

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS ON THE ENTRY
LEVEL JOB SEARCH PROCESS IN THE FIELD OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School of
University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

MISHELLE D. BANAS

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dissertation Supervisor

DECEMBER 2010

© Copyright by Mishelle D. Banas 2010
All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled,

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS ON THE ENTRY
LEVEL JOB SEARCH PROCESS IN THE FIELD OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

presented by Mishelle D. Banas
a candidate for the degree of doctor of education,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson

Dr. Robert Bowman

Dr. David Kreiner

Dr. Barbara Martin

DEDICATION

Each person is only as strong as the team of individuals that support them. When I began this educational goal, I was given the advice to develop a team that would support and cheer me on, challenge me, and motivate me to progress and persist. Without that team, I could have easily given up on numerous occasions.

I am so extremely grateful to my parents, John and Kathy, and my sister, Jaime, as well as my extended family, who may not have always understood what I was going through but continued to ask about my research, encouraging me to see the light at the end of the tunnel. I specifically dedicate the completion of my degree to my grandfather (PaPa), Joseph Campbell, who always took a great interest in the advancement of my education and I know would be proud to see me stand as a Dr. In addition, one of my newest cheerleaders, who came along after the journey had started but pushed me to finish this goal, Josh Oaks. Without you, I would not have been as motivated to complete this degree in the time frame needed for us to then begin our life together. To my friends, Matt and Stacy Bierman, your continued support and interest made me feel as though someone was always holding me accountable. From day one, you agreed to serve on my doctorate “board of directors” and I can never tell you how much it meant to know that you were there for me.

Finally, those who have mentored me in my student affairs career (Dr. Andrea Trinklein, John Biernbaum, and Derek Jackson). Without their guidance, I would not have understood what it means to be a good mentor to emerging professionals. You have instilled the passion of mentoring within me and I will always pay it forward!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely grateful for the support of the University Housing department, my colleagues, and specifically my supervisor, Alan Nordyke. I thank you all for understanding my commitments with the program and supporting me as I pursued this educational goal. I could not have done it without you. I appreciate my friends, Dr. Brenda Moeder, who went through the program before me and paved the way to mentor me on my journey; and Kirsti Brunsvold. Without the two of you, I would not have continued after summer one.

I could not have completed this research without the help of the Upper Midwest Region of the Association of College and University Housing Officers (UMR-ACUHO) and the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) staff. In addition, my colleague and friend, Kelly Waldram Cramer assisted a great deal in the creation of my survey, offering her assessment expertise, and encouraging me in so many ways (Doctor by December!).

I wish to thank Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, for serving as my advisor throughout the program. In addition, I am in debt to the time and encouragement provided by my dissertation committee: Dr. Robert Bowman, Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dr. David Kriener, and Dr. Barbara Martin.

To my fellow cohort six members, we went through two years of class together and we have continued to support each other on the second level of this end goal. I knew that each and every one of you was behind me in spirit and it kept me going!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
APPENDICES	vii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER ONE	
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Conceptual Underpinnings of the Study.....	3
Statement of Problem	5
Purpose of Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Null Hypotheses	7
Limitations of the Study	9
Design Controls	10
Definition of Key Terms.....	11
Summary.....	11
CHAPTER TWO	
Literature Review.....	13
Student Affairs Profession.....	13
History of Mentoring.....	16

Definitions of Mentoring	19
Theories Utilized with Mentoring	22
Kram’s Phases of Mentoring	25
Functions that Mentoring Serves	26
Components of Effective Mentoring	28
Challenges of the Mentoring Relationship	31
Barriers within the Mentoring Relationship	33
Benefits for Mentees.....	35
Benefits for Mentors	37
Gender and Mentoring.....	39
Types of Mentoring Programs	42
Formal Mentoring Programs	42
Electronic Mentoring Programs.....	46
Conclusion	48

CHAPTER THREE

Statement of the Problem.....	49
Purpose of the Study.....	50
Research Questions.....	50
Research Design	51
Population and Sample	52
Data Collection	53
Instrument.....	54
Data Analysis.....	55

Summary.....	60
CHAPTER FOUR	
Data Analysis	61
Instrument and Data Collection.....	63
Demographics.....	64
Mentor Information	64
Lack of a Mentoring Relationship	70
Job Search Preparation	71
Research Questions Reviewed.....	72
Research Question One	72
Research Question Two.....	73
Research Question Three.....	73
Research Question Four.....	74
Research Question Five and Six.....	74
Hypothesis Testing	75
Psychosocial Support and Mentoring.....	75
Job Search Etiquette and Mentoring.....	77
Gender and Mentoring.....	78
Length of Time and Mentoring	82
Modes of Communication and Mentoring.....	87
Summary of Findings	90

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary of Findings and Discussion	92
Purpose of Study.....	92
Overview of the Study	93
Major Findings	95
Psychosocial Support and Mentoring.....	95
Job Search Etiquette and Mentoring.....	96
Gender and Mentoring.....	97
Length of Time and Mentoring	98
Modes of Communication and Mentoring.....	100
Discussion.....	101
Psychosocial Support and Mentoring.....	102
Job Search Etiquette and Mentoring.....	104
Gender and Mentoring.....	105
Length of Time and Mentoring	107
Modes of Communication and Mentoring.....	108
Implications for Practice.....	109
Recommendations for Future Research.....	111
Summary.....	113
REFERENCES	115

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form.....121

Appendix B: Letter of Support from the OPE Staff.....122

Appendix C: Participant Communications.....123

Appendix D: Survey Questions125

Appendix E: IRB Approval Form129

VITA.....130

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1: Demographics of Regional Affiliations	65
2: Mentor Relationship	66
3: Mentor Gender Pairings	66
4: Length of time in the Mentoring Relationship.....	67
5: Primary Method of Contact with Mentor	68
6: Amount of Contact with Mentor.....	69
7: Perceived Impact of a Mentor.....	70
8: Self Rated Psychosocial Skill Development Awareness	72
9: Independent Sample t-test on Confidence, Informed Levels of Knowledge About the Field, and Skill Development Related to the Mentor	76
10: Independent Sample t-test on Job Search Etiquette Related to Mentoring.....	78
11: Two Way Factorial ANOVA Related to Gender and Mentoring	81
12: Respondents Isolated for Research Question Four	84
13: One Way Between Subjects ANOVA Related to Self Confidence, Informed Levels of Knowledge About the Field, Skill Development and Job Search Etiquette and Length of Time of Mentoring	85
14: One Way Between Subjects ANOVA Continued.....	86
15: Respondents Isolated for Research Question Five	88
16: One Way Between Subjects ANOVA Related to Self Confidence, Informed Levels of Knowledge About the Field, Skill Development and Job Search Etiquette and Modes of Communication in Mentoring	89

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS ON THE ENTRY
LEVEL JOB SEARCH PROCESS IN THE FIELD OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

MISHELLE D. BANAS

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare those emerging professionals in the field of student affairs who engaged in a mentoring relationship and those who did not engage in a mentoring relationship. Specific areas assessed included psychosocial support (self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development) and career preparation in the form of job search etiquette.

The study population consisted of students who participated in a job search in the spring 2010 recruitment season. These students were accessed through the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) registration. The survey was distributed to 570 participants, and 183 surveys were collected, therefore yielding a response rate of 32%.

The study findings revealed no significant difference in whether or not an emerging professional engaged in a mentoring relationship compared to those who did not engage in a mentoring relationship in the areas of psychosocial support (self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development). Those who had a mentor showed no significant difference in the length of time of the mentoring relationship or the differing modes of communication within the mentoring relationship. In addition, there was no significant difference found within the comparisons of gender pairings within the mentee-mentor relationship. Finally, there was a significant difference found with job search etiquette preparation for those who engaged in a mentoring relationship compared to those who were not engaged in the mentoring relationship.

Implications for practice include supporting individuals who are embarking upon the first entry level job as this study showed a significant impact in those that were prepared through a mentoring relationship. Housing/residence life professionals should begin to spend more time on job search preparation programs as well as mentor matching as a student begins to explore the profession. There are also opportunities within the profession to enhance training for our seasoned professionals to understand the mentoring role and responsibilities. Finally, while the focus of this study was on those who did engage in a mentoring relationship, it is important to consider the impact on those who did not engage in a mentoring relationship. As professionals in student affairs, it will be important to seek out students to support who may not have access to a mentoring relationship or may not feel comfortable in approaching a mentor.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

The concept of “mentoring” was integrated into the mainstream, stemming from a long history beginning in the medical profession (Rose & Rukstalis, 2008; Williams, Levine, Malhotra, & Holtzheimer, 2004). In an early version of the Hippocratic Oath, taken by doctors upon completion of medical school, teachers were considered parent figures, serving with the intent to develop character in others. Soon medical mentors learned what was needed to develop a student’s professional and personal character. The concept of supporting a student’s professional character was further supported by Forehand’s (2008) research, which stated, “mentoring relationships can be characterized as ‘academic parenting’ in which the mentor works to support the personal and professional growth of the mentee in a selfless way” (p. 749).

Despite the previous research on mentoring, there can still be a large discrepancy in the definition of mentoring. One definition often referred to derives from Greek mythology,

a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experience adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes this important task. (Kram, 1985, p. 2)

While definitions may vary, the intent is the same - an experienced individual who utilizes experience and knowledge to support the growth of a young professional. Within the field of Student affairs, mentoring is becoming more prevalent. Professionals are

seeking ways to foster the growth of the profession, and are finding that encouraging emerging professionals is the place to start. In an effort to help young professionals prepare for the job search and start to a career, many seasoned professionals are embarking on a mentoring relationship. With little research done on mentoring of individuals in the field of higher education, seasoned professionals are finding this to be new territory to navigate.

As professionals begin to seek ways to share their experiences, they are finding the shared relationship with an emerging professional to be very rewarding. A shared relationship allows professionals to foster the growth of the mentee, while re-energizing their own professional career. Being accountable to another helps remind each professional of the rewards of the work in which they are engaged. However, guidelines, direction, and understanding of the concept of mentoring are still needed. The purpose of this research study is to identify what is working and where the gaps are within mentoring of emerging professionals within the field of student affairs.

This current research will assess individuals entering their first job search for an entry level position (defined as either at the graduate assistant level or full-time level) to determine if they had a mentor who helped them in an on-going relationship to prepare for their search, as well as the realities of entering the field. Additionally, this study will focus on the meaningful mentoring relationships that are occurring and the areas in which mentees have received support from their mentor. Besides studies by Blackhurst (2000) and Kelly (1984), research specific to mentoring in student affairs is lacking. Blackhurst and Kelly created a foundation for the need for mentoring in the field of student affairs. However, times have changed, and so have students who are entering the profession. It is

necessary to begin to address the needs of these professionals by engaging in additional research, thus creating a new foundation. In addition, no research can be found specific to the student affairs entry level job search and preparation, specifically from a mentor perspective. This is another layer to the research that is needed.

Conceptual Underpinnings of Study

When studying theory related to mentoring, the research provided a basis to show that psychosocial and leadership theories can be applied to support the concept of mentoring. Specifically, social exchange theory, social learning theory, human development theory, attachment theory, and Kram's phases of mentoring can be used as a basis for the research (Allen, Poteet, & Russell, 2000; Cooper & Miller, 1998; Dougherty, Turban, & Haggard, 2007; Eby, Lockwood & Butts, 2006; Gormley, 2008; Kram, 1985; Mertz 2004; Russell, 2000).

One example of a theory used to examine the relationship between mentor and mentee is the social exchange theory (Allen et al., 2000; Dougherty et al., 2007; Mertz, 2004; Russell, 2000). Social exchange theory looks at the "model of human behavior that views an interaction between two people as an exchange where the cost of participation in the relationship is compared to the perceived benefits" (Allen et al., p. 272). This is based on the idea if an individual believes the relationship will provide more beneficial outcomes than it will cost the individual to engage in the relationship, there will be more inclination to develop and foster this relationship (Allen et al.; Mertz).

Additional theories can be utilized when studying mentoring. Social learning theory has indicated humans learn through imitation and observation. Specifically, "in order for learning to occur, individuals must observe appropriate behavior, if there are no

role models for the desired behavior then individuals are less likely to learn. Further, once the behavior is learned, reinforcement is necessary in order for it to be maintained” (Eby et al, 2006, p. 269). This indicates the necessity for a new professional to engage in an on-going learning experience with a mentor who can serve as a strong role model.

Psychosocial theories such as human development theory and attachment theory can also serve as a basis for mentoring. Understanding that one role of a student affairs professional is to help advance the psychosocial development of students, it would stand to reason that mentoring should be a core responsibility of that advancement. Attachment theory is a good way to understand the functional and dysfunctional aspects of a mentoring relationship (Gormley, 2008). This particular depth of a bond created is one of the ways a mentoring relationship is separated from a traditional relationship (Gormley). Through research supported by Cooper and Miller (1998) and Gormley, the relationship created puts the mentor in the role as an attachment figure and the relationship cannot be easily replaced for the student. Cooper and Miller argue the mentoring relationship is much deeper than that of a relationship with an advisor or supervisor, and if lost, the career development of the mentee could be impacted. Human development theory supports this concept during times of transition, as students seek out support to find balance between the challenge and the success during the time of transition (Cooper & Miller).

Finally, and arguably most significantly related to mentoring theory, is the work done by Kram (1985). Kram identified a model of the phases of the mentoring process to include four phases, including initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. While the phases may differ in the length, Kram describes the natural process and time frame of

a mentoring relationship. It is important to note, though the phases are identified and a helpful tool to studying mentoring, the phases are not always a linear process. There can be overlap and connecting, or even repetition, as one engages in a mentoring relationship (Kram; Kochan & Trimble, 2000). Kram's phases of mentoring will, therefore, serve as the theoretical basis for this study.

Statement of the Problem

Mentoring is an important part of the success of mentees and organizations. It has been shown to assist mentees in the development of career skills, as well as assist organizations in retention and innovative future success (Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). Student affairs professionals have a responsibility to foster the growth of the individuals who are entering the profession. The concept of mentoring should be a motivational challenge to entice seasoned professionals to share their experiences and knowledge with the emerging professionals. Through opportunities and networking, mentees can benefit from the support of mentors.

Currently in the field of student affairs, specifically housing and residence life, there are many students entering the job search each year to embark upon a career. Through the interview process, seasoned professionals are noticing more and more preparation problems of these candidates, as well as struggles with self confidence and support for the skills of the candidates.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain if individuals pursuing their first housing/residence life entry level position in student affairs (defined as a graduate assistant level or first full-time level) have engaged in a mentoring relationship and the

nature of that relationship in terms of psychosocial support. In addition, this study will identify the impact of that relationship upon the individual in relation to professional development. Finally, the study will explore the role gender plays within mentoring relationships of young professionals entering the field of housing/residence life.

Specific outcomes of the research would be to determine what role mentors are serving for entry level professionals in housing/residence life, as well as the gaps in supporting these students. In doing so, the researcher will be able to recommend training and evaluation components required of seasoned professionals in an effort to assist those emerging professionals in the area of housing/residence life. Specifically, this study will identify the needs of emerging professionals who were involved in a 2010 job search through the Oshkosh Placement Exchange, the annual job placement conference for housing/residence life professionals. The focus of this study will be on gender in mentoring relationships; experiences within mentoring relationships; skills and growth; and job search preparation and etiquette.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support on items such as self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development with the emerging professional if they had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?
2. Is there a difference in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the individual had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?

3. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) or job search etiquette depending on the gender combination of the mentor and mentee?
4. Does the duration of the mentoring relationship impact the preparation an emerging professional has related to their job search etiquette and psychosocial support (confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development)?
5. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) received from the mentor to the emerging professional if the mentoring is done through differing modes of communication?
6. Are there differences in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the modes of communication differ?

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were used to answer the research questions:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in self confidence of those individuals who have a mentor and those who do not.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in the informed level of knowledge about the field of those individuals who have a mentor and those who do not.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in the skill development of those individuals who have a mentor and those who do not.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference in job search etiquette between those who have a mentor and those who do not.

H05: There is no significant difference in those who had male versus female mentors.

H06: There is no significant difference between male and female respondents (mentees).

H07: There is no significant interaction of gender within the mentoring relationship (male and female mentors are the same for male and female respondents).

H08: There is no significant difference in self confidence of mentees by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

H09: There is no significant difference in the informed level of knowledge about the field of mentees by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

H010: There is no significant difference in the skill development of mentees by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

H011: There is no significant difference in job search etiquette of mentees by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

H012: There is no significant difference in self confidence of mentees between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

H013: There is no significant difference in informed level of knowledge about the field of mentees between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

H014: There is no significant difference in skill development of mentees between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

H015: There is no significant difference in job search etiquette of mentees between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations exist within this study and include the following:

This study will specifically look at the mentoring experiences of emerging professionals who engaged in a job search during the spring of 2010, which limits the results and assessment to a specific year and a specific job search experience.

This study will also specifically look at the mentoring experiences of a group of emerging professionals who attended the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) to search for a position. No inferences can be drawn about other professionals who participated in a job search through another format. As such, careful caution should be taken when generalizing to all emerging housing/residence life professionals in student affairs who participated in a job search during the spring of 2010.

Respondents who participated in the job search process at OPE could include emerging professionals from the University that employs the researcher, therefore, those particular responses could have been a result of the researcher serving in the role of a mentor.

There is always the possibility that individuals completing the survey have a bias to the questions asked or do not follow the definitions as a guide for their responses, which could alter the data on what a definition of a mentor is, in the eyes of the respondent.

The survey instrument was created by the researcher. Face validity was established by the survey review done by fellow student affairs professionals and a statistical professor on the researcher's dissertation committee. Both of these were done to increase reliability and validity.

The researcher assumes that all responses were honest and accurate to represent experiences of participants related to mentoring and the job search process.

Design Controls

In an effort to control for the limitations above, the researcher has considered several items. Related to the researcher's role as a mentor in the process, it is important to note this potential bias in the outcome of the study. Since the researcher's own students could be participating in the survey, it is critical to consider this perspective as part of the results. With participants it is important to encourage open and honest answers, and to take these answers at face value. Since the survey was created by the researcher for the purpose of this study, it was important to garner outside perspectives from professionals in student affairs in an effort to make sure the questions were clear and not biased.

The population selected, through the Oshkosh Placement Exchange registration for 2010, is ideal due to the amount of individuals the survey can reach, as well as the diversity in areas of the country. However, it is important to note that the results found cannot be generalized to all job search candidates in 2010. In addition, the year the survey is being administered (2010) may be different than another year when candidates could be surveyed. However, with mentoring entering more of the mainstream, the researcher is confident that answers would not be altered extensively if duplicating the study in another year in the near future. The field of student affairs stays fairly consistent, and if anything, mentoring in recent years would have increased, thus not allowing this limitation to be of a greater concern.

Definition of Key Terms

The following terms will be used throughout the study and will be identified as follows:

Mentees: individuals who are new to the chosen field and are exploring their career and psychosocial skills, and seek out support from a mentor in a meaningful relationship.

Mentors: individuals who have guided, sponsored, or otherwise had a positive and significant influence on the professional career development of another individual (Allen & Poteet, 1999).

Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE): a placement exchange designed for college and university Residence Life employers to meet and interview candidates from across the country. Most positions available for application include entry level or graduate assistantships in residence life or housing.

Student Affairs Professional: defined by Helfgot (2005) as individuals who work within the focus of student affairs, to include all areas related to college students and their lives outside of the college classroom. It can be further defined by Helfgot, therefore, as the “administrative unit of the college in which the services, programs, functions, and activities with this focus are housed” (p. 7).

Summary

Mentoring of emerging professionals continues to be a significant growing concern among housing and residence life professionals. Emerging professionals are significantly involved in technology and a fast-paced lifestyle seeking immediate results. It is important that seasoned professionals in the field continue to help educate emerging

professionals on job search etiquette and assist in the development of self confidence among job skills areas. The role of a mentor has been shown to make a positive impact on career and psychosocial development of individuals (Kram, 1985). Within the field of student affairs, professionals often work with students on the enhancement of skills and personal self confidence, so it would stand to reason that assistance should be extended to students as they prepare to begin a career in student affairs. Chapter Two will provide a literature review citing background in student affairs and mentoring, followed by Chapter Three, which will expand on the research design. Finally, Chapters Four and Five will provide an overview of the survey results found and address the outcomes of the research questions posed.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Mentoring is a mainstream approach to assist emerging professionals by providing opportunities, insight, and guidance from a seasoned professional. Within the field of student affairs, the concept of mentoring is a current issue, especially related to entry level professionals and the job search process. The history of mentoring and the foundation that has been created provides a basis for understanding how to help emerging professionals. This chapter provides a literature review on the history of student affairs, context of mentoring, the impact of mentoring on the mentee and mentor, and types of mentoring.

Student Affairs Profession

Student affairs professionals have long debated the exact nature of their work. It can involve counseling, coaching, student development, administration, and applying theory. Student affairs is defined by Helfgot (2005) as a “discipline practiced by all those who work in the general field and its numerous specialties” (p. 7). Generally, student affairs focuses on all things related to college students and their lives outside of the college classroom. It can be further defined by Helfgot, therefore, as the “administrative unit of the college in which the services, programs, functions, and activities with this focus [all things related to college students and lives outside of the classroom] are housed” (p. 7). Therefore, student affairs professionals are those who work in this area and provide programs and services for students. The field of student affairs often includes, but is not limited to, Housing/Residence Life, Campus Activities, Career Services, Multicultural Services, and Accessibility Services.

In a 1937 founding statement, the development of the field of student affairs established core values for the profession. These values are (a) commitment to the whole student; (b) recognition and appreciation of individual differences; (c) commitment to facilitating student development, success, and learning; (d) providing quality services to meet student needs; (e) belief in the power and richness of the out of class environment; (f) commitment to providing access and opportunity (Helfgot, 2005). In an effort to facilitate these core values, it is important for a professional to have academic preparation in the field of student affairs (Waple, 2006). In 1913, the first formal graduate program in student affairs was developed through Columbia University, and was designed to serve as a “program of special training, exclusively on the graduate level, designed to train deans and advisors of women” (Waple, p.7). In a quick advancement by 1948, there were over 50 institutions providing training in college level student affairs work (Waple). Programs offered a variety of counseling techniques, administrative skills, and advancement of one’s understanding of student development theory.

Services offered by student affairs offices are often designed to support student development, which is defined as the “theoretical and conceptual underpinning of the student affairs profession” (Helfgot, 2005, p. 7). One of the roles of student affairs professionals is to utilize student development theory as a guide in their work with students. Student development theory is designed to “describe how students change, grow, and develop as a result of the college experience” (Helfgot, p. 7). Student development theory focuses on two areas: psychosocial development and identity (or cognitive) development. Student affairs professionals embrace student development theory in their daily work and use it as a tool to best serve students on college campuses.

By understanding the development of psychosocial needs, as well as how students take in and process information, professionals are better able to assist students in this developmental process.

Within the field of student affairs there has been a decrease in those remaining committed to their role in the profession. Barham and Winston (2006) found evidence that 60% of professionals abandon the field of student affairs within six years of entering. In addition, the “attrition rate of new professionals, during the first five years, is between 39% and 68%” (Barham & Winston, p. 64). While a large new cohort of professionals enters the field each year, retention is important to the overall success of the profession. Perhaps Cooper and Miller (1998) put it the best, “mature professionals with whom student affairs practitioners associate and work, especially in their formative years and during transitional phases, can and do have significant influence on the quality and character of their professional development” (p. 55).

One item cited by Barham and Winston (2006), and further supported by Roberts (2007) and Bolton (2005), indicated new professionals need ongoing professional development and mentoring. Kelly (1984) noted a relationship with a mentor in student affairs is common with the research study showing 66.7% of professionals had one or more mentors. With the passing of twenty-five years of research in mentoring, one would have to question if that number is still true today. The relationship between supervisor and new professional can be key to the success of the new professional. However, new professionals must also embrace their own career path and engage in seeking out ways to make their work meaningful through their own professional development (Barham & Winston). The path, therefore, must be two-fold, with the supervisor or other seasoned

professionals providing opportunities or experiences but also the new professional engaging in seeking out ways to learn and grow. Research indicates new professionals must seek out mentors, who do not serve as a supervisor, who can guide them in their professional growth and support their desire to learn about furthering their skill areas (Barham & Winston; Bolton; Roberts).

Roberts (2007) defined new professionals as “members with less than five years experience, in their first full time positions, and not supervising other professional staff members” (p. 564). In a study conducted by Roberts, it was found that new professionals’ most preferred method of professional development is discussions with mentors. While new professionals may have opportunities to learn and grow through seminars, conferences, and presentations, it is imperative that one-on-one discussions within a meaningful relationship are explored. New professionals were most likely to bring up mentoring; mid-level managers see the value in mentoring; and senior student affairs professionals are now at the stage in their career where they should be serving as the mentor (Roberts). As cited by Bolton (2005), mentoring is a core value of student affairs professionals and higher education professional development. However, mentoring is an area some professionals struggle in offering to new professionals or it can be something disappearing on the list of tasks to accomplish in any given week. Mentors are ones who help a new professional develop a sense of self, personally and professionally, so they can view themselves as a successful student affairs practitioner (Bolton).

History of Mentoring

For decades mentoring has been utilized in every profession from sports to politics to medicine to education. Coaches mentor players. Teachers mentor students.

Even those with political experience mentor those who come after them. One could argue that any successful individual needed help at some point in the individual's career to advance. What many individuals do not realize at the time it is occurring is that the relationship they were engaged in can be defined as a mentoring relationship. However, almost all successful individuals today would cite one or more individuals who had an influence on their professional, and often personal, lives (Stone, 2007).

Mentoring began in times of Greek mythology with an individual named Mentor. He served as a tutor for Odysseus's son while Odysseus was away fighting in the Trojan War (Dougherty, Turban, & Haggard, 2007). From there, mentoring instances continued, such as early medical professors mentoring medical students pursuing the goal of helping individuals. Levinson began the study of human development, showing how relationships can play an important role in said development (Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007). Levinson compared this mentoring relationship to a parenting relationship, and stated that poor mentoring is equated to poor parenting (Eby et al.). In 1977, a study was conducted on the most outstanding men and women in the nation and determined those who were the most successful had a mentor at a young age (Eby et al.). Finally, in 1979, Roche studied top executives and reported in the Wall Street Journal that two-thirds of the 4000 executives surveyed had a mentor (Eby et al.).

While the concept of mentoring was created in Greek mythology, it was not until extensive mentoring research was conducted by Kathy Kram, in the mid-1980s, that the idea of developmental relationships became mainstream within organizations. Soon individuals were able to look at the relationships they were in or wanted to be in and understand the intentionality that came with the relationship. Kram (1985) was a pioneer

who developed definitions, theory, and phases of mentoring relationships. Kram's qualitative research on 18 different relationships determined these developmental relationships at work, later to be termed mentoring relationships, are rare. Kram also developed phases of mentoring and examined the cross-gender relationships that can occur within mentoring. What Kram found through her initial research was that 10 of the 18 dyad relationships had a direct supervisor as a mentor, and most female protégés were involved in a cross-gender mentoring relationship. Kram suggested mentoring served two functions: career and psychosocial support. In 1992, Scandura added a third component of mentoring: role modeling (Dougherty et al., 2007). Kram recognized two types of mentoring: primary mentoring where a strong individual relationship is developed with one mentor; and secondary mentoring, where the relationship is less intense and often times with multiple mentors.

Mentoring research found that mentoring, in various forms with all ages, served the purpose of reducing drop-out rates of school children, increasing academic achievement, promoting self confidence, and advancing career development (Eby et al., 2007). Furthermore, research during this same time frame showed the importance of a non-family member relationship with an adult, especially for college students. Researchers of college students, such as Chickering, Pascarella, Astin, Wilson, Gaff, Dienst, Wood, and Bavry, found that "faculty-staff interaction has a positive influence on wide range of personal, career, and educational outcomes" (Eby et al., p. 9). This further suggests engagement in a mentoring relationship, at the college level, is critical to the advancement of development.

Definitions of Mentoring

Many years ago the concept of “mentoring” was integrated into the mainstream, stemming from a long history beginning in the medical profession (Rose & Rukstalis, 2008; Williams, Levine, Malhotra, & Holtzheimer, 2004). In an early version of the Hippocratic Oath, taken by doctors upon completion of medical school, the teachers were considered parent figures, serving with the intent to develop character in others. Soon medical mentors learned what was needed to develop a student’s professional and personal character. The concept of supporting a student’s professional character was further supported by Forehand’s (2008) research, which stated, “mentoring relationships can be characterized as ‘academic parenting’ in which the mentor works to support the personal and professional growth of the mentee in a selfless way” (Forehand, p. 749).

Despite the previous research on mentoring, there can still be a large discrepancy in the definition of mentoring. A definition often referred to derives from Greek mythology,

a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes this important task. (Kram, 1985, p. 2)

Kram used this definition when examining the relationships in her qualitative studies. While definitions continue to develop and alter from the original premise that Kram began to identify, most basic definitions still contain some of the above key components. Mentors are often viewed as senior individuals who possess knowledge and experience in a given career field. Most often these individuals are able to train, teach, and support

those junior employees (Allen, Poteet, & Russell, 2000; Mertz, 2004). While a mentor may or may not be in the same organization as an employee, it is often easiest to connect with an individual who is in immediate proximity of the protégé. Definitions have expanded to include the key concept of mentoring, separating it from other relationships in the work place, which is the developmental one-on-one relationship (Eby & McManus, 2004; Eby et al., 2007; Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Mertz; Smith-Jentsch, Scielzo, Yarbrough, & Rosopa, 2008). Eby et al. discussed a common framework for agreement of a definition which includes a learning partnership that is reciprocal and the relationship is dynamic, changing over time. Furthermore, compared to other relationships, a mentoring relationship can be defined, informally, by characteristics such as relationship closeness and emotional support, including empathy for the individual in times of challenge and celebrations in times of success.

One area that is still argued within the definition of mentoring is whether or not a mentor will have day-to-day formal supervision over the mentee. A mentor may be assigned through a formal program in the organization or chosen by the mentee through an informal relationship. Williams et al. (2004) described the relationship as based on professional and personal interests, and indicated a supervisor-type relationship is acceptable for a mentoring relationship. Williams et al. further shared, “just like it would be difficult for a child to grow up without a parent, it would be very difficult for a professional student to have a full and enriching development without a mentor” (p. 113).

A mentor is often a trusted source whose advice and insight is seen as beneficial to the mentees development (Mertz, 2004). Definitions can be seen as complex due to the various roles that are associated with mentoring, such as coach, teacher, sponsor, or guide

(Mertz). However, while important and useful, these roles are arguably not at the depth that is needed to experience a true mentor partnership. Erikson, a leading researcher on development, indicated that mentoring is designed to help a mentor realize the developmental transitions a mentee goes through and how the mentor can serve oneself through others (Mertz). An individual may be a teacher, a supervisor, a counselor, or advisor, but to truly be seen as a mentor, one must be invested into creating and developing the individual mentee (Johnson, 2003; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007).

Johnson (2003), as well as Scandura and Pellegrini (2007), support the theory created by Kram that the developmental relationship is what separates a mentoring relationship from a day to day interaction in the work place. As Johnson discussed, one can be an advisor without being a mentor, and vice versa. As suggested by Cooper and Miller (1998) and Rose and Rukstalis (2008), a mentoring relationship can often be defined by the type of relationship rather than by role definition. The relationship is defined by a personal and reciprocal relationship between mentor and mentee, with the mentor assisting in career development and emotional support, and mentor supporting the identity and growth of a mentee (Rose & Rukstalis). Since relationships can blur over time and definitions can be inconsistent, sometimes an individual may not identify someone as a mentor until after the fact (Johnson; Williams et al., 2004). Some mentoring relationships transpire with a smooth, seamless transition, and some relationships are defined early on to determine the purpose of the said relationship.

Overall, most definitions will support the concept that mentoring is created to encourage and support the career goals of a mentee through complete socialization into the organization (Aagaard & Hauer, 2003; Cooper & Miller, 1998; Gormley, 2008;

Johnson, 2003; Moberg, 2008). The mentor is there to provide opportunities and to teach the mentee the unwritten rules of the organization (Johnson; Moberg). Due to the intense one-on-one relationship the mentor also has an impact on the overall development of the individuals, which includes areas of moral and character development (Moberg).

Theories Utilized with Mentoring

While theories on mentoring specifically are limited, many psychosocial and leadership theories can be applied to support mentoring. Scandura and Pellegrini (2007) stated the ongoing research criteria needed for developing mentoring theory include career theory and organizational research, which is motivating organizations to develop formal programs. One example of a theory used to examine the relationship between mentor and mentee is the social exchange theory (Allen et al., 2000; Dougherty et al., 2007; Mertz, 2004; Russell, 2000). Social exchange theory looks at the “model of human behavior that views an interaction between two people as an exchange where the cost of participation in the relationship is compared to the perceived benefits” (Allen et al., p. 272). This is based on the idea if an individual believes the relationship will provide more beneficial outcomes than it will cost the individual to engage in the relationship, there will be more inclination to develop and foster this relationship (Allen et al.; Mertz). Psychological benefits of this theory are respect, esteem, and approval. Benefits perceived within the social exchange theory are building a network, two-way learning, increased job performance for both mentor and mentee, and personal satisfaction (Dougherty et al.). When utilizing social exchange theory, one has to consider the costs associated with mentoring. Costs for the mentor can be time, energy, and most importantly, impact on reputation (Dougherty et al.). If a mentor is very advanced in the

mentor's career and works with a poorly functioning mentee, this can impact the mentor's reputation at a high cost to their own professional advancement. It has been cited that those who have mentored before are more likely to engage in a new relationship, whereas, those who have not yet served as a mentor are more likely to see the costs as higher (Dougherty et al.).

Additional theories can be utilized when studying mentoring. Social learning theory has indicated humans can learn through imitation and observation. Specifically, in order for learning to occur, individuals must observe appropriate behavior, if there are no role models for the desired behavior then individuals are less likely to learn. Further, once the behavior is learned, reinforcement is necessary in order for it to be maintained (Eby, Lockwood & Butts, 2006, p. 269).

Social learning theory shows a necessity for a new professional to engage in an on-going learning experience with a mentor who can serve as a strong role model. Another leadership theory used to expand on mentoring is the leadership exchange theory which is seen as transactional leadership (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007). However, it is further explained that the goal of mentoring is to focus on transformational leadership, involving mutual commitment to long term development of the mentee (Scandura & Pellegrini; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000).

Psychosocial theories such as human development theory and attachment theory are also explored as a basis for mentoring. Understanding one role of student affairs professional is to help advance the psychosocial development of a student, it would stand to reason that mentoring should be a core responsibility of that advancement. Attachment theory is a good way to understand the functional and dysfunctional aspects of a

mentoring relationship (Gormley, 2008). Gormley focused on a study of at-risk college students, which showed that creating a healthy attachment in a healthy relationship with a mentor resulted in changes in the behaviors these students had with future teachers. This particular depth of a bond created is one of the ways a mentoring relationship is separated from a traditional relationship (Gormley). Through research supported by Cooper and Miller (1998), Gormley indicated the relationship created puts the mentor in the role as an attachment figure and it cannot be easily replaced for the student. Cooper and Miller would argue the mentoring relationship is much deeper than that of a relationship with an advisor or supervisor, and if lost, the career development of the mentee could be impacted. Human development theory supports this concept during times of transition, as students will seek out support to find balance between the challenge and the success of this time (Cooper & Miller).

Liang, Tracy, Taylor, and Willaims (2002) defined a relational model that supports mentoring of women as an “ongoing, growth-fostering connection as critical to women’s development” (p. 274). Liang et al. described this relationship as a way to empower women to increase their self worth and desire for furthering connections. As with many other mentoring definitions, they described it as including mutual engagement, closeness, authenticity, and empowerment. In essence, the research by Liang et al. supports taking the mentoring relationship to a higher level with a woman to woman mentoring relationship, allowing a female mentor to empower a young mentee in her development.

Kram's Phases of Mentoring

Kram (1985) identified a model of the phases of the mentoring process to include four phases. These phases were initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition (Kram). While the phases may differ from the original length determined, Kram framed the natural process of a mentoring relationship. The model begins with the initiation phase, which is when both individuals begin the relationship, identifying thoughts of one another, needs of the mentee, and expectations of the relationship (Kram). Kram shared the initiation phase can have a duration of six to twelve months before individuals proceed to the cultivation phase. During the cultivation phase, the expectations of the relationship are tested and this is where the true work of mentoring begins. With this phase lasting anywhere from two to five years, the cultivating of the relationship is where Kram saw the two functions of mentoring (career and psychosocial) at work (Kram).

The third phase, separation, can occur when one individual leaves the organization and can also occur psychologically (Kram, 1985). This separation can occur when both parties acknowledge the mentee is ready to move forward in a new stage of development, and with this separation there are no hard feelings. There can be dysfunctional separation between the mentor and mentee when there is conflict in the relationship. Within the separation phase there is a transitional time frame when both individuals are unsure of the change in relationship and how they will begin to relate to each other in a different form.

Finally, and one can argue most importantly, there is a redefinition phase, which is where the mentor and mentee come out of the transitional phase and find new ways to begin to relate to one another (Kram, 1985). If the two individuals had engaged in a

functional relationship, they would often now be peers, colleagues, and friends. The individuals may maintain contact but in a different format than before. However, if the relationship had been dysfunctional, it is not likely the two would remain friends. Sometimes redefinition can happen quickly after separation or can be years later, when the relationship has evolved into one of serving as colleagues and friends. It is important to note, though the phases are identified and a helpful tool to studying mentoring, the phases are not always a linear process. There can be overlap, connecting, or even repetition of the phases as one engages in a mentoring relationship (Kram; Kochan & Trimble, 2000).

Functions that Mentoring Serves

Psychosocial and career supports are the primary functions that mentors serve (Forehand, 2008; Kram, 1985; Smith-Jentsch et al., 2008; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000). Psychosocial support includes role-modeling, friendship, acceptance and support (Forehand; Kram; Smith-Jentsch et al; Sosik & Godshalk). Career support includes helping educate a protégé on the rules of the organization, providing opportunities to expose themselves to career advancement, coaching, and offering career advice and feedback (Forehand; Kram; Smith-Jentsch et al; Sosik & Godshalk). However, even beyond these two traditional functions, mentors serve many impactful roles for a mentee.

Within an organization, there are many rules and often politics to be navigated. A mentor can assist the mentee by providing protection from these politics (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). One-on-one conversations with a mentor allow for accelerated learning of the mentee, and the counsel that comes from the mentor can only further allow the mentee to be a stronger employee. Many organizations,

including educational ones, can benefit from this type of relationship. An organization has a responsibility to train their employees, thus retaining them in the organization longer if they feel a sense of support from advanced professionals (Mertz, 2004). Mentors can serve as a role model and aid in removing stress felt by mentees as they navigate the early stages of their career (Cooper & Miller, 1998; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000). Finally, within the organization, the mentor serves as someone who can collaborate with the mentee, share in decision making, serve as an active listener, and assist the mentee in achieving goals (Kochan & Trimble, 2000; Williams et al., 2004).

Mentoring relationships, if satisfactory, allow a mentee to feel more connected to the organization and therefore develop a higher commitment to remaining employed in that organization (Johnson, 2003). This type of relationship not only enhances an employee's professional skills, but the individual will grow personally, which will also benefit the organization. The happier an individual is in their personal life, the higher the morale within the organization will be. One additional function, as noted by Johnson, is mentoring serving as an identity transformation of the mentee, changing them from a young, inexperienced employee, to one day developing as a colleague to the mentor. Moberg (2008) further expands on this concept, discussing the moral development that occurs in the mentee. Areas such as character building, ethics, wisdom, and additional knowledge are all developed or enhanced within the mentee. As Rose and Rukstalis (2008) summarized, "an individual who listens empathetically, lives in accordance with personal values and conveys enthusiasm and positive attitude about the profession will inspire trainees to do the same" (p. 77).

Components of Effective Mentoring

As with any relationship, there must be components in place for an effective relationship to occur between the mentor and mentee. There is much discussion in the research about the differences in success of mentoring when the mentors are formally assigned versus when there is an informal selection. Mertz (2004) argued one component of effective mentoring is that the selection be voluntary. While this is still debated in the literature, it is important to note the other components that are critical to effective mentoring relationships and these aspects could be argued to develop more naturally within an informal relationship. However, a formal program still serves more purpose than no mentoring in an organization at all. Aagaard and Hauer's (2003) study of medical students found only 35% had a mentor, whereas, 96% believed it was an important aspect of their career path that was needed. This was supported by Barnett (2008) and Forehand (2008) who stated that a major goal of effective mentoring is to create a cycle of the profession. The investment made in another individual creates a rewarding experience for both members, and for the career field as a whole. One new form of mentoring assisting in this struggle is multiple mentoring, which Kram had described as secondary mentoring (Dougherty et al., 2007). This is a solution when one-on-one mentoring may not be available. A mentee meets with and has several mentors, each providing some aspect of mentoring rather than relying on one person to cover it all (Rose & Rukstalis, 2008).

Mentoring relationships often develop over time and require participation from both the mentor and mentee. Often times a mentor will initiate an informal relationship with a mentee they believe has potential or needs support within the organization (Kelly, 1984). However, Kelly found relationships were initiated by mentors or mutually

initiated and women were less likely to initiate the relationship, especially if with a male. Kelly also found that individuals were more likely to have a mentor in student affairs than in the business world. However, one could argue in the twenty-five years since Kelly's research, mentoring has become mainstream and is now found in a variety of professions as a way to support individuals. For an effective relationship, the mentee must be an active participant and a partner in the process (Barnett, 2008; Smith-Jentsch et al., 2008). With this agreement, the mentor is better able to tailor the guidance and advice given to a mentee.

On the side of the mentor, it is important for the mentor to assess the mentor's own comfort, skill level, and knowledge before mentoring another individual. Qualities of good mentors include support, willingness to devote the time to build a meaningful relationship, accessibility, and openness to sharing their own professional path and growth with the mentee (Allen & Eby, 2008; Johnson, 2003; Stone, 2007; Williams et al., 2004). Others indicate qualities to look for in a mentor include similar values, professional competence in the area of interest, nurturing, and ultimately someone you like (Kelly, 1984; Kochan & Trimble, 2000; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000). Kochan and Trimble also found that most effective mentoring relationships moved from mentor-mentee to a co-mentoring relationship and then eventually became colleagues and friends over time.

Another controversial aspect of the research is whether or not the mentor should be someone who is in an evaluative role, such as a direct supervisor. Rose and Rukstalis (2008) and Gormley (2008) indicated the mentor should not be a supervisor, due to the idea that a level of trust needs to be developed, and a mentee should be able to speak

openly to their mentor. Gormley stated, “mentoring relationships are influenced by the mentors and the mentees, their interpersonal processes, and the organizations and professions in which they work” (p. 45). Mentees see mentors as the primary person they wish to spend time with professionally and the one they seek out and turn to for support. Healthy mentoring relationships provide solutions to problems, support the mentee in their development, empower, and offer autonomy. Gormley supported these concepts by citing, “healthy mentees facilitate their own professional development by arranging to spend time with mentors who are psychologically and physically available” (p. 49).

Finally, it should be noted that not every professional should serve in the role of a mentor. Different individuals are motivated by different benefits and, therefore, not all senior professionals feel the desire to further the psychosocial development of a young professional through this format. Research by Mertz (2004) would indicate this was reasonable. Motives and willingness to engage in a mentoring relationship have an impact on the outcome of the relationship. Mertz explored this through intent versus involvement. Intent is the “perceived purpose of the activity and whether that intent is sought or valued” (Mertz, p. 547). Intent is looking at the relationship from beginning, to middle, to how it might end and how each party in the relationship values the entire complexity of the relationship. Involvement, as described by Mertz, is the “amount of time and effort required to realize the intent” (p. 547). Involvement is when both parties look at the relationship to see what will be required emotionally and physically as well as how deep the investment will be.

Challenges of Mentoring Relationships

When considering mentoring, it is important to note that mentoring relationships fall along a spectrum of functional to dysfunctional, with most falling in between (Eby & Allen, 2002; Eby & McManus, 2004; Gormley, 2008; Johnson, 2003; Ragins & Scandura, 1999). The pairing, informal or formal, of mentor-mentee is key to the start of the relationship, and from there, establishing mutual expectations and an agreement on the commitment of the roles is critical to formulating a successful relationship. A functional mentoring relationship is one that facilitates the psychosocial and career development of the mentee (Gormley). A dysfunctional relationship can negatively impact both the psychosocial and career development of both the mentor and mentee (Eby & McManus; Gormley).

Eby and Allen (2002) suggested the research is so focused on positive aspects of mentoring that most often the negative aspects then seem unnatural, even though they are common. Eby and Allen created a framework of five possible levels of negative mentoring experiences, which ranged from a difference in personality and values to manipulative and exploitative behaviors. It should be noted the negative experiences can influence the mentee's job experience as much as the positive aspects can. If either party in the relationship does not feel there is anything to be gained, stress will become a large component of the relationship (Eby & Allen). A mentor-mentee partnership should strive for the highest functioning relationship but it does not come without some challenges at times. As with any relationship, especially long term, conflict is inevitable.

Mentees can often see mentors as contributing or creating the relationship dysfunction, as seen through a betrayal. Whereas, the mentor could feel the mentee is a

poor reflection on the mentor's reputation. If the relationship is having a problem but it is in the middle ground of the continuum, it is often classified as an ineffective relationship. This will often be due to a disappointment in expectations, interpersonal difficulties or resentment towards one another, but with no harm done (Eby & McManus, 2004; Johnson, 2003). A truly dysfunctional mentoring relationship is often marked by bad intent, harassment, or sabotage (Eby & McManus; Johnson). Many relationship issues can arise due to the power differences, with the mentor overworking the mentee or withholding resources.

Eby and McManus (2004) explained that all relationships have problems, and these negative experiences could be an isolated event or could be ongoing. How the mentor and mentee work through the situation is key to whether or not the relationship will move forward, as each negative experience could lead to the relationship dissolving. Benishek, Biseschke, Park, and Slattery (2004) explained the highest reason a relationship may struggle is because of a disagreement with what the relationship entails and the idea that one size fits all in a mentoring relationship when it should be tailored to facilitate individual growth. Eby and McManus found 70% of their sample (161 respondents) cited having at least one negative mentoring experience. It was also noted that longevity is not a statement of a successful relationship. Eby and McManus found that many individuals stay in marginally satisfying relationships long term due to the investment already made. This is especially true on the mentor side because they may not wish to "give up" on a mentee. Eby et al. (2000) studied 156 mentees and 84 of them cited having a negative experience, which most often stemmed from differences in

attitudes, beliefs and values. This further supports the concept of critical mentor matching.

Another challenge of a mentoring relationship is to establish boundaries. A mentor must find the balance between the role of a peer and the role of a parent (Barnett, 2008; Gormley, 2008; Johnson, 2003). Barnett stated all professional relationships with any sense of power shift should establish clear boundaries. In addition, without established boundaries, there can often be ethical concerns, especially in cross-gendered mentoring relationships where there could be perceived romantic interests (Johnson). Barnett discussed considering touch, gift giving, locations of meetings, and self disclosure levels as part of setting boundaries. Due to the fact that a mentoring relationship is a deep and intimate relationship, it is important to discuss the expectations because withholding information can also impact the richness of the relationship. Johnson noted, “good mentoring requires the mentor to shape and prepare the protégé for a career path similar to their own, while working to discern and honor the protégé’s unique mix of talents, inclinations, values, and perspectives” (p. 144).

Barriers Within Mentoring Relationships

Research is just beginning to touch the surface of the barriers that may come within a mentoring relationship. Specific obstacles, studied by Allen et al., (2000), were the mentor experiencing problems within their own work that must be focused on and the feeling of lack of qualifications. Furthermore, a major consideration by many when looking into serving as a mentor is the lack of time (Allen et al.; Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). One way to combat the lack of time mentors feel is to consider assigning mentors to a group of mentees, which is often done in the medical

field, as well as considering the use of technology in place of face-to-face interactions (Hopkins-Thompson).

Students in the medical field, which may be similar to other mentoring situations, struggle in facing a barrier to mentoring relationships. These students cited discomfort in seeking out a mentor and failing to connect with someone who has similar personal interests (Aagaard & Hauer, 2003; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). Within the medical profession, there are numerous faculties, thus making it challenging for students to connect one-on-one with an individual to build a meaningful mentoring relationship. Faculty members, as with many who consider mentoring, struggle in considering the ethical behaviors of the mentee that they may have to be responsible for if they enter into a mentoring relationship. Individuals fear having to choose between ethics and the loyalty to the relationship (Rose & Rukstalis). These conflicting roles can create more barriers than what is already there. Often time mentors can become friends, but there is an expectation to manage an intimate and mutual relationship, while still serving in an evaluative role (Gormley, 2008).

Another barrier found by Williams et al. (2004) was the mentor struggling if the mentee surpasses his/her level of expertise in the field and then resentment can begin. This is a barrier that occurs during the relationship but not one that prevents someone from starting a relationship. With proper planning, barriers such as time, personality matching and the perceived costs can be addressed and approached with open communication (Campbell & Campbell, 2000; Grogan & Crow, 2004; Williams et al.).

Benefits for Mentees

When a mentee considers a mentoring relationship, the mentee might not even be fully aware of the benefits that could be received from this relationship. Research showed benefits received by mentees in the mentoring process included positive attitudes towards career, greater promotions or rewards at work, greater personal and professional satisfaction, and enhanced self-esteem and confidence (Eby & McManus, 2004; Johnson, 2003; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). Having a dedicated individual to guide one's performance and skills within a new career or organization is a large benefit that mentees can experience (Eby et al., 2000; Johnson; Rose & Rukstalis). Having a sense of understanding in an organization, as well as additional help navigating the political plane of that organization, helps the mentee in his/her transition. This assistance is what enhances the personal confidence in the mentee's abilities to be a contributing member of the organization. The mentor is able to share tacit knowledge that is hidden and might not otherwise be learned (Rose & Rukstalis). In addition, a mentor can offer emotional support while a mentee pursues personal and professional growth (Rose & Rukstalis; Gormley, 2008). This emotional support is irreplaceable in times of stress and struggle. Having someone to openly talk to who can share in these struggles is a large benefit often cited by mentees. The idea that someone in this organization or career field understands and can help one navigate the rocky terrain is not to be taken for granted.

Another large benefit for the mentee is having a positive role model within the organization (Campbell & Campbell, 2000; Cooper & Miller, 1998). A mentor who has already traveled the professional road that a new mentee is traveling is of large assistance. The mentee can process and discuss with the mentor, while at the same time

watching the mentor in his/her career roles, the way he/she makes decisions, and the demonstrated skills used in a variety of situations. This intimate professional relationship allows a mentee to explore things further with a mentor after much observation (Barnett, 2008; Cooper & Miller). The mentee begins to find great increased skills in networking, professional development and knowledge of job functions (Barnett). The relationship between mentee and mentor begins as a protective relationship filled with guidance and, through time, develops into a relationship with mutual support and understanding (Gormley, 2008). Through the development of a meaningful relationship, the mentee can find the mentee now as a colleague, a friend, and someone who will maintain open communication to accepting the ideas and thoughts of the mentee (Cooper & Miller).

Increased self esteem, confidence, and identity development are further benefits the mentee may gain from a mentor (Eby & McManus, 2004; Johnson, 2003; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). The identity development that occurs when someone has an individual dedicated to assisting the mentee's advancement is an area that the mentees do not always recognize at the time of the relationship. When looking back on the relationships, the mentees are able to observe the ways the mentor had helped advance their self confidence. The mentees can often see this through the steps they begin to make in their career that they may not have made without the help of a mentor. A mentor can also assist the mentee with research, resume building, grants, and other career related endeavors (Forehand, 2008). However, as much as a mentor could help, the mentee has to develop a belief in his/her ability to tackle these projects. This belief is instilled in the mentee from the mentee's mentor as they work on psychosocial skills. Benefits to the mentee are large and worth the time invested.

Benefits for Mentors

While research often explores the benefits to the mentee in a mentoring relationship, there are also benefits the mentor receives. Mentors will often select those they believe can bring certain attributes or competencies to the relationship in an effort to gain benefits through the time and effort spent (Allen et al., 2000). Mentors often prefer those they expect to be successful (Allen et al.; Dougherty et al., 2007; Gormley, 2008). Mentors are often more likely to mentor those seen at a higher performing level, therefore they can anticipate better rewards and higher benefits to their own career. Standing in the spotlight of those one mentors is a high benefit to the mentor's career advancement. If a mentor assists a new professional who then is seen as an asset to the field, it can serve to enhance the reputation of the mentor (Allen et al.; Cooper & Miller, 1998; Johnson, 2003).

A mentor may find value in dedicating extra time to a mentee that the mentor feels can contribute positively to the organization if offered direction and guidance. This type of relationship with the "underdog" can either work out positively, with growth seen in the mentee by others, or negatively, with the mentee failing and embarrassing the mentor (Allen et al., 2000; Dougherty et al., 2007). This is a risk a mentor must choose to take. Mentors can also build relationships with those who seek them out for help, rather than the mentor seeking out the mentee. In this type of approach, the mentor must also determine the cost and benefits of this particular relationship. Allen et al. indicated these types of relationships can still bring about rewards but they may be different rewards than one would receive from working with a naturally higher performing mentee. Usually in these cases, more time is needed from the mentor to help this mentee in his/her career

advancement and skill building. It can also sometimes be seen as a burden to a highly ambitious mentor (Allen et al.).

Some benefits of mentoring are the increased life experiences of the mentor, creating a loyal base of supporters through mentees, and enhancement of work related information (Eby & McManus, 2004; Ragins & Scandura, 1999; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007). By assisting a mentee, a mentor enhances his/her own social support networks and can find new career outcomes (Johnson, 2003). Overall, it has been found that mentors will have a higher career satisfaction when engaging in a mentoring relationship (Cooper & Miller, 1998; Eby & McManus; Johnson; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). The mentors will find new ways to engage in their own learning because they feel a responsibility as a role model for the mentee. They will find a passion for research and work harder to show a balance between home and family (Forehand, 2008). The mentors will receive both tangible and intangible benefits, including developing new professionals that will soon become lifelong colleagues in the field (Rose & Rukstalis). Campbell and Campbell (2000) found mentors often cite friendship development as an outcome of the relationships studied. This only further proves the depth of the relationship that is built between a mentee and a mentor.

Decisions to mentor are often associated with perceived benefits, but also with prior mentoring experiences, either the mentor's own experience as a mentee or serving as a mentor previously. The expectations and outcomes of the previous relationships impact the desire and motivation to mentor again (Ragins & Scandura, 1999). Ragins and Scandura argued there is a sense of satisfaction received through working with a younger adult. The development of a new professional can be very rewarding for a mentor.

Mentors are often at a midpoint in their own career and they can find value in sharing the insights learned with a mentee, as well as learn from the mentee ways to rejuvenate their own career. The creative exchange between a mentor and a mentee can enhance both careers. The recognition the mentor can often receive from fostering another member of the organization is a large benefit. This might not be the benefit the mentor foresees when beginning the relationship, but through the growth in the mentee, it becomes a natural outcome. Sometimes those who have not yet mentored cannot imagine these benefits and believe it will take more time than it is worth (Ragins & Scandura). Without a realistic view, it is often easy to overestimate the costs and underestimate the benefits one will receive from mentoring relationships. This is why there is criticism about formal mentoring programs, when one is assigned to be a mentor. Unrealistic views of a mentoring relationship can cause the relationship to fail.

Gender and Mentoring

As within any work relationship, gender issues may have interplay in the setup of the relationship. In a study by the research organization, Catalyst, in 2005, it was noted “only eight women were included among the Fortune 500 CEOs; only 5.2% of the Fortune 500 top earners were women” (McKeen & Bujaki, 2007, p. 199). Catalyst also found that mentoring was an effective way for female professionals to begin to overcome the glass ceiling (McKeen & Bujaki). Those who mentor women further assist by helping female mentees identify barriers in their professional careers. Female mentees can often be excluded from the informal networking loop, as well as be stereotyped, thus not often allocated the challenging assignments in the organization. Female mentors can help female mentees find a leadership style to use when interacting with male managers,

which will allow them to be included in meetings, networking, and project assignments (McKeen & Bujaki). A mentor can assist in finding ways to overcome these additional challenges.

Research by Allen et al. (2000) indicated that females are often seen as nurturers. Therefore, females are more likely to mentor someone based on emotional need than a male might. Allen et al., also identified that commitment is very important to female mentees and, therefore, female mentors are often viewed as having a higher level of commitment to the intimate relationship. Men, on the other hand, will respond more favorably to relationships with higher levels of autonomy and freedom, thus what they may offer a mentee in return. In cross gender relationships, Copper and Miller (1998) noted women would often provide psychological support and men more often provide career guidance.

In 2000, Blackhurst's study on women in student affairs found women were still underrepresented at the highest levels in the field. Women only held 23-33% of senior level positions, despite increasing numbers of women at the entry and mid level management positions (Blackhurst). With that being said, it is challenging to have women serve in mentoring roles when the majority of positions are held by men. Therefore, cross-gender mentoring relationships are not uncommon. It is important for men to commit to mentoring young professionals who are both male and female (Blackhurst; Johnson 2003). With the imbalance of gender in most career fields, it can be a challenge for women to get the mentoring they want. There is a need to break the "glass ceiling" and help women achieve professional success (Lafreniere & Longman, 2008).

Blackhurst (2000) found many women were dissatisfied with their career in student affairs and this was due to a variety of reasons such as devaluation of feminine traits and values, perceived sex discrimination, role conflict, uncertainty about performance expectations, and organizational values. With those in mind, it is important for women to be mentored early in their career in an effort to find value in what they offer to the organization and develop the needed skills to advance their careers. Mentoring increases a woman's chances for professional advancement, and also helps women learn the political frameworks of the organization (Blackhurst). In Blackhurst's study, 35% of the participants had a mentor in their current work environment and reported less role conflict and a significantly greater commitment to their organization.

Johnson (2003) found more and more graduate and medical schools engaging in intentional mentoring of women to help them advance and succeed. Johnson also found that if it does not occur in graduate school, the mentoring is unlikely to occur later on. Aagaard and Hauer (2003) found women in medical school were not necessarily less likely to have mentors due to the fact that the female faculties were making extra efforts to assist, knowing there were barriers to becoming a female doctor. Women are often overextended due to serving as a mentor and role model at work and also as a caregiver at home (Lafreniere & Longman, 2008). With that being reality, though, it is important for female mentees to have strong female mentors to demonstrate how to juggle all of the tasks.

An important component of cross-gender relationships is for both individuals to understand the boundaries necessary. Women were noted as not always having a preference between a male or female mentor; however, those female mentees who had

previously engaged in a mentoring relationship with a male mentor were better able to identify the possible challenges (McKeen & Bujaki, 2007).

McKeen & Bukaki (2007) stated,

Since women are more likely than men to be in cross-gender mentoring relationships, and these are more difficult to manage than same-gender mentoring relationships, this contributes to an unlevel playing field for managerial and professional women, making advancement even more difficult. (p. 206)

Female versus male relationships include more “mutual self disclosing, dyadic, emphatic, and intimate relationships” (Liang et al., 2002, p. 274). Therefore, male mentors must understand the dynamics of the intimate nature and dependency that female mentees may have. Gormley (2008), as well as Cooper and Miller (1998) and Benishek et al. (2004), noted a perceived sexual interest between male mentors and female protégés. A result of this is women receiving less mentoring.

Types of Mentoring Programs

Formal Mentor Programs

Mentoring can be developed informally or formally, with more and more organizations creating formal mentoring programs. Informal mentoring occurs when an individual mentee seeks out a mentor on the mentee’s own, or a mentor finds a mentee worthy of an investment of his/her time and seeks out the individual to create a developmental relationship. Most importantly, the informal mentoring relationship develops naturally and over time without outside assistance (Eby et al., 2007). The new trend in organizations, to support and advance employees, is to create formal mentoring

programs. However, little research exists on how to approach these programs in a way that allows for successful mentoring relationships. It is important to avoid pairing two people up with little knowledge of how they might be best suited to be in a relationship at a mentoring level. Failure to consider all dynamics of formal mentoring may cause undue stress on the relationship and the outcomes intended by the organization.

To begin a formal mentoring program, Allen and Eby (2008) suggested commitment is the first step. Mentor and mentee must have a commitment to the relationship that they are about to embark upon. Without a commitment, the relationship is sure to face some challenges, more so than those challenges faced in any other mentoring relationship. This includes a willingness to spend time together to develop the relationship, as well as being open to disclosing personal information and offering feedback (Allen & Eby). Sosik and Godshalk (2000) summarized this approach the best by stating it should include “a deliberate pairing of a more skilled or experienced person with a lesser skilled or experienced one, with the agreed-upon goal of having the lesser skilled person grow and develop specific competencies” (p. 366). The program should be based on understanding the process and the relationships (Darling, 2006).

One thing to note about a formal program is mentees may have more unrealistic expectations about mentoring and because of the pressure of the formal program, a mentee may feel trapped in the relationship if it is not working (Eby & Allen, 2007). Research from Eby and Allen showed negative experiences and stress are greater in formal versus informal programs. Formal mentoring programs are often shorter in duration and less intimate due to the nature of the setup in the organization.

A major focus on formal mentoring programs is for the mentor to serve as a role model in an effort to enhance the self confidence of the mentee to increase their ability to perform (Smith-Jentsch et al., 2008). It is important to match personalities and have training in place for expectations to be clear and realistic for both parties involved (Darling, 2006; Eby & McManus, 2004). When an organization develops a formal mentoring program it should consider a clear purpose, commitment, develop a feedback process, and have someone available to oversee the process (Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006; Eby et al., 2007; Gormley, 2008; Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). Mentors will be more likely to schedule time and devote a focus to the relationship if they feel the organization supports the relationship within a formal program. Many authors cited the need to screen and select mentors, noting they should be highly skilled in communicating, listening, and providing feedback. Mentors should also believe in personal and professional development and be willing to adjust expectations of the mentee (Hopkins-Thompson). Formal programs often use personality inventories or interest inventories in an effort to match the mentor and mentee at the highest level possible.

Another component necessary for a formal program to be successful is the need for focused training. The training should be done within the organization and have components for both mentees and mentors. Mentor training should focus on communication and feedback, as well as a needs assessment of the mentee (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). The mentee training should focus on program expectations, self development and reflection (Hopkins-Thompson). By creating training in a formal program, both individuals are set up to be successful as they approach the relationship. They are also aware of organizational resources that may be available to assist the

development of the relationship. As an organization, if a formal program is implemented, it is important to support the ongoing need for the dyad to meet and discuss growth, and a reminder that mentoring is not a linear experience.

Eby et al. (2007) did note that due to negative mentoring experiences only those who are truly invested in serving in the role of a mentor should be encouraged to participate in the program. Assigning mentors without making sure there is an interest in participation could be a detriment for the mentee. If there are not enough mentors for a formal program or not enough qualified mentors, other alternatives can be sought by the organization, such as multiple mentors or team mentoring (Eby et al; Williams et al., 2004). Multiple mentoring allows the mentee to maintain a relationship with a former mentor while establishing a relationship with a new mentor, or it can also mean finding more than one mentor to have a relationship with at one time. Eby et al. describes team mentoring as a leader serving as a team member and allowing the team to develop with each member having a responsibility for learning and mentoring one another.

The organization will benefit from a formal mentoring program as well. Dougherty et al. (2007) stated a need for organizations to open communication between all levels of employees in the hierarchy. There will be a more positive climate, rewards for staff members, and individuals ready to take on additional responsibilities (Barnett, 2008; Cooper & Miller, 1998; Dougherty et al.; Eby et al., 2000; Grogan & Crow, 2004; Stone, 2007). A formal mentoring program helps staff feel comfortable and stronger in tasks, and allows them to have access to a more knowledgeable colleague when needed. Benefits seen within an organization can also include decreased turn-over, increased loyalty, a higher sense of team, and more innovation (Stone).

Without a formal mentoring structure, a supervisor can end up in a mentoring role because they have a higher opportunity to interact with a mentee and are aware of their abilities. However, one could argue this naturally developing relationship with a supervisor, versus a more intentional relationship with a mentor, may not be as effective. Stone (2007) found a mentee could feel pressure to give his/her supervisor loyalty, above the normal supervisor-supervisee relationship. This is not to say that relationships, at a mentoring level between supervisor and supervisee, do not exist, but they will need to be based on a high level of trust (Stone). As Cooper and Miller (1998) shared, “formal programs, as part of a staff development plan, can ensure that all employees have the opportunity to benefit from an ongoing relationship with a senior staff member who is positioned and qualified to provide this type of guidance” (p. 68). Finally, Barnett (2008) shared there is also a lower rate of individuals leaving the organization when there is a formal mentoring program established. In addition, there is a higher likelihood for more individuals to become mentors in the future.

Electronic Mentoring Programs

A cutting edge technique that is infiltrating the mentoring world is electronic mentoring (e-mentoring). This new technique takes place when mentoring is provided by a mentor through computer technology (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007; Smith-Jentsch et al, 2008; Stone, 2007). Through this innovative type of mentoring, forms of technology such as email, message boards, instant messaging, and electronic chatting are used. Since this is a new technique, research has not fully been developed yet on how this impacts individuals who are being mentored. When using e-mentoring as a substitute for face-to-

face mentoring, it is important to determine who is best suited for this type of mentoring (Stone).

Many formal mentoring programs are beginning to utilize e-mentoring. Benefits include a decrease in time and distance, as well as more access (Smith-Jentsch et al., 2008). A diverse network of mentors can be reached by utilizing e-mentoring. Some struggles with e-mentoring is the lack of a paper trail to document conversations between mentor and mentee, as well as constrictions on individuals to do more personal sharing due to the fact that something can be misconstrued in writing. Critics of the e-mentoring technique explain there is an absence of warmth and support that comes through in the mentor-mentee process (Smith-Jentsch et al.). There is concern about miscommunication and privacy issues when utilizing technology as a means of sharing (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007).

In addition, given the same amount of time as face-to-face mentoring, communication may be less due to not being able to type quickly, which can also limit the feedback given. Gender plays a role in e-mentoring as well. Males will condense communication and are more likely to use irony or metaphors. Females will work to adjust their communication in situations where it could be misinterpreted (Smith-Jentsch et al., 2008). Smith-Jentsch et al. found that words to offer psychosocial support were higher in e-mentoring than face to face mentoring. Those with a male mentor felt less psychosocial support through e-mentoring when compared to face to face. However, they did find that mentor-mentee dialogue was significantly more interactive in an e-chat than face to face conditions (Smith-Jentsch et al.).

Conclusion

Mentoring continues to be a topic of discussion among many professions as a means of assisting employees in their transition and development in the organization. Research has indicated mentoring is a successful means to assist in career and psychosocial support for mentees in an organization. Through a formal program or informal interactions, a mentor-mentee relationship can benefit both individuals in the relationship. Within the student affairs profession, individuals can be retained at a higher level if they receive support through a mentoring relationship, which they most often desire. Mentoring individuals allows for an honest and open place to explore job concerns, as well as personal support while learning skills and character development. The benefits far outweigh the costs and it stands to reason mentoring is a solution that can easily assist mentors, mentees and organizations at the highest possible level for the betterment of the chosen profession.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will focus on the methods and procedures used to conduct this study. Specifics of the purpose, research questions, hypotheses, limitations, populations studied, instrument used, data collected and data analysis will be shared.

Statement of the Problem

Mentoring is an important part of the success for mentees and for organizations. It has been proven to assist in the development of career skills for mentees, as well as assisting organizations in retention and innovative future success (Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). Student affairs professionals have a responsibility to foster the growth of the individuals who are entering the field. While the “to do” lists of professionals is intensifying, it is important that mentoring fall on the list of priorities, and should be seen as more than a task to be completed. The concept of mentoring should be a motivational challenge to entice seasoned professionals to provide their experiences and knowledge to the emerging professionals. Through opportunities and networking, mentees can benefit from the support of mentors.

Currently in the field of student affairs, specifically housing and residence life, many students enter the job search each year to embark upon a career. Through experience as an employer, the researcher has seen many of these individuals not prepared, either on the career side with items such as job etiquette and expectations, but also on the emotional side, such as with a sense of confidence and support for their own skills.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if individuals pursuing their first housing/residence life entry level position in student affairs (defined as a graduate assistant level or first full-time level) had engaged in a mentoring relationship and the nature of that relationship in terms of psychosocial support. In addition, this study identified the impact of that relationship upon the individual in relation to professional development. Finally, the study explored the role gender plays within mentoring relationships of young professionals entering the field of housing/residence life in student affairs.

Specific outcomes of the research were to determine what role mentors were serving for entry level professionals in housing/residence life, as well as the missing gaps in supporting these students. The researcher is able to recommend training and evaluation components that might be required of seasoned professionals in an effort to assist those emerging professionals in the area of housing and residence life. Specifically, this study identified the needs of emerging professionals who were involved in a 2010 job search through the Oshkosh Placement Exchange, which is the annual job placement conference for housing and residence life professionals. The focus of this study was on (a) gender in mentoring relationships; (b) experiences within mentoring relationships; (c) skills and growth; and (d) job search etiquette.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support on items such as self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill

development with the emerging professional if they had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?

2. Is there a difference in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the individual had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?
3. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) or job search etiquette depending on the gender combination of the mentor and mentee?
4. Does the duration of the mentoring relationship impact the preparation an emerging professional has related to their job search etiquette and psychosocial support (confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development)?
5. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) received from the mentor to the emerging professional if the mentoring is done through differing modes of communication?
6. Are there differences in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the modes of communication differ?

Research Design

Based on the intent of this study, a quantitative approach was ideal when considering the research design. A quantitative approach allowed the researcher to collect data on a predetermined instrument to garner statistical data (Creswell, 2003). The

researcher had specific theories to test and found quantitative research would be the most appropriate way to gather large amounts of data in a short time frame to test the theories. As Creswell stated, quantitative research would use an unbiased approach and employ statistical approaches to measure theories numerically. A survey provided a numeric description of attitudes of the population being studied. A sample was used to draw conclusions to the larger population. A survey was the preferred method due to the economy of the design, ease of distribution, and desired type of results (Creswell).

The researcher chose carefully the quantitative approach to the research design. When weighing options, the researcher found quantitative methods would collect the most data through a larger population. Due to the lack of research available in this area, the researcher believed it was important to reach out to a large sample in an effort to draw some conclusions for a larger population. This would create a foundation for the field of student affairs, and allow others to create additional research from the findings of this author's research results.

Population and Sample

The individuals surveyed were those participating in a job search in the spring 2010 recruitment season. The survey gathered information from those searching for a first time entry level position, either graduate level assistantships or full time positions. The sample was accessed through the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) database. OPE is a recruitment conference held yearly for the housing and residence life profession. Candidates from across the nation register to interview with colleges and institutions from throughout the nation as well. Through seeking permission from the OPE staff, the researcher was granted access to the database after employees (potential mentees)

registered and participated as a candidate in the job search placement. Candidates were notified, prior to registration, that research would be conducted this year. Candidates were asked to give permission to have their name used in the survey distribution.

Data Collection

Individuals were invited via email to participate in a survey. This survey was distributed after the follow up placement evaluation done by the OPE staff, which has a traditionally high response rate. The survey was distributed late enough in the job search process to obtain the needed information, but prior to individuals switching institutions and changing their email addresses. This allowed for a higher response rate by not losing a portion of the sample due to faulty email addresses. It was the researcher's intent to gather quantitative data through a survey distributed electronically to these individuals. Individuals were notified of the voluntary nature of the survey and were invited to participate. Participants were sent a reminder and encouraged to complete the survey, had they not done so already.

It was the intent to seek out the individual experiences with a mentor prior to the job search, as well as the level of support received through the job search and preparation for transition to an entry level position. The researcher desired to understand if respondents had a mentor, as defined by the literature review, as well as ask questions to determine in what way those mentors assisted them in their personal and professional development and job search preparation. It was also the desire to study gender within the mentoring relationship. Finally, for those sharing they did not have a mentoring relationship, the researcher sought out a comparison on the individual's growth and

development in the absence of the mentoring relationship to those who did have a mentor.

Instrument

An on line format, Survey Monkey, was used to distribute the survey. The survey was created by the researcher and circulated to student affairs professionals to review. These experts consisted of a statistician, serving on the researcher's dissertation committee, as well as several student affairs professionals. It was important to attempt to ensure reliability and validity within a self created survey. Reliability focused on the consistency of the results, which is why it was important to have the survey reviewed by student affairs professionals. These professionals were able to assist in determining if the questions were sound, and indicating that if asked more than once, they would likely yield consistent results over time. These experts also provided content validity through review of the questions on the survey and studying the appropriateness of the questions to what was studied. The validity reflects the survey measuring what it was intended to measure. In an effort to ensure validity, the researcher worked with the statistician on the committee to determine that when the answers would be given these answers would generate the data believed to be necessary to answer the research questions. Questions included demographics, gender, mentoring relationship dynamics, length of the mentoring relationship, job search preparation questions, and questions about psychosocial support. In addition, the survey explored the etiquette participants were aware of and the preparation for transition into the field of housing/residence life. The researcher utilized the mentoring literature review to format questions as a guide for the

development of the survey. The reliability of the questions posed and reviewed by student affairs professionals indicated results would be consistent over time.

Data Analysis

The analysis of results was done statistically, comparing those who had a mentor and those who did not, as well as looking at gender within the mentoring relationship to determine if it was a factor related to the areas of self confidence, informed knowledge about the field, skill development, and job etiquette. The internal consistency reliability coefficient was reviewed to confirm the reliability and validity of the instrument. The researcher utilized statistical tests for each research question, as outlined in the table below, in the computer program SPSS to study and determine outcomes. Significance was determined at the .05 level.

Research Question	Survey Questions Addressing Research Questions	Statistical Method to Address Research Question
1. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support on items such as self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development with the emerging professional if they had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?	Upon entering your job search process in the spring of 2010, how CONFIDENT did you feel about the following areas: personal resume, interviewing skills, expectations of communication with employers, understanding how to handle on campus job interview offers, and follow up with the institutions after the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) conference. ----- Upon entering your job search process in the spring of 2010, how INFORMED did you feel about the following areas: personal resume, interviewing skills, expectations of communication with employers, understanding how to handle on campus job interview offers, and follow up with the institutions after the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) conference.	Independent t-test

	<p>-----</p> <p>Prior to your job search, how would you rate yourself in the following areas: confidence in abilities, self awareness, ability to relate to others in the same peer group, verbal communication, written communication, leadership skills, and understanding the impact you have on those around you.</p>	
<p>2. Is there a difference in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the individual had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?</p>	<p>Please rate the following statements based on your personal knowledge and beliefs regarding the job search process</p> <p>I believe I should provide my references to every school I apply to.</p> <p>I believe I should notify my references that they may be contacted</p> <p>I believe I should submit a cover letter with my resume to every school I apply to</p> <p>I believe a school should recruit and contact me</p> <p>I believe I should recruit and contact schools</p> <p>I believe I should have my resume reviewed by an individual other than myself</p> <p>I believe I should always return an email from a school when contacted, regardless of whether I am interested or not</p> <p>I believe I should always return a phone call from a school when contacted, regardless of whether I am interested or not</p> <p>I believe I have a responsibility to communicate to the school (search chairperson) any conflicts I have when scheduling an interview</p>	<p>Independent t-test</p>

	<p>I believe it is appropriate to cancel an interview with a school after you have already scheduled it</p> <p>I believe I should try to give ample notice to a school (search chairperson) when canceling an interview</p> <p>I believe if I am offered an on campus interview, I need to notify the school of my answer within 48 hours</p> <p>I believe I should discuss my campus interview offers with another professional to seek out advice before I make any decisions</p> <p>I believe it is acceptable to tell a school no to an interview/offer and still maintain a positive relationship</p>	
<p>3. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) or job search etiquette depending on the gender combination of the mentor and mentee?</p>	<p>What is the gender of your mentor? What is your gender *Will be compared to items explained in Research Question One (confidence, informed levels of knowledge, and skill development) and Research Question Two (job search etiquette)</p>	<p>Two-Way Factorial ANOVA</p>
<p>4. Does the duration of the mentoring relationship impact the preparation an emerging professional has related to their job search etiquette and psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development)?</p>	<p>How long have you been involved in this particular mentoring relationship? *Will be compared to items explained in Research Question One (confidence, informed levels of knowledge, and skill development) and Research Question Two (job search etiquette)</p>	<p>One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA</p>

<p>5. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) received from the mentor to the emerging professional if the mentoring is done through differing modes of communication?</p>	<p>Which of the following is the primary method of contact you have with your mentor on most occasions *Will be compared to items explained in Research Question One (confidence, informed levels of knowledge, and skill development)</p>	<p>One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA</p>
<p>6. Are there differences in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the modes of communication differ?</p>	<p>Which of the following is the primary method of contact you have with your mentor on most occasions *Will be compared to items explained in Research Question Two (job search etiquette)</p>	<p>One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA</p>

Demographic information was also reviewed. Since candidates for the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) came from all over the nation, the researcher was able to look at different institutions and regions of this professional association to determine if mentoring was happening at a higher rate within different regional areas of the country. For the purpose of this study, nine regions within the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) were reviewed. The Association of Intermountain Housing Officers (AIMHO) consists of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. The Great Lakes Association of College and University Housing Officers (GLACUHO) encompasses the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. The states of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, are a part of the Mid-Atlantic Association of College and University

Housing Officers (MACUHO). The Northeast Association of College and University Housing Officers (NEACUHO) includes Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington are included in the Northwest Association of College and University Housing Officers (NWACUHO). The Southeastern Association of Housing Officers (SEAO) includes Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. The states of Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas are affiliated with the Southwest Association of College and University Housing Officers (SWACUHO). The Upper Midwest Region of the Association of College and University Housing Officers (UMR-ACUHO) includes Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Finally, the state of California is affiliated with the Western Association of College and University Housing Officers (WACUHO). By assessing the demographics in various regions when presenting the results the researcher was able to share best practices in certain regions of the country.

Through this analysis it was the hope of the researcher to be able to educate students (emerging professionals) on the important reasons for seeking out a mentoring relationship, as well as share this knowledge with Upper Midwest Region of the Association of College and University Housing Officers (UMR-ACUHO) professionals in order to begin to enhance the importance of mentoring these students, from the perspective of a seasoned professional. After conducting and completing this research, it is the researcher's intent to present these research findings with the UMR-ACUHO region through a presentation at our regional conference.

Summary

An important component in the job search is preparation. This study will show how our students are being prepared through a meaningful one-on-one relationship with another individual. This preparation is more than the actual job search interviews, but rather if this relationship has enhanced a student's personal and professional development. The level of self confidence an individual has an impact his/her approach to the job search. This researcher believes a mentoring relationship can have an impact on individuals in many ways, but specifically as students begin to prepare for the transition of a new job and role in student affairs.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

As professionals begin to seek ways to share their experiences, professionals are finding the shared relationship with an emerging professional can be very rewarding. It allows professionals to foster the growth of the mentee, while re-energizing their own professional career. The purpose of this research study was to identify what is working and where the gaps are within mentoring of the emerging professionals within the field of student affairs. Mentoring is an important part of the success for mentees and for organizations. It has been proven to assist in the development of career skills for mentees, as well as assisting organizations in retention (Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). Student affairs professionals have a responsibility to foster the growth of the individuals who are entering the field. This research study created a foundation for mentoring research in student affairs, an area that has not been widely studied. Research questions for this study provoked more questions in an effort to continue the dialogue among emerging and seasoned professionals.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if individuals pursuing their first housing/residence life entry level position in student affairs (defined as a graduate assistant level or first full-time level) had engaged in a mentoring relationship and the nature of that relationship in terms of psychosocial support. In addition, this study identified the impact of that relationship upon the individual in relation to job search etiquette. Finally, the study explored the role gender played within mentoring relationships of young professionals entering the field of housing/residence life.

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support on items such as self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development with the emerging professional if they had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?
2. Is there a difference in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the individual had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship?
3. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) or job search etiquette depending on the gender combination of the mentor and mentee?
4. Does the duration of the mentoring relationship impact the preparation an emerging professional has related to their job search etiquette and psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development)?
5. Is there a difference in the psychosocial support (self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) received from the mentor to the emerging professional if the mentoring is done through differing modes of communication?
6. Are there differences in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the modes of communication differ?

Instrument and Data Collection

The individuals surveyed were accessed by contacting the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) staff. OPE is a recruitment conference held annually for the housing/residence life profession. Candidates from across the nation registered to interview with colleges and institutions from throughout the nation. Through seeking permission from the OPE staff, the researcher was granted access to the database after employees (potential mentees) registered and participated as a candidate in the job search placement. Candidates were notified, prior to registration, that research would be conducted this year. Candidates were told they would be contacted at a later date, after the interview process, and asked to participate in a research study. All candidates had a right to opt out of the study.

Individuals were invited via email in early April 2010 to participate in the survey. The email was forwarded to the participants by the OPE staff. The survey was distributed after most initial job search interviews had occurred, but prior to participants switching institutions and changing email addresses. The researcher gathered quantitative data through a survey distributed electronically to these participants. Participants were notified of the voluntary nature of the survey and were invited to participate. Participants were sent a reminder within a week of the deadline and encouraged to complete the survey, had they not done so already.

An on-line format, Survey Monkey, was used to distribute the survey. The survey was created by the researcher. Questions included demographics, gender, mentoring relationship dynamics, the length of time for the mentoring relationships, job search preparation questions, and questions about psychosocial support. In addition, the survey

explored the etiquette participants were aware of and the preparation for transition into the field of student affairs. The researcher utilized the mentoring literature review to format questions as a guide for the development of the survey. The questions were developed in two types of formats. Portions of the questions on the survey were multiple choice, with a series of answers from which to choose. The second set of questions were Likert type Scale questions, most often running from one to four or five (excellent to poor; strongly agree to strongly disagree).

Demographics

The survey was distributed to 570 respondents. Through the distribution, ten emails were returned as invalid. Through the survey collection, 184 individuals began the survey, with one person opting out upon reading the release statement. While 183 individuals completed the survey, 16 of those individuals were removed because they were searching for a position beyond a first full-time position which did not meet the eligible criteria for this study. Therefore, 167 surveys were used for analysis. It should be noted, however, that not all individuals answered every question within the survey.

Of those completing the survey, 88 (48.1%) were seeking graduate level assistantships in housing/residence life within student affairs, and 79 (43.2%) were seeking a first full-time position in housing/residence life within student affairs. Of the 167 usable surveys, 59 respondents (35.3%) were males and 108 respondents (64.6%) were females. Indicated in Table 1 the area of the country in which respondents reside.

Mentor Information

Respondents were asked if they had a mentor or if they had been engaged in a mentoring relationship.

Mentoring was defined as

a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes this important task (Kram, 1985, p. 2).

Table 1

Demographics of Regional Affiliations

Professional Regional Affiliates of the Association of College and University Housing Officers	States Represented	N
Great Lakes (GLACUHO)	Illinois	31
	Indiana	4
	Michigan	16
	Ohio	5
Intermountain (AIMHO)	Arizona	2
	Colorado	3
Mid-Atlantic (MACUHO)	New Jersey	1
Northeast (NEACUHO)	New York	1
Northwest (NWACUHO)	Oregon	2
Southeastern (SEAHO)	Kentucky	1
	Louisiana	1
	South Carolina	1
	Tennessee	1
Southwest (SWACUHO)	Arkansas	1
	Oklahoma	1
Upper-Midwest (UMR-ACUHO)	Iowa	9
	Kansas	7
	Minnesota	11
	Missouri	16
	Nebraska	1
	North Dakota	4
	South Dakota	3
Western (WACUHO)	Wisconsin	39
	California	5

Results indicated that 135 (80.8%) had a mentor, 20 (12.0%) did not have a mentor and 12 (7.2%) were unsure. This is demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2

Mentor Relationship

Answer	Percentage	N
Yes	80.8%	135
No	12.0%	20
Unsure	7.2%	12

Follow up questions were asked of the 135 respondents who indicated they had participated in a mentoring relationship. The first follow up question related to the gender of the mentee and mentor. Results showed that 47 were mentored by males and 84 were mentored by females. Four individuals declined to answer this question. When comparing the gender of the mentor to the gender of the mentee, displayed in Table 3 are the gender pairings from respondents.

Table 3

Mentor Gender Pairings

Mentor	Mentee	N
Male	Male	22
Female	Male	28
Female	Female	56
Male	Female	25

Respondents were then asked how the mentoring relationship was created. Of the 135 respondents, the majority of individuals developed this relationship naturally over time (103 respondents). Others sought out their mentor (9); a mentor sought them out to be a mentee (6); or a mentor was assigned to the mentee (12). Five individuals noted “other” responses, consisting of supervisors/bosses and one individual who developed a closer relationship to an instructor.

An additional follow-up question focused on the length of time the mentees had engaged in the mentoring relationship. Five choices were presented to respondents. Only three individuals had been in the mentoring relationship for less than three months. Additionally, individuals were engaged in the relationship for three to six months (13) and seven to twelve months (24). However, the largest amount of respondents had been involved in the relationship for more than a year (89). Finally, six respondents answering “other” cited such time spans as three, four or five years and varying lengths of time in more than one mentoring relationship. Illustrated in Table 4 are the results of length of time engaged in a mentoring relationship.

Table 4

Length of Time in the Mentoring Relationship

Length of Time	Percent	N
Less than 3 months	2.2%	3
3-6 months	9.6%	13
7-12 months	17.8%	24
More than a year	65.9%	89
Other	4.4%	6

Another follow-up question focused on the primary method of contact the mentee had with the mentor on most occasions. Again respondents were given five choices from which to select, and the largest portion of respondents (93) indicated the communication was face-to-face. Only two respondents engaged in mentoring through on line media (Facebook, MySpace, etc), whereas 22 respondents did engage in mentoring primary through email communication. Finally, 17 respondents shared the primary method of contact was through the phone. The individual citing “other” as a response noted all of the above equally. Showcased in Table 5 are the results of the primary method of contact between the mentee and the mentor.

Table 5

Primary Method of Contact with Mentor

Method of Contact	Percent	N
Face to face communication	68.9%	93
Phone communication	12.6%	17
Email communication	16.3%	22
On line social media	1.5%	2
Other	0.7%	1

To further follow-up and investigate this relationship, respondents were then asked about the amount of contact the mentee had with the mentor. The majority of respondents (75) indicated they engage in a mentoring relationship once a week. Every other week was selected by 23 respondents, and once a month was selected by 21 respondents. Only eight respondents indicated every few months, and six cited that

contact is not on a regular basis but rather when a need arises. The two respondents who cited “other” noted the contact as three to four times per week. The results of the amount of contact between mentee and mentor are reflected in Table 6.

Table 6

Amount of Contact with Mentor

Answer	Percent	N
At least once a week	55.6%	75
Every other week	17.0%	23
Once a month	15.6%	21
Every few months	5.9%	8
Contact is not on a regular basis	4.4%	6
Other	1.5%	2

Respondents were asked to score statements in relation to the mentee’s view of the impact the mentor had on the mentee. There were 135 respondents to the set of questions on the perceived impact of the mentor. Respondents were asked if the mentor had helped increase the mentee’s self confidence. The majority of individuals (129) indicated they “strongly agree” or “agree” with this statement. Respondents were asked if the mentor provided the mentee with encouragement on a consistent basis, and 126 respondents replied with “strongly agree” or “agree.” A total of 132 respondents stated they “strongly agree” or “agree” when asked if the mentor offered the mentee direction, and 131 answered “strongly agree” or “agree” related to the mentor providing feedback. Reflected in Table 7 are the results of the perceived impact of the mentor on mentee.

Table 7

Perceived Impact of a Mentor

Question	5 (Strongly agree)	4 (Agree)	3 (No opinion)	2 (Disagree)	1 (Strongly disagree)	N
My mentor has helped me increase my self confidence	69	60	4	2	0	135
My mentor encourages me on a consistent basis	65	61	9	0	0	135
My mentor offers me direction	67	65	3	0	0	135
My mentor offers me feedback	73	58	3	1	0	135

Lack of a Mentoring Relationship

Several questions were asked of those who indicated they did not engage in a mentoring relationship. Of those who did not have a mentor, 14 said they did wish they had a mentor, whereas, two said no, and five stated they were unsure if it would matter. When exploring why they did not have a mentor, 10 individuals stated they did not find someone they wanted to have as a mentor, and 10 stated they were not approached by anyone to be a mentee. Others cited reasons such as feeling as though no one had gone through a similar experience to be able to assist them, enrollment at a small institution and not finding a mentor, having several professionals helping the individual in the job search, and not feeling connected to the university staff and therefore not feeling supported. One individual noted he/she did not feel it would be necessary to have a mentor in the job search process.

Job Search Preparation

Respondents were asked a series of questions related to the respondent's psychosocial awareness. Psychosocial awareness included self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development. Self confidence was based on how confident the respondents felt in areas of resume preparation, interviewing, communication with employers, and follow-up with job offers. Informed levels of knowledge about the field included assessing how informed respondents felt about resume preparation, interviewing, communication with employers, and follow-up with job offers. Finally, the skill development area asked respondents to rate themselves in the areas of confidence in abilities, self awareness, ability to relate to others in the same peer group, verbal communication, written communication, leadership skills, and understanding the impact an individual has on others. For the purpose of this section of the survey, 164 respondents answered the questions related to psychosocial awareness related to skill development. Respondents most often answered "excellent" or "good" in all areas of skill development. Related to confidence in abilities, the majority of respondents (92) answered "good" and 54 answered "excellent" concerning the respondent's understanding of confidence in their own abilities. In asking respondents about their own self awareness, 81 respondents answered "good" regarding self awareness and 63 respondents stated "excellent." Regarding an ability to relate to others in the same peer group, the majority of respondents (80) indicated a score of "good." Written and verbal communication were very similar, with respondents feeling slightly stronger in verbal communication (78), although written communication was closely scored with 67 respondents selecting a choice of "excellent" and 69 respondents selecting

“good.” When asked about an understanding of the impact the mentee has on those around the mentee, 80 respondents indicated a score of “good.” Reflected in Table 8 are the outcome of the psychosocial awareness questions.

Table 8

Self Rated Psychosocial Skill Development Awareness

Psychosocial Skills	5 (Excellent)	4 (Good)	3 (Average)	2 (Needs Improvement)	1 (Poor)	N
Confidence in abilities	54	92	16	2	0	164
Self awareness	63	81	15	5	0	164
Ability to relate to others in the same peer group	67	80	17	0	0	164
Verbal communication	78	61	24	1	0	164
Written communication	67	69	25	3	0	164
Leadership skills	91	59	13	1	0	164
Understanding the impact you have on those around you	61	80	23	0	0	164

Research Questions Reviewed

Research Question One

The first research question explored if there was a difference in the psychosocial support on items such as self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development of the emerging professional if they had a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship. For the

purpose of this research question, the researcher compared responses on three sections of the survey between those who had a mentor and those who did not. The three sections included self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development. The researcher conducted an independent t-test to explore the results of this research question.

Research Question Two

Research question two asked if there was a difference in the individual's self reported knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the individual has a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship. The purpose of this research question was to determine if those engaging in job searches had a strong understanding of job search etiquette and if it differed between those who had a mentor and those who did not. Respondents were asked a series of questions. Their responses were totaled and divided by the number of questions to create a job search etiquette average score, which was used in the analysis of data. This section included the following statements and asked respondents to select items on a Likert type scale (strongly agree-5, agree-4, neutral-3, disagree-2, or strongly disagree-1). The researcher conducted an independent t-test to explore the results.

Research Question Three

Research question three asked if there is a difference in the psychosocial support (confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development) or job search etiquette depending on the gender combination of the mentor and mentee. This research question explored the concept of gender within the mentoring relationship. The researcher was seeking to understand if the pairing of gender matches (female-male;

female-female; male-male; male-female) had an impact on the respondents in the areas of job search etiquette (based on questions mentioned in research question two), and self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development (based on questions in research question one). A two-way factorial ANOVA was used to analyze this research question.

Research Question Four

Research question four explored if the duration of the mentoring relationship impacted the preparation an emerging professional perceives related to their job search etiquette and psychosocial support (confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development). The respondents were asked the question of “how long have you been involved in this particular mentoring relationship”. This question was used in conjunction with self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field and skill development (from research question one) and job search etiquette questions (from research question two) through a one-way between subjects ANOVA comparing three categories of duration.

Research Question Five and Six

Research question five studied the difference in the psychosocial support on items such as self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development received if the mentoring is done through differing modes of communication. Research question six questioned if there were differences in the individual’s knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the modes of communication differ. A statistical analysis was used to determine if different methods of communication could impact the mentoring relationship. Respondents were asked “which

of the following is the primary method of contact you have with your mentor on most occasions.” While there were five choices from which to select, the focus of the analysis was on two types of communication: face-to-face communication and email communication. Through a one-way between subjects ANOVA, results were analyzed in conjunction with self confidence, informed level of knowledge of the field, and skill development questions (from research question one) and job search etiquette questions (from research question two).

Hypothesis Testing

Psychosocial Support and Mentoring

There were three null hypotheses generated to study the link between having a mentor and psychosocial support. Psychosocial support included self confidence (RQ one), informed level of knowledge about the field (RQ one), and skill development (RQ one). The following null hypotheses were tested:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in self confidence of those individuals who have a mentor and those who do not.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in the informed level of knowledge about the field of those individuals who have a mentor and those who do not.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in the skill development of those individuals who have a mentor and those who do not.

An independent sample t-test was performed. Each respondent had a total score created by the answers to the questions given in each section of the survey related to self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and abilities. Related to self confidence, there were 152 respondents analyzed with a mean of 16.1 if they had a

mentor and 15.8 if they did not. The standard deviation for those with a mentor was 2.06 and those without resulted in a standard deviation of 1.97, thus resulting in a significance level of 0.41. When analyzing the informed level of knowledge of the field, 154 respondents yielded a significance level of 0.38. The mean score for those with a mentor was 16.6 and those without a mentor had a mean of 15.7. For the area of skill development, the mean score with a mentor was 29.9 and the mean score for those without a mentor was 30.5. As a result the significance level was 0.47 for 152 respondents, resulting in standard deviation scores of 3.25 with a mentor and 3.56 without a mentor. Revealed in Table 9 are the outcome of the independent sample t-tests for hypotheses *Ho1*, *Ho2*, and *Ho3*.

Table 9

Independent Sample T-Test on Confidence, Informed Level of Knowledge, and Skill Development Related to Mentoring

Variable	N	Means	Means	SD	SD	Significance Level
		Mentor	No Mentor	Mentor	No Mentor	
Self Confidence	152	16.1	15.8	2.06	1.97	0.41
Informed Level of Knowledge	154	16.6	15.7	2.64	2.42	0.38
Skill Development	152	29.9	30.5	3.25	3.56	0.47

Through this analysis, an independent sample t-test showed no significant difference between those who had a mentor and those who did not have a mentor in regard to self confidence level, $t(150) = 0.64, p = 0.41$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (*Ho1*).

In addition, an independent sample t-test showed no significant difference between those who had a mentor and those who did not have a mentor in regard to informed level of knowledge about the field, $t(152) = 1.35, p = 0.38$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{02}).

Finally, an independent sample t-test showed no significant difference between those who had a mentor and those who did not have a mentor in regard to skill development, $t(150) = -0.69, p = 0.47$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{03}).

Job Search Etiquette and Mentoring

There was one null hypothesis generated to study the link between having a mentor and job search etiquette. Job search etiquette included questions from research question two. An average score was calculated to create an etiquette score for each respondent. The following null hypothesis was tested:

H_{04} : There is no significant difference in job search etiquette between those who have a mentor and those who do not.

An independent sample t-test was performed. The results were based on 146 respondents, yielding a mean score of 4.36 for those with a mentor, and a 4.22 mean for those without a mentor. The standard deviation results were 0.31 and 0.41 for those with a mentor and without a mentor, respectively. This resulted in a significance level of 0.02. The results of the independent sample t-tests for hypothesis H_{04} are reflected in Table 10.

Table 10

Independent Sample T-Test on Job Search Etiquette Related to Mentoring

Variable	N	Means	Means	SD	SD	Significance Level
		Mentor	No Mentor	Mentor	No Mentor	
Job Search Etiquette	146	4.36	4.22	0.31	0.41	0.02*

Through this analysis, an independent sample t-test showed a significant difference between those who had a mentor and those who did not have a mentor in regard to job search etiquette, $t(144) = 1.70, p = 0.02^*$. This analysis resulted in rejecting the null hypothesis (H_04).

Gender and Mentoring

There were three null hypotheses generated to study the link between the gender relationship and mentoring. The following null hypotheses were tested:

H_05 : There is no significant difference in those who had male versus female mentors.

H_06 : There is no significant difference between male and female respondents (mentees).

H_07 : There is no significant interaction of gender within the mentoring relationship (male and female mentors are the same for male and female respondents).

Respondents who answered completely both the questions regarding the respondent's gender and the gender of the respondent's mentor were isolated for the purpose of analyzing this research question. This was done through a select cases

statistical method. When analyzing the results of the questions, respondents were isolated on the confidence variable to 129; the informed level of knowledge about the field variable to 131; the skill development variable to 129; and those answering the job etiquette questions to 124 respondents.

A two-way factorial ANOVA was performed for all three null hypotheses. Related to the area of self confidence, the female mentor-female mentee pairing resulted in a mean score of 16.2 and a standard deviation of 2.26. The female mentor-male mentee pairing resulted in a mean score of 16.6 and a standard deviation of 1.84. With regards to the males, the male mentor-mentee combination has a mean score of 15.9 and a standard deviation of 1.96. Finally, the male mentor-female mentee combination had a mean score of 15.7 and a standard deviation of 2.07. This resulted in a significance level of 0.87.

Related to the informed level of knowledge of the field, the female mentor-female mentee pairing had a mean score of 16.8 and a standard deviation of 2.79. The female mentor-male mentee combination had a mean score of 17.1 and a standard deviation result of 2.22. The male mentor-female mentee pairing had a mean score of 16.0 and a standard deviation score of 2.73. Finally, the male mentor-male mentee mean score was 15.7 with a standard deviation score of 2.38. This resulted in a significance level of 0.59.

When analyzing the questions related to skill development, the pairing of female mentor-female mentee resulted in a mean score of 30.0 and a standard deviation score of 3.17. The female mentor-male mentee pairing had a mean score of 31.4 and a standard deviation score of 3.04. When assessing the results of the men, the male mentor-male mentee pairing resulted in a mean score of 29.1, with a standard deviation of 3.73.

Finally, the male mentor-female mentee combination had a mean score of 29.0 and a standard deviation of 2.99. These results yielded a significance level of 0.33

Finally, in assessing the job search etiquette score, there were 124 respondents involved yielding a mean score of 4.36 for the female mentor-female mentee, female mentor-male mentee, and male mentor-female mentee combinations, and a mean score of 4.34 for male mentor-male mentee combination. The standard deviation for the female mentor-female mentee pairing was 0.34 and the male mentor-male mentee pairing was a 0.31. For both the female mentor-male mentee and male mentor-female mentee pairing the standard deviation was a 0.28. Illustrated in Table 11 are the outcome of the two-way factorial ANOVA for the null hypotheses H_{05} , H_{06} , and H_{07} .

A two-way factorial ANOVA showed no significant interaction between gender of the mentor and gender of the mentee related to self confidence $f(1, 125) = 0.02, p = 0.87$; related to informed level of knowledge about the field, $f(1, 127) = 0.29, p = 0.59$; related to skill development, $f(1, 125) = 0.92, p = 0.33$; and related to job etiquette, $f(1, 120) = 0.04, p = 0.83$. The above f scores are all a reflection of the interaction between gender of the mentor and gender of the mentee. These statistical analyses resulted in a failure to reject all three null hypotheses (H_{05} ; H_{06} ; H_{07}).

Table 11

Two-Way Factorial ANOVA Related to Gender and Mentoring

Variable	N	Means	Means	SD	SD	F scores (based on interaction)	Significance Level
Self Confidence	129	Female Mentor- Female Mentee	Female Mentor- Male Mentee	Female Mentor- Female Mentee	Female Mentor- Male Mentee	0.02	0.87
		16.2	16.6	2.26	1.84		
Informed Level of Knowledge	131	Male Mentor- Male Mentee	Male Mentor- Female Mentee	Male Mentor- Male Mentee	Male Mentor- Female Mentee	0.29	0.59
		15.9	15.7	1.96	2.07		
Skill Development	129	Female Mentor- Female Mentee	Female Mentor- Male Mentee	Female Mentor- Female Mentee	Female Mentor- Male Mentee	0.92	0.33
		30.0	31.4	3.17	3.04		
		Male Mentor- Male Mentee	Male Mentor- Female Mentee	Male Mentor- Male Mentee	Male Mentor- Female Mentee		0
		29.1	29.0	3.73	2.99		

Job Etiquette	124	Female Mentor- Female Mentee 4.36	Female Mentor- Male Mentee 4.36	Female Mentor- Female Mentee 0.34	Female Mentor- Male Mentee 0.28	0.04	0.83
		Male Mentor- Male Mentee 4.34	Male Mentor- Female Mentee 4.36	Male Mentor- Male Mentee 0.31	Male Mentor- Female Mentee 0.28		

Length of Time and Mentoring

There were four null hypotheses generated to study the link between the length of time of the mentoring relationship and psychosocial support (includes items such as self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development), and job search etiquette. The following four null hypotheses were tested:

H₀₈: There is no significant difference in self confidence by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

H₀₉: There is no significant difference in the informed level of knowledge about the field by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

H₀₁₀: There is no significant difference in the skill development by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

H₀₁₁: There is no significant difference in job search etiquette by the amount of time the mentor relationship has been established.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA test was performed. Each respondent had a total score created for the answers to the questions given in each section of the survey related to self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill

development (as noted in research question one). The assessment on job search etiquette included questions from research question two. An average score for job search etiquette was calculated for each respondent to create an etiquette score for each respondent.

While some additional categories were offered, the largest portion of respondents could be narrowed to three categories (three-six months; seven-twelve months; and more than a year) and it was these three categories that were analyzed for the purpose of this study. In an effort to isolate those individuals who selected additional time frames of duration or those who did not answer the question, a process of select cases statistical method was used in analyzing the results. Related to self confidence, 87 respondents indicated a duration of more than a year, 24 respondents indicated a relationship with a mentor between seven and twelve months, and finally, 13 respondents were engaged in the relationship for three to six months. For the informed level of knowledge about the field questions, 89 respondents were in the category of more than a year, 24 respondents in the category of seven to twelve months, and 13 respondents were in the category of three to six months. Related to skill development, out of the 124 respondents, 89 were in a relationship for more than a year, 22 were in the relationship from seven to twelve months, and finally, 13 were between three to six months. In the last portion, job etiquette, 120 respondents were isolated with a breakdown of 87 respondents in the relationship for more than a year, 21 respondents between seven to twelve months, and 12 were engaged in the relationship between three to six months. When analyzing the results of these questions, the number of respondents was isolated as shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Respondents Isolated for Research Question Four

Question	3-6 months	7-12 months	More than a year	N
Self Confidence	13	24	87	124
Informed Level of Knowledge	13	24	89	126
Skill Development	13	22	89	124
Job Search Etiquette	12	21	87	120

For the self confidence analysis, the mean score for three to six months was 15.3, for seven to twelve months was 16.1, and for more than a year was 16.3. The standard deviations were 2.18, 1.65, and 2.03 respectively for three to six months, seven to twelve months, and more than a year. The significance level was 0.28.

Related to the informed level of knowledge about the field questions, the mean score for three to six months was 15.3 with a standard deviation of 2.53. For seven to twelve months, the mean score was 16.3 and the standard deviation was 2.87. Finally, for those in a relationship for more than a year, the mean score was 16.8 with a standard deviation score of 2.58. The resulting significance level was 0.09.

For the questions related to skill development the mean for the time frame of three to six months was 28.1 with a standard deviation of 3.52. For the time period of seven to twelve months, there was a resulting mean score of 30.0 and a standard deviation of 2.70. Finally, for those in a relationship for more than a year, a resulting mean score of 30.2

and a standard deviation score of 3.28 was found. The significance level for skill development was 0.09.

Finally, the job search etiquette questions, resulted in a mean score of 4.34 for three to six months, a mean score of 4.38 for seven to twelve months, and a mean score of 4.36 for more than a year. There was a standard deviation score of 0.29 for three to six months, a score of 0.36 for seven to twelve months, and a standard deviation of 0.31 for those in a relationship for more than a year. This statistical analysis resulted in a significance level of 0.92. Table 13 and Table 14 reflects the outcome of the one-way between subjects ANOVAs for the hypotheses *Ho8*, *Ho9*, *Ho10*, and *Ho11*.

Table 13

One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA Related to Self Confidence, Informed Level of Knowledge, Skill Development, Job Search Etiquette and Length of Time of Mentoring

Variable	N	Means	Means	Means	SD	SD	SD
		3-6 months	7-12 months	More than year	3-6 months	7-12 months	More than year
Self Confidence	124	15.3	16.1	16.3	2.18	1.65	2.03
Informed Level of Knowledge	126	15.3	16.3	16.8	2.53	2.87	2.58
Skill Development	124	28.1	30.0	30.2	3.53	2.70	3.28
Job Etiquette	120	4.34	4.38	4.36	0.29	0.36	0.31

Table 14

One-Way Between Subjects ANOVA Related to Self Confidence, Informed Level of Knowledge, Skill Development, Job Search Etiquette and Length of Time of Mentoring

Variable	N	F Score	Significance Level
Self Confidence	124	1.26	0.28
Informed Level of Knowledge	126	1.94	0.14
Skill Development	124	2.37	0.09
Job Search Etiquette	120	0.08	0.92

A one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between the length of time a respondent had a mentor and self confidence, $f(2, 121) = 1.26$, $p = 0.28$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{08}).

The next statistical analysis of a one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between the length of time a respondent had a mentor and informed level of knowledge about the field, $f(2, 123) = 1.94$, $p = 0.14$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{09}).

Finally, when looking at psychosocial support, a one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between the length of time a respondent had a mentor and skill development, $f(2, 121) = 2.37$, $p = 0.09$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{010}).

A one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between the length of time a respondent had a mentor and job search etiquette, $f(2, 117) = 0.08$, $p = 0.92$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{011}).

Modes of Communication and Mentoring

There were four null hypotheses generated to study the link between the modes of communication and psychosocial support (includes items such as self confidence, informed level of knowledge, and skill development), and also job search etiquette. The following null hypotheses were tested:

H₀₁₂: There is no significant difference in self confidence between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

H₀₁₃: There is no significant difference in informed level of knowledge about the field between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

H₀₁₄: There is no significant difference in skill development between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

H₀₁₅: There is no significant difference in job search etiquette between e-mentoring and face-to-face mentoring.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was performed. Each respondent had a total score created for the answers to the questions given in each section of the survey related to self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development (as noted in research question one). Job search etiquette included questions from research question two. An average score for job search etiquette was calculated for each respondent to create an etiquette score for each respondent.

In an effort to isolate those individuals who selected these two specific modes of communication, a statistical method of select cases was used in analyzing the results. For the questions related to self confidence, 113 respondents were isolated, with the majority of the respondents (91) engaging in face-to-face communication. Related to the informed level of knowledge about the field, 115 respondents were isolated, with the majority (93) engaged most often with face-to-face communication. For the area of skill development, 113 respondents were isolated, with 91 respondents indicating a primary method of face-to-face communication. Finally, related to job search etiquette, 110 respondents were isolated. Of those respondents, 89 engaged primarily in face-to-face communication. When analyzing the results of the questions, the isolated number of respondents are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Respondents Isolated for Research Question Five and Six

Question	Face to face communication	Email communication	N
Self Confidence	91	22	113
Informed Level of Knowledge	93	22	115
Skill Development	91	22	113
Job Search Etiquette	89	21	110

The mean score for face-to-face communication under self confidence was 16.09 and for email communication the mean score was 16.04. The standard deviations were 1.94 and 2.55, respectively. The analyzed significance level was 0.91. When focusing on the informed level of knowledge about the field, the significance level was 0.62. This was

a result of a mean score of 16.66 and a standard deviation score of 2.61 on face-to-face communication. The mean score for email communication was 16.95, with a standard deviation score of 2.34. Finally, when looking at skill development the results showed a mean for face-to-face communication at 29.92 and email communication at 29.36. The standard deviation scores were 3.17 and 3.86, respectively. The significance level for skill development was 0.47.

When analyzing the information for job search etiquette, a mean score of 4.34 in face-to-face communication and a mean score of 4.41 in email communication were found. The standard deviation for face-to-face and email communication was 0.31. This resulted in a significance level of 0.40. Table 16 reflects the summarized analysis of the one-way between subjects ANOVAs for hypotheses *Ho12*, *Ho13*, *Ho14*, and *Ho15*.

Table 16

One Way Between Subjects ANOVA Related to Self Confidence, Informed Level of Knowledge, Skill Development, Job Search Etiquette and Modes of Communication in Mentoring

Variable	N	Means	Means	SD	SD	F Scores	Significance Level
		Face-to-Face	Email	Face-to-Face	Email		
Self Confidence	113	16.09	16.04	1.94	2.55	0.01	0.91
Informed Level of Knowledge	115	16.66	16.95	2.61	2.34	0.24	0.62
Skill Development	113	29.92	29.36	3.17	3.86	0.50	0.47
Job Etiquette	110	4.34	4.41	0.31	0.31	0.70	0.40

A one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between modes of communication and self confidence, $f(1, 111) = 0.012, p = 0.91$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{012}).

The next statistical analysis of a one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between modes of communication and informed level of knowledge about the field, $f(1, 113) = 0.24, p = 0.62$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{013}).

Finally, when looking at psychosocial support, a one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between modes of communication and skill development, $f(1, 111) = 0.50, p = 0.47$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{014}).

A one-way between subjects ANOVA showed no significant difference between modes of communication and job search etiquette, $f(1, 108) = 0.70, p = 0.40$. This analysis resulted in a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_{015}).

Summary of Findings

Demographic information was collected and used in the analysis to provide information about the sample of the survey. A broad range of respondents from areas across the country completed the survey, which provided a stronger foundation of research results. Analysis conducted through independent sample t-tests, one-way between subjects ANOVA, and a two-way factorial ANOVA, showed minimal to no impact on individuals in a mentoring relationship versus those who were not. The only significant result was related to respondents who had a mentor and the preparation for the respondent's job search through proper job search etiquette understanding. Although the

research results yielded little to no significant difference overall, the results provide a basis for future research in the area of mentoring and student affairs.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Mentoring continues to be an issue within the field of student affairs. As professionals seek ways to retain students in the field, as well as recruit students to join the profession, there is much emphasis put on interactions with students to share knowledge about the professional work experience. In doing so, mentoring would be a formal way to encompass this knowledge and experience, sharing with those students interested in furthering their professional career in higher education. As such, further research was needed to explore the mentoring relationships that are and are not occurring in higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if emerging professionals seeking their first housing/residence life entry level position in student affairs (defined as a graduate assistant level or first full-time level), had engaged in a mentoring relationship and the nature of that relationship in terms of psychosocial support. In addition, this study attempted to identify the impact of that relationship upon the individual's understanding of appropriate job search etiquette. Finally, the study explored the role gender played within mentoring relationships of young professionals entering the field of housing/residence life, in addition to exploring if the duration and form of primary communication had an impact.

The focus of the study was on graduate level and entry level professionals, through the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) job search process. The study was conducted through an on line survey in an effort to understand the mentoring

relationships these candidates pursued prior to the start of their job search, as well as job search etiquette, self confidence, informed levels of knowledge, and skill development gained either through a mentoring relationship or in absence of one. The researcher sought to determine if there were a correlation in the previously mentioned areas and a mentoring relationship. Utilization of a mentoring survey created by the researcher provided a basis for the variables used in analyzing the research.

Overview of the Study

Mentoring is a factor for many individuals, not just in the field of student affairs. It has been demonstrated that mentoring, in most professional fields, provides a basis for an individual to learn and grow in a new environment. Higher education, and most specifically student affairs, is no exception to this philosophy. Recruiting and retaining staff is an ongoing concern in current trends of student affairs, and mentoring seems to be a start to a solution for assisting new and emerging professionals. These professionals are tasked with growing in the areas of self awareness and psychosocial development, as well as career knowledge. These areas can be best supported by those that have traveled the road before the emerging professional, specifically a mentor. This research was conducted to assess if seasoned professionals were supporting emerging professionals through the mentoring process, and if emerging professionals were learning from this type of one-on-one mentoring relationship, specifically as they prepared to enter their first job search.

An on-line format, Survey Monkey, was used to distribute the survey. The survey was created by the researcher. Questions included demographics, gender, mentoring relationship dynamics, the length of time for the mentoring relationships, job search

preparation questions, and questions about psychosocial support. In addition, the survey explored the job search etiquette participants were aware of and the preparation for transition into the field of student affairs. The researcher utilized the mentoring literature review to format questions as a guide for the development of the survey. The questions were developed in two types of formats. A portion of the questions on the survey were multiple choice, with a series of answers from which to choose. The second set of questions were Likert type scale questions, most often running from one to four or five (excellent to poor; strongly agree to strongly disagree).

The survey was distributed to 570 respondents. Through the distribution, ten emails were returned as invalid. Through the survey collection, 184 individuals began the survey, with one person opting out upon reading the release statement. While 183 individuals completed the survey, 16 of those individuals were removed because they were searching for a position beyond a first full-time position which did not meet the eligible criteria for this study. Therefore, 167 surveys were used for analysis. It should be noted, however, that not all individuals answered every question within the survey.

Of those completing the survey, 88 (48.1%) were seeking graduate level assistantships in housing/residence life, and 79 (43.2%) were seeking a first full-time position in housing/residence life within student affairs. Of the 167 usable surveys, 59 respondents (35.3%) were males and 108 respondents (64.6%) were females. Not all respondents answered all questions.

The largest respondent population was drawn from the GLACUHO and UMR-ACUHO regions, which is not surprising due to the fact that those regions are located in the Midwest and the job placement exchange is hosted annually in Wisconsin. When

looking at gender within the mentoring relationship, the results of the study showed that more females were mentoring currently than males, despite the gender of the mentee.

Major Findings

Psychosocial Support and Mentoring

The purpose of research question one was to explore those who reported being part of a mentoring relationship, as defined as,

a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experience adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes this important task (Kram, 1985, p. 2).

This research question looked at the difference between those with a mentor and those without, specifically focused on areas of self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development needed to pursue a job in housing/residence life. There were three hypotheses explored within this research question and through the use of independent t-tests.

Relating the variable of self confidence and mentoring, a significance level of 0.41 was found from analyzing 152 respondents. When analyzing 154 respondents on the informed level of knowledge about the field and mentoring, the significance level was 0.38. Skill development and mentoring yielded a significance level of 0.47. The highest mean scores for those with a mentor were on the level of skill development (29.9) compared to 16.1 and 16.6 for self confidence and informed level of knowledge about the field respectively. This showed similar results for those without a mentor, with skill

development having the highest mean at 30.5. However, no significant results were found in any of the three areas of confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development. This study found no significant relationship between psychosocial support and whether or not a respondent had a mentor.

Job Search Etiquette and Mentoring

The second research question in this study asked, if there is a difference in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the individual has a mentor as compared to those emerging professionals who did not engage in a mentoring relationship. The purpose of this research question was to determine if those engaging in job searches had a strong understanding of job search etiquette, and if it differed between those who had a mentor and those who did not. Respondents were asked a series of questions and the responses were totaled and divided by the number of questions to create a job search etiquette average score, which was used in the analysis of data.

One hypothesis tested the impact between mentor support and job search etiquette with an independent t-test. A significant impact was found between mentor support and job search etiquette. The significance level was 0.02*. The number of respondents analyzed was 146 with a mean score of 4.36 with a mentor and mean score of 4.22 without a mentor. This outcome supported the theory that those individuals who engage in a mentoring relationship with someone in the field of housing/residence life as they prepare for a job search in housing/residence life are more prepared to handle the expectations of a job search, in the field of housing/residence life. Those individuals without a mentor often scored themselves lower in the areas of the job search process that go beyond the initial contact. Individuals are often aware of how to begin the process, but

when it comes to advancing stages such as communicating with employers after interviews or follow-up on job offers, individuals without guidance, most often, were not confident in their understanding of the expectations of the field as it relates to a job search.

Gender and Mentoring

The third research question explored gender by asking, if there is a difference in the psychosocial support (confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development) or job search etiquette depending on the gender combination of the mentor and mentee. This research question explored the concept of gender (from the question “what is the gender of your mentor” and “what is your gender” on the survey) within the mentoring relationship. The researcher sought to understand if the pairing of gender matches (female mentor-male mentee; female mentor-female mentee; male mentor-male mentee; male mentor-female mentee) had an impact on the respondents in the areas of job search etiquette (based on questions mentioned in research question two), and self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development (based on questions in research question one. Respondents who answered both the question concerning the respondent’s gender and the gender of the respondent’s mentor were isolated for the purpose of analyzing this research question.

This research question sought to analyze the mentor-mentee relationship in terms of the gender set up. Three hypotheses were studied within this research question. In analyzing the results, the greatest means were found in the area of skill development, with the highest noted in the female mentor-male mentee pairing (31.4). The next closest means were found within the job search etiquette analysis. For the pairings of female

mentor-female mentee, female mentor-male mentee, and male mentor-female mentee, the resulting mean was 4.36. The pairing of male mentor-male mentee had a resulting mean of 4.34, which was statistically close to the previous pairings. The significance levels in all four areas were higher than what would be considered statistically significant. The resulting significance levels ranged from 0.33 to 0.87 with the four categories. Through analysis of a two-way factorial ANOVA statistical method, all three hypotheses yielded no significant difference with gender in relation to mentoring. There is no evidence of gender within the mentoring relationship impacting an individual's self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, skill development, or job search etiquette.

Length of Time and Mentoring

Research question four focused on the length of time of a mentoring relationship by asking, if the duration of the mentoring relationship impacts the preparation an emerging professional perceives related to their job search etiquette and psychosocial support (confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development). The respondents were asked the question "how long have you been involved in this particular mentoring relationship". This question was used in conjunction with self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field and skill development (from Research question one) and job search etiquette questions (from research question two) through a one way between subjects ANOVA statistical method comparing three categories of duration.

While some additional categories were offered, the largest portion of respondents could be narrowed to three categories (three-six months; seven-twelve months; and more than a year) and it was these three categories that were analyzed for the purpose of this

study. In an effort to isolate those individuals who selected additional time frames of duration or those who did not answer the question, a process of select cases statistical method was used in analyzing the results. Related to self confidence, 87 respondents indicated the length of time of the relationship at more than a year, 24 respondents indicated a relationship with a mentor between seven and twelve months, and finally, 13 respondents were engaged in the relationship for three to six months. For the informed level of knowledge about the field questions, 89 respondents were in the category of more than a year, 24 respondents in the category of seven to twelve months, and 13 respondents were in the category of three to six months. Related to skill development, out of the 124 respondents, 89 were in a relationship for more than a year, 22 were in the relationship from seven to twelve months, and finally 13 were between three to six months. In the last portion, job etiquette, 120 respondents were isolated with a breakdown of 87 respondents in the relationship for more than a year, 21 respondents between seven to twelve months, and 12 engaged in the relationship between three to six months.

This research question compared self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, skill development, and job search etiquette of those having a mentor to the variable of the length of time an individual had been in a mentoring relationship. There were four hypotheses focused for this research question. Through statistical analysis, again the highest mean scores were found between length of time mentoring and skill development, with a 28.1 mean for three to six months, a 30.0 mean for seven to twelve months, and a 30.2 mean for more than a year. The lowest mean scores were found among the length of time mentoring and job search etiquette, with a range of means of 4.34, 4.36, and 4.38. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was used to analyze

the data related to length of time in a mentoring relationship. There was no significant difference between duration of the mentoring relationship and the psychosocial support areas (confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development) or job search etiquette. The significance level for confidence variable was 0.28, informed level of knowledge about the field variable had a significance level of 0.14, and the job search etiquette variable had a significance level of 0.92. When testing significance, the skill development variable analysis at a significance level of 0.09 was close to being significant, but did not meet the significance rate of 0.05 or less. Therefore, the duration of a mentoring relationship does not appear to have a significant impact on job search etiquette and psychosocial support.

Modes of Communication and Mentoring

Research question five asked, if there is a difference in the psychosocial support on items such as self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development received from the mentor to the emerging professional if the mentoring is done through differing modes of communication. Furthermore, research question six asked, if there is are differences in the individual's knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette when the modes of communication differ. The focus of the analysis was on two types of communication: face-to-face communication and email communication.

Through a one-way between subjects ANOVA, results were analyzed in conjunction with self confidence, informed level of knowledge of the field, and skill development questions (from research question one) and job search etiquette questions (from research question two).

These two research questions sought to understand if the type of mentoring offered to an individual through the primary mode of communication had any significant impact on the above mentioned areas. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was implemented to explore four hypotheses for these two research questions. The highest means resulted within the area of skill development (29.92 for face to face and 29.36 for email communication). The lowest means were again found related to the job search etiquette, with a 4.34 for face to face communication and a 4.41 for email communication. No significant difference in any of the areas (confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, skill development, and job search etiquette) was found. Therefore, for research question five, there was no significant difference in the psychosocial support through differing modes of communication. For research question six, no significant difference was found between job search etiquette and differing forms of communication. Therefore, the mode of communication within the mentoring relationship does not have a significant impact on job search etiquette and psychosocial support of the mentee.

Discussion

Social learning theory focuses on humans learning from other humans through role modeling and imitation (Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006). Social learning theory is a strong basis for the development of the concept of mentoring. However, further theories such as psychosocial support through attachment theory and human development theory, help enhance the need for a mentoring relationship (Cooper & Miller, 1998; Gormley, 2008). The most significant theory driving this research study was the work of Kathy Kram (1985). Kram determined phases of mentoring as a base foundation within a

mentoring relationship. This research study was focused on the initiation phase, where individuals begin the relationship, and the cultivation phase, where expectations are enhanced and the true work of mentoring begins (Kram).

Psychosocial Support and Mentoring

Psychosocial support is a strong foundation for success of individuals in their personal and professional lives. When studying psychosocial support (self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, and skill development) and mentoring there was no significant difference found in this study. These results were slightly in contradiction with previous research which indicates that having a mentor has an impact on one's self confidence and understanding of self awareness in the work place. Eby, Rhodes and Allen (2007) cited how relationships can play a key role in human development of individuals. Through the research of Eby et al., it was determined that those who had a mentor at a younger age were more successful. The concept of having a mentor at a young age, when beginning to explore the early stages of a career, is rooted in research and was a base for studying this research study. Mentoring research found that mentoring, in various forms with all ages, served the purpose of increasing academic achievement, promoting self confidence, and advancing career development (Eby et al., 2007). Furthermore, research during this same time frame showed the importance of a non-family member relationship with an adult, especially for college students. Researchers of college students, such as Chickering, Pascarella, Astin, Wilson, Gaff, Dienst, Wood, and Bavry, found that "faculty-staff interaction has a positive influence on wide range of personal, career, and educational outcomes" (Eby et al., p. 9). This further suggests engagement in a mentoring relationship, at the college level, is critical to the

advancement of development. However, this was not proven within the realms of this research study.

In addition, past research also shows that encouragement from a mentor enhances an individual's ability to pursue new opportunities, such as job advancement. One effective function mentoring serves was that of offering career support (Forehand, 2008; Kram, 1985; Smith-Jentsch, Scielzo, Yarbrough, & Rosopa, 2008; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000). Career support includes helping educate a mentee about the organization, demonstrating an understanding of the unwritten rules of how to advance a career, and providing opportunities to further expose oneself within the profession (Forehand; Kram; Smith-Jentsch et al; Sosik & Godshalk). Within the organization, there are many rules and often politics to be navigated. A mentor can assist the mentee by providing protection from these politics (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that a mentor provides this type of support to emerging professionals in student affairs. Mentors can serve as a role model and aid in removing stress felt by mentees as they navigate the early stages of their career (Cooper & Miller, 1998; Sosik & Godshalk). While the current study explored mentoring relationships prior to and during the job search, it did not explore mentoring relationships once the professionals were placed in a position.

Within this study, no significant difference was found through comparing means. Ultimately, no connection could be made between mentoring and psychosocial support of the emerging professional in this research study. However, when asked questions about the impact a mentor had on a mentee in the area of increasing self confidence, 129 of 135 respondents indicated a score of strongly agree or agree. This same was true for

encouragement (126), offering direction (132) and offering feedback (131). One speculation about the discrepancy between the answers related to mentor impact and the statistical analysis on psychosocial support is an individual with a mentor may have always had the support and may not be able to adequately draw the conclusion that the mentor, therefore, was helpful to the individual's self confidence, informed levels of knowledge about the field, and skill development. A conclusion could be drawn that the individual knows no difference and, therefore, has no reason to correlate the comfort level on these items to the mentor's support. Ultimately, no connection could be made from a mentor and psychosocial support of the emerging professional.

Job Search Etiquette and Mentoring

The specific area of job search etiquette as it relates to mentoring is not an area that has been researched widely, thus it was an area of exploration in this research study. A basis for this exploration stemmed from social learning theory, which indicates humans can learn through imitation and observation (Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006).

Specifically,

in order for learning to occur, individuals must observe appropriate behavior, if there are no role models for the desired behavior then individuals are less likely to learn. Further, once the behavior is learned, reinforcement is necessary in order for it to be maintained (Eby, Lockwood & Butts, p. 269).

Social learning theory indicates a necessity for a new professional to engage in an on-going learning experience with a mentor who can serve as a strong role model,

specifically in teaching the mentee how to navigate the unwritten expectations of job search etiquette.

Previous research had indicated that individuals supported by a mentor in their job opportunities were more self confident and knowledgeable about the politics of the profession. Having a dedicated individual to guide one's performance and skills within a new career or organization is a large benefit that mentees can experience (Eby et al., 2000; Johnson, 2003; Rose & Rukstalis, 2008). Having a sense of understanding in an organization and additional help navigating an area like the first job search helps a mentee in the mentee's transition. The mentor is able to share tacit knowledge that is hidden and might not otherwise be learned (Rose & Rukstalis). With this base knowledge, the researcher determined it was important to determine through this study if mentors, when assisting in the job search of the mentee, had an impact on the mentee's preparation and comfort in the expectations through the job search process. When a professional helps an individual navigate the job search, including resume support, interviewing preparation, and an understanding of expectations in communicating with employers, the individual then feels more confident in the knowledge of appropriate job search etiquette. This, in turn, helps the employers who are interviewing these individuals have a more effective experience within the job search process. It should be noted, however, that even though the difference was significant between those who did and did not have a mentor, the actual difference between the means was small.

Gender and Mentoring

When analyzing the variables of gender pairings and mentoring, the results are in contradiction to past research which indicated gender pairings, in some cases, can have

an impact on the mentoring relationship (Blackhurst, 2000; Johnson, 2003; Lafreniere & Longman, 2008). This is often true specifically with the need for a female mentee to have a female mentor in an effort to have support to advance in the field. While there has been some criticism in cross-gender mentoring relationships, it is more and more common in the field of student affairs (Cooper & Miller, 1998). With a shortage of female leadership at the senior levels of student affairs, it made sense to assess the possible significance in the pairing of gender within the mentor relationship.

Research by Allen, Poteet, and Russell (2000) indicated that females are often seen as nurturers. Therefore, females are more likely to mentor someone based on emotional need than a male might. Allen et al., also identified that commitment is very important to female mentees and, therefore, female mentors are often viewed as having a higher level of commitment to the intimate relationship. Men, on the other hand, will respond more favorably to relationships with higher levels of autonomy and freedom. These characteristics were considered when developing questions on the survey distributed to respondents. Questions focusing on gender of the mentor and mentee, as well as psychosocial support and career guidance, helped the researcher assess if a same sex mentor pairing or a cross gender mentor pairing made for a significant difference.

At the level of this research study, entry level professionals were surveyed. These entry level professionals are often mentored by seasoned professionals, although not all high ranking in the hierarchy of student affairs. Therefore, cross-gender mentoring relationships are not uncommon. With the imbalance of gender in most career fields, it can be a challenge for women to get the mentoring they want. Blackhurst (2000) found many women were dissatisfied with their career in student affairs and this was due to a

variety of reasons such as devaluation of feminine traits and values, perceived sex discrimination, role conflict, uncertainty about performance expectations, and organizational values. With those in mind, it is important for women to be mentored early in their career in an effort to find value in what they offer to the organization and develop the needed skills to advance their careers. Mentoring increases a woman's chances for professional career advancement and also helps women learn the political frameworks of the organization (Blackhurst). Within this research study, it was identified that 84 of the 135 respondents were mentored by females. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that females are making an impact in the field on both female and male mentees. Past research by Cooper and Miller (1998) has shown cross-gender mentor relationships are not uncommon and the results of this survey support those same outcomes.

Length of Time and Mentoring

When assessing length of time in a mentoring relationship compared to self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, skill development, and job search etiquette, no significant results were determined. This outcome supports previous research indicating having a mentor, despite the short length of time, is more impactful than not having a mentor (Eby & McManus, 2004; Eby et al., 2007; Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Mertz, 2004; Smith-Jentsch et al., 2008). Mentoring relationships often develop over time and require participation from both the mentor and mentee. Often times a mentor will initiate an informal relationship with a mentee they believe has potential or needs support within the organization (Kelly, 1984). For an effective relationship, the mentee must be an active participant and a partner in the process (Barnett, 2008; Smith-Jentsch et al.). Within the work of Kram (1985), it was found that the initiation phase,

when individuals begin the relationship, can last between six to twelve months. After that time frame, most mentoring partnerships will enter into the cultivation phase, focusing more intently on psychosocial and career support (Kram). Therefore, while the length of time in a mentoring relationship could have an impact on the mentoring relationship, within this study, the proposed hypotheses were not supported as most individuals were reporting engagement in a mentoring relationship at the year mark or slightly more than a year. A conclusion could be drawn that the longer an individual is engaged in a mentoring relationship, the stronger they will feel about their own self-awareness and self-confidence, as well as having an understanding about the field of student affairs, but the research from this survey did not demonstrate a significant difference. In most cases, the mean between the length of time in the mentoring relationship was very limited, specifically in the job search etiquette section of questions. Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that having a mentor, regardless of the time frame, could provide some level of support and knowledge, which is comparable to previous research on this topic.

Modes of Communication and Mentoring

The current research has shown a cutting edge technique called electronic mentoring (e-mentoring) that is infiltrating the mentoring world, which provides mentoring through computer technology (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007; Smith-Jentsch et al, 2008; Stone, 2007). Through this current trend of mentoring, forms of technology such as email, instant message chatting, and facebook can be used. Since this is a new technique, research has not fully been developed yet on how this impacts individuals who are being mentored. Given the same amount of time as face-to-face mentoring, communication may be less due to not being able to type quickly, which can also limit

the feedback given. Smith-Jentsch et al. found that words to offer psychosocial support were higher in e-mentoring than face to face mentoring. Smith-Jentsch et al. also found that mentor-mentee dialogue was significantly more interactive in an e-chat than face to face conditions.

In this area of the survey, while many options were offered, the primary methods of communication were face-to-face communication and email communication. As anticipated from previous research, there was no significant difference at this time based on the type of primary method of communication utilized in a mentoring relationship. Previous research shows some strong value in face-to-face communication while in a mentoring relationship, but it also indicates that e-mentoring can be an applicable substitute, again stronger than having no mentor at all (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007; Smith-Jentsch et al, 2008; Stone, 2007). These current results indicate that some form of communication is still important to a mentoring relationship, but there was no strong impact on the areas of self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, skill development or job search etiquette regardless of how the mentoring was executed.

Implications for Practice

While the results of this study did not yield a significant difference in the mentoring relationship related to self confidence, informed level of knowledge about the field, skill development and job etiquette, there is still some value in the findings.

Since there was a significant difference found between job search etiquette and mentoring, it would be important to continue to make sure that emerging professionals in the field of student affairs, specifically housing/residence life, have the support of a mentor as the individual embarks upon a job search. This support would benefit both the

student and the employer, who expects certain job search etiquette be followed while going through the job search season. Some of this job search etiquette is unwritten or what some employers may view as “common sense”, but it is a large assumption to expect emerging professionals, most often undergraduate students, to have a clear understanding of these expectations. Therefore, as seasoned professionals in the field of student affairs, specifically housing/residence life, we should be expected to support the field by serving as mentors and fostering mentoring relationships.

Opportunities within the field of student affairs, specifically housing/residence life, exist to enhance training opportunities for current and seasoned professionals to understand mentoring of emerging professionals and the responsibility the seasoned professionals have within recruitment and retention of the profession.

While the length of time of the mentoring relationship was not proven to be a factor in the psychosocial support or job search etiquette, nor was the variable of mode of communication, there is some opportunity to continue to explore how mentoring is facilitated. How often a mentoring relationship occurs and how it is maintained over time can be of possible benefit to the mentee. In addition, in a changing society with social media at the helm, it is important for seasoned professionals to be challenged to find ways to mentor students non-traditionally. The past option of face-to-face mentoring may not always be the best or most viable option for the emerging professional, but a mentoring opportunity is still stronger than no mentoring.

While the gender pairings of the mentor-mentee did not show a significant difference, it is still important to consider gender when viewing how mentoring is facilitated within an organization. Cross-gender relationships have been shown to be

effective, but research has also shown that women are seeking role models to advance a career. Therefore, it would be prudent to encourage women in high leadership positions to branch out and mentor young female professionals.

While the focus was on those individuals with a mentor, there was some information gathered from those who did not have a mentor. The lack of a mentoring relationship could have an impact on individuals at some level, despite not being supported through this research. Past research has shown a mentoring relationship is still a strong foundation for success. Some individuals without a mentor indicated the individual had not been approached to engage in a mentoring relationship, which would further suggest that seasoned professionals have a responsibility, at times, to seek out these students and support their desire to pursue a career in the profession. In addition, one noted problem from comments in the study is that smaller institutions/departments may lack a variety of mentors to offer to mentees. Therefore, the profession as a whole should seek out opportunities (for those within departments that cannot offer mentoring, or mentoring that a mentee feels comfortable pursuing) to pursue a long distance mentoring relationship with someone in the field.

Recommendations for Further Research

This particular research study did not produce a significant finding in 14 of the 15 hypotheses. Based on this study and past research on mentoring, the following concepts could yield further research possibilities:

1. This research study showed some significance in job search etiquette related to mentoring, therefore the researcher would suggest further research be completed with a focus on job search etiquette techniques and mentoring at a

deeper level. Specifically, a way to approach this would be to consider the perceived understanding of job search etiquette and the actual implementation of this job search etiquette in the job search process.

2. It would be of benefit to the field to do some long term assessment of mentoring. Therefore, it might be suggested that further research could be implemented on this same sample of individuals after they have been engaged in their first full-time job or graduate assistantship. The purpose of the study could be to assess if these individuals still utilized their mentor after beginning the job, and if this mentoring relationship supported their confidence level and knowledge about the profession.
3. While no significance was found in relation to modes of communication of mentoring further research could be done on new ways to communicate through a mentoring relationship, with a specific emphasis on e-mentoring or forms of social media.
4. This study was focused on a specific job search population for the year of 2010. Further research could be done nationwide through other venues of job placement or additional years for longitudinal data.
5. The demographics data showed the largest amount of respondents engaged in mentoring relationships were from the GLACUHO and UMR-ACUHO regional areas of the country. Further research could be explored within these regional organizations to determine what the schools are doing to implement and support mentoring, thus setting an example for other regional areas of the country to follow.

6. Finally, additional research could be done on training programs currently implemented within organizations in student affairs that support mentoring of mentees exploring a job search. This additional research and exploration could provide a foundation for other institutions to support their emerging professionals going into the field, specifically within housing/residence life. Programs that support these students can provide guidance to the profession through our regional and national organizations.

Summary of Study

Recruitment and retention in the field of student affairs, specifically in housing/residence life, continues to be an ongoing concern. The responsibilities that current professionals have to support the profession have grown significantly in recent years. Seasoned professionals need to continue to seek out emerging professionals and assist their skill development and self confidence. Research shows one method to help assist in this process would be the concept of mentoring. This research, while not statistically significant in most accounts, shows that mentoring provides a foundation on some level. Past research supports this assertion. Mentoring is an effective method to build relationships, provide guidance and support, and educate about job search processes. This type of relationship helps not only the mentee, but the institutions within the field as well. As an employer, it is important to have candidates who understand the expectations regarding communication within the job search process. If candidates are taught the job search etiquette expectations, employer relationships will be more effective. Overall, this study touched on the beginning issues related to mentoring in the

field of student affairs, specifically housing/residence life, and heightened the awareness for further research in the area of mentoring to enhance the field.

REFERENCES

- Aagaard, E. M., & Hauer, K. E. (2003). A cross-sectional descriptive study of mentoring relationships formed by medical students. *Journal of Internal Medicine*, *18*(4), 298-302.
- Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2008). Mentor commitment in formal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *72*(3), 309-316.
- Allen, T. D., & Poteet, M. L. (1999). Developing effective mentoring relationships: Strategies from the mentor's viewpoint. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *48*, 59-73.
- Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Russell, J. E. (2000). Protégé selection by mentors; What makes the difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 271-282.
- Barham, J. D., & Winston, R. B. (2006). Supervision of new professionals in student affairs: Assessing and addressing needs. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, *26*(1), 64-89.
- Barnett, J. E. (2008). Mentoring, boundaries, and multiple relationships: Opportunities and challenges. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *16*(1), 3-16.
- Benishek, L. A., Bieschke, K. J., Park, J., & Slattery, S. M. (2004). A multicultural feminist model of mentoring. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *32*, 428-442.
- Blackhurst, A. (2000). Effects of mentoring on the employment experiences and career satisfaction of women student affairs administrators. *NASPA Journal*, *37*(4), 573-86.
- Bolton, C. (2005). The role of mentors in our personal and professional lives. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, *24*(2), 180-188.

- Campbell, D., & Campbell, T. (2000). The mentoring relationship: Differing perceptions of benefits. *College Student Journal, 34*(4), 516.
- Cooper, D. L., & Miller, T. K. (1998). Influence and impact: Professional development in Student Affairs. *New Directions for Student Services, 84*, 55-69.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Darling, N., Bogat, G. A., Cavell, T. A., Murphy, S. E., & Sanchez, B. (2006). Gender, ethnicity, development, and risk: Mentoring and the consideration of individual differences. *Journal of Community Psychology, 34*(6), 765-779.
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Haggard, D. L. (2007). Naturally occurring mentoring relationships involving workplace employees. In T. Allen & L. Eby (Eds), *Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 139-158). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Eby, L. T., & Allen, T. D. (2002). Further investigation of protégés' negative mentoring experiences. *Group & Organization Management, 27*(4), 456-479.
- Eby, L. T., Lockwood, A. L., & Butts, M. (2006). Perceived support for mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*, 267-291.
- 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. (2000). The protégé's perspective regarding negative mentoring experiences: The development of a taxonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*, 1-21.

- Eby, L. T., Rhodes, J. E., & Allen, T. D. (2007). Definition and evolution of mentoring. In T. Allen & L. Eby (Eds), *Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 7-20). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Forehand, R. L. (2008). The art and science of mentoring in psychology: A necessary practice to ensure our future. *American Psychologist*, 63(8), 744-755.
- Gormley, B. (2008). An application of attachment theory: Mentoring relationship dynamics and ethical concerns. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(1), 45-62.
- Grogan, M., & Crow, G. (2004). Mentoring in the context of educational leadership preparation and development – Old wine in new bottles? Introduction to a Special Issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 463-467.
- Helfgot, S. R. (2005). Core values and major issues in Student Affairs Practice: What really matters? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 131, 5-18.
- Hopkins-Thompson, P. (2000). Colleagues helping colleagues: Mentoring and coaching. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 29-36.
- Johnson, W. B. (2003). A framework for conceptualizing competence to mentor. *Ethics & Behavior*, 13(2), 127-151.
- Kelly, K. E. (1984). Initiating a relationship with a mentor in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 21(3), 49-54.
- Kochan, F. K., & Trimble, S. B. (2000). From mentoring to co-mentoring: Establishing collaborative relationships. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(1), 20-28.
- Kram, K. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. London, England: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

- Lafreniere, S. L., & Longman, K. A. (2008). Gendered realities and women's leadership development: Participant voices from faith-based higher education. *Christian Higher Education, 388-404*.
- Liang, B., Tracy, A. J., Taylor, C. A., Williams, L. M. (2002). Mentoring college-age women: A relational approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30(2)*, 271-288.
- McKeen, C. & Bujaki, M. (2007). Gender and Mentoring. In B. R. Ragins & K. Kram (Eds), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 197-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mertz, N. (2004). What's a mentor, anyway? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40(4)*, 541-560.
- Putsche, L., Storrs, D., Lewis, A. E., & Haylett, J. (2008). The development of a mentoring program for university undergraduate women. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 38(4)*, 513-528
- Raabe, B., & Beehr, T. A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and coworker relationships: Differences in perceptions and impact. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 271-293.
- Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1999). Burden or blessing? Expected costs and benefits of being a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 493-509.
- Robert, D. M. (2007). Preferred methods of professional development in Student Affairs. *NASPA Journal, 44(3)*, 561-577.

- Rose, G. L., & Rukstalis, M. R. (2008). Imparting medical ethics: The role of mentorship in clinical training. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(1), 77-89.
- Scandura, T. A., & Pellegrini, E. K. (2007). Workplace mentoring: Theoretical approaches and methodological issues. In T. Allen & L. Eby (Eds), *Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 71-91). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Smith-Jentsch, K., Scielzo, S. A., Yarbrough, C. S., & Rosopa, P. J. (2008). A comparison of face-to-face and electronic peer-mentoring: Interactions with mentor gender. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(2), 193-206.
- Sosik, J. J. & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 365-390.
- Sprengel, A. D., & Job, L. (2004). Reducing student anxiety by using clinical peer mentoring with beginning nursing students. *Nurse Educator*, 29(6), 246-250.
- Stone, F. M. (2007). *Coaching, counseling & mentoring (2nd Edition)*. New York: AMACOM.
- Waple, J. N. (2006). An assessment of skills and competencies necessary for entry-level Student Affairs work. *NASPA Journal*, 43(1), 1-18.
- Williams, L. L., Levine, J. B., Malhotra, S., & Holtzheimer, P. (2004). The good-enough mentoring relationship. *Academic Psychiatry*, 28, 111-115.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Date _____
I, _____ consent to participate in this
(please sign name)
research project and understand the following:

Project Background: This project is the research component of a dissertation entitled “A Study of the Impact of Mentoring Relationships on the Entry Level Job Search Process in the Field of Student Affairs” as part of a degree program through the University of Missouri – Columbia.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to ascertain if individuals, pursuing their first student affairs entry level position (graduate level or first full-time level), have engaged in a mentoring relationship and what that relationship entailed in terms of psychosocial and career support. In addition, this study will identify what that relationship has done for the individual in his/her professional development. Finally, the study will explore the role gender plays within mentoring relationships of young professionals entering the field of student affairs.

Voluntary: Your participation in completing the “Mentoring in Student Affairs” survey instrument is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or choose to withdraw from participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

What do you do?: You will be asked to complete a survey via an email link sent to you through the on line database, Survey Monkey. This survey link will take you through several questions related to mentoring and the job search process, as created by the researcher. You will be asked to complete the survey by a deadline provided. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Risks: This project does not involve any risks greater than those encountered in everyday life.

Confidentiality: Your confidentiality will be maintained in that I will not identify the institution or a participant’s name in the study itself. The data will only be reported in aggregate form and your name will not be used. The results of this study will be published in the Upper-Midwest Region of the Association of College and University Housing Officers (UMR-ACUHO) News as well as through a program presentation at the annual UMR-ACUHO conference.

Incentive: Individuals will be asked at the end of the survey if they wish to submit their name and email address. Those choosing to do this will be submitted into a random drawing for one of two \$20 gift cards. Should a participant be selected for this award incentive, the researcher will contact them via email. The drawing will occur after the close date of the survey has occurred.

I greatly appreciate your willingness to work with me on this research. If you have any questions regarding this research project, please do not hesitate to contact me. Should you have any questions you can contact me, the primary investigator, at banas@ucmo.edu or (660) 543-4212. You can contact my faculty advisor at Hutchinson@ucmo.edu You can also contact the University of Missouri IRB office at 483 McReynolds Hall, Columbia, MO 65211, by email at umcresearchcibr@missouri.edu, or by phone at (573) 882-9585.

APPENDIX B

Letter of Support from Oshkosh Placement Exchange Staff



March 23, 2010

Dear Institutional Review Board:

The University of Wisconsin Oshkosh Department of Residence Life and Gruenhagen Conference Center have proudly hosted the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE), a national job placement conference, for the past 31 years. We believe hosting the annual event is one way we are able to serve our profession.

In May 2009, Mishelle Banas contacted Marc Nylen and I, OPE Co-Chairs, to discuss the possibilities of partnering to support her research project. We applaud her efforts to conduct research, and feel it is yet another way for Mishelle to serve our profession; a woman who is already well-respected in our field. We have agreed to assist Mishelle in accessing the survey population, the 2010 OPE candidates.

Since Mishelle had worked with us before the 2010 OPE registration opened, the following statement was able to be included on the candidate registration form, "OPE Candidates will be invited to participate in a higher education research study related to mentoring through the job search process. At the time of the invitation, you can choose whether to be in the study or not. Participation or non-participation will not affect your service or status as a candidate."

It is our pleasure to support Mishelle Banas' research. Please feel free to contact me at (920) 424-3212 or develice@uwosh.edu if any additional information would be useful.

Respectfully,

Lori M. Develice Collins
Assistant Director of Residence Life – Leadership and Community Development
Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE) Co-Chair
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

APPENDIX C

Participant Communication

Page 1 of 1

Mishelle Banas - Research Study

From: Andy Schumacher <schuma28@mio.uwosh.edu>
To: Norleen Luebke <Luebke@mio.uwosh.edu>, Tyler Theyerl <theyet68@mio.uwosh.edu>, Nathan Wielgosh <wielgn82@mio.uwosh.edu>
Date: 3/30/2010 8:55 AM
Subject: Research Study
CC: Lori Develice Collins <develice@mio.uwosh.edu>, Marc Nysten <nysten@mio.uwosh.edu>, <banas@ucmo.edu>

Dear 2010 OPE Participants,

My name is Mishelle Banas and I am a professional staff member at the University of Central Missouri. I am also currently a doctoral student and I am seeking your assistance!

I have joined with the OPE staff to distribute a survey on mentoring in student affairs on how it relates to your job search. They have been gracious enough to allow me to contact you to ask for your help in filling out my survey. The knowledge gained from this survey will be used for my dissertation, as well as (we hope!) advancements of our field.

The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes and can be found at the following link:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MentoringinStudentAffairs>

The survey is completely optional and will not impact your candidacy through OPE in any way. You also can opt out of the survey at any time.

The survey will be open until April 15, 2010, at 11:45pm.

Please take a few moments to complete this information and contribute to the knowledge we, as professionals, can learn from you to better the field!

If you have any questions, my contact information, as well as my advisors contact information, is located on the first page of the survey link.

Thank you, in advance, for your time!!!
Mishelle

Mishelle Banas
MACURH Regional Co-Advisor
Assistant Director of Residence Life
University of Central Missouri
660-543-4212

file:///C:/Documents and Settings/banas/Local Settings/Temp/XPgrpwise/4BB1BC76CEN... 10/12/2010

Mishelle Banas - Research Study Reminder

From: Andy Schumacher <schuma28@mio.uwosh.edu>
To: Norleen Luebke <Luebke@mio.uwosh.edu>, Tyler Theyerl <theyet68@mio.uwosh.edu>, Nathan Wielgosh <wielgn82@mio.uwosh.edu>
Date: 4/13/2010 9:03 AM
Subject: Research Study Reminder
CC: Lori Develice Collins <develice@mio.uwosh.edu>, <banas@ucmo.edu>

Dear 2010 OPE Participants,

Recently you received a request to complete a survey on mentoring in student affairs. Thank you in advance to those of you who took the time to complete it. You have already been a great asset to my research study!

The deadline for the survey completion is approaching quickly -- April 15, 2010 at 11:45pm.

If you have not yet filled the survey out, I seek your assistance this week in taking a few minutes to do so. This final push will help my survey results a great deal.

The link again is as follows:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MentoringinStudentAffairs>

Thank you again so much for your assistance!

If you have any questions, my contact information, as well as my advisors contact information, is located on the first page of the survey link.

Mishelle Banas

Mishelle Banas
MACURH Regional Co-Advisor
Assistant Director of Residence Life
University of Central Missouri
660-543-4212

file://C:\Documents and Settings\banas\Local Settings\Temp\XPgrpwise\4BC43369CEN... 10/12/2010

APPENDIX D

Survey Questions

This project is the research component of a dissertation entitled “A Study of the Impact of Mentoring Relationships on the Entry Level Job Search Process in the Field of Student Affairs” as part of a degree program through the University of Missouri – Columbia.

Your participation in completing the “Mentoring in Student Affairs” survey instrument is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or choose to withdraw from participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. This project does not involve any risks greater than those encountered in everyday life.

Please check here if you understand this information and agree to participate in the study. By checking "yes", this will be considered your informed consent for the study.

- Yes
- No

What is your gender:

- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- Prefer not to answer

What level of position were you searching for at the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE):

- Graduate level/assistantships
- First full time position
- Beyond first full time position (end survey)

The state where I currently live/attend undergraduate or graduate school is:

Do you have a mentor, as defined by the following definition, "a relationship between a young adult and an older, more experience adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work. A mentor supports, guides, and counsels the young adult as he or she accomplishes this important task." (Kram, 1985, p. 2)

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

What is the gender of your mentor?

- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- Prefer not to answer

Which of the following statements best applies to how you entered into a mentoring relationship with your current mentor?

- I sought out this person to be my mentor
- This person sought me out to be their mentee
- My mentor was assigned to me
- It happened naturally over time and I grew more comfortable seeing this person in a mentoring role
- Other (please specify) _____

How long have you been involved in this particular mentoring relationship?

- Less than 3 months
- 3-6 months
- 7-12 months
- More than a year
- Other (please specify) _____

Please score the following statements in relation to YOUR view of the impact your mentor has had on you:

Using the following scale:

5 (Strongly agree) 4 (Agree) 3 (No opinion) 2 (Disagree) 1 (Strongly disagree)

- My mentor has helped increase my self confidence
- My mentor encourages me on a consistent basis
- My mentor offers me direction
- My mentor offers me feedback

In your view, what are characteristics of a good mentor?

Which of the following is the primary method of contact you have with your mentor on most occasions:

- Face-to-face communication
- Phone communication
- Email communication
- On line media form (Facebook, MySpace, Instant Messaging)
- Other (please specify) _____

The amount of contact you have with your mentor is:

- At least once a week
- Every other week
- Once a month
- Every few months
- Contact is not on a regular basis, just when I need something
- Other (please specify): _____

Upon embarking in the 2010 job search process, do you wish you would have had a mentor?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure if it matters

Why did you not engage in a mentoring relationship?

- I did not feel that I needed to have a mentor
- I did not find a someone I wanted to have as a mentor
- No one approached me to be a mentee
- Other (please specify): _____

Upon entering your job search process in the spring of 2010, how CONFIDENT did you feel about the following areas:

Using the following scale:

4 (Extremely confident) 3 (Somewhat confident) 2 (Somewhat NOT confident) or 1 (Extremely NOT confident)

- Your resume
- Interviewing skills
- Expectations for communication with employers
- Knowing how to handle on campus interview offers
- Follow up with institutions after the Oshkosh Placement Exchange

Upon entering your job search process in the spring of 2010, how INFORMED did you feel about the following areas

Using the following scale:

4 (Extremely informed) 3 (Somewhat informed) 2 (Somewhat UNinformed) or 1 (Extremely UNinformed)

- Your resume
- Interviewing skills
- Expectations for communication with employers
- Knowing how to handle on campus interview offers
- Follow up with institutions after the Oshkosh Placement Exchange

Prior to the start of your job search in the spring of 2010, how would you rate yourself in the following areas:

Using the following scale:

5 (Excellent) 4 (Good) 3 (Average) 2 (Needs Improvement) 1 (Poor)

- Confidence in abilities
- Self awareness
- Ability to relate to others in same peer group
- Verbal communication
- Written communication
- Leadership skills
- Understanding of impact you have on those around you

Please rate the following statements based on your personal knowledge and beliefs regarding the job search process:

Using the following scale:

5 (Strongly agree) 4 (Agree) 3 (Neutral) 2 (Disagree) 1 (Strongly Disagree)

- I believe I should provide my references to every school I apply to
- I believe I should notify my references that they may be contacted
- I believe I should submit a cover letter with my resume to be reviewed
- I believe a school should recruit and contact me
- I believe I should recruit and contact schools
- I believe I should have my resume reviewed by an individual other than myself
- I believe I should always return an email from a school when contacted, regardless of whether I am interested or not
- I believe I should always return a phone call from a school when contacted, regardless of whether I am interested or not
- I believe I have a responsibility to communicate to the school (search chairperson) any conflicts I have when scheduling an interview
- I believe it is appropriate to cancel an interview with a school after you have already scheduled it
- I believe I should try to give ample notice to a school (search person) when canceling an interview
- I believe if I am offered an on campus interview, I need to notify the school of my answer within 48 hours
- I believe I should discuss my campus interview offers with someone
- I believe it is acceptable to tell a school no to an interview/offer and still maintain a positive relationship

APPENDIX E

IRB Approval Form

Page 1 of 1

Mishelle Banas - Campus IRB Exempt Approval Letter: IRB # 1164157

From: "Schmidt, Rachel D" <SchmidtRD@missouri.edu>
To: <banas@ucmo.edu>, <hutchinson@ucmo.edu>
Date: 3/24/2010 3:59 PM
Subject: Campus IRB Exempt Approval Letter: IRB # 1164157

Dear Investigator:

Your human subject research project entitled A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS ON THE ENTRY LEVEL JOB SEARCH PROCESS IN THE FIELD OF STUDENT AFFAIRS meets the criteria for EXEMPT APPROVAL and will expire on March 24, 2011. Your approval will be contingent upon your agreement to annually submit the "Annual Exempt Research Certification" form to maintain current IRB approval.

You must submit the Annual Exempt Research Certification form 30 days prior to the expiration date. Failure to timely submit the certification form by the deadline will result in automatic expiration of IRB approval.

Study Changes: If you wish to revise your exempt project, you must complete the Exempt Amendment Form for review.

Please be aware that all human subject research activities must receive prior approval by the IRB prior to initiation, regardless of the review level status. If you have any questions regarding the IRB process, do not hesitate to contact the Campus IRB office at (573) 882-9585.

Campus Institutional Review Board

file://C:\Documents and Settings\banas\Local Settings\Temp\XPgrpwise\4BAA36E4CEN... 10/12/2010

VITA

Mishelle Banas, daughter of Kathleen and John Banas, was born July 15, 1975 in Chicago, Illinois. She attended high school in Bolingbrook, Illinois and then attended college at Western Illinois University, where she completed a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology. Mishelle continued her education at Missouri State University, earning a Master in Science of Education degree, which was completed in 1999.

After graduation, she accepted a position at Kansas State University where she served as a full time Residence Hall Coordinator for five years. After her time at K-State, Mishelle worked for two years as a Complex Director position at Minnesota State University-Mankato. In 2006, Mishelle accepted her current position as an Assistant Director of Residence Life in University Housing at the University of Central Missouri. She also teaches in the College Student Personnel program at UCM.