Scandura, T. A. & Pellegrini, E. K. (2007). Workplace mentoring: Theoretical approaches and methodological issues. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), Handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspective approach. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

WORKPLACE MENTORING:

THEORETICAL APPROACHES AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Although mentoring relations can be traced back to Greek mythology (i.e., the relationship between Mentor and Telemachus), organizational mentoring has gained the attention of academicians and practitioners only within the last two decades. The majority of the research on mentoring in the workplace has been published in the last 25 years following the seminal works of Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978) and Kram (1983, 1985). These early studies suggested that mentoring plays a key role in successful career development (Kram, 1985; Roche, 1979; Vertz, 1985).

The purpose of this chapter is to provide mentoring scholars with a review of key theories and methods used in organizational mentoring research. While reviewing existing approaches, we will discuss both the limitations associated with current research and new directions for future research. First, we will review the key streams of thought in mentoring theory that have guided research. We will discuss the traditional definition of mentoring, followed by discussions of potential problems in mentoring relations (e.g., marginal mentoring, dysfunctional mentoring) and new forms of mentoring (e.g., team mentoring, e-mentoring). Next, we will address the theoretical limitations in the study of mentoring and suggest new directions for future mentoring research. Lastly, we will review major

transformational leadership behaviors displayed by mentors may facilitate mentoring via building protégé's self-confidence.

Another leadership construct which should be differentiated from mentoring is paternalistic leadership. Paternalism is an emerging area in leadership research and refers to managers' personal interest in workers' off-the-job lives and attempts to promote workers' personal welfare (Pasa, Kabasakal, & Bodur, 2001). In paternalistic cultures, people in authority assume the role of parents and consider it an obligation to provide protection to others under their care. Subordinates, in turn, reciprocate by showing loyalty, deference and compliance. Following Graen and Uhl-Bien's (1995) taxonomy, the primary distinction among paternalism and mentoring may be conceptualized as differences in leader-based versus follower-based leadership domains. The leader-based domain studies the appropriate behavior of the person in the leader role. Paternalistic leadership is an example of the leader-based approach as it examines leader behaviors such as being interested in every aspect of employees' lives, making decisions on behalf of employees without asking for their approval, and participating in employees' special days (e.g. weddings, funerals). The follower-based domain studies "ability and motivation to manage one's own performance" (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; p. 224). Mentoring illustrates this approach through its focus on protégé skill development. Another distinction between mentoring and paternalism is that paternalism is a dyadic relationship between a more powerful leader and a follower, whereas mentoring relations may be dyadic, team, or network relations. Finally, with respect to the employee's freedom in making decisions, in paternalistic leadership, decision-making is directive rather than empowering (Uhl-Bien & Maslyn, 2005). In contrast, in a mentoring relationship, the decision-making is participative whereby the protégé learns the ropes of the organization

and/or attains management skills through participating in the decision-making process alongside the mentor.

Temporal Theories of Mentoring

Since the inception of mentoring theory, the concept of time has been considered to be an important component of mentoring relationships. According to Kram (1983), although developmental relations such as mentoring vary in length, they generally proceed through four predictable phases. The relationship gets started in the *initiation* phase during which the mentor and the protégé start learning each other's personal style and work habits. Kram (1983) suggested that this stage lasts six months to one year. If the relationship matures into a mentorship, it then progresses to the *cultivation* phase. During this stage, which may last anywhere from two to five years, the protégé learns from the mentor and advances in his or her career. The mentor promotes the protégé through developing the protégé's performance, potential, and visibility within the organization (Chao, 1997). The protégé gains knowledge while the mentor gains loyalty and support of the protégé along with a sense of well-being from passing on knowledge to the next generation (Levinson et al., 1978). This is considered to be the stage of mentorship during which most benefits accrue to the mentor and the protégé (Scandura & Hamilton, 2002). As noted by Scandura (1998), mentoring research has largely focused on issues in the cultivation phase.

As the protégé outgrows the relationship and becomes more independent, the structure of the relation begins to change. This signifies the *separation* phase which involves a structural and/or psychological disconnection between the mentor and the protégé and may last anywhere from six months to two years. Often, the reason for separation is geographical separation (Kram, 1985; Ragins & Scandura, 1997). The protégé may move onto another

position either through job rotation or promotion which begins to limit opportunities for continued interaction (Ragins & Scandura, 1999). Indeed, Eby and McManus (2004) found that in their sample of 90 mentors, only 6 (7%) of them gave relationship problems as the reason for termination. The majority of these mentors mentioned protégé resignation, protégé termination, or transfers from the organization as the reason for separation.

The separation phase may be emotionally stressful as either one or both members perceive it with anxiety or defiance (Chao, 1997). After the separation phase, the existing mentoring relationship is no longer needed. In the final *redefinition* phase, a new relationship begins to form where it may either terminate or evolve into a peer-like friendship characterized by mutual support and informal contact (Chao, 1997; Scandura, 1998).

Criterion Variables in Mentoring Theory

Mentoring theory has adopted several distinct approaches to outcome, or criterion variables. The first is to take a career theory perspective and examine the career outcomes of mentoring for protégés. Mentoring research has examined the career progress of protégés in terms of performance, salary and promotions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Scandura, 1992; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). Mentoring relations may also support protégé career development through positive effects on protégé's learning. The development of a successful relationship reinforces the protégés' confidence in their ability to learn and may support risk-taking and innovation (Lankau & Scandura, 2002). Hall (1996) suggests that the ability to regularly grow and change by learning is indispensable for successful careers. Lankau and Scandura (2002) found the presence of mentoring functions to be antecedents of protégé's learning, which positively related to job satisfaction and negatively associated with role ambiguity, intentions to leave (turnover intentions) and actual leaving (turnover behavior).

The second major approach to criterion variables in mentoring research employs variables that are typically studied in organizational research. Several studies relate mentoring to role stress, an extensively studied variable in organizational behavior. For example, Baugh, Lankau, and Scandura (1996) found mentoring to be negatively related to role stress and Nielson, Carlson, and Lankau (2001) examined mentoring in relation to a specific form of role stress – work-family conflict. Similarly, Kram and Hall (1991) found support for mentoring as a stress reducer during organizational turmoil. Other organizational behavior outcomes examined in relation to mentoring include justice perceptions (Scandura, 1997; Williams & Scandura, 2001), withdrawal intentions (Scandura & Viator, 1994) and withdrawal behavior (Lankau & Scandura, 2002).

Mentoring theory has also addressed benefits at the organizational level of analysis. Organizations are increasingly recognizing the value of mentoring relationships and attempt to reap the advantages through launching formal mentoring programs as part of their career development initiatives. In addition to outcomes for protégé career development and work attitudes, the benefits of mentoring relationships may accrue at the organizational level as well as the management level. Some theorists have suggested that mentoring benefits organizations by improving competencies (Clutterback, 2004). There is little theoretical development, however for outcomes associated with mentoring at the organizational level. For example, institutional theory might be applied to better understand whether mentoring occurs more frequently in certain types of organizational settings (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Outcomes for mentors have also been examined as criterion variables in mentoring theory and research. Mentoring a less experienced junior person may provide a creative and rejuvenating life experience to the adult mentor (Levinson et al., 1978). By contributing to

future generations, mentors may also get a sense of immortality (Erikson, 1963). Second, mentors may obtain valuable, work-related information from their protégés (Mullen, 1994). Kram (1985) suggests that protégés can provide a loyal base of support which may help improve the mentor job performance. The benefit that mentors derive is yet another area that is in need of further theoretical development. For example, theories of upward influence and/or power sharing might be applied to better understand how protégés might influence powerful mentors in the organization by providing loyalty and other benefits. It can be expected that mentoring relationships follow norms of reciprocity and mentoring theory might examine the ways in which mentors and protégés influence one another.

Potential Problems in Mentoring Relationships

Marginal Mentoring

Mentoring is likely to be marked by both positive and negative experiences over time. Recently, Ragins, Cotton, and Miller (2000) proposed the potential for the existence of marginal mentoring relationships which do not involve serious dysfunction, but reduce relationship effectiveness. Marginal relationships may be limited in the scope or degree of mentoring functions provided. They fall midway on a continuum anchored with highly satisfying relationships on one end and highly dissatisfying relations on the other. Ragins et al. (2000) found that the attitudes of protégés who reported marginal satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their mentor were equivalent to or even sometimes worse than those of individuals without mentors. Ragins et al. (2000: 1178) refer to marginal mentors as "good enough mentors" and suggest that although truly dysfunctional mentoring relations are likely to terminate (Ragins & Scandura, 1997), relationships that are marginally effective may endure.

Marginally effective relationships involve problems that minimize the potential of the relationship to meet important needs, but there is no malice involved and the relationship is likely to remain intact (Eby & McManus, 2004). For example, according to Eby and McManus (2004), protégé's unwillingness to learn and performing below expectations may represent two broad problems that characterize marginally effective relationships since they limit the benefits that can be realized from the relationship but do not cause serious harm to the mentor or the relationship.

Dysfunctional Mentoring

Dysfunctional mentoring relations are those in which the relationship is not beneficial for either the mentor, protégé or both (Scandura, 1998). Kram (1985) warned that under certain conditions, a mentoring relationship can become destructive for one or both individuals. Her assertion was supported by subsequent research and dysfunctional mentoring relations are reported in both the empirical (Eby et al., 2000; Ragins & Scandura, 1997) and practitioner literature (Myers & Humphreys, 1985). Scandura (1998) emphasized that most mentoring relationships are positive and productive, however when dysfunction occurs, it may have negative effects on the performance and work attitudes of the protégé, and the result may be increased stress and employee withdrawal in the form of absenteeism and turnover (Scandura & Hamilton, 2002). Moreover, the negative emotions resulting from mentoring problems may be detrimental to both the protégé's career progress and the organization (Hunt & Michael, 1983).

Scandura (1998) provides a theoretical discussion of the various dysfunctions that may occur in a mentoring relationship. Building upon Scandura's theoretical foundation, Williams, Scandura and Hamilton (2001) developed a measure of dysfunction in mentoring

(DIM) measuring four dimensions of dysfunctionality. *Negative relations* involve psychosocial problems with bad intent (bullying, intimidation, overly aggressive behavior, abuse of power, and provoking diversity issues). *Difficulty* involves psychosocial problems with good intent (different personalities, different work styles, unresolved conflicts, disagreements, placement of binds by the mentor, mentor on the wrong career track, and over-dependence). *Spoiling* reflects changes in the relationship that make a previously satisfying relationship disappointing. It involves vocational issues with good intent (vocational issues with the absence of malice, betrayal, and regret). Eby and McManus (2004) provide an example of spoiling where a mentor discusses poor judgment when a protégé became romantically involved with a senior manager who was married. The protégé's actions disappointed the mentor and strained the relationship. Finally, *submissiveness* reinforces the balance of power (the protégé is submissive, over-dependent, accommodating, meek, and passive). Employing this scale, Williams et al. (2001) found that perceived dysfunction had a negative effect on protégé performance and an even stronger negative effect on self-esteem.

Negative Mentoring

Eby and McManus (2004) suggested *malevolent deception* as another dimension of dysfunctionality. This reflects overt acts of deceit on the part of the protégé. Given the essential role of trust in close relationships (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2003), perceptions of protégé deception may lead to mentor's psychological and/or physical withdrawal from the relationship. Eby and McManus (2004) also discuss *jealousy* and *competition* as dimensions of dysfunctional mentoring relationships since they can lead to suspicion, reduced trust, and counterproductive behavior. New measures of the negative aspects of mentoring have recently emerged (Eby et al. 2004), however more work is

necessary to determine the construct validity of these measures and what outcomes these measures are related to.

New Forms of Mentoring

Multiple Mentoring

The literature on mentoring suggests that individuals develop more than one mentoring relationship in the course of their careers. Kram (1983) originally proposed that individuals rely upon not just one but multiple mentors for developmental support. A protégé may maintain a peer-like relationship with a former mentor, while at the same time developing a new mentoring relationship with a different mentor. Henderson (1985) found both male and female protégés to have two to three mentors in the course of their careers. Baugh and Scandura (1999) also supported the existence of multiple mentoring relationships and proposed that having multiple mentors may enhance mentoring outcomes. Their results suggest that experiencing multiple mentoring relations may result in greater organizational commitment, job satisfaction, career expectations, increased perceptions of alternative employment, and lower ambiguity about one's work.

Recently, Higgins and Kram (2001) reconceptualized the traditional "single dyadic relationship" definition of a mentoring relation into a "multiple relationships" phenomenon in which the protégé has a network of concurrent mentoring relationships. Network mentoring is a multiple mentoring model capturing the existence of a constellation of different mentors at one point in time rather than a sequential existence of single mentoring relations.

Team Mentoring

Team mentoring occurs when the leader serves as a team mentor and develops the team through career coaching, psychosocial support, and role modeling (Williams, 2000). In

team mentoring the expertise resident in one individual is made available to multiple protégés at the same time (Ambrose, 2003). Williams (2000) notes that team mentoring also involves a responsibility for each team member to support the learning being promoted by the team mentor through peer mentoring. Thus, team mentoring is both dyadic and group focused with mentoring ties between both the team leader and each team member and among team members themselves. Kaye and Jacobson (1996) suggest that in team mentoring, a formal mentor does not always lead members, rather members usually provide mentoring to each other. This aspect of team mentoring may be used for corrective feedback and building shared expectations and understanding (Knouse, 2001).

E-Mentoring

E-mentoring uses electronic means as the primary channel of communication between the mentor and the protégé (Hamilton & Scandura, 2003). E-mentoring relationships are maintained through various electronic media, including e-mail, chat, or the Web, whereas the traditional mentoring relationships are created and nurtured by frequent face-to-face contact between the mentor and the protégé. According to Ensher, Huen, and Blanchard (2003), electronic mentoring is not different from traditional mentoring in terms of its ability to provide vocational support and friendship. However, they propose that e-mentoring relations have added risks including greater chance of miscommunication, longer time to develop the relationship, and concerns with privacy and confidentiality. E-mentoring literature is still evolving and there is yet to be an empirical analysis that compares face-to-face and computer mediated mentoring relationships.

Needs-Driven Mentoring

Higgins and Kram (2001) conceptualized mentoring as a network of relationships that span a protégé's entire career. Mezias and Scandura (2005) integrated this perspective with the research on international mentoring and developed a theory of expatriate mentoring as a network of relationships. This "needs-driven" approach focuses on the changing developmental needs of expatriate protégés and on the type of mentoring necessary during the different stages of an international assignment (predeparture, expatriation, repatriation). Mezias and Scandura (2005) argue that there are different socialization needs during the different stages of an international assignment and as a consequence expatriate protégés may need multiple, concurrent developmental relationships due to the increasing ambiguity, uncertainty, and pressure stemming from challenges of international assignments.

Theoretical Limitations

Based on the preceding sections, several theoretical limitations are identified. These limitations include: definitional issues, lack of integration from other disciplines, and limited range of criteria examined. These limitations are discussed, followed by directions for future research.

Definitional Issues

A major theoretical limitation in mentoring research pertains to construct clarification. Almost four decades ago, Levinson et al. (1978) described the mentor's function as guide, counselor, and sponsor. Contemporary research is still yet to discriminate among coaching, mentoring, and sponsoring. Future research should address this definitional confusion and distinguish how mentoring offers benefits above and beyond coaching or sponsoring.

Further, despite flourishing research in the new forms of mentoring (e.g., team mentoring, network mentoring, e-mentoring), research is still yet to empirically assess the

dynamics in mentoring relationships that take place in virtual space. Ensher et al. (2003) and Hamilton and Scandura (2003) suggest that the traditional mentoring functions (career-related, psychosocial, and role modeling) are still present in e-mentoring and therefore, the electronic relationship may be referred to as another type of mentoring relationship that relies on computer-mediated communication. However, Kram's (1985) original conceptualization of career-related functions involve protection and providing exposure and visibility, neither of which can be easily provided when the mentor reaches the protégé only through electronic means. In fact, the only vocational function that may easily be provided in an e-mentoring relation is coaching. Further, Kram (1985) proposed that the psychosocial functions are provided through an interpersonal relationship that fosters increasing intimacy. This level of relating, however, may not easily develop without frequent face-to-face interaction. Finally, the role modeling function may not occur in a virtual environment since it is mastered through direct observation of the mentor's behavior. More research is needed on the mentoring functions provided through e-mentoring before referring to these as 'mentoring relationships'.

Lack of Theoretical Integration from Other Disciplines

Research on mentoring has largely advanced independent of research in other fields of management and organizational psychology. McManus and Russell (1997) noted that mentoring research could benefit from integration with other psychological research, such as social support and stress. According to Wanberg et al. (2003) integration with other areas of research will enhance the understanding of the nomological network in which mentoring is embedded. There are some studies that sought to integrate mentoring with the literature on organizational justice (Scandura, 1997), organizational citizenship behavior (McManus and Russell, 1997), socialization (Chao et al., 1992; Feldman, Folks, & Turnley, 1999), Leader-

member exchange (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994), perceptions of trust (Bouquillon, Sosik, & Lee, 2005) and transformational leadership (Scandura & Williams, 2004; Sosik, Godshalk, & Yammarino, 2004).

Despite attempts to integrate mentoring with other areas of research, there is additional theoretical integration that might be developed. For example research on abusive supervision (Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994; Tepper, 2000; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002) appears to be relevant to the study of problems in mentoring relationships. For example, the question of whether mentoring is less likely to be abusive than supervisor-subordinate relationships is an interesting research question. Theories from clinical and counseling psychology also seem relevant to the development of mentoring relationships. For example, Scandura and Pellegrini (2004) employed attachment theory as a theoretical framework to better understand initial relationships development among mentor and protégé. Similarly, theories of interpersonal attraction (Berscheid & Walster, 1969) might be employed to better understand why some mentoring relationships flourish and others wane. Educational research has also examined the development of mentoring relationships (Bierema & Merriam, 2002; Johnson, 1989; Ugbah & Williams, 1989). Theories of mentoring in the academic context may provide insights into the development of workplace mentoring.

Limited Range of Criteria Examined

As discussed previously, existing research typically examines how mentoring influences protégé career outcomes, including promotion, compensation, career satisfaction, career commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions (Allen et al., 2004). Research on mentoring needs to go beyond these variables to expand the nomological network of mentoring. For example, Kram's definition of mentoring involves 'exposure and challenging

assignments' which may imply increased empowerment and delegation. However, to date the mentoring literature has almost been silent on the issue of participative decision-making. As another example, Scandura (1997) argues that mentoring may relate to justice perceptions. Of particular relevance are interpersonal and informational justice perceptions, neither of which has been examined to date in relation to mentoring. Interpersonal justice reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, respect, and dignity whereas informational justice focuses on the explanations provided to the employees that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion (Colquitt, 2001).

Cross-cultural Mentoring

Another area that warrants attention is cross-cultural research on mentoring relations. The impact of mentoring in the international context is an area where research is just beginning (Scandura & Von Glinow, 1997). The majority of mentoring research has been conducted with Western samples, however, globalization increasingly challenges today's managers to become more cross-culturally adept. Societal culture is a superordinate determinant of a person's values, perceptions and expectations (Shweder & Levine, 1984) and given the vast cultural differences among different regions of the world, we may find significant differences in the way protégés respond to various mentoring functions. For example, recently Pellegrini and Scandura (2004) found that employees in the Middle East may be disinterested in delegation. Thus, international mentoring research may find divergent results concerning the effectiveness of certain mentoring functions, such as fair treatment (i.e., justice perceptions) and participative decision-making (i.e., delegation).

Directions for Future Research

Kram (1985) initially conceptualized mentoring relations as being parental, emotional and intense. However, Kram and Isabella (1985) defined mentor-protégé relationships as being in the middle way between intense paternalistic relations and peer-like friendships. Given the increasing interest in research on paternalism, we need empirical research to clarify how mentoring relations differ from paternalistic ones. Paternalistic managers assume the role of parents and consider it an obligation to provide protection to others under their care (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2004). In a paternalistic relationship, the follower voluntarily depends on the leader which is similar to the 'loyal base of support' conceptualized by Kram (1985). It is important to empirically discriminate between mentoring and paternalism for various reasons. First, both literatures are still evolving and prior to developing advanced theoretical frameworks, we need to establish construct validity for both of these constructs. Further, paternalism is perceived negatively in the Western context which has been reflected in metaphors regarding paternalistic leadership, such as "benevolent dictatorship" (Northouse, 1997, p. 39), "cradle to grave management" (Fitzsimons, 1991, p. 48), "country club management style" (Winning, 1994) and "noncoercive exploitation" (Goodell, 1985, p. 252). Thus, we need to empirically examine if and how psychosocial mentoring differs from paternalistic leadership.

Mentor and/or protégé characteristics that may influence the creation and maintenance of mentoring relations will also inform our understanding of the development and process of mentoring relationships (Wanberg et al., 2003). From a practitioner perspective, this information may be useful in identifying employees who will flourish as protégés and/or mentors. Previous research has identified various personality correlates of mentoring. For protégés, these personality characteristics include extraversion and Type A personality

(Aryee, Lo, & Kang, 1999), self-monitoring and self-esteem (Turban & Doughtery, 1994), and the need for affiliation and achievement (Fagenson, 1992). The personality characteristics that are found to influence effective mentoring include positive affectivity and altruism (Aryee et al., 1999), self-monitoring (Mullen & Noe, 1999), and upward striving (Allen, Poteet, Russell, & Dobbins, 1997). These studies suggest some antecedents to effective mentoring relationships, however there is still not sufficient information regarding how mentoring relations develop in early phases. With the exception of diversity variables (cf., Ragins, 1997), theoretical frameworks to guide research on personality and other individual differences are needed. As an illustration, Scandura and Pellegrini (2004) delved into attachment theory and the issues of dependency and counter-dependency from both mentor and mentee perspectives. They propose that mentoring may mediate the relationship between attachment styles and work outcomes such that mentoring relations involving counterdependent (avoidant attachment) or dependent (anxious/ambivalent attachment) people either as protégés or mentors will become either marginal or dysfunctional. They suggest that an interdependent stance (secure attachment) is most likely to result in functional mentoring relationships.

Major Methodological Approaches and Limitations

In this section, major methodological approaches to the study of mentoring are discussed, along with methodological limitations. This includes a discussion of both measurement and research design issues.

Measurement

Kram (1983) conceptualized mentoring as a two-dimensional construct involving career development (e.g., coaching, exposure, protection) and psychological support (e.g.,

role modeling, counseling, and friendship). She studied role modeling as a form of psychosocial support, however in some subsequent studies it emerged as a separate and distinct mentoring function (Burke, 1984; Scandura, 1992; Scandura & Ragins, 1993).

The debate over whether mentoring relationships involve two or three independent functions is also reflected in the most commonly used mentoring instruments. Noe (1988) suggests that mentors provide career and psychosocial functions and he measures these two functions with 21 items. Dreher and Ash (1990) also developed a two-dimensional scale involving 18 items. On the other hand, Scandura and Ragins (1993) developed the three-dimensional Mentoring Functions Questionnaire (MFQ) which measures the career, psychosocial, and role modeling functions with 15 items. Recently, Castro and Scandura (2005) reduced the measure to 9 items using multiple samples and analyses. The MFQ is the only three-dimensional mentoring instrument with sufficient evidence supporting its three dimensional factor structure (Scandura & Ragins, 1993), concurrent validity (Baugh et al., 1996; Nielson, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001), and convergent and discriminant validity (Castro & Scandura, 2005).

Recently, Pellegrini and Scandura (2005) concluded that an accepted measure of mentoring has not emerged. There are a number of commonly used scales (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Noe, 1988; Scandura & Ragins, 1993), but there is still insufficient information regarding their psychometric properties. However, one recent construct validation study is noteworthy. Pellegrini and Scandura (2005) used multiple confirmatory factor analyses to investigate the factorial stability of the MFQ across two groups: protégés who are satisfied with their mentor and those who are not. The results suggested partial measurement invariance indicating that the mentoring relationship might be fundamentally different across

satisfying and dissatisfying relationships, and this may affect the way the items are interpreted. Overall, the MFQ-9 demonstrated excellent psychometric properties when used in dissatisfying relationships. The results of this study also show that measuring the mentoring construct with adequate validity may require more items in satisfying relationships. Pellegrini and Scandura (2005) conclude that by identifying invariant items and improving those that are nonequivalent, research on mentoring should be improved. In addition to basic psychometric work, more research is needed that examines the most commonly used mentoring instruments by careful comparison. For example, Castro and Scandura (2004) examined two commonly-used mentoring measures and found that both are useful, but perhaps for different purposes.

Another measurement concern is that research has typically examined the quality of the mentoring relationship from the protégé's perspective. However, the correlation between mentor and protégé ratings of the mentoring relationship is low enough to raise questions about scale validity for one or both sources. For example, Raabe and Beehr (2003) found that mentors believed they were giving more career support than mentees believed they were getting, but mentees perceived greater psychosocial support and role modeling than mentors indicated providing. Measurement perspective is an important issue because it may act as a moderator of the relationship between mentoring and its correlates. For example, the association between mentoring functions and protégé's job satisfaction might be stronger when mentoring functions are measured from the protégé's perspective as compared with the mentor's point of view. Therefore, future research should examine mentoring from both perspectives to identify whether measurement perspective acts as a moderator, and if so, among which mentoring functions and outcomes.

Research Design

Qualitative research. Research on mentoring has flourished over the past 25 years owing primarily to the seminal works of Kram (1983, 1985), who studied 18 mentor-protégé relationships via in-depth interviews. Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs (1997) also conducted a qualitative study examining factors that influence an individual's decision to mentor others. As a result of their in-depth interviews with 27 mentors, they suggested 13 influential factors such as the desire to pass information onto others, the desire to help others succeed, personal desire to work with others, and to increase personal learning. Recently, Eby and Lockwood (in press) interviewed mentors and protégés in two formal mentoring programs. They concluded that the benefits included learning, coaching, career planning, and psychosocial support for protégés, and learning, developing a personal relationship, personal gratification, and enhanced managerial skills for the mentors. Qualitative research is important in understanding the dynamics involved in mentoring relationships. Research in mentoring is in need of more qualitative field studies to have a more holistic and an in-depth understanding of mentoring relations.

Time horizon of research. In order for mentoring research to go beyond showing associations with career outcomes, it is important to demonstrate that mentoring precedes career success outcomes. To date mentoring research has largely relied on cross-sectional field studies and is in need of more longitudinal studies in order to establish causal directions among mentoring and career success outcome variables.

Initial research on the temporal sequencing of mentoring and outcomes is promising (Wanberg et al., 2003). For example, Donaldson, Ensher, and Grant-Vallone (2000) found that high-quality mentoring relationships were related to organizational commitment and

organizational citizenship behaviors reported six months later. Silverhart (1994) found that new insurance agents who reported having a mentor were more likely to be with the organization at the end of the first year and to have sold more policies. In a longitudinal study of the careers of lawyers, Higgins and Thomas (2001) found that the organizational level of a protégé's set of developmental relationships was related to promotion to a partner position seven years later. More recently, Payne and Huffman (2005) found that mentoring was positively related to affective and continuance commitment and negatively related to turnover behavior one year later in a sample of 1,000 U.S. Army officers.

Experimental research. While mentoring research tends to use cross-sectional designs, there are several examples of field experiments. For example, Seibert (1999) found that one year after a formal mentoring program was initiated, protégés participating in the mentor program reported higher job satisfaction, but did not differ from their non-mentored counterparts in terms of work role stress or self-esteem at work. While providing some experimental control, it is important to note that this study is a quasi-experiment because it lacked random assignment.

Experimental laboratory research involving both random assignment and high experimental control could contribute greatly to our understanding of mentoring. As an illustration, the field experiment by Olian, Carroll, and Giannantonio (1993) provided interesting insights about the establishment phase of mentoring. Their sample which consisted of one hundred and forty-five managers in the banking industry revealed that mentors were more willing to engage in mentoring when the protégé had a good past performance record, if male protégés were married and female protégés were single.

Experimental and longitudinal comparative research. It is perhaps most surprising that there have been no attempts to examine the efficacy of formal mentoring programs using field experimental designs or longitudinal designs. Yet, as far back as Kram (1985), the suggestion that assigned (i.e., formal) mentoring relationships may not be as beneficial as mentoring relations that develop informally has been asserted. Formal programs are those which are implemented and overseen by the organization, directed by written policy and guidelines (Burke & McKeen, 1989). Studies comparing formal mentoring to informal mentoring have typically found informal mentoring to be more effective. For example, Allen, Day, and Lentz (2002) found that individuals in informal mentoring relations reported higher levels of career mentoring and higher quality mentoring relationships than individuals in formal relationships. Chao et al. (1992) also found that protégés in formal mentoring relationships reported receiving less career mentoring functions than protégés in informal relationships. Regarding psychosocial mentoring functions, Fagenson-Eland, Marks, and Amendola (1997) found that formal protégés reported lower levels of psychosocial functions than informal protégés. With respect to specific mentoring functions, Ragins and Cotton (1999) found that in comparison to informal protégés, formal protégés reported lower levels of mentoring on almost every mentoring function (e.g., sponsoring, coaching, protection, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship, social support, role modeling, and acceptance). Formal protégés also reported lower compensation than individuals with informal mentors.

The need for experimental and longitudinal research on formal and informal mentoring is a critical area for future research, since many authors have called into question the effectiveness of formal mentoring (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Noe, 1988; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). In the formal mentoring context, processes that need to be examined include

the mentor's motivation and the protégé's openness to mentoring. Also, formal mentoring may result in feelings of coercion and set up an evaluation agenda which may put individuals in the program on the defensive (Kram, 1985). Nonetheless, organizations are increasingly seeking to formalize mentoring relationships as a career development strategy, despite lack of sufficient empirical evidence supporting the value of formal mentoring initiatives. Scandura (1998, p. 451) suggests that notwithstanding continued practitioner interest "the jury is still out on the efficacy of formal mentoring programs".

Conclusions

The field of mentoring has had a unique stream of development over the past 25 years. Unlike other areas of management research, clear models emerged relatively early in the theoretical development of the field due to the insightful work of Levinson et al. and Kram. These frameworks guided research on mentoring and career outcomes for many years. Also, diversity issues were well-integrated with mentoring theory (cf., Ragins, 1997). This careful attention to theoretical issues provided clear guidance for research. In the late 1990s, new models of mentoring emerged such as multiple, team and network mentoring. Some of these ideas were part of the original work of Kram, such as the idea of developmental networks. These areas of research need further theoretical development and empirical attention.

In our review of methodological issues, we highlighted several areas that are in need of further attention. In particular, there is a need for more attention to the measurement of mentoring and a broader array of research designs. A standard measure of mentoring has not emerged, yet there are similarities among all mentoring measures because most are derived from the original work of Kram. A comparison of the psychometric properties of mentoring measures would be a useful study. For example, Castro and Scandura (2004) compared two

measures, but a more comprehensive review is clearly needed. Also, more recent research has sought to carefully define mentoring for respondents and this is a recommended practice. Finally, as many previous authors, we suggest more longitudinal research on mentoring to better understand how the process unfolds over time.

We also suggest that a broader set of processes and criterion variables be examined. For example, Sosik et al. (2004) examined the learning goal orientations of protégés. The learning goal orientations approach is consistent with Lankau and Scandura's (2002) theory of personal learning as an integral part of the mentoring process. Protégé learning within the mentoring relationship is a potentially important new direction for the examination of mentoring outcomes. Also, there has been recent attention to what mentors learn from the relationship (Germain, 2004). Traditionally, outcomes of career mobility have been studied, however, with organizational downsizing and the changes in careers, a focus on skill development and learning may be more meaningful.

The field of mentoring appears to be flourishing as new theoretical perspectives emerge and empirical research continues to employ a variety of research methods. Some theories were well grounded in qualitative work and resulted in empirical research that has opened up even more avenues for research. Currently, mentoring theory enjoys continued interest and the development of new theoretical perspectives such as mentoring networks and needs-driven approaches. Despite continued theoretical and practitioner interest in mentoring, we feel that mentoring needs to address key issues in the areas of measurement and longitudinal as well as experimental designs. There are yet many unanswered questions for mentoring theorists and researchers to explore. In this chapter, we reviewed the major

theoretical streams of research, methodological issues and developed some suggestions for future theory and research.

References

Allen, T. D., Day, R. & Lentz, E. (2002). Interpersonal comfort in mentorship: A mediating mechanism. Paper presented at the 17th Annual SIOP Conference, Toronto, ON.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M., Lima, L., & Lentz, E. (2004). Outcomes associated with mentoring protégés: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 127-136.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51, 70-89.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., Russell, J. E. A., & Dobbins, G. H. (1997). A field study of factor related to willingness to mentor others. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50, 1-22.

Ambrose, L. (2003). Multiple mentoring. Health Executive. Retrieved from http://www.ache.org/newclub/CAREER/MentorArticles/Multiple.cfm on April 25, 2005.

Aryee, S., Lo, S., & Kang, I.L. (1999). Antecedents of early career stage mentoring among Chinese employees. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20,563-576.

Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Baugh, S. G., & Scandura, T.A. (1999). The effect of multiple mentors on protégé attitudes towards the job setting. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 14, 503-521.

Baugh, S. G., Lankau, M. J., & Scandura, T. A. (1996). An investigation of the effects of protégé gender on responses to mentoring. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49, 309-323.

Baugh, S. G. & Scandura, T. A. (2000). The effect of multiple mentors on protégé attitudes toward the work setting. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 4, 503-521.

Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. H. (1969). Interpersonal attraction. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Bierema and Merriam (2002). E-mentoring: Using computer mediated communication (CMC) to enhance the mentoring process. Innovative Higher Education, 26, 214-221.

Bouquillon, E.A., Sosik, J.J., & Lee, D.Y. (2005). It's only a phase: Examining trust, identification and mentoring functions received across the mentoring phases. Mentoring and Tutoring, 13, 241-260.

Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. Group and Organization Studies, 9, 353-372.

Burke, R. J. and McKeen, C.A. (1990). Mentoring in organizations: Implications for women. Journal of Business Ethics, 9, 317-333.

Castro, S. L., & Scandura, T. A. (2004). The tale of two measures: Evaluation and comparison of Scandura's (1992) and Ragins and McFarlin's (1990) mentoring measures. Paper presented at the Southern Management Association Meeting, San Antonio, TX.

Chao, G.T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51, 15-28.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. Personnel Psychology, 45, 619-636.

Clutterback, D. (2004). What about mentee competences? In. Clutterback, D. A. & Lane, G. (Eds.), The situational mentor: An international review of competences and capabilities in mentoring. Hants, U.K.: Gower Publishing.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 386-400.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W.J. (1975). A vertical dyad approach to leadership within formal organizations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 46-78.

Davis, G. & Watson, G. (1982). Black life in corporate America. New York: Anchor Press.

Donaldson, S. I., Ensher, E. A., & Grant-Vallone, E. (2000). Longitudinal examination of mentoring relationships and organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. Journal of Career Development, 26, 233-248.

Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 539-546.

Dreher, G. F., & Chargois, J. A. (1998). Gender, mentoring experiences, and salary attainment among graduates of an historically black university. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 53, 401-416.

Dreher, G. F. & Cox, T. H., Jr. (1996). Race, gender, and opportunity: A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 297-308.

Eby, L. T., Butts, M., Lockwood, A., & Simon, S. A. (2004). Protégés' negative mentoring experiences: Construct development and nomological validation. Personnel Psychology, 57, 411-447.

Eby, L. T. & Lockwood, A. (in press). Protégés' and mentors' reactions to participating in formal mentoring programs: A qualitative investigation. Journal of Vocational Behavior.

Eby, L. T. & McManus, S. E. (2004). The protégé's role in negative mentoring experiences. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65, 255-275.

Eby, L. T., McManus, S. E., Simon, S. A., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). The protégé's perspective regarding negative mentoring experiences: The development of a taxonomy. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57, 1-21.

Ensher, E.A., Huen, C., & Blanchard, A. (2003). Online mentoring and computer-mediated communication: New directions in research. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63, 264-288.

Ensher, E. A. & Murphy, S. E. (1997). Effects of race, gender, perceived similarity, and contact on mentor relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50, 460-481.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and Society. 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton.

Fagenson, E. A. (1988). The power of a mentor: Protégés' and nonproteges' perceptions of their own power in organizations. Group and Organization Studies, 13: 182-194.

Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10, 309-320.

Fagenson, E.A. (1992). Mentoring: Who needs it? A comparison of protégés' and nonprotégés' needs for power, achievement, affiliation, and autonomy. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 41, 48-60.

Fagenson-Eland, E. A., Marks, M. A., & Amendola, K. L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51, 29-42.

Feldman, D.F., Folks, W.R., & Turnley, W.H. (1999). The socialization of expatriate interns. Journal of Managerial Issues, 10, 403-418.

Feldman, D. C. & Lankau, M. J. (in press). Executive Coaching: A review and agenda for future research. Journal of Management.

Fitzsimons, D. J. (1991). From paternalism to partnership. Journal of Compensation and Benefits, 6, 48-52.

Germain, M. (2004). Mentor learning: New constructs for mentoring research. Southern Management Association Meeting, San Antonio, Texas.

Gerstner, C. R. & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 827-844.

Goodell, G. E. (1985). Paternalism, patronage, and potlatch: The dynamics of giving and being given to. Current Anthropology, 26: 247-257.

Graen, G. B., Liden, R. C., & Hoel, W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 868-872.

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. Research in Organizational Behavior, 9, 175-208.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 219-247.

Hamilton, B. A., Pellegrini, E. K., & Williams, E. A. (2003). Race, Sex and Dysfunction: An Empirical Analysis of Unexpected Mentoring Outcomes. Academy of Management

Meeting, Seattle, WA.

Hamilton, B. A., & Scandura, T. A. (2003). E-Mentoring: Implications for organizational learning and development in a wired world. Organizational Dynamics, 31, 388-402.

Henderson, D., W. (1985). Enlightened mentoring: A characteristic of public management professionalism. Public Administration Review, 15, 857-863.

Higgins, M. C. & Kram, K. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. Academy of Management Review, 26, 264-288.

Higgins, M. C. & D. A. Thomas (2001). Constellations and careers: Toward understanding the effects of multiple developmental relationships. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22, 223-247.

Hunt, D.M. & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool, Academy of Management Review, 8, 475-485.

Johnson, C. S. (1989). Mentoring programs. In M. L. Upcraft & J. Gardner (Eds.), The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college (pp. 118-128). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaye, B. & Jacobson, B. (1996). Reframing Mentoring. Training & Development, 50, 44-47.

Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. Violence and Victims, 9, 341–357.

Keller, T. & Dansereau, F. (1995). Leadership and empowerment: A social exchange perspective. Human Relations, 48, 127-145.

Knouse, S.B. (2001). Virtual mentors: Mentoring on the internet. Journal of Employment Counseling, 38, 162-169.

Koberg, C., Boss, R., Chappell, D & Ringer, R. (1994). Mentoring at work: Developmental

relationships in organizational life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. Academy of Management Journal, (December 1983), 608-625.

Kram, K. & Hall, D. (1991). Mentoring as an antidote to stress during corporate trauma. Human Resource Management, 28, 493-510.

Kram, K. E. & Isabella, L A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. Academy of Management Journal, 28, 110-132.

Lankau, M., & Scandura, T. A. (2002). An examination of personal learning in mentoring relationships: Content, antecedents, and consequences. Academy of Management Journal, 45, 779-790.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. A., & McKee, B. (1978). Season's of a Man's Life. New York: Knopf.

Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1995). Trust in relationships: A model of trust development and decline. In B. B. Bunker and J. Z. Rubin (Eds.), Conflict, cooperation, and justice. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 15, 47-119.

Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 662-674.

McManus, S. E., & Russell, J. E. (1997). New directions for mentoring research: An examination of related constructs. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51, 145-161.

Meyer J. W. & Rowan B. (1977). Institutional Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83, 343-363.

Mezias, J. M. & Scandura, T. A. (in press). A needs-driven approach to expatriate adjustment and career development: A multiple mentoring perspective. Journal of International Business Studies.

Mullen, E. J. (1994). Framing the mentoring relationship as an information exchange. Human Resource Management Review, 4, 257-281.

Mullen, E.J. & Noe, R.A. (1999). The Mentoring information exchange: When do mentors seek information from their proteges? Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20, 233-242.

Myers, D.W. & Humphreys, N.J. (1985). The caveats of mentorship. Business Horizons, 28, 9-14.

Nielson, T. R., Carlson, D. S., & Lankau, M. J. (2001). The supportive mentor as a means of reducing work-family conflict. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59, 364-381.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. Personnel Psychology, 41, 457-479.

Northouse, P. G. (1997). Leadership: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Olian, J. D., Carroll, S. J. & Giannantonio, C. M. (1993). Mentor reactions to protégés: An experiment with managers. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 41, 266-278.

Pasa, S. F., Kabasakal, H, & Bodur, M. (2001). Society, organizations, and leadership in

Turkey. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50, 559-589.

Payne, S. C. & Huffman, A. H. (2005). A longitudinal examination of the influence of mentoring on organizational commitment and turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 48, 158-168.

Pellegrini, E. K. & Scandura, T. A. (2004). Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), Paternalism and Delegation in the Turkish Business Culture: An Empirical Investigation. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Pellegrini, E.K. & Scandura, T. A. (2005). Construct equivalence across groups: An unexplored issue in mentoring research. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 65, 323-335.

Raabe, B., & Beehr, T. A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and coworker relationship: Differences in perceptions and impact. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24, 271-293.

Ragins, B. R. & Cotton, J. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 529-550.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 1177-1194.

Ragins, B. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1990). Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37, 321-339.

Ragins, B. R. & Scandura T.A. (1994). Gender differences in expected outcomes of mentoring relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 957-971.

Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. Academy of Management Review, 22, 482-521.

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. Harvard Business Review, 57, 14-28.

Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13, 169-174.

Scandura, T. A. (1997). Mentoring and organizational justice: An empirical investigation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51, 58-69.

Scandura, T. A. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. Journal of Management, 24, 449-467.

Scandura, T. A., & Hamilton, B. A. (2002). Enhancing performance through mentoring. In, S. Sonnentag (ed) The Psychological Management of Individual Performance. A Handbook in the Psychology of Management in Organizations (pp.293-308). Chichester: Wiley.

Scandura, T. A. & Pellegrini, E. K. (2003). A Multidimensional Model of Trust and LMX. Southern Management Association Meeting, Clearwater Beach, FL.

Scandura, T. A. & Pellegrini, E. K. (2004). Competences of building the developmental relationship. In Clutterback, D. & Lane, G. (Eds.), The situational mentor: An international review of competences and capabilities in mentoring. Hants, England: Gower Publishing Limited.

Scandura, T. A., & Ragins, B. R. (1993). The effects of sex and gender role orientation on mentorship in male-dominated occupations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 43, 251-265.

Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1994). Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complementary constructs in leadership research. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 1588-1602.

Scandura, T. A. & Viator, R. (1994). Mentoring in public accounting firms: An analysis of mentor-protege relationships, mentoring functions, and protégé turnover intentions. Accounting, Organizations & Society, 19, 717-734.

Scandura, T. A. & Von Glinow, M. A. (1997). Development of the international manager: The role of mentoring. Business and the Contemporary World, 9, 95-115.

Scandura, T. A. & Williams, E. A. (2001). Formal mentoring: The promise and the precipice. In: Cooper, C. & R. Burke, (Eds.) The new world of work: Challenges and opportunities. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, pp. 241-257.

Schriesheim, C. A. & Castro, S. L. (1995). A structural modeling investigation of leader-member exchange (LMX) and mentoring as complementary concepts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, Orlando, Florida.

Schmitt, N. W. & Klimoski, R. J. (1991). Research methods in human resources management. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing.

Schwab, D.P. (1980). Construct validity in organization behavior. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, Vol. 2. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Seibert, S. (1999). The effectiveness of facilitated mentoring: A longitudinal quasi-experiment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54, 483-502.

Shweder, R. & LeVine, R. (1984). Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion. New

York: Cambridge University Press.

Silverhart, T. A. (1994). It works: Mentoring drives productivity higher. Managers Magazine, 69, 14-15.

Sosik, J. J., Godshalk, V. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (2004). Transformational leadership, learning goal orientation, and expectations for career success in mentor-protégé relationships: A multiple levels of analysis perspective. The Leadership Quarterly, 15, 241-261.

Steinberg, A. G., & Foley, D. M. (1999). Mentoring in the Army: From buzzword to practice. Military Psychology, 11, 365 - 380.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. Academy of Management Journal, 43, 178–190.

Tepper, K., Shaffer, B. C., & Tepper, B. J. (1996). Latent structure of mentoring function scales. Education and Psychological Measurement, 56, 848-857.

Thomas, D. A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, 479-492.

Thomas, D. A. (2001). The truth about mentoring minorities: Race matters. Harvard Business Review, 79, 99-107.

Thomas, D. A. & Higgins, M. C. (1996). Mentoring as an extra-organizational activity: Lessons from minority experience. In The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era, Arthur M.B. & Rousseau D.M. (Eds.). Oxford University Press: New York.

Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1994). Role of protégé personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 688-702.

Ugbah, S., & Williams, S. A. (1989). The mentor-protégé relationship: Its impact on Blacks in predominantly White institutions. In J. C. Elam (Ed.), Blacks in higher education: Overcoming the odds. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Uhl-Bien, M. & Maslyn, M. (2005). Paternalism as a form of leadership: Differentiating paternalism from Leader-Member Exchange. Academy of Management Meeting, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Vertz, L. L., (1985). Women, occupational advancement, and mentoring: An analysis of one public organization. Public Administrative Review, 415-423.

Wakabayashi, M., Graen, G.B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1990). The generalizability of the hidden investment process in leading Japanese corporations. Human Relations, 43, 1099-1116.

Williams, E. A. (2000). Team mentoring: New directions for research on employee development in organizations. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meeting, Toronto, Canada.

Williams, E.A., Scandura, T.A., & Hamilton, B.A.. (2001). Dysfunctional Mentoring Relationships and Negative Social Exchange: Uncovering Some Unpleasant Realities in Mentoring Relationships. Southern Management Association Proceedings (pp. 62-66). New Orleans: Southern Management Association Meeting.

Winning, E. A. (1994). Pitfalls in Paternalism. Retrieved February 22, 2005, from http://www.ewin.com/articles/paternal.htm.

Yukl, G. (1989). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J. & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 1062-1076.