactions between a manager and a subordinate. Collecting data from several hundred junior and senior university students, they found that the attraction of a potential protégé to a mentor was significantly affected by the respondent’s perceptions of the mentor’s interpersonal competence. This finding was replicated in the two subsequent experiments. The first experiment also examined attraction to a potential mentor based on gender without finding support; however, males expressed greater attraction to mentors than did females. Attraction to a potential mentor was not significantly
influenced by the gender of the potential mentor. The second experiment examined attraction to a potential mentor based on age but attraction was also not influenced significantly by the age of the potential mentor. Younger potential protégés did not identify greater attraction to a potential mentor, nor did potential protégés with shorter periods of prior work experience.

Using structural equation modeling, Turban and Dougherty (1994) investigated relationships among protégés’ personality characteristics, initiation of mentoring, mentoring received, and career success. The study focused on the experiences of managers and professionals who graduated from the same university from 1979 to 1988. They “proposed that individuals’ personality characteristics influence the extent to which they report attempts to initiate mentoring relationships, which is, in turn related to their reports of mentoring received” (p. 688). The personality constructs of internal locus of control, self-monitoring, and emotional stability (measured as self-esteem and negative affectivity) were found to influence the initiation of mentoring relationships which in turn mediated the amount of mentoring received. Specifically, they observed that individuals with internal loci of control and high levels of self-monitoring and emotional stability were more likely to
initiate mentoring relationships and, subsequently, more likely to receive mentoring. These individuals reported engaging in proactive behaviors to initiate mentoring.

Similarly, Green and Bauer (1995) reported that the most capable newcomers in their research (doctoral students in physical sciences) received the most mentoring functions. The study examined the mentoring that occurred within adviser-student relationships during doctoral training. Green and Bauer had anticipated that greater supervisory mentoring would occur when the student possessed characteristics that signaled the adviser that the student was likely to be committed to his or her endeavors, had positive attitudes toward the adviser, and had the talent to succeed. They found that only the students' a priori abilities were predictive.

Research that included aspects of mentoring relationship formation was reviewed. Mentoring relationships do not seem to originate predominately from the interest of either the mentor or the protégé. Protégés expressed attraction to mentors who possessed strong interpersonal abilities. Protégés appear to be able to influence the initiation of mentoring relationships and the amount of mentoring received. This seems to be influenced by the protégés own personality. However, protégés abilities also
seem to contribute to the amount of mentoring received. These seemingly contradictory findings have not been addressed.

Mentoring Relationship Formation in Graduate Psychology Training

Literature reviewed above comes from business, academia, and non-psychology graduate training settings. The purpose of this dissertation is to provide a model of formation of mentoring relationships in graduate psychology training. The following will explore literature that is specifically relevant to this purpose.

Why is mentoring so critical in the training of psychologists? O’Neil (1981) stated,

Mentoring can positively affect the training of psychologists as well as the satisfaction that academic faculty experience in their training roles. The dissemination of psychological, clinical, and research skills is mainly accomplished through individual or small group interactions between students and faculty. (p. 3)

Mentors may assist students in progressing through the graduate program requirements, help identify and clarify career goals, and support students in developing a professional network (Bogat & Redner, 1985). Mentors can also aid in the learning of
professional skills, the building of confidence, and promoting the student’s welfare within the department (Bogat & Redner, 1985). Also critical to professional development, learning ethics involves more than coursework. Kitchener (1992) argued that “the most influential ethical attitudes that students learn will not come from explicit ethics education but from the experiences that they have in other areas of the curriculum” (p. 190). This includes mentoring relationships.

Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) found in their study of graduate psychology students that students with mentors were more productive in research, publications, and conference papers, and spent more time with faculty members. Mellott, Arden and Cho (1997) recommended that participation in mentoring relationships provides excellent preparation for internship selection. They suggested protégés select mentors that are similar in personal characteristics, research interests, or theoretical orientation. Butki and Andersen (1994) stressed the importance of advisors and mentors of graduate students preparing the students for entrance into a variety of work settings and for teaching ethical and pragmatic material related to presentations and publications.
Theory

O’Neil (1981), and O’Neil and Wrightsman (1981) provided the only theoretical approach to conceptualizing mentoring in psychology training programs. The relationships that develop between faculty and students from formal and informal interactions in graduate school are critical to personal and professional development (O’Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). The resulting relationships vary widely and serve a multitude of needs and purposes. Typically, the relationships begin when the student is assigned to the professor as an advisee. O’Neil (1981) declared this relationship as the ideal situation for mentoring relationships to develop. The quality of early interactions sets the stage for the development of a positive mentoring relationship.

The initial stage involves the tasks of critical decision and entry. The protégé and mentor must determine if the potential exists for an effective mentoring relationship. Though the understanding of this initial stage and its tasks is admittedly undeveloped, O’Neil and Wrightsman (1981) draw on social psychology findings related to attraction and social exchange. Both the protégé and mentor bring needs to the relationship which can enhance or disrupt the formation of the mentoring relationship. It is critical for both to have
knowledge of the other's behavior potential to determine if needs can be met.

Physical attractiveness, interpersonal competence, intelligence, and humor are certainly operational in the initial stage of mentoring relationships (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981).

Research

Research focused on mentoring relationships in graduate psychology education is limited. None has focused specifically on the formation of mentoring relationships.

In a study of school psychologists by Swerdlik and Bardon (1988) respondents reported that most of their mentoring relationships occurred during graduate school. Atkinson et al. (1994) examined the mentoring relationships of ethnic minority psychologists and found that 49% of the protégés reported initiating the mentoring relationship, 21% reported assignment, 10% mutually initiated, 10% were initiated by the mentors, and 10% by various methods.

Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) explored the mentoring relationships of psychology graduate students but did not specifically ask about the formation of the relationship. They did ask about the protégés reasons for choosing their mentors. Over 80% sought out their mentors due to similar interests, 46%
perceived their mentor as an inspiring instructor, 27% were sought out by the mentor, 17% reported assignment to their mentor as an assistant, and 13% said their mentor recruited them into a graduate program. For those protégés who sought out specific mentors, the personality of the mentor, not intelligence, was the prime determinant of their desirability.

Cesa and Fraser (1989) reported the results of a mentoring program at the University of Southern California. This program provided a forum for students to give feedback about their experience with faculty as mentors. The data was collected and summarized for incoming students to use in selecting a mentor. Overall, the program helped students find mentors and faculty to understand what students were looking for in a mentor. Cesa and Fraser concluded "the nature of a good mentor-protégé relationship depends too much on matching the personalities, styles, and interests of mentors and protégés for any assignment to work effectively" (p.127).

The theory and research concentrating on mentoring in graduate psychology training programs is undeveloped. The theory offered by O'Neil (1981), and O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) is intriguing. It is comprehensive and thoughtful, but it has not lead to any research focused on mentoring in graduate psychology training programs. The research reviewed failed to explicitly
explore the formation of mentoring relationships and offered only limited information on how mentoring relationships are initiated. This is similar to studying marriage while ignoring dating.

In summary, the literature reviewed offers a significantly disjointed and incomplete perspective on the formation of mentoring relationships. Theories tend to overlook formation and research typically ignores it. Even the theory offered concerning mentoring relationships in graduate psychology training programs does not acknowledge or emphasize the critical nature of formation in the course of a successful mentoring relationship.

The next chapter presents a model for the formation of mentoring relationships in graduate psychology training programs. It identifies material for educating professors and students about mentoring, particularly formation. It explores the similarities mentoring relationships share with love relationships as described by Sternberg (1988). The model provides elements that will facilitate the selection process. Additionally a description of Research Vertical Teams (RVTs) which may be a vehicle for implementing the model is included.
CHAPTER 3

MODEL OF MENTOR/PROTÉGÉ RELATIONSHIP FORMATION

There is evidence that graduate students in psychology are participating in mentoring relationships (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 1998). This literature review identified a lack of research on the formation of these mentoring relationships. This is true in spite of the call from various leaders that mentoring can and should occur in graduate psychology training programs (Ellis, 1992, Hardy, 1994).

Mentoring relationships, which occur during the formative years of graduate training, are valuable to the individuals involved and the profession of psychology as a whole. Protégés are likely to benefit the most. They are afforded the opportunity for personal and professional development in ways that transcend professor/student or advisor/advisee relationships. Professors who do not mentor reported they were insufficiently motivated by doctoral programs to do so (Busch, 1985). Students reported that they could not find suitable mentors or that the program did not encourage the development of mentoring
relationships (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986). A way to develop such an atmosphere is to implement a program to educate professors and students concerning mentoring and assist them in the selection process. However, it is inadvisable to prescribe the nature of the mentoring relationship. The nature of the specific mentoring relationship that evolves beyond these facilitated conditions must be determined by each dyad and each set of circumstances.

A model for the formation of mentoring relationships involving professors and students in graduate psychology training programs is absent. The following model offers guidelines and suggestions to enhance the establishment of mentoring relationships. It covers the components of mentoring including informal mentoring, departmental support, education of participants, and careful selection.

Model Components

**Informal Mentoring (versus Formalized)**

There is ongoing debate about the effect of attempts to structure mentoring relationships. Criticisms of formal mentoring programs focus on the matching of mentor and protégé. The concern is that such relationships lack foundational
elements and are unlikely to succeed. Namely, forced-matching eliminates the normal process of increased attraction to each other and a desire to work together which often develops between a professor and student prior to establishing a mentoring relationship (Merriam, 1983). However, participants in formal programs have demonstrated benefits from the mentoring relationship, particularly psychosocial benefits (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Noe, 1988b).

Chao et al. (1992) offered a way to distinguish between formal and informal mentoring:

The distinction between formal and informal mentorships lies in the formation of the relationship. Informal mentorships are not managed, structured, nor formally recognized by the organization. Traditionally, they are spontaneous relationships that occur without external involvement from the organization. In contrast, formal mentorships are programs that are managed and sanctioned by the organization. (p. 620)

Typically, formal mentoring programs focus on the completion of designated tasks, activities, or specific skill development (Noe, 1988b). However, within formal mentoring programs, the opportunity for "classical" mentoring exists. Moreover, Healy
and Welchert (1990) believed the condemnation of formalized mentoring as inferior is a premature conclusion.

However, the author is not proposing a formal mentoring program; what is strongly recommended is that graduate psychology programs develop an atmosphere which will increase the likelihood of the formation of mentoring relationships. This might best be described as a facilitated mentoring environment.

Department Support

Whether or not the program encourages mentoring appears to play a significant role in such relationships forming (Phillips-Jones, 1983). Mandating that professors serve as mentors may exceed the program's prerogative, but the program can create mechanisms that facilitate the development of mentoring relationships (Burke, 1984). Programs that choose to encourage mentoring relationships "should instill a climate of mutual interest and participation without obligation or intimidating participation" (Chao et al., 1992, p. 633). Participation must be voluntary; professors and students who choose not to participate must not fear sanctions or penalties (Bowen, 1985; Phillips-Jones, 1983).

Programs would do well to identify mentoring as a goal. Hiring of faculty could include exploration of applicants'
background and history in regard to mentoring. While previous experience providing mentoring cannot completely predict capability, it certainly attests to sufficient motivation. Programs may also attract higher caliber students if mentoring is available and encouraged.

There are costs associated with mentoring. The program must acknowledge the demands on faculty time that mentoring requires and avoid demanding excessive involvement. Professors must be able to limit the number of mentoring relationships to which they commit. Female and ethnic minority faculty may be in higher demand by female and ethnic minority students. Ethnic minority faculty may have the additional burden of representing ethnic concerns on numerous committees placing their time availability at a premium (Atkinson et al., 1994).

The program must also ensure that faculty have adequate space to meet with protégés. Resources, including computers and library materials, are also important to the success of mentoring.

Education

It has been observed that mentoring is less likely to occur when potential mentors and protégés are unaware of the benefits of mentoring (Kram, 1985). Both mentors and protégés must
believe they will benefit to assure investment of energy to promote growth in the relationship (Healy & Welchert, 1990). Participants also need to be aware of the negative aspects of mentoring relationships (Carden, 1990). Promises of specific benefits or outcomes for participation or disadvantages for no-participation should be avoided (Chao et al., 1992).

Programs committed to mentoring should provide orientation. Faculty interested in serving as mentors should attend a series of sessions that present the program's goals and provide relevant information (Alleman et al., 1984). Incoming students should also be invited to attend orientation sessions designed to introduce them to the program's opportunities for mentoring.

Before exploring the specific issues pertaining to the education of professors and students separately, I will summarize those elements of mentoring education that should apply to both. These include defining mentoring, interpersonal attraction, self-awareness, advisors and mentoring, cross-gender relationships, initiation stage, and problems and changes in mentoring relationships.

**Material for Professors and Students**

**Defining mentoring.** As observed in Chapter 1, a definition of mentoring is elusive. However, it is probably less important for the program to define the term or relationship, than it is
for the participants. Mentoring is foremost a relationship, however, it is unclear how intense and intimate mentoring relationships need to be (Bowen, 1986). Expectations of the roles and functions in each relationship are negotiable requiring participants to explore their needs and skills (Monaghan & Lunt, 1992; O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). If the participants collaborate to engage in determining what each is expected to contribute, a positive outcome is more likely.

Advisors and mentoring. Many programs assign an academic advisor to incoming students. Advisors may become mentors (O'Neil, 1981), however, these two roles are not synonymous primarily because the latter involves a personal relationship (Hardy, 1994). The former is more likely to meet the criteria of guide or possibly sponsor (Bushardt et al., 1991). For a mentoring relationship to be formed out of the advising relationship, it is important for both participants to explicitly acknowledge the evolution.

Besides having an advisor who also serves as a mentor, students are also likely to have the professor as a course instructor. Professors and students may also encounter each other in other arenas: committees, organizations, church, and so forth. While most of the relationships that occur in these other settings will not result in ethical violations, it is
important for professors and students to understand dual, or multiple, relationships, and particularly the possibility of exploitation (Biaggio et al., 1997). The risk may seem innocuous because it falls in a gray area; "they are the subtle but little-discussed everyday experiences of faculty and students, and they probably account for the majority of problematic faculty/student relationships (Biaggio et al., p. 185). The best way to avoid exploitation is to maintain frequent communication that directly addresses aspects of the mentoring relationship which may be exploitative.

**Attraction.** Interpersonal attraction was evaluated in the previous chapter. Several principles are applicable to educating professors and students regarding the formations of mentoring relationships. Certainly professors and students could benefit from an introduction, or reintroduction, to the physical attractiveness bias. Both are susceptible to incorrectly attributing certain qualities and abilities based on appearance alone. Sharing a few values or attitudes may also indicate potential promise of a successful mentoring relationship. However, initial impressions, whatever their basis, need to be more thoroughly tested before any decisions to form a mentoring relationship are made. Professors and students need numerous opportunities for interaction in a variety of situations to
expand their understanding of the other. Ideally these interactions would allow occasion for some exchange and self-disclosure, which plays a role in intimacy and relationship development.

Interpersonal attraction principles should be presented as normal and natural aspects of interpersonal interaction. However, personal needs and cultural norms may influence expression of these principles. Thus, sexuality, dependency, and manipulation, to name a few, can easily characterize negative components of attraction.

Self-awareness. Baum (1992) has suggested that successful mentoring relationships rest on the maturity of the participants. Contributing to maturity is self-awareness (Kram, 1985). O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) stated "probably, each person's self-knowledge and personal reflection will provide the best information about how the other person's personality will affect the mentoring dynamics" (p. 204). Programs may wish to evaluate participants' capacity for self-awareness and self-reflection, possibly in growth groups or other similar activities. Seminars, or other educative forums, could contribute to increased self-awareness, understanding of relationship dynamics, and skills in building and maintaining
relationships and could have considerable potential for enhancing mentoring relationships (Kram, 1985).

**Cross-gender mentoring.** Cross-gender mentoring relationships are potentially problematic. Gilbert and Rossman (1992) stated that it is important to identify potential differences in the ways males and females mentor and the needs of male and female protégés. Interacting in ways that are stereotypic and sexist will damage the relationship (Noe, 1988a). In addition, mentors and protégés would be well served to be aware of and acknowledge the influence of past or present parental, supervisory, or love relationships on their mentoring relationships (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981).

**Trust in mentoring relationships.** Early in the academic relationship there is little basis for trust between professors and students. Each must demonstrate to the other values of respect, honesty, and dedication to learning and personal growth. Failure to exhibit these attitudes and values in behavior will impede the formation of a mentoring relationship.

Like other close relationships, mentoring relationships require a high degree of trust. Trust is an element of intimacy which is founded on the mutual, reciprocal, sharing of personal thoughts, feelings, and experiences.
Mentors and protégés must trust that each has the best interest of the other at heart, and mentors and protégés must act in a manner that embodies this trust. This involves relinquishing the need or desire to control or manipulate each other for personal gain. It involves being able to be truthful with one another and not place inappropriate or unrealistic expectations or boundaries upon each other or the relationship. It is important to remember that trust grows as the relationship grows, and, if undermined, the spirit of the relationship can be broken. (Hardy, 1994, p. 202)

Problems and changes. Mentoring relationships, like love relationships, also experience travail and change over time. In fact, the relationship must change (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). At some point the student will become a peer. As for problems that arise, mentors and protégés must anticipate unfulfilled expectations, jealousy, and miscommunication (Newby & Heide, 1992). Some mentors and protégés have also experienced problems in other relationships due to their participation in a mentoring relationship (Bowen, 1985). The key to effectively addressing these is to actively monitor their existence and communicate in an open and non-judgmental manner (Cesa & Fraser, 1989).
Initiation phase. After professors and students agree to form mentoring relationships, the work begins. A positive mentoring relationship is determined only in part by the initial choice (Cesa & Fraser, 1989). It is during this phase of the relationship that the critical foundation of the relationship is established (Newby & Heide, 1992).

Mentors and protégés must collaboratively assess the protégés needs and goals (Zey, 1988) and develop a learning plan (Lawrie, 1987). Mentors and protégés must also "discuss role definitions and functions in order to establish the purposes and to identify the dimensions of their relationship" (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981, p. 201). Mentors and protégés must also address fears and concerns about committing to a mentoring relationship (Newby & Heide, 1992). After completing these tasks the participants can create a mentoring contract that delineates the purpose and goals, roles and functions, and parameters of the relationship.

Mentors and protégés must understand that the relationship is not permanent, and that they can terminate it at any time with no risk of negative consequences (Zey, 1985). An incompatible match is dealt with best during this phase (Newby & Heide, 1992). A review of the reasons and contributing factors could benefit both participants and is recommended.
Professors and students may benefit from reading the detailed descriptions of the subsequent stages/phases of mentoring identified by Kram (1983) and Phillips-Jones (1982). At the least a brief description may be helpful. Both Kram and Phillips-Jones identified multiple steps in the relationships of the participants in their studies.

Phillips-Jones (1982) proposed a five-stage model. She referred to time prior to the actual formation of the relationship as “initiation” but described it as “preparatory behavior.” The first stage is mutual attraction that is followed by a stage of development. In the third stage, the protégé becomes disillusioned with the mentor eventually resulting in a parting. Finally, the relationship experiences a transformation into a collegial relationship or friendship.

Kram’s (1983) model has only four phases though they are similar to Phillips-Jones. After initiating the relationship, the participants cultivate it. Inevitably there is a separation when the tasks of the relationship have been accomplished. Then the participants struggle to redefine the relationship.

From this it is clear that the relationship, if healthy, must change over time. As it changes, the degree of difference between the mentor and protégé decreases. The student progresses to peer and colleague. It may result in the end of the mentoring
relationship, but it does not have to end the relationship. Mentors and protégés must anticipate and prepare for this so that as the mentoring relationship changes the participants can change their expectations and functions.

**Material for Professors**

**Potential benefits.** Before professors agree to serve as mentors, it is critical that they understand what mentoring is and what the graduate program expects mentoring to provide students. Professors can benefit from serving as a mentor. They can advance their research agendas by tapping into students' creativity and energy (Atkinson et al., 1994). Professors can also enjoy the satisfaction of contributing to the personal and professional development of students (Atkinson et al., 1994; Busch, 1985). Effective mentors can also expect their reputations to be bolstered (Atkinson et al., 1994).

**Program expectations.** What is the program expecting of professors mentoring students? The primary expectation of professors is that they are willing to share accumulated knowledge and experience with another that is less knowledgeable and experienced (Bolton, 1980). Professors who participate are expected to contribute to the preparation of students to meet the demands of working in the field of psychology and, possibly, in life. Professors will be required to spend time with students
on a regular basis, to help students identify personal and professional goals, and to facilitate the learning of clinical and research skills. The program expects to be able to identify these contributions during and after students' enrollment.

**Time commitment.** Mentoring is demanding. Most professors' time is at a premium, but time spent with protégés is critical to the success of the relationship and the student (Busch, 1985; Noe, 1988b; O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). Minimally, weekly contact is preferable (Noe, 1988b); however, this may include exchanging e-mail or chatting over a cup of coffee. The interaction need not be formal and/or task focused to be rewarding. Without adequate contact the relationship can "unravel and cease being helpful" (Zey, 1985, p. 55).

**Student needs.** Some students may demonstrate excessive dependency (Busch, 1985; Mehlman & Glickauf-Hughes, 1994) and professors should encourage autonomy (Brown & Krager, 1985). Some students desire surrogate parents (Hardcastle, 1988). Students may also look for mentors to bolster lagging confidence and self-esteem. Having several protégés at a time lends itself to jealousy and competition that mentors will need to monitor and openly address when necessary.

Most students will be able to identify professional goals that mentors can assist in attaining. Students may desire a
professor-mentor who can assist in creating a network or helping develop skills in research, publication, or presentation. Students also may “use” the mentor in the development of personal ethics and professional values (Atkinson et al., 1991; Kitchener, 1992).

**Elitism.** Professors may struggle with deciding which students they want to mentor. Mentoring has been characterized as elitist. Even in programs where advisors serve as mentors, mentors tend to provide more mentoring to students with higher potential (Green & Bauer, 1995). Undeniably, students with potential and initiative are easier to work with; however, it may be unethical, or at least somewhat unfair, to limit mentoring to students deficient in these, or any other, desirable qualities.

**Ethics.** Kitchener's (1992) challenge to professors to model ethical behavior as well as teach ethics is part of mentoring (cf. Brown & Krager, 1985). Professors have primary responsibility for monitoring potential ethical violations in the mentoring relationship and must lead in working to avoid or resolve ethical problems in mentoring (Biaggio et al., 1997).

**Similarity with other relationships.** Mentoring relationships have been compared to other types of relationships. Levinson et al., (1978) identified parallels
between mentoring and parent/child and mating/love relationships. They were more comfortable with the love relationship parallel, stating "the mentor is not a parent or crypto-parent" (p. 99). However, they did acknowledge that the mentor embodies a combination of parent and peer, and must not emphasize one over the other. The desire of students to have mentoring relationships with professors is likely to provide students with a hoped for opportunity to engage in a corrective interpersonal relationship (Mehlman & Glickauf-Hughes, 1994). However, one significant difference between mentoring relationships and child/parent relationships is that parents do not typically choose their children and vice versa.

Probably due to the intimacy of mentoring relationships, several authors have discussed the similarities between mentoring and love relationships (Baum, 1992; Kram, 1985; O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981; Phillips-Jones, 1982). Phillips-Jones likened the stage, in mentoring relationships, of Mutual Admiration to falling in love. Baum (1992) reported that protégés "explicitly and implicitly...speak of feeling intimately, intensely in love with a perfect mentor" (p. 230). The emotional component of mentoring relationships is unavoidable even for the most instrumental of mentors (Baum). The intimacy, emotional
closeness, of mentoring relationships can be inviting but could also be considered potentially threatening if misinterpreted.

**Sternberg’s Triangular Theory of Love.** Based on the attribution of similarity between mentoring and love relationships, it may be helpful to explore Sternberg's (1986, 1988) triangular theory of love. Based on his previous research (Sternberg & Barnes, 1985; Sternberg & Grajek, 1984) Sternberg (1986, 1988) identified three components in love relationships that appear to play roles over and above other attributes. The three components are identified as intimacy, passion, and decision/commitment.

"The intimacy component refers to feelings of closeness, connectedness, and bondedness in loving relationships" (Sternberg, 1986). Intimacy probably begins and is maintained by self-disclosure (Sternberg, 1988). Intimacy is vital to the health of the relationship but it can also threaten the viability. People have varying needs for closeness or distance in interpersonal relationships that intimacy interacts with (Sternberg, 1988). "Relationships work because of a balance between intimacy and independence, and can fail when the balance tips too far one way or the other" (Sternberg, 1988, p. 29). The search for this balance is elusive.
"Passion is largely the expression of desires and needs—such as for self-esteem, nurturance, affiliation, dominance, submission, and sexual fulfillment" (Sternberg, 1988, p. 42). Passion involves motivation and arousal (Sternberg, 1986). The expression of desires and needs is through psychological and physiological arousal (Sternberg, 1986). Passion tends to interact strongly with intimacy (Sternberg, 1986, 1988).

In close relationships, commitment is what keeps dyads together (Sternberg, 1988). The decision/commitment component has short-term and long-term aspects. In the short-term it refers to the decision to love someone else, while in the long-term it refers to the commitment to maintain that love (Sternberg, 1986, 1988). It is primarily a cognitive decision (Sternberg, 1986). Individuals committed to something are expected to maintain that commitment until the goal is attained (Sternberg, 1988).

Sternberg (1986, 1988) developed taxonomy of kinds of love based on the presence of the various components. Mentoring relationships are likely characterized as having higher levels of intimacy, little to no passion, and moderate levels of commitment. Within Sternberg's taxonomy, mentoring relationships could be labeled "liking" or "companionate love." Liking involves emotional closeness and friendship and is used in a
non-trivial sense (Sternberg, 1986). Companionate love is "essentially a long-term, committed friendship" similar to marriages in which the passion has faded (Sternberg, 1986).

Sternberg (1986, 1988) identified courses for the three components as a function of the duration of the relationship. In successful relationships, intimacy tends to increase as the relationships continues though the breadth of self-disclosure may decrease as familiarity increases. Passion tends to peak early and then taper to a semi-stable level. Commitment tends to depend on the success of the relationship over time. It increases to the point of decision and then plateaus as long as the relationship is satisfactory, a term that can be broadly defined. Certainly, the three components are on a continuum meaning the love experienced in the relationship will vary according to the levels of the three components (Sternberg, 1986).

It is important to understand that each relationship actually involves at least four triangles. Each person brings a triangle representing the ideal relationship as well as a triangle representing the actual experience of the relationship. When the real and ideal for each person are closely matched the person is more satisfied with the relationship (Sternberg, 1986, 1988). The mismatches can include underinvolvement,
overinvolvement, and misinvolvement. Also, the matches can range from perfectly matched to severely mismatched.

Sternberg's triangular theory of love is applicable to mentoring relationships. In all close relationships, intimacy is a critical component and its absence can certainly be taken to raise doubts about the closeness of the relationship. Within mentoring relationships passion may originate in the experience of intimacy (Baum, 1992), and mentors and protégés should monitor their needs, motivations, and arousal level, particularly in cross.gender relationships (Kram, 1985).

Commitment in mentoring relationships will likely vary depending on the participants and the situation. Some professors and students will develop long-term relationships that extend beyond the students’ enrollment in the program. Other mentoring relationships, which may be characterized as primarily instrumental, may have lower levels of intimacy and/or commitment.

For professors, mentoring can be both rewarding and demanding. The willingness to provide mentoring to students exemplifies the academicians’ commitment to invest in the lives of tomorrow’s leaders. Programs would do well to look for ways to reward this willingness.
Material for Students

Questions to consider. Prior to engaging in a mentoring relationship, Newby and Heide (1992) suggested potential protégés determine the practicable value of a mentoring relationship. Possible questions include the following: Why do I need a mentor? How can a mentor facilitate the learning process? What are the potential benefits with a mentor? What are the possible results if I choose not have a mentor? By considering these and related questions, the students can better gauge their commitment to participating in a mentoring relationship.

Purpose. That students can benefit from having a mentor is clear. The opportunity to work with knowledgeable and experienced professors will likely result in personal and professional development (Atkinson et al., 1991; Busch, 1985).

Benefits. Students stand to gain the most from mentoring. However, many students are unaware of the benefits that mentoring has to offer them. Those who are aware may lack information and understanding about how to develop and maintain mentoring relationships. Students need information about the purpose of mentoring and the roles and functions they are expected to perform (Newby & Heide, 1992).
Potential problems. Not every mentoring relationship has a successful outcome (Kram, 1985). Unfortunately, unsuccessful relationships have not been adequately examined to provide information on how to avoid them or intervene when necessary. Potential problems may include exploitation, conflict, difficulty around change or termination, and neglect.

Writing about the mentoring experiences of women, Richey et al., (1988) identified three problem areas and possible remedies. Women protégés reported difficulty when their personalities did not match well with the mentors. Careful selection and development of skills to resist premature commitment were suggested as remedies. Other women cited unrealistic and inappropriate expectations as the cause of problematic relationships. Open communication was offered as the best means of addressing such problems. Finally, several reported low self-esteem and fear of criticism as disruptive. These problems are more difficult to address, even though mentors may attempt to bolster protégés’ self-perceptions.

Mentors’ time limitations. Protégés must also understand the limitations on the mentors’ time. Professors will likely have several protégés. Professors also have responsibilities within the program and the university. Of course, professors also have private lives to balance with their professional
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responsibilities. Ideally, students would directly discuss time expectations with professors early in the relationship.

**Needs assessment.** Probably the most critical information prospective protégés must consider is their needs. Protégés who have awareness of their needs and deficits are better prepared to establish goals and objectives. "The personal needs and concerns that the protégé brings to the relationship also will have an impact on the outcomes of the mentorship" (Hunt & Michael, 1983, p.482). Students may not completely understand how to best address their needs and deficits, but the personal knowledge--whatever the depth--they bring to the mentoring relationships will contribute to the mentors' ability to assist them.

Hardcastle (1988) reported two common situations that protégés identified as influencing the selection of a specific mentor. Some protégés were in a critical period, experiencing identity crises, interpersonal crises, or life transitions. Others were looking for parent substitutes, similar to Mehlman and Glickauf-Hughes (1994).

Some students will be more aware of their needs than others. However, all students who desire a mentoring relationship must spend time and make an effort to identify professional needs. Students may review the career functions and
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psychosocial functions identified by Kram (1985) to help them explore their own needs. This would provide them a common language with professors who would be mentors.

Goals. Personal and professional development has been referred to above as the primary goals. However, the students will want to identify more specific goals. Personal development is complex and students should not expect mentors to serve as therapists. Mentors typically contribute to growing self-esteem and confidence but not in the psychotherapeutic tradition.

Professional development is more easily broken down into tasks and functions. Mentors can advocate for students to become graduate assistants, teaching classes and conducting research. Mentors can also co-author articles and presentations with students increasing the students' visibility. Students may additionally learn valuable insights into the practice of therapy, including the business side of practicing psychology in a variety of settings.

Selection

Educating professors and students about mentoring is relatively easy compared to the task of correctly matching them in effective mentoring relationships. There are not any foolproof equations, mathematical or clinical. Selection of a
Mentor "should be carefully considered, informed decision" (Brown & Krager, 1985, p. 416).

There is speculation that not everyone is suited for serving as a mentor (Burke, 1984; Kram, 1985), yet it is not clear whether this is sufficient reason for professors to decline the opportunity. Certainly some professors will be viewed as better mentors, but this may be an artifact of the protégés they mentor. However, reputations for professors' mentoring style and ability will contribute to protégés' interest and attraction.

As for personality characteristics and qualities of mentors and protégés that are associated with successful mentoring relationships, the literature is divided. Alleman et al. (1984) did not find personality differences between mentors and non-mentors. But Burke (1984) and Cronan-Hillix et al. (1986) concluded that personality characteristics contributed to attraction to mentors. O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) were probably correct when they declared that the protégés' self-knowledge is probably the best indicator of the mentors with whom they can effectively work. Protégés who are aware of their own values before selecting a mentor should enjoy increased chances of positive mentoring matches (Bushardt et al., 1982).
Selection is difficult but important to the success of mentoring relationships. The following elements may facilitate the process:

1. Programs will likely wish to limit mentoring to professors and students who complete the orientation discussed above and are committed to the purpose and goals of mentoring. Participants who are unfamiliar with the purpose and goals will likely experience confusion and false expectations (Zey, 1985).

2. Protégés and mentors must be allowed to exercise autonomy in making their selections (Newby & Heide, 1992; Phillips-Jones, 1983; Zey, 1985). Opportunity to interact is critical to the selection process. Proximity, having a professor as a teacher, or even an advisor, is insufficient to foster mentoring relationships. Opportunity for self-disclosure is also important. It is the early interactions between professors and students that set the stage for the formation of mentoring relationships (O'Neil, 1981).

3. Possibly, the program could prepare biographies of professors interested in mentoring that describe their basic approach to mentoring, clinical and/or research interests, general background, statement of faith and/or values, and any other potentially helpful or interesting information. Similar to the program described by Cesa and Fraser (1989), protégés could
complete rating scales for current mentors. The summaries of these ratings could be included with the biographies. This would allow some exploration of factors associated with successful and less successful mentors.

4. Students also could complete background questionnaires and interest inventories. Students could identify previous research and/or clinical experience as well as future goals and aspirations.

5. Protégés are encouraged to be active in initiating mentoring relationships (O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981), and research suggests that those who behaved proactively reported more satisfactory mentoring relationships (Turban & Dougherty, 1994). However, in the institutional setting, mentors and protégés share the responsibility for initiating mentoring relationships (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986).

6. Lastly, it may be helpful if programs appoint a third party, a mentoring coordinator, to review applications for mentorships. This would provide a check and balance for potential problems. This need not necessarily take a great deal of time, especially if student and professor agree, but it offers an objective evaluation of the match. This person would also review relationships that end precipitously and/or unsatisfactorily.
Research Vertical Teams

At George Fox University, the Graduate School of Clinical Psychology uses Research Vertical Teams (RVTs). The RVTs are designed to involve students in collaborative research efforts with peers and a faculty mentor. In the RVT model each student is required to attend and participate in a faculty led research team. The teams meet every other week. During the first year, students rotate through each faculty member’s RVT. When students identify the RVT they wish to join, they must request approval from the faculty member leader. When approved the faculty member automatically becomes the students' dissertation chair and academic advisor (unless the RVT leader is not a clinical psychologist). The students remain in that RVT through the fourth year unless a transfer is requested and the Director of Research approves the transfer to another RVT.

Since academic advisors are assigned during the first year, they could assist students in assessing needs, defining goals, and selecting an RVT. The RVTs model allows students to interact with professors and to observe professors interacting with other students. This exposure provides professors and students another avenue for learning about each other’s values, interests, and styles leading to greater confidence in making selections. This
model supports the selection criteria identified by Zey (1984) and reviewed in Chapter 2.

Students should be encouraged to delay their decisions on which RVT to join until they have participated in all RVTs. Whether or not mentoring relationships will form is left to the RVT leaders and students (of course, mentoring relationships are encouraged). Students may choose a mentor that is not the faculty leader of their chosen RVT. These informal relationships may be formed at the discretion of the participants. Programs may want to establish guidelines for this type of mentoring relationships, especially for monitoring purposes.

A secondary goal of the proposed model is ability for investigation by research. RVTs provide programs with several avenues of investigation of mentoring relationships between professors and students. For example, the formation of mentoring relationships in the proposed model could be compared to non-mentoring relationships in RVTs.

Conclusion

Mentoring relationships between professors and students in graduate psychology programs are more likely to occur when professors and students are educated concerning the benefits,
challenges, and processes of mentoring. Selecting a mentor or protégé should be done thoughtfully and with care. Self-knowledge and ability to communicate are vital attributes of participants in mentoring relationships. RVTs offer a means of gaining valuable information about professors and students to be used in the selection process. Initiating mentoring relationships should be a collaborative venture requiring effort from professors and students. Successful mentoring relationships have a greater probability of developing when mentors and protégés take the time and make the effort to carefully develop them.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In Chapter 1 a broad review of the literature indicated that the definition of mentoring is elusive, though it is generally agreed that mentoring relationships are personal and often intimate. The personality characteristics of the participants are considered by some as critical to the attraction that results in the formation of mentoring relationships (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986); however, the research of others did not find that mentors and protégés differed from non-mentors and non-protégés with respect to personality features (Alleman et al., 1984). Mentors provide psychosocial and career functions that contribute to the personal and professional development of the protégés. Mentors and organizations also appear to benefit from mentoring. Ethical concerns may arise in mentoring relationships, particularly in cross-gender relationships (Lean, 1983, Kram, 1985), if the intimacy of mentoring leads to a sexualization of the
relationship (Kram). In graduate programs, mentoring raises questions about dual relationships (Biaggio et al., 1997). In spite of these potential negative aspects, most authors recommend mentoring because the potential benefits appear to exceed the potential problems.

A great deal is written about mentoring but only a fraction is concerned with the formation of mentoring relationships. The rationale for this dissertation comes from the finding that mentoring contributes to personal and professional development, yet one in two graduate students reported not having a mentor. The years in graduate school are formative and mentoring during this period could positively influence students' development.

Focusing on the formation of mentoring relationships, Chapter 2 explored the literature in greater detail. Several explanations of the dynamics of mentoring relationships were reviewed, including self-psychology, social learning, and biological dimorphism. Interpersonal attraction also appeared to contribute to the formation of mentoring relationships. Various authors have described stages/phases in mentoring relationships and refer to the first as Initiation (Kram, 1983) and Mutual Admiration (Phillips-Jones, 1982). Other authors have recommended criteria and strategies for selecting the best mentor (Bushardt et al., 1982; Zey, 1984). Unfortunately,
research on the formation of mentoring relationships is extremely limited. The foci of this research are on who initiated the relationship and which personality characteristics appear to have attracted mentors and protégés. O'Neil and Wrightsman (1981) offered an elegant description of mentoring in graduate psychology training but only briefly discussed the formation of mentoring relationships. They proposed that academic advising relationships could potentially develop into mentoring relationships.

The findings of the first two chapters indicated that graduate psychology students would benefit from mentoring but that the formation of mentoring relationships is poorly understood. Chapter 3 presented a model for the formation of mentoring relationships. Informal mentoring appears to result in more benefits than formal mentoring programs. In this model, the education of potential mentors and protégés is emphasized and considered critical to the success of forming effective mentoring relationships. Professors and students are provided with information regarding interpersonal attraction, self-awareness, definition of mentoring, dual relationships, cross-gender relationships, and similarity of mentoring to other close relationships.
The model also provides recommendations on the selection process. It is important that students explore their needs and goals prior to initiating mentoring relationships. Both participants, professor and student, will benefit from having information about the other in making a selection. The Research Vertical Teams model was presented as one means to this end.

Initiating mentoring relationships requires the efforts of both participants. Needs, goals, and expectations must be explored jointly, and a mentoring contract should be developed and consented to in writing. By following this model, mentoring relationships are expected to be more grounded, leading to higher satisfaction and better outcomes.

Model-based Research Recommendations

The model presented in the previous chapter is designed to increase the number and quality of mentoring relationships that begin during psychologists' graduate training. Programs that decide to follow the model will likely want to assess the model's efficacy.

The model lends itself to evaluation from several perspectives. Several results are expected when a program implements this model. Students and professors should report
greater awareness of the benefits of mentoring. Subsequently, more students should report participating in mentoring (greater than 50%). Students and professors will report students are more aware of their needs and goals. Students and professors should also report increased understanding of the factors associated with selecting mentors and protégés, respectively. This should lead to better matching of professors and students. Mentors and protégés following this model should also report that mutually determined expectations, identified at the beginning of the relationship, were more consistently realized. The mentoring relationship should also be experienced as more satisfactory to the participants.

It is further expected that mentoring relationships, formed according to this model, will last beyond the years of enrollment because participants are more aware of the critical aspects of successful mentoring formation. This is in direct contradiction to Atkinson et al. (1994) who reported 88% of the mentoring relationships of ethnic minority graduate psychology students lasted four years or less.

Program evaluation of the model is also recommended. Based on the model, the formation of mentoring relationships following this model will result in positive mentoring relationships that
have a profound influence on the lives of students and professors.

Students who are mentored will report high levels of satisfaction in the education experience. Students will report higher levels of self-confidence and competence as professional psychologists. They also will be more productive, submitting more articles for publication and making more presentations. They may report receiving better letters of recommendation and better placements for practicums, internships, and residencies. Student-protégés will also have a higher incidence of dissertations completed prior to internship. Student-protégés will report greater levels of career advancement and satisfaction.

Professors will report increased personal satisfaction based in helping students' personal and professional development. Further professors will express greater enthusiasm for research, teaching, and/or clinical practice. Professors will report that their time is used more efficiently by student-protégés. Professors will also realize an increase in their productivity related to publications and presentations. Professors will express greater confidence in the personal and professional development of protégés. Protégés will be described as having higher degrees of competence in areas of ethics,
clinical knowledge and effectiveness, and research skills. Professors rated as effective mentors will achieve tenure status sooner. Professors may also experience increased visibility and reputation directly related to protégés' success.

Programs will also benefit from mentoring relationships between professors and students. Students will report greater satisfaction with the program and their educational experience. Site visits from accreditation committees will identify high proportions of excellent relationships between faculty and students who are in mentoring relationships. The program will experience an improvement in reputation due to the increased scholarly production of publications and presentations. Subsequently, the program will receive more applications for entrance from high caliber applicants.

Research addressing validation of these expected results should be longitudinal, beginning at admission and extending beyond graduation. Participants should be questioned repeatedly about the status of the mentoring relationship. Terminated mentoring relationships need to be as thoroughly evaluated as successful relationships. Case studies might provide qualitative information on the dynamics of selecting and initiating mentoring relationships.
Specific research questions might reflect the following: What factors contributed to the attraction? Why are some students not interested in mentoring given the information on its benefits? What are the commonalities of negative mentoring relationships? Are there limits to the number of protégés a mentor can have at any one time? What is the relationship between the model and positive mentoring relationships? Are the components identified necessary and/or sufficient? Are mentored students different from non-mentored students?

Mentoring has received increased interest in the past 20 years, but the formation of mentoring relationships has received insufficient investigation. The model presented draws primarily from practical suggestions of various authors. Thus, the model needs to be evaluated in a systematic manner. It is hoped this dissertation will contribute to this end.
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CURRICULUM VITA

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS
American Psychological Association, Student Affiliate, 1992-Present
Mental Health Designee, Multnomah County, OR, 1992-1995

EDUCATION
M.A., Clinical Psychology (1994), George Fox University, Newberg, Oregon
B.A., Psychology (1987), Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio

CLINICAL TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

7/97-2/98, Garlington Center Behavioral HealthCare, Director of Community Support Services.
Supervision of four clinical supervisors, housing program manager, and support staff
manager. Developed programs and budgets. Served as a Member of the Executive Committee.
Represented agency on committees within a network, Advanced Behavioral Health (ABH),
including Clinical Design and Quality Management.

1/97-7/97, Garlington Center Behavioral HealthCare, Clinical Supervisor.
Supervised a team of QMHPs and QMHAs. Served as a member of the Management
Team. Conducted Mental Health Assessments and provided Treatment Planning to severely
and persistently mentally ill adults.

11/96-1/97, Banyan Tree, Respite Program Administrator.
Supervised QMHPs, QMHAs, and direct care staff. Screened admissions. Conducted
Mental Health Assessments and provided Treatment Planning to residents. Provided individual
and group therapy. Oversaw staff scheduling, budget and physical plant.

9/95-8/96, Caremark Behavioral Health Services, Psychological Intern.
Provided individual and group therapy. Conducted psychological assessments. Provided
clinical supervision. Maintained a caseload of three clients while working in a day treatment
program. Participated in multidisciplinary staff meetings.
Supervisors: Susan Schradle, Ph.D. & Craig Montgomery, Ph.D.

2/94-8/95, The Ryles Center for Evaluation and Treatment, Clinical Supervisor.
Supervised the evening shift staff consisting of RNs, QMHPs, and QMHAs. Served as a
member of the Management Team. Lead multidisciplinary team meetings. Primary auditor for
clinical record management.

Provided intensive individual psychotherapy. Evaluated new admissions, developed
treatment plans, coordinated discharge planning with community mental health agencies.
Participated in multidisciplinary team meetings. Conducted psychological assessments using psychological tests and interview. Provided individual and group therapy.

Supervisor: Joelle Gelao, M.S.

Supervised the night shift staff consisting of RNs, QMHPs, QMHA, and CNAs. Served as a member of the Management Team. Screened admission referral calls and evaluated new admissions. Served as the primary auditor for clinical record management.

8/91-10/91, The Ryles Center for Evaluation and Treatment, Qualified Mental Health Professional. Provided milieu therapy for adults with severe and persistent mental illnesses. Evaluated new admissions, developed individual treatment plans. Developed chart-auditing system for Quality Assurance.

Provided individual psychotherapy. Maintained a caseload of 6-8 clients. Served a mixed population including adults, adolescents, children, families and couples.
Supervised by Barbara Rickeman, M.S. & Randy Bennett, M.A.

10/87-5/89, Central DuPage Hospital, Psychiatric Technician.
Evaluated new admissions. Developed treatment plans focusing on behavioral objectives. Counseled individual clients with a wide range of presenting problems and disorders. Co-led group counseling sessions.

CONTINUING EDUCATION
Management of Assaultive Behaviors (2/92; 6hrs), Dan Dowd
Introduction to the Masterson Approach (10/22/93; 1.75 hrs), Ralph Klein, M.D.
The Disorders of the Self (10/23/93; 5.75 hrs), Ralph Klein, M.D.
Symposium on Homosexuality (11/13/93; 5 hrs), Howard Macy, Ph.D., Rev. Gary Davis, Maryka Biaggio, Ph.D., Joseph Nicolosi, Ph.D.
Advances in the Treatment and Diagnosis of Depressive Disorder and Schizophrenia (4/5/94; 3 hrs), David L. Dunner, M.D. & William C. Wirshing, M.D.
1994 Civil Commitment Update (4/27/94; 8 hrs), Brett Asmann, M.A.
Highlights of the DSM-IV Videoconference (6/4/94; 3 hrs), Thomas A Widiger, Ph.D., Le Anna Clark, Ph.D., Peter E Nathan, Ph.D.
Professional Boundary Issues: Countertransference (8/94; 1.5 hrs), Mark Lenetsky
Understanding Defense Mechanisms in Managing Personality Disorders (10/11/95; 4 hrs), George E. Vaillant, M.D.
Amphetamine Misuse (12/1/95; 1 hr), Keith Cheng, M.D.
Tourette's Syndrome (2/16/96; 1 hr), Keith Cheng, M.D.
Narcissistic Disorder: Advanced Level Training (4/19-20/96; 14 hrs), Ralph Klein, M.D.
Accountability in the Practice of Mental Health ( 4/26/96; 6 hrs), Donald E Wiger, Ph.D.
Obsessive Compulsive Disorders (4/14/96; 1 hr), James Hancey, M.D.
Employment: 1997 and Beyond (10/31/97; 4 hrs), Miller, Nash et al. Attorneys at Law
Building a Mental Health QA/QI Program from the Ground Up (11/13/97; 6hrs), Rupert Goetz, M.D., Vijay Ganju, Ph.D., Kathryn Ross, Ph.D., James MacLeod, LCSW.
Navigating Through a Sea of Change (12/10/97; 8 hrs), MHDDSD staff et al.
AWARDS
Academic Scholarship, Wheaton College, 1988
The Arthur Franklin Williams Award, 1987
The Oxford University Press Award, 1987
Cedarville College Alumni Scholarship, 1986
Academic Scholarship, Cedarville College, 1983-1987

REFERENCES
Available on request.

PERSONAL INFORMATION
DOB: January 19, 1966
Married for 10 years; excellent health
Two children: daughter, age 3, son, age 1.