Olivet Nazarene University
Digital Commons @ Olivet

Ed.D. Dissertations School of Graduate and Continuing Studies

5-1-2010

The Impact of Career, Psychosocial, and Spiritual Functions of Mentoring on Undergraduate Students

Tom Middendorf
Olivet Nazarene University, tmiddend@olivet.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss

Part of the Counseling Psychology Commons, Higher Education Administration Commons, Social Psychology Commons, and the Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons

Recommended Citation

Middendorf, Tom, "The Impact of Career, Psychosocial, and Spiritual Functions of Mentoring on Undergraduate Students" (2010). *Ed.D. Dissertations.* Paper 9.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies at Digital Commons @ Olivet. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ed.D. Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Olivet. For more information, please contact kboyens@olivet.edu.

THE IMPACT OF CAREER, PSYCHOSOCIAL, AND SPIRITUAL FUNCTIONS OF MENTORING ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by

Tom Middendorf

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of
Olivet Nazarene University
School of Graduate and Continuing Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of

Doctor of Education
in
Ethical Leadership
May 2010

THE IMPACT OF CAREER, PSYCHOSOCIAL, AND SPIRITUAL FUNCTIONS OF MENTORING ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by

Tom Middendorf

Dissertation

Alice E. Patterson
Dissertation Adviser

1-4-10
Date

Dissertation Reader

1-4-10
Date

Dissertation Coordinator

5-1-10
Date

Program Director

5-1-10
Date

Dean of the School of Graduate
and Continuing Studies

5-5-10
Date

Vice-President for Academic Affairs

5-5-2010
Date

© 2010

Tom Middendorf

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a few people who were vital to me throughout this experience. First, I wish to thank Dr. Alice Patterson for her guidance and true mentorship throughout this journey. She provided support, encouragement, and direction throughout. She helped me to believe that I could achieve the impossible. I was blessed to have her on my dissertation team.

Second, I cannot thank Dr. Melvin Welch enough for his leadership in the program. He was a stabilizing force for Cohort 1. There was no quit for this man. He refused to allow us to accept defeat!

Third, I wish to thank Craig and Joan Bishop for their friendship, hospitality, and selflessness as they gave me a place to stay when traveling to school. Their confidence, support, and encouragement were crucial to believing that I could achieve my goal.

Fourth, I thank Dr. Mindy Burch for allowing me to send her countless tables and statistics for review. She was always willing to take a look and offer feedback.

Fifth, I thank my family for their patience and encouragement over the last few years. I feel like I have missed out on a lot. Thank you for your understanding.

Finally, I thank my beautiful wife, Jessica, on what seemed like a long journey at times. Without her support and encouragement, I would never have walked through the door of opportunity to begin this journey. We have both earned this doctorate!

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to a faithful God! May the opportunities that I receive through this accomplishment be to His glory. I pray that He uses my life, my labor, and everything that I have to fulfill His work on this earth.

ABSTRACT

by
Tom Middendorf, Ed.D.
Olivet Nazarene University
May 2010

Major Area: Ethical Leadership Number of Words: 120

This study investigated the perceived utilization and importance of career, psychosocial, and spiritual mentoring functions in the mentoring relationships with university personnel at select Nazarene Higher Educational Institutions (NHEI). Quantitative methodology utilizing survey research was used to collect data. A total of 366 traditional undergraduate students were surveyed from the Behavioral Sciences Division at four select NHEIs. Data analysis indicated statistically significant differences on students' ethnicity and the mentoring function of protection, denomination and the function of exposure and visibility, college or university and the function of spiritual accountability, major and the functions of exposure and visibility and challenging assignments, classification and the mentoring function of sponsorship. All responses to the perceived importance of the mentoring functions were statistically significant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 3

Background 5

Research Questions 9

Description of Terms 9

Significance of the Study 12

Process to Accomplish 13

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 16

Introduction 16

What is Mentoring 17

Mentoring Functions 21

The Nature of the Mentoring Relationship 26

Types of Mentoring Relationships 32

Benefits of Mentorship 37

Negative Outcomes 43

Race and Gender 47

Spiritual Impact 53

Conclusion 59

III. METHODOLOGY 61

Chapter Page

Introduction....61

Research Design....61

Population....62

Data Collection Procedures....66

Analytical Methods....72

Limitations....74

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS....77

Introduction....77

Findings....78

Conclusions....87

Implications and Recommendations....90

REFERENCES....93

APPENDIXES

A. 57 Elements of Mentoring....105

B. (Table 1) Demographical Data on Participants....108

C. Email Authorization from Nazarene Higher Education Institutions....112

D. Emails to Participants....115

E. Mentor Functions Survey....118

F. Informed Consent....123

G. (Table 2) Mentor Selection Responses....126

Chapter Page

H. (Tables 3-5) Comparisons of
Mentoring Functions by Gender 128

I. (Tables 6-8) Comparisons of
Mentoring Functions by Age 132

J. (Tables 9-11) Comparisons of
Mentoring Functions by Ethnicity 139

K. (Tables 12-14) Comparisons of
Mentoring Functions by Denomination 144

L. (Tables 15-17) Comparisons of
Mentoring Functions by College 148

M. (Tables 18-20) Comparisons of
Mentoring Functions by Major 152

N. (Tables 21-23) Comparisons of
Mentoring Functions by Classification 157

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Student and faculty relationships outside of the classroom are seen as an important component of the development of the college student (Chickering, 1969). Much research (i.e., Allen & Eby, 2007; Chickering, 1969; Nagada, Gregerman, Jonides, von Hippel, & Lerner, 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1979; Pascarella, Terenzini, & Hibel, 1978) has been conducted in this area and shows that these interactions are linked to many positive outcomes such as the social integration of students into the college community, retention, institutional commitment, academic achievement, career aspirations, and academic self-image. Moreover, mentoring is linked with the enhancement of professional confidence and identity (Johnson, 2007). The outcomes related to these relationships represent an academic, career, and institutional commitment impact on the college student.

One form of these out-of-classroom relationships is the mentoring relationships between faculty and student. There is a broad understanding of what a mentoring relationship is throughout the literature (e.g., Allen, Rhodes, & Eby, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985; Zachary, 2005). However, some descriptions and definitions do exist. In her study of workplace mentoring, Kram described mentorship as a relationship between a younger adult (mentee) and an older more experienced adult (mentor) that aids the younger person in navigating the adult world. A mentor serves as a support, guide, and counsel for the mentee as he or she enters the work world. Similarly, Johnson and Ridley (2004) defined mentorship as,

> …dynamic, reciprocal, personal relationships in which a more experienced person (mentor) acts as a guide, role model, teacher, and sponsor of a less experienced person (protégé). Mentors provide protégés with knowledge, advice, counsel, support, and opportunity in the protégé's pursuit of full membership in a particular profession. (p. xv)

Mentorship is viewed as an important relationship for personal, academic, and professional development (Jacobi, 1991; Daloz, 1986; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978; Ramani, Gruppen, & Kachur, 2006) and potentially offers opportunities for faculty to impact students positively. Kram (1985) identified a set of career and psychosocial functions within the mentoring relationship that enhance the growth and development of both the mentor and mentee. These functions are roles or behaviors that can be demonstrated throughout the cycle of mentorship.

Of particular interest to this study was the perceived impact of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentorship for undergraduate students. Kram (1985) noted that the functions demonstrated by the mentor vary and impact the overall strength of the relationship. A relationship that consists of both career and psychosocial functions is considered to be a stronger and more intimate relationship. Kram's career functions consist of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protecting, and challenging assignments. Her psychosocial functions consist of role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. As an attempt to emulate benefits derived from these types of behaviors in informal mentoring, many formal mentoring programs were created to address both the academic and psychosocial needs of students to achieve student success (Jacobi, 1991).

Student success generally implies the retention of students in a degree program, improvement of grades, or increased number of students that participate in programming within the university setting (Campbell, 2007). Many formal mentoring programs were established to meet these needs. Issues such as retention, socialization, career and personal decision making, at-risk students, and leadership development were listed within the literature as target areas of formal mentoring programs (Campbell; Jacobi, 1991; Santos & Reigadas, 2005).

While these relationships appear to be beneficial to both the mentee and mentor (Ramani et al., 2006), problems have existed in the actual understanding of the relationship. There is no universally accepted definition of mentoring (Zachary, 2005), nor is there universal agreement on the mentoring functions and their meaning (Jacobi, 1991). Thus, it can be said that it is difficult to delineate what a mentor is (definition) and what a mentor does (functions). The lack of a clear definition could negatively impact both communication and the expectations within the mentor and mentee relationship (English, 1998). Additionally, it has become increasingly difficult to evaluate the process of mentoring without an operational definition, thus, leaving a broad interpretation of the success of these types of relationships (Jacobi; Santos & Reigadas, 2005).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to determine the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentoring relationships between university personnel and undergraduate students at selected Nazarene higher education institutions.

The use of mentoring relationships in diverse settings and its wide-range of potential benefit produced definitional and conceptual confusion about the actual relationship (Allen et al., 2007; Jacobi, 1991). As a result, many different definitions exist, some of which conflict, leading to issues of clarity (Jacobi). More specific to this study, there was no universally accepted definition of mentoring within the field of higher education (Allen et al.; English, 1998; Jacobi; Johnson, 2003; Luna & Cullen, 1995; Zachary, 2005).

Additionally, while mentoring appears to be a popular term used to describe the relationship between faculty and students, there is very little known about the nature and prevalence of such relationships within higher education (Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, 2007). Informal mentoring relationships may not be officially recognized or sanctioned within the institution and could be so ingrained in the culture that they get little attention (Mullen, 2007; Zachary, 2005). Moreover, formal mentoring programs are so diverse among higher education institutions that they actually had little in common, thus leading to difficulties in evaluating whether or not such programs were effective for student success (Jacobi).

Furthermore, a search through the literature produced very little information on the spiritual impact of mentoring relationships between faculty and traditional undergraduate students. There was no evidence on the influence of a specific set of spiritual functions demonstrated by the mentor within the literature for higher education. Instead, only the career and psychosocial functions were cited as the common mentoring functions demonstrated by a mentor (Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985; Mullen, 2007). Most of the research pointed to the potential academic, career, and personal benefits of mentoring relationships (Jacobi; Kram) with no specific spiritual outcomes.

Background

The term *mentor* originated from Greek mythology. The actual word itself was the name of a character in Homer's *Odyssey* (Warren, 2005). Mentor, the mythical figure, was given the responsibility of overseeing Telemachus, son of Odysseus. Odysseus entrusted his friend, Mentor, with the care and protection of Telemachus in his absence as he fought in the Trojan War (Kuhn & Padak, 2006). Mentor was recognized as a very wise and competent friend who served as an influential figure for Telemachus in his father's absence (Johnson & Ridley, 2004). Mentor's guiding relationship of Telemachus began the understanding of the word *mentor* as it is currently used today (Ramani et al., 2006).

The research on the concept of mentoring originated from three particular fields: education, management, and psychology (Zachary, 2005). Researchers identified two types of mentoring relationships, formal and informal mentoring (i.e., Allen et al., 2007; English, 1998; Mee-Lee & Bush, 2003; Zachary). Informal mentoring relationships are believed to have occurred on some level for centuries (Allen et al.; Zachary). These relationships are characterized as reciprocal and developing naturally between individuals without a structured set of expectations (English). Informal mentoring relationships occur spontaneously and develop at a level that is dictated by the individuals (Zachary). Essentially, the pace and expectations of the relationship are determined by the mentor and mentee. According to Zachary, these relationships may also be referred to as unstructured, casual, or natural mentoring relationships.

Formal mentoring relationships are characterized by intentionally pairing the more experienced (senior) individuals with the younger (junior), lesser experienced individuals with specific goals and practices to be implemented during the process (Kram, 1985). Such terms as structured, planned, or organized mentoring have been used to describe these relationships (Zachary, 2005). Zachary pointed to the mid to late 1970s as a period of time that formal mentoring programs became popular. The popularity and implementation of formal mentoring programs were traced back to the business field as a means to allow for senior employees to train the younger, more inexperienced protégés (Zachary). In fact, formal mentoring programs were established by such companies as Coca Cola, General Electric, and Proctor & Gamble (Luna & Cullen, 1998). The initial premise of formal mentoring programs was the transfer of information as a product with career development implications (Kram; Zachary).

As these mentoring strategies became more popular, the overall understanding of mentoring began to change. The concept of mentoring evolved from a product to a process (Zachary, 2005). According to Zachary, mentorship evolved from a "product-oriented model" to a "process-oriented relationship" (p. 2). As outlined by Zachary, no longer was mentoring about the mere transfer of knowledge from an older, more experienced employee to a younger protégé. It became a relational process that involved a more personal investment between the mentor and mentee. The mentoring relationship was beginning to get more attention, thus leading to personal development as opposed to just the career development of the mentee.

Both formal and informal mentoring relationships continue to be widespread in the field of higher education (Campbell, 2007). It is believed that informal mentoring occurs so naturally within organizations that it happens without much attention and recognition from the organization itself (Zachary, 2005). Many colleges and universities created formal mentoring programs as a means to address retention and socialization issues among college students (Jacobi, 1991). Additionally, formal mentoring programs have been utilized to address issues of at-risk and under-represented students (Santos & Reigadas, 2005). These programs served as means to provide mentoring opportunities for all students as many researchers suggested that minority students and women received less mentoring (Campbell; Ferrari, 2004; Jacobi; Santos & Reigadas**).**

The issue of retention is related to the mentoring relationship in higher education as it applies to student-faculty interaction. Pascarella and Terenzini (1979) pointed out that student and faculty interaction outside of the classroom is related to the retention rate of students. Moreover, as outlined by Nagda et al. (1998) the lack of integration into college culture was a factor with attrition which is directly related to a weak bond with student-faculty interactions. The emphasis placed on the informal contact between students and faculty outside of the classroom is a key to helping students integrate into the college environment. Specifically, it helps students in their academic and social integration within the institution (Nagda et al.).

The importance of the student-faculty relationship outside of the classroom cannot be overlooked, particularly as it applies to informal mentoring relationships. These informal relationships are believed to last longer and possess a stronger interpersonal bond between the mentor and mentee (Kram, 1985; Mullen, 2007). The depth of the mentoring relationship allows the groundwork for the sharing of values between the mentor and mentee. Johnson and Ridley (2004) alluded to the sharing of values as an indicator of a strong relationship. It is not rare for protégés to accept some of the values of the mentor as their own as a result of the mentoring relationship (Johnson & Ridley).

Johnson and Ridley (2004) listed such values as ethical-moral, societal, and religious areas where a protégé can be influenced by the mentor. The religious influence of the mentor was one of the interests in the current study. There is some debate regarding whether or not a mentor should have an impact on the values of the protégé. However, Johnson and Ridley believed it is impossible for the mentor not to have an impact in this way. They stated,

> Protégés adopt the behaviors, professional practices, and over time, the values of an influential mentor. Although experts may caution mentors to be “value neutral” in dealings with protégés, we assert that this is an improbably stance. Protégés inevitably will become aware of the mentor’s values on important issues no matter how much the mentor strives for neutrality. Therefore, “neutrality” is neither realistic nor desirable. It is preferable that protégés see the mentor’s value positions without feeling coerced to adopt them. (p. 59)

Overall, mentoring relationships were viewed as a key for academic, personal, and professional development (e.g., Jacobi, 1991; Levinson et al., 1978; Kram, 1985; Ramani et al., 2006). Ferrari (2004) emphasized a holistic approach to mentoring that included more than just an academic focus. Formal mentoring programs have become more popular to address a wide range of student needs (Campbell, 2007). These programs are diverse and have little standardization, thus leading to difficulties in evaluation (Jacobi). The focus of this study was on the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions mentoring relationships within selected Nazarene Higher Education Institutions (NHEI).

A search through the literature presented very little information on mentoring within NHEI.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What were undergraduate students’ perceptions of who serves as a mentor among university personnel?
2. To what extent were the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions utilized in the mentoring relationships for undergraduate students at Nazarene higher educational institutions?
3. What was the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions among undergraduate mentees?

Description of Terms

The following definitions provide clarity to the terms used in this dissertation:

Attrition. Attrition was used to describe the reduction in the overall numbers of the student body over a span of time.

Career functions. The functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments that were specific to the advancement in one’s career.

Discipleship. The intentional teaching of religious beliefs or values (using personal testimonies, scripture, religious readings) between the mentor and mentee that enhanced their religious, personal, and career development.

Formal mentoring. The intentional pairing of a mentor and mentee(s) in a structured relationship that may include specific goals and expectations to serve as the guide for the mentor and mentee process within an organization.

Informal mentoring. The natural or spontaneous development of a mentoring relationship that was reciprocal in nature and was characterized by the self-motivated nature of the mentor and mentee.

Integration of faith and learning. This phrase was used to describe the effort or process of connecting the academic disciplines to religious convictions within the context of higher education.

Mentee or protégé. The younger and/or inexperienced person that enters into a developmental relationship with an older or more experienced individual for the purpose of career, personal, and academic achievement.

Mentor. A trusted, more experienced person within the mentoring relationship who engages in a mutually beneficial relationship with a younger or more inexperienced person in an attempt to impact their career, personal, and academic achievement positively.

Mentoring functions. The roles or behaviors demonstrated by the mentor within a mentoring relationship that enhanced the career, personal, and academic development of the mentee.

Mission statement. This term refers to the identifying statement on behalf of an organization to communicate its purpose, mission, and values.

Nazarene higher education institution (NHEI). This term refers to the colleges and universities located within the United States that have a Nazarene denominational affiliation.

Psychosocial functions. The functions of role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, friendship, and counseling that are specific to personal development (e.g., identity, social interaction, competence) and were considered to be more intimate.

Retention. This term is used in higher education to describe the rate at which a college or university retains the student population from freshman year.

Social and Behavioral Sciences Department. The departments varied among the selected Nazarene higher education institutions so the majors of Behavioral Science, Psychology, Social Work, Sociology, and Criminal Justice (or Criminology) were utilized for the purpose of this study.

Spiritual accountability. The act of providing positive and negative feedback concerning a commitment to faith between a mentor and mentee that encourages a sense of religious responsibility.

Spiritual advising. The act of sharing sensitive or personal information (e.g., faith, relationships, hardships, and decision making) with a trusted individual to gain a religious perspective.

Spiritual functions. The functions of spiritual accountability, advising, discipleship, and prayer containing specific Christian religious connotations separate from the career and psychosocial functions.

Spiritual impact. This term was used to describe whether faculty demonstrated or communicated in a Christian way through the mentoring relationship with undergraduate students.

Social impact. The term used to evaluate whether the social affiliation with faculty in mentoring relationships positively or negatively influenced the mentee's social integration into the university or college environment.

Student success. This term was used to describe the holistic development of the college student (academic, social, and spiritual) that resulted in retention and eventual graduation from the college or university.

Traditional undergraduate student. This term referred to unmarried college students within the age range of 17-23 who were pursuing their undergraduate degree while living on campus at the college or university (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Significance of the Study

Mentoring relationships occur both formally and informally throughout higher education. Some institutions organize formal mentoring programs that focus on a specific set of goals and values (Kram, 1985). Other institutions support mentoring indirectly by encouraging faculty to enter into these relationships without giving much direction or supervision (Campbell, 2007). Additionally, mentoring occurs naturally between some faculty and students that evolves over time without the need of encouragement from administration (Zachary, 2005).

Mentoring is a popular activity among colleges and universities (Campbell, 2007). It is widespread in its use across academia. The problem exists in the diverse meaning and understanding of what mentoring actually is. There is no universal definition of mentoring (Allen et al., 2007; English, 1998; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, 2003; Luna & Cullen, 1995; Zachary, 2005). Moreover, a search through the literature did not present a definition of mentoring within higher education that included an emphasis on the spiritual impact of the student. According to Johnson (2007), there is very little known about the prevalence of mentoring within higher education. This study gave some information regarding the prevalence of mentoring among undergraduate students at select Nazarene institutions.

The outcome of this investigation provided information regarding the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentoring relationships between university personnel and undergraduate students at selected Nazarene higher education institutions. Moreover, the potential implications on the spiritual functions in the mentoring relationships with undergraduate students was a unique feature of this investigation as there was little information presented within the literature regarding the presence or influence of these types of functions.

Process to Accomplish

The researcher conducted survey research using a quantitative methodology on mentoring undergraduate students in four selected NHEI to determine the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions in their mentoring relationships with university personnel. The study was explorative in nature with the intent on collecting data regarding the perceptions of traditional undergraduate students on their mentoring relationships with university personnel.

The research populations were traditional undergraduate students at the four selected Nazarene colleges and universities within the United States. For the sample, students in the Behavioral Science Department of these institutions were chosen to participate in the study. The disciplines within these departments included Behavioral Sciences, Psychology, Sociology, Social Work, and Criminal Justice.

To address the first major research question regarding the perceptions of who served as mentors, an online survey was conducted. The survey asked the students to identify university personnel. The choices were academic advisor, administrator, athletic coach, chaplain, peer, professor, resident assistant, resident director, staff personnel, other, and an option to choose if there was no mentor. In the case students chose the "other" option, they were asked to specify the individual's role and title within the university. Moreover, students were not limited as to the number of individuals that served as a mentor. From the choices selected, students were asked to identify the most important mentoring relationship to answer the rest of the survey questions. The data were analyzed quantitatively using a frequency of occurrence.

To answer research question two, undergraduate students were asked to identify which career (sponsorship, exposure, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments), psychosocial (role modeling, friendship, counseling, acceptance and confirmation), and spiritual (spiritual accountability, spiritual advising, discipleship, and prayer) functions were present within their mentoring relationship with university personnel. Students were not limited to selecting one career, psychosocial, or spiritual function. Instead, they were given the opportunity to select all that applied to their most important mentoring relationship. These data were investigated quantitatively. The responses were compared and analyzed with a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

To determine the importance of career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions from undergraduate mentees, the students were asked to identify the most important functions. The data were analyzed using chi-square analysis.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

While the origin of the term “mentor” may have evolved from Greek mythology, there is no date of evolution for this type of relationship. It is unknown how far back these types of relationships have existed. According to Zachary (2005), it is believed that informal mentoring relationships have occurred for hundreds of years. There were glimpses of the mentoring relationship through some of the early European Universities. For instance, Oxford University adopted a form of mentoring where tutors (or Dons) acted as mentors (Davis, 2005). These tutors lived with the students at the university and were responsible for overseeing more than just the academic success of the students. They were charged with overseeing the personal and social development of students as well (Davis).

Mentoring could also be traced back to the Industrial Revolution in the form of apprenticeships. The need for skilled workers within the trades led to a more career-focused relationship of master-apprentice (Davis, 2005). The apprentice would shadow the master and learn the skills necessary for successful work. This form of induction into the work force was crucial to the continuance and improvement of many occupations (English, 1998). Presently, mentorship continues to be an effective means of induction within the trades.

A more traceable facet of this relationship may be the work of research. According to Zachary (2005), research on the mentoring relationship can be traced back to the mid-1970s to present where much of the focus was in the fields of education, management, and psychology. Much of the work was qualitative in nature, with an interest in understanding why this may be a significant relationship. The focus of the research was on three broad areas: mentoring of youth, faculty-student mentoring, and mentoring within the workplace (Allen & Eby, 2007).

What is Mentoring?

Today, the overall understanding of mentorship is very broad. There is no universal definition of mentoring used for higher education or any other field for that matter. In fact, there are many terms that are synonymous with mentoring. Terms such as teacher, advisor, or sponsor have been used synonymously with mentoring (Pando, 1993). Additionally, friend and wise person have been used equally (Davis, 2005). Kuhn and Padak (2006) listed terms such, "…guide, tutor, teacher, example, precursor, guru, coach, advocate, and sponsor" (p. 1) that are synonymously related to mentorship. Allen (2006) listed words such as, "Guide, mediator, encourager, coach, and tutor" (p. 31). The tantamount versions of mentorship add to the difficulty in the overall understanding of this relationship.

A search through the literature presented little as far as a consensus on an overall definition of mentoring. In fact, there were many different definitions among the literature. Works such as Levinson et al., (1978) described mentorship when they stated:

> The true mentor, in the meaning intended here, serves as an analogue in adulthood of the 'good enough' parent for the child. He fosters the young adult's

> development by believing in him, sharing the youthful Dream and giving it his blessing, helping to define the newly emerging self in its newly discovered world, and creating a space in which the young man can work on a reasonably satisfactory life structure that contains that Dream. (pp. 98-99)

Levinson and colleagues provided one of the earliest attempts at defining the mentoring relationship (Johnson, 2003). They conducted a study on the lives of 40 men in which there were specific accounts of where these men attributed mentoring relationships as being important to their development. Their work was cited frequently within the literature (e.g., Allen, et al., 2007; Ferrari, 2004; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1980; 1985; Luna & Cullen, 1998) and was one of the pioneers for research on the mentoring relationship.

Furthermore, Kram (1985) explained mentorship as, “a relationship between a younger adult and an older, more experienced adult that helps the younger individual learn to navigate in the adult world and the world of work” (p. 2). Kram was noted for some of her contributions to the concept of mentoring. Many researchers (e.g., Davis, 2005; English, 1998; Johnson & Ridley, 2004; Mullen, 2007; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Warren, 2005) pointed to Kram’s mentoring functions and phases of the mentoring relationship.

In addition, Daloz (1986) was recognized by some for his contributions to mentoring in higher education regarding his work, *Effective Teaching and Mentoring* (e.g., Cannister, 1999; English, 1998; Luna & Cullen, 1998; Pando, 1993). Specifically, Daloz was noted as providing one of the most thorough insights into the mentoring relationships between faculty and student in higher education (English). Daloz may be best known for his comparison of education to a “transformational journey” for the student (p. 16). In this comparison, Daloz explained that the mentor should serve as a guide for the student along this part of their journey. He stated:

> Mentors are guides. They lead us along the journey of our lives. We trust them because they have been there before. They embody our hopes, cast light on the way ahead, interpret arcane signs, warn us of lurking dangers, and point out unexpected delights along the way. (p. 17)

While there were many differences within the definitions and descriptions, Davis (2005) outlined two commonalities within the research. First, the mentor is viewed as being more experienced as compared to the protégé. Some researchers (e.g., Day, 2006; Kram, 1985; Levinson et al., 1978; Ramani et al., 2006) emphasized the mentor as a person that is older than the protégé or mentee. In fact, Day stated that a mentor is traditionally 8-15 years older than the mentee. With the recent trends on peer mentorship, those views have changed somewhat. Overall, being more experienced as opposed to an emphasis on age appears to be the more consistent means of describing the relationship.

According to Davis (2005), the second consistent theme among the definitions and descriptions of mentorship is the developmental nature of this relationship. It can be both for personal and/or professional development. As Allen (2006) explained, “They serve as a catalyst to transform as they instruct, counsel, guide and facilitate the development of others” (p. 30). The perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual mentoring functions were of particular interest to this study.

While commonalities existed, there was no universally accepted definition of mentoring within the literature. Theorists disagreed on the definitions, roles, and functions of the mentoring relationship. However, Jacobi (1991) outlined five components of mentoring that were consistent within the literature:

1. Mentoring relationships are helping relationships designed to assist and support the mentee in the achievement of their goals (e.g., graduation, promotion).
2. Mentoring relationships include any or all of the following: (a) emotional or psychological support, (b) support in career and professional development, and (c) role modeling.
3. The protégés are not the only benefactor in the mentoring relationship. Mentorship is considered to be a reciprocal relationship where the mentor may benefit emotionally in some way.
4. Mentorship is a personal relationship.
5. The mentor, as opposed to the protégé, is considered to be the more experienced and influential figure within an organization.

These components are not meant to substitute for a definition of mentoring. Instead, these characteristics give a basis to work from in understanding the mentoring relationship.

For the purpose of this study, the following definition was used to describe mentoring:

> Mentorship can be described as a relationship between a more experienced and knowledgeable adult (mentor) and a younger, more inexperienced adult (mentee) with the purpose of helping the younger person as they find maturity and enter the world of work. A mentor assists the mentee by providing support, direction, and counsel as he or she achieves this task.

This definition was based off of Kram’s (1985) description of the mentor relationship.

Mentoring Functions

Just as it was difficult to come to a consensus on an overall definition of mentoring, it was just as difficult to come to a consensus on the roles and functions of a mentor. Kram (1985) was a good place to start in understanding the mentoring relationship as many researchers (e.g., Davis, 2005; Erdem & Ozen, 2008; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson & Ridley, 2004; Luna & Cullen, 1998; Mullen, 2007; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Young & Perrewe, 2004) cited her for her research on mentoring functions and/or phases of mentorship. Kram’s (1980) original research identified a set of mentoring functions specific to mentorship within the workplace.

Kram (1980) explored the relationships between junior and senior managers within the workplace. A qualitative methodology was used with biographical interviews as the main method of collecting data on 18 relationships within a single organization. The organization was characterized as a “large northeastern public utility of 15,000 employees” (p. 36). The management population (4,000 managers) was hierarchical in nature with five different levels of administration identified in the study. Female and male managers (between the ages of 25 to 35) interviewed about their job histories. Additionally, they were asked about the relationships they experienced along the way that contributed to their development. Similarly, the senior managers, including some that were identified as “significant others” from younger managers, were asked to expound on their job histories and key relationships according to their development.

An analysis of the interviews was conducted and categorized according to certain themes that became evident. The purpose of her the study was to develop an understanding of the developmental relationships that existed among junior and senior employees. Based on the interviews, Kram (1980) noted that there were crucial characteristics within developmental relationships that were reflected in a variety of functions.

Mentoring functions were what separated a normal working relationship from a developmental relationship. Kram (1985) defined mentoring functions as "…those aspects of a developmental relationship that enhance both individual's growth and advancement" (p. 22). Of particular interest to this study was the mentee's (traditional undergraduate students) perceived importance of functions demonstrated by the mentor. Kram (1980) listed two categories of mentoring functions through an analysis of the interviews with research participants: career functions and psychosocial functions.

The career functions were those facets of the mentoring relationship that aided the protégés with their advancement in an organization. In a sense, the mentor helped the mentee "learn the ropes" within the hierarchical structure of an organization. These functions were based more on the mentor's position within the organization. The mentor's experience, organizational rank or status, and influence were potentially helpful to the protégé within the organizational framework. It is in this role that the mentor could exhibit such qualities as sponsorship, coaching, exposure-and-visibility, protection, and challenging assignments to aid the mentee in the potential advancement within an organization.

Each of these functions was unique and could be critical for the advancement of the mentee's career within an organization (Kram, 1985). Sponsorship was described as the active nomination of the mentee for moves or promotions within the organization. The exposure-and-visibility function involved the intentional assignment of responsibilities that would allow the mentee to establish relationships with important figures that could play a role in future advancement within the organization. The career function of coaching was compared to the coaching of athletics in that it was the sharing of skills and techniques to accomplish work and achieve career goals. Protection was explained as the willingness to intervene in instances where the mentee may be ill-prepared to handle a given situation. And finally, challenging assignments were characterized by entrusting difficult tasks to the mentee so he or she could develop technical skills and competencies that could result in a sense of accomplishment.

Kram’s (1985) psychosocial functions were those facets of the mentoring relationship that were more personal in nature. The mentor could demonstrate such qualities as role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship for the protégé. These functions may impact the mentee’s feelings of competence, uniqueness, and success in their professional position within an organization. The relationship was characterized more by the impact on the protégé’s relationship with self and others as opposed to the relationship with the organization. In other words, these functions carry over to the personal context of a relationship as opposed to an organizational context.

Like the career functions, the psychosocial functions were unique and differed in meaning. Role modeling was the representation of the mentor’s attitudes, values, and behaviors of the idealized person that the mentee could become. These may be features of the mentor that the mentee admired and respected. The acceptance-and-confirmation function was demonstrated by the mentor through support and encouragement of the mentee as he or she strived to get established within the organization. In the counseling function, the mentor provided a platform for self-exploration of the mentee by listening and offering personal advice and experience as the mentee attempts to resolve personal and professional issues. Finally, the psychosocial function of friendship was characterized by the mutual liking and enjoyment of the social interactions from the mentor and mentee. The friendship function may give the mentee a sense of equality with the mentor and serve as an escape from the pressures of work.

The degree to which the career and psychosocial functions appeared within the mentoring relationship varied. Kram (1985) listed three factors that influence which functions will appear in the mentoring relationship. First, the developmental needs of the mentor and mentee determine which functions will be sought and offered in a potential relationship. Second, the interpersonal skills of both the mentor and protégé may determine whether a relationship is sustained. Finally, the organizational context may impact the demonstrated functions based on hierarchy, opportunities, and whether or not such relationships are encouraged within the work environment. In summary, a mentoring relationship that contains all of the career and psychosocial functions is ideal for a protégé within the working environment.

Luna and Cullen (1998) conducted a survey on graduate students based on Kram’s (1980) career and psychosocial functions. A total of 109 students were surveyed and asked a variety of questions concerning mentoring. Ninety of the respondents indicated that it was important for graduate students to have a mentor. Fifty-three percent placed an emphasis on mentoring behaviors such as of role modeling, guidance and support, listening, and building self-confidence. These skills were listed among Kram’s psychosocial functions. The students indicated that these were important functions demonstrated by mentors.

Many of Kram's (1985) mentoring functions were found in the work of Johnson and Ridley (2004). They came up with 57 elements of mentoring that were created from over 1,000 mentoring publications from the fields of business, psychology, and education (see Appendix A). Johnson and Ridley described these elements of mentoring as behaviors or functions of mentoring. These elements were viewed as skills and compared to tools in a toolbox. The mentor must know when to use the appropriate tool within the mentoring relationship. Many of these elements would be dependent on the protégé. Mentors were encouraged to use different tools at each stage of development for the protégé.

Jacobi (1991) articulated 15 different mentoring functions from many of the authors cited within the literature on mentoring. These functions have value because many theorists and researchers have attempted to define mentoring by identifying the functions or roles demonstrated by the mentor. Jacobi listed such characteristics as: Acceptance/support/encouragement, advice/guidance, bypass bureaucracy/access to resources, challenge/opportunity/plum assignments, clarify values/clarify goals, coaching, information, protection, role model, social status/reflected credit, socialization/host and guide, sponsorship/advocacy, stimulate acquisition of knowledge, training/instruction, and visibility/exposure, in her literature review on mentoring. It is important to note that while many researchers may agree with some of these functions within the mentoring relationship, they may disagree on how to define each function. For instance, sponsorship to one theorist may mean something completely different to another theorist.

Jacobi (1991) attempted to separate the 15 functions into three categories of the mentoring relationship. First, there were some functions that fit within the scope of emotional or psychological support. These were similar to Kram's (1985) psychosocial functions. Secondly, there were some functions that would fit into the direct assistance with career development. Again, this was similar to Kram's career functions. Finally, Jacobi categorized a third component as role modeling. Jacobi chose to distinguish role modeling as a third facet of mentoring.

Overall, what a mentor does was as broad as how a mentor was defined. This reality reaffirmed the overall problem with mentoring. While there are similarities in the understanding of the concept, there is still no universally accepted definition for this type of relationship. The particular interest of this investigation was to gain insights into the undergraduate student mentee's perceptions of career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentorship. A review of the characteristics of the relationship was needed to understand better the dynamics between mentor and protégé. It should be noted that there were no spiritual functions of mentoring listed within the literature.

The Nature of the Mentoring Relationship

Each mentoring relationship is unique and was dependent on the needs of the mentor and mentee (Pando, 1993). Research (e.g., Allen & Poteet, 1999; Kalbfleish & Davies, 1993; Kram, 1980; Levinson et al., 1978; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000) has been conducted to better understand the nature of this relationship. Topics such as how the mentoring relationships are initiated, the phases of mentorship, and the length of the relationship were discussed within the literature, all of which added a very diverse perspective on the dynamics between the mentor and protégé.

Relationship initiation varies depending on whether the mentoring relationship was formal or informal. In a formal mentoring relationship, the mentor and protégé may not have much control over how the relationship is initiated. A mentor and mentee are more likely to be assigned in a formalized mentoring program and may not have had any prior knowledge of each other (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006). An emphasis is given toward matching a mentor to a mentee. The details of this process were included in a later section within this chapter.

According to Ragins et al., (2000), informal mentoring relationships were formed by mutual identification between the mentor and mentee. A mentor may choose a protégé based on perceived potential and/or the protégé’s need for help, and the protégé may choose a mentor based on whom they view as a good role model (Allen, Poteet, & Russell, 2000; Kram, 1985, Ragins et al., 2000). The more gifted students or employees may grab the attention of the mentor. Kalbfleisch and Davies (1993) concluded that the protégé’s ability to communicate and feelings of self-worth were directly related to their participation in a mentoring relationship. Other factors such as perceived similarities, the ability to identify with the protégé, and the interpersonal comfort were listed in the literature as factors that may attract the mentor (Kram, 1983, 1985; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Ragins et al., 2000). In a sense, the mentor may seek a protégé that serves as a reminder of him or her when coming through the ranks.

It is important to note that many informal mentoring relationships develop naturally between a mentor and mentee. They are based on mutual attraction and are evolutionary in nature (Kram, 1985, Levinson et al., 1978). The relationship changes over time as would any other personal relationship. In fact, there is some research on the phases of mentorship (Kram, 1980).

In her study, Kram (1980) concluded that the developmental mentoring relationships between senior and junior managers are evolutionary in nature. To describe the relationship solely in terms of the career and psychosocial functions is inadequate. Instead, mentorships are developmental in nature and may be best explained in phases. Kram identified four phases of mentorship based on a biographical interview study of 18 work relationships. The first phase is the *initiation* phase which lasts from six months to one year and is characterized by the acknowledgement of a mentoring relationship between the mentor and mentee with the communication of expectations and guidelines. The second phase is the *cultivation* phase lasting from two to five years and is identified when the mentor and mentee form a deepened emotional bond with more frequent and meaningful interactions. The *separation* phase follows lasting a period of six months to two years and is characterized by the mentee seeking independence from the mentor with the interactions becoming more infrequent. Finally, the *redefinition* phase results lasting indefinitely after the third phase and is characterized by a new appreciation for the former mentoring relationship thus ending in a peer-like bond between the mentor and mentee.

Kram's (1983) phases of the mentorship illustrate the developmental nature of the relationship. Through her observations of the cultivation phase, the junior employee (protégé) has a sense of vision and excitement for his or her future within the organization. The protégé recognizes the senior employee as a benchmark or role model to achieve their dream. The senior employee (mentor) is at a point of midlife and finds vitality in taking a junior employee under his or her wing. The mentor has a sense of leaving a legacy upon mentoring a younger employee.

Within the cultivation phase, the career and psychosocial functions peak. As the interpersonal bond between the mentor and mentee strengthens over time, the psychosocial functions emerge resulting in intimacy and trust. A shift to mutuality begins as the senior employee (mentor) is able to take pride in the efforts and accomplishments of the younger employee (protégé). Likewise, the mentee grows in appreciation for the support and guidance from the mentor. Kram (1985) described this as the most positive stage in which there is little conflict and the least amount of insecurity.

The separation phase is characterized by significant changes within the relationship between the mentor and mentee. By now, the protégé has developed a sense of independence from the mentor. He or she would not need the support and guidance given from the mentor. The mentor is faced with the reality of not being needed in the same way during this phase. He or she has to come to terms that his influence is not as important as it once was. Both the mentor and mentee deals with loss during this phase. The relationship will never be the same as a result of this stage.

Finally, the redefinition phase completes the levels of mentoring. According to Kram’s (1980) study on the workplace relationships, this phase is characterized by a new outlook from both the mentor and mentee. It is more of a peer relationship between the two. The mentor continues to support the mentee and takes pride in his accomplishments. The mentee now enters the new relationship on equal ground with a sense of gratitude for the support along the way. The mentor and mentee establish a new sense of friendship based on equality.

Kram’s (1983) phases of mentorship provide an in-depth look at the relationship paying attention to the emotional bond between the mentor and mentee. Kram discussed intimacy and trust within the cultivation phase of mentoring. While the literature suggested that mentoring relationships varied in relationship intensity (e.g., Allen et al., 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Levinson et al., 1978; Ragins et al., 2000), Kram was not alone on her views of the level of intimacy and trust within the relationship. Other theorists (e.g., Allen & Poteet, 1999; Bennetts, 2002; Erdem & Ozen, 2008; Jacobi, 1991; Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1993; Levinson et al., 1978) have touched on this emotional intimacy within mentorship. In fact, Levinson et al. described the mentorship as a “love relationship” (p. 100) and compared it to one of the most intense relationships such as how a parent loves a child.

According to Bennetts (2002), intimacy appears to be a key part of the mentoring relationship. Likewise, Erdem and Ozen (2008) stated, “Satisfaction with a mentoring relationship depends on the nature of the interaction between the mentor and protégé. Mentoring is seen as an extremely powerful human relationship, and just as in all personal relationships, trust is a key component” (p. 56).

The results of Allen and Poteet’s (1999) study supported this thought. They investigated a set of ideal mentoring characteristics. Twenty-seven mentor participants were chosen from five different institutions. A qualitative methodology was used to collect data by using semi-structured interviews. Mentors were questioned about their experiences as a mentor and as a mentee (if applicable) and asked about the characteristics they felt were ideal for a mentor to possess. The content was analyzed and broken down into categories and groups. Out of 20 dimensions listed, trustworthiness was listed in the top four as an ideal mentoring characteristic. Trustworthiness followed communication skills, patience, and knowledge of the organization.

These results supported the idea of the interpersonal nature of mentoring relationships and lend credence to Kram's (1985) perspectives regarding the psychosocial functions within mentoring. The frequency of meetings between the mentor and mentee may aid in this process. The more the two could meet and spend meaningful time together, the better the outcomes (Kram).

Just as there was some dissention within the research about the emotional depth of the mentoring relationship (Jacobi, 1991; Mullen, 2007), there was also a broad perspective on the duration of mentorship. Some of the earlier research (e.g., Kram, 1980; Levinson et al., 1978) on mentorship described this relationship in terms of lasting for multiple years. In fact, each of Kram's (1985) phases could last from six months to two years. Levinson et al. describe the relationship lasting two to three years on average and eight to ten at most.

The research appeared to be divided on the length of the relationship (Jacobi, 1991). Some of the research (e.g., Guetzloe, 1997; Sosik, Lee, & Bouquillon, 2005) focused in the field of education viewed the relationship in terms of one year or less as it was geared toward formal mentoring programs for youths or first year students entering college. Many of these formal mentoring programs had a structured timetable for mentoring. A natural end to the mentoring relationship may occur as a student finishes a program. Overall, like the emotional intensity, mentoring relationships vary in degree and form.

Types of Mentoring Relationships

Traditionally, the general understanding of mentorship is viewed as a one-on-one relationship between the mentor and mentee. Much of the literature (e.g., Day, 2006; English, 1998; Jacobi, 1991; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Kram, 1985; Levinson et al., 1978) described the relationship in this way. Researchers (i.e., Allen et al., 2007; English; Mee-Lee & Bush, 2003; Zachary, 2005) generally referred to two types of mentoring relationships, formal and informal. These two forms of mentorship could be considered the basic forms of mentoring and were discussed in this section. However, other forms of mentoring have evolved over time as a means to maximize the potential benefits of the mentoring relationship.

Formal and informal mentoring relationships differ on a fundamental level. Informal mentoring relationships develop spontaneously and evolve over time with the mentor and mentee determining the goals and expectations (Ragins & Cottin, 1999; Sosik et al., 2005). This mutually evolving relationship is seen as being more intimate and potentially offering more of the career and psychosocial functions (Kram, 1985). On the other hand, formal mentoring relationships are orchestrated by the organization with the hopes of producing many of the career and psychosocial benefits of informal mentorship. It is generally viewed that informal mentoring relationships are more productive than the formal mentoring programs (Davis, 2005). In an attempt to draw upon the benefits of these relationships, the organization determines a specific set of goals and expectations for the mentoring relationship in the hopes of achieving positive outcomes.

In spite of the diverse understandings of mentoring, both formal and informal mentoring relationships continue to be widespread in the business, psychology, and education fields. It is believed that informal mentoring occurs so naturally within organizations that it happens without much attention and recognition from the organization itself (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Zachary, 2005). Institutions may not put much of an emphasis on mentoring and therefore do not keep tabs on such relationships. In fact, it is unknown how prevalent these types of informal relationships were (Campbell, 2007).

Formal mentoring, however, is much different. Because these programs are structured and often times administered by the management of an institution, they are more likely to be accounted for in some way (Chao et al., 1992). The goals of these programs are quite diverse. Colleges and universities organize formal mentoring programs as a means to address retention and socialization issues among college students (Jacobi, 1991). More specifically, these types of programs are being used to address issues of at-risk and under-represented students (Santos & Reigadas, 2005). It is believed that formal mentoring programs could benefit minority students and women as the research indicates that each receives less mentoring (Ferrari, 2004; Jacobi; Santos & Reigadas). Further information regarding the research on women and ethnic minorities in mentoring relationships was provided in a later section.

Even though formal and informal mentoring relationships are viewed as an important relationship for early adulthood, it should be noted that mentoring does exist among youth (Keller, 2007). Keller described the mentoring on this level by stating, "…youth mentoring is characterized by a personal relationship in which a caring individual provides consistent companionship, support, and guidance aimed at developing the competence and character of a child or adolescent" (p. 42). The mentor may find himself or herself taking on more responsibility for the adolescent mentee due to the youth’s level of maturity. Keller outlined three different aims of formal or informal mentoring relationships among adolescents. First, the relationships may target the prevention and/or intervention of problematic behaviors or psychosocial risks. Second, mentoring on this level may aim to support adolescents in their development within a particular competency. Finally, the aim of youth mentoring may be to facilitate the integration of adolescents into a community or social network.

The overall benefits of formal and informal mentoring relationships evolve over time to create new understandings and usages of mentorship. For example, Kram (1985) suggested that individuals may have multiple developmental supports as they develop in their careers. This is different from the traditional view of a one-on-one relationship between a mentor and mentee. Kram referred to these multiple sources of support as “relationship constellations.” According to Higgins and Kram (2001), such a suggestion prompts much debate among scholars as to whether or not this perspective lessens the significance or meaning of the original understanding of mentorship. This new outlook on the mentoring relationship allows for a broad understanding of how an individual may receive mentoring assistance from many people. It could be that a person has mentoring relationships with a senior colleague, family member, professor, peer, or other member within the community. Individuals may find numerous mentoring sources to meet their developmental needs as opposed to a single mentoring relationship.

Peer impact is another type of mentorship that evolved. Peer mentorship is different from traditional mentorship in that it is not a hierarchical relationship (Terrion & Leonard, 2007). Instead, peer mentorship can be defined as a helping relationship in which two participants of a similar age and experience engage in a relationship that supports traditional mentoring functions. These functions include the career and psychosocial functions of mentoring. Peer mentoring relationships can occur formally or informally (Terrion & Leonard). They are particularly popular among many college and university programs.

There is some skepticism as to whether or not peer mentoring relationships are as beneficial to a protégé compared to traditional mentoring relationships. For instance, some believe that career functions are limited to simple information sharing among peers due to the lack of experience in a particular career (Davis, 2005). It is a scenario of the blind leading the blind. On the other hand, the psychosocial functions are thought to be highly beneficial among peer mentoring. Similar to the traditional mentoring relationship, such psychosocial functions as confirmation, emotional support, personal encouragement, and friendship were listed as potential benefits to the mentees (Davis; Terrion & Leonard, 2007).

Another form of mentoring relationship that evolves with time is that of group mentoring. According to Davis (2005), group mentoring consists of more than one mentor and more than one protégé where mentoring is conducted as a group activity. Here the protégés are able to experience more than one mentor giving them additional perspectives from other senior leaders. Moreover, mentees are able to learn from each other through peer interaction among the group which provides an additional support network.

Mentoring cohorts are also listed as a form of group mentoring (Mullen, 2007). These cohorts are popular among many colleges and universities to help with graduate dissertation work. Group membership and cohesiveness is an important aspect of persistence in achieving graduate work. A study on 108 doctoral students reported that the groups that felt committed to each other and to the group were more likely to achieve the shared goal of the group. A survey research method, using a *Cohesiveness and Persistence Questionnaire* (CPQ), was administered to doctoral students. Additionally, open-ended responses were included as a supplement to the questionnaire. Respondents from this study considered their group to be a crucial factor in their completion of the program. Themes arose within these responses indicating that the groups were nurturing, supportive, motivating, and encouraging. Furthermore, the group dynamic allowed students to share work, concerns, and frustrations. This reaffirmed the perspective that peer influences within a mentoring structure can positively impact the mentee.

One final alternative form of mentoring that evolved over time was that of online mentoring (Donald, 2007). As the awareness and attention grew for mentoring relationships, so did technology. According to Donald, online mentoring or *e-mentoring* developed as one of the most recent forms of mentoring. This type of mentorship is characterized as a relationship between a mentor (more experienced) and mentee (lesser experienced), primarily using electronic modes of communication, to meet the career and psychosocial functions typically seen in traditional mentoring relationships. Some of the advantages of online mentoring include a wider potential of mentoring options, matching potential with online options, efficiency of time, and less interpersonal discomfort due to using a computer. While online mentoring shows many potential benefits, it is important to note that research is still needed to better understand its implications.

Benefits of Mentorship

It can be said that there are three different stakeholders in many mentoring relationships. There is the mentor, the protégé, and the business or organization. All three of these entities stand to gain from mentoring relationships. The following section is an attempt to discuss each of these beneficiaries. As this study aimed to investigate the impact of mentoring within higher education, each beneficiary was discussed from a broad perspective and narrowed to outcomes within higher education.

As mentoring relationships are seen as helping relationships, it is easy to assume that the protégé would be the greatest beneficiary. Much of the research (e.g., Chao et al., 1992; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Fagenson, 1989; Scandura, 1992; Turban & Dougherty, 1994) supports the overall extrinsic and intrinsic benefits to the protégé. For instance, as a result of mentoring, mentees receive the extrinsic benefits of more promotions (Dreher & Ash; Scandura), higher incomes (Chao et al.; Dreher & Ash), and reported more career mobility (Scandura) than those who were not mentored. Intrinsically, mentees reported higher career satisfaction (Fagenson) and greater emotional stability (Turban & Dougherty) than subjects who were not mentored.

The field of higher education offered more of the same. Earlier works on the faculty-student relationship were conducted to investigate the impact of these relationships outside of the classroom. Chickering's (1969) conceptual model of college impact noted that the informal contact of faculty with students outside of the classroom positively impacted the students' intellectual development, academic achievement, career aspirations, and academic self-image. Furthermore, other research (e.g., Pascarella et al., 1978; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1979; Nagda et al., 1998) on the out-of- classroom influence of faculty concluded that faculty had an influence on students' motivation for academic achievement (Pascarella et al.), persistence in college (Pascarella & Terenzini), and retention (Negada et al.).

The research (e.g., Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000; Thile & Matt, 1995) on mentoring is linked to a number of positive outcomes for student protégés. There is some support for academic outcomes for students. Thile and Matt (1995) conducted an investigation that reported freshmen minority students who participated in a formal mentoring program were less likely to attrite and earned higher GPAs than students who did not experience the same program. Moreover, mentoring relationships made an impact on whether or not students were satisfied with their educational program and institution. Additionally, this thought was supported by Clark et al. (2000) study on nearly 800 subjects. Nearly two-thirds of the students reported having a faculty mentor. Ninety-one percent of those mentored students indicated that their mentorship was a positive experience and mentored graduates were significantly more satisfied with their program as compared to non-mentored graduates.

The research (e.g., Cannister, 1999; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Laing, Tracy, Taylor, & Williams 2002) also supported some personal and psychological benefits of mentoring for the college protégé. Hoffman and Wallach investigated the impact of a formal mentoring program on community college students. A total of 27 students participated in the study. The students in the experimental group (n = 14) were partnered with a mentor and were exposed to various activities (e.g., gardening on campus with mentor) that included tours of a local four year-university. Mentors were selected from the four-year university to serve as mentors with the community college students.

Students were asked to assess the quality of the program in terms of their internal locus of control and self-esteem. These results were compared to a control group (*n* = 13) of students who had not participated in the program. Results indicated that the students participating in the mentoring program showed higher levels of self-esteem and self-confidence. To further the point of personal and psychological benefits, Laing et al. found that mentor relationships high in relational qualities were linked with higher self-esteem and less loneliness among 450 female college students. Cannister found that students were more likely to report a higher level of spiritual well-being after participating in a year-long formal mentoring program when compared to non-mentored peers.

The body of research (e.g, Daloz, 1987; Ferrari, 2004; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1980; Levinson et al., 1978) is vast when considering the implications of the mentoring relationship for the mentee. However, it is documented within the literature that more attention is needed to understand the potential implications for the mentor (Kram, 1985). Levinson and colleagues observed that mentors could be at a plateaued stage in life (middle-age) and may find satisfaction from using their skills and wisdom for an inexperienced protégé. Additionally, there is a sense of rejuvenation for mentors as they work with a creative and youthful protégé. Kram (1985) suggested that the mentor benefits from the psychosocial facets of the relationship (e.g., friendship). However, the mentor may also benefit from career functions. By providing technical and psychological support, the mentee may form a more global base of support within the organization which could help the mentor improve his or her own job performance. Moreover, the mentor could be recognized within the organization for developing young talent.

According to Johnson (2007), empirical research is scarce for the benefits to mentors within higher education. However, a search through the literature did present a study on a large sample of faculty. Busch (1985) conducted a study on 537 education professors from 40 different colleges and universities to ascertain personal outcomes associated with serving as a mentor. Data were collected through a mentoring instrument that was created by the researcher. The results of the study showed that faculty members who had mentors of their own were more likely to have a protégé. The likelihood of these mentors engaging in the mentorship of a mentee was increased due to experiencing the benefits of once being a protégé themselves. The benefit to the mentor that was mentioned most often through the study was the observation of the career and intellectual growth of the mentee. There was a sort of fulfillment for the mentor in developing a protégé both personally and professionally. Additionally, the faculty mentors indicated a sense of their own career development through serving as a mentor. It requires the mentors to stay on the cutting edge of the field in order to impact their students positively. These benefits were consistent to the observations of Kram (1985) and Levinson et al. (1978).

The third stakeholder that stands to gain from the mentoring relationship is the organization itself. According to Zey (1991), mentoring does not exist just for the sake of the mentor and mentee. It exists because of the overall impact and benefit to the organization. It stands to reason that if the relationship benefits the employees (mentors and mentees), then it should benefit the overall organization. Zey outlined the potential benefits to an organization as result of mentoring. For instance, he listed the integration of an individual into the organization as a benefit. A mentor can help a protégé become more knowledgeable about the goals and values of the organization thus giving a better sense of belonging. Reduction in turnover was another benefit listed. Increased job satisfaction and the loyalty established between a mentor and mentee can reduce the amount of turnover within the organization.

Additionally, Zey (1991) listed management development and management succession as potential benefits to the organization. Management development comes through the transfer of skills and knowledge from the mentor to the mentee thus leading to the development of a competent employee deserving of potential promotions. Moreover, mentoring relationships aids in the transfer of leadership from one generation to the next potentially resulting in management succession. Key positions can be filled as the mentor passes on crucial values and skills before leaving the organization.

Finally, Zey (1991) listed organizational communication, productivity, and the socialization to power as benefits to the organization as a result of mentorship. The organizational communication comes as a result of the mentee experiencing an eclectic status within the organization by being a younger or inexperienced person with the advocacy of a more experienced and powerful mentor. This dynamic allows for a wide variety of interactions within the organization that can give exposure on a number of different hierarchical tiers. Additionally, productivity may increase as a mentor coaches the mentee helping him or her to enhance his or her skills and avoid the mistakes made by the mentor. Lastly, the socialization of power is a benefit to the organization. Mentoring can produce managers that can deal with the power of leadership while properly motivating and mobilizing others.

There are also positive outcomes of mentoring for organizations within higher education. As listed before as benefits to the protégé, Clark et al. (2000) found that mentored graduates were significantly more satisfied with their doctoral program than those non-mentored graduates. Ferrari (2004) found that student protégés with a mentor in life and at school indicated stronger perceptions of their institution's educational mission, a greater feeling of campus independence, and a commitment to lifelong engagement in education than those students who only had a mentor in life or no mentor at all. Both of these studies had a direct impact on the student protégé's perceptions toward the institution.

Furthermore, mentoring may help with student attrition and academic achievement (Thile & Matt, 1995) thus, retaining students within the institution. The ability of a university or college to retain students is paramount. Mentoring programs are established as a means to help with retention. Moreover, it appears that additional mentoring efforts are beneficial to the organization in that mentorship produces more mentorship within academia (Johnson, 2007). Research (i.e., Busch, 1985; Clark et al., 2000; Luna & Cullen, 1998) indicates that students who are mentored are more likely to mentor others, thus passing along beneficial skills and traits.

Negative Outcomes

Favorable mentoring outcomes are the most documented throughout the literature. However, it may be best to view mentorship in terms of a relationship continuum. Some of these relationships are highly rewarding and others can be marginal or even destructive in their results (Kram, 1985; Ragins et al., 2000). Moreover, as mentorship can be viewed as deeply personal relationship, some ethical issues may develop as a result.

Kram (1985) described mentoring relationships as dynamic and changing. They can be highly beneficial at one point and evolve into something less fulfilling or even destructive. Other mentorships can only be mediocre in nature. Marginal mentoring is a term used to describe the mentorships that fall at the midpoint of the relationship continuum (Ragins et al., 2000) and may occur due to the absence or limited degree of key mentoring functions. Levinson et al. (1978) may have explained it best when they stated, "[mentoring] relationships vary tremendously in the degree and form of mentoring involved. Mentoring is not a simple, all-or-none matter" (p. 100). In fact, they went on to explain that the relationship may be very limited but still be important. Levinson et al. touched on the idea that a person could have a symbolic mentor (i.e., an author of a book, television character, music artist) that they have never met, which is contrary to the views of the mentoring relationship being a personal and reciprocal relationship (e.g., Allen et al., 2000; Kram,1985; Warren, 2005). In this case, the mentor is an ideal figure whom the mentee aspires to become.

Ragins et al. (2000) conducted a study on a sample of 1,162 employees that assessed the effects of the type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. The data were collected using a one-time survey to assess career and job attitudes, relationship satisfaction, perceived effectiveness of mentoring program, and program design. As expected, individuals who were highly satisfied with their mentoring relationships revealed more positive attitudes than those who received no mentoring. However, those subjects who indicated they were dissatisfied or marginally satisfied with their mentoring relationships reported attitudes that were equal to the individuals who were not mentored. Furthermore, some of the non-mentored subjects actually expressed more positive attitudes than mentees in dissatisfying relationships. This study indicates that having a mentor does not automatically lead to beneficial outcomes. Instead, the key to positive outcomes may be closely related to the quality of mentorship. Having a bad mentoring relationship may actually be worse than not having a mentoring relationship at all.

This cause may be directly linked to the competence of the mentor. According to Johnson (2003), it is often assumed that mentoring relationships are always positive relationships and that those who take on the role of the mentor are competent to do a good job. Therefore, it is often taken for granted that any manager or faculty member is motivated and prepared to serve as a mentor over a mentee. Formal mentoring programs have been criticized for this potential assumption as it is not unusual for mentors to be self-nominated to work in formal programs even though they may lack the ideal characteristics needed to conduct effective mentorship (Kram, 1985). Johnson emphasized competence in the area of mentoring when he stated, “Mentor competence is a deep and integrated structure requiring the faculty mentor to skillfully manage and integrate various virtues, abilities, and focal skills—all in the service of developing a junior professional” (p. 134).

The lack of experience in mentorship may also impact the outcome of this relationship. Ragins and Scandura (1999) examined the relationship between anticipated costs and benefits of being a mentor, mentoring experience, and the intentions to mentor. The study was carried out on 275 participants (176 women and 99 men) with surveys as the means for collecting data. Respondents were asked about their experience as mentors, as mentees, and the nature of those relationships (e.g., length of time and number of these relationships). Additionally, a seven-point Likert instrument was developed to measure the costs and benefits of mentoring relationships.

Results indicated that individuals lacking mentoring experience anticipated lesser benefits and more costs to entering a mentoring relationship with a protégé than those subjects who had already experienced mentorship through being mentor or mentee. Ragins and Scandura (1999) emphasized that lack of experience may not allow for the mentor to have an accurate view of the potential for mentorship. They suggested that organizations make more of an effort to reduce the perceived costs of mentorship by using mentoring or training programs which focus on the costs and benefits associated with mentorship.

Proper training is important when considering the potential ethical issues involved with mentorship. The very nature of the mentoring relationship is a dual relationship. This potential ethical issue was cited among the literature (e.g., Maistre, Boudreau, & Paré, 2006; Warren, 2005). A dilemma could pose itself when a faculty mentor is faced with the role of teacher and ally. The mentoring relationship can be a very close relationship. The roles of the mentor may become confusing so that he or she becomes more of a friend than a mentor (Warren). In these types of situations, there exists the potential for students to become a faculty member’s confidante about personal concerns which could lead to an inappropriate relationship. Maistre and colleagues emphasized the need for proper training, clear guidelines, and communication in dealing with the duality in mentoring relationships.

Mentors need to assess the potential commitment of having such a relationship. Choosing a protégé should not be a quick and trivial decision. According to Johnson and

Ridley (2004), a good mentor appreciates the costs of mentoring. Mentoring takes time, energy, and professional resources. Time and the potential mismatch of mentors and mentees were listed as negative outcomes within the literature (Cunningham, 1998; Hansford & Ehrich, 2006). Some mentors may not choose to enter a mentoring relationship for fear of the amount of time required. A proper assessment of the relationship may help with future obstacles. Mentors should seek protégés that share similar interests and career aspirations. Additionally, the mentee should demonstrate competency stability in the areas of communication, intelligence, emotions, ambition, and loyalty (Johnson & Ridley).

This type of relationship assessment may not be an option for a mentor that participates in a formal mentoring program as he or she may be involuntarily assigned to a mentee. In such cases, there may be a lack of chemistry between the mentor and mentee due to the structured process of forming the relationship (Kram, 1985). This has been a criticism of formal mentoring programs (Davis, 2005).

Other negative outcomes that are associated with mentoring relationships are included within the literature. Levinson et al. (1978) touched on the fact that the relationship may turn into an unhealthy form of mutual exploitation. Similarly, Davis (2005) pointed out that informal mentoring relationships may lead to feelings of resentment for other members of the organization that do not have a similar relationship. There could be a sense of jealousy among employees or unhealthy forms of dependency (Cunningham, 1998). Finally, Kram (1985) pointed out that a poorly performing mentee can potentially impact how others view the mentor’s decision making and competency. Choosing an incompetent mentee may cast a negative image of the mentor.

Race and Gender

The literature (e.g., Davis, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Noe, 1988; Ragins & Cotton, 1991; Ragins & Scandura, 1994; Zey, 1991) presented potential obstacles for women and minorities in developing mentoring relationships, which were well documented by research on mentoring within the workplace. In fact, early research, like the study by Levinson et al. (1978), focused almost exclusively on male mentors and noted that female mentors were scarce, particularly within the world of work. Similar theories were consistent with minority students at predominantly white institutions where white men represented the majority of the leadership (Jacobi). The following section covers theory and research concerning the mentoring relationships of women and minority students.

A search through the literature did not produce many differences between the outcomes of male and female students in higher education. However, there were many such theories and studies conducted within the business field. Zey (1991) discussed the reasons why women may face sex-related barriers to advancement within an organization. He noted that the lack of advancement for women within institutions may be related to the traditional image of women in the world of work. Women may be perceived as a threat to male managers and those in management may feel that women lack the skills and talents necessary to do the work. Zey emphasized that mentorships can be a way of overcoming some of these perceptions and can lead to the advancement of women within the workplace.

This process sounds easy enough, but the literature (e.g., Ragins & Cotton, 1991; Zey, 1991) presented a picture in which women face potential barriers to establishing mentoring relationships. In fact, Ragins and Cotton confirmed that women perceive more barriers to gaining a mentor than men. Not only are there barriers to advancement for women when compared to men (Zey), there are perceived barriers to developing the very mentoring relationships that could help them (Ragins & Cotton).

It may be that women are limited in finding a same-sex mentor due to the number of females in management compared to males (Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985). In his review of the literature on women and mentoring, Noe (1988) outlined six different barriers that may inhibit women from developing mentoring relationships with men (cross-gender). First, there may be a lack of access to informational networks for women. In other words, women may have limited contact with those who could serve as potential mentors. Moreover, there is evidence that suggests that women have less opportunities of interaction within the dominant organizational coalition when compared to men (Brass, 1985).

Second, women may experience tokenism within an organization which could serve as a barrier to developing a mentoring relationship. This term is used to describe the move by organizations to hire women in management positions due to affirmative action plans which give women equal opportunities for potential areas of management. Such opportunities tend to give women more attention and may lead to feelings of resentment or hesitancy within the organization to enter into mentoring relationships with females due to perceived preferential treatment.

According to Noe (1988), a third barrier for women to develop mentoring relationships is gender stereotypes. Members within an organization may have certain negative attitudes toward a female’s abilities. These attitudes could be the result of a term used by Noe known as *sex-characteristic stereotyping*. Noe defined sex-characteristic stereotyping when he stated, “Sex-characteristic stereotypes result in the attribution of characteristics or traits to an individual that are believed to describe a particular gender” (p. 68).

These stereotypes are directly related to the fourth barrier of socialization practices that Noe (1988) listed that women may face in developing mentoring relationships within the organization. There may be certain societal influences that encourage the development of personality traits and behaviors. Women may not have developed a deep sense of traits such as the need for achievement or power compared to male counterparts (O’Leary, 1974). These socialized roles and expectations may impact females’ aspirations of achievement within an organization if they lack the modeling of behaviors and skills that are required to nurture these types of traits or behaviors that can be crucial to the pursuit of advancement within the institution.

A fifth barrier that Noe (1988) listed is the norms regarding cross-gender relationships. A lack of potential female mentors within an organization might leave a woman feeling like she had few options for mentorship. Male managers may prefer to develop mentorships with other males thus leaving female candidates no option at all. Furthermore, a mentoring relationship between a male and female may be viewed negatively (e.g., as a sexual relationship) among peers, thus leading to feelings of jealousy, resentment, and gossip within an organization. These types of fears may impact a potential male mentor to refrain from entering into a mentoring relationship with a female protégé.

And finally, Noe (1988) listed the reliance on ineffective power bases as a potential barrier for women to develop mentoring relationships. This concept deals with how men and women exert power. Men may demonstrate more direct methods of the exertion of power by giving orders or by stressing their own expertise. Noe explained that women may use more indirect or “acquiescence” methods when compared to men. He stated, “An acquiescence influence strategy is characterized by acceptance of power imbalance and dependent, helpless behavior” (p. 71). Potential female mentees may be bypassed for mentoring relationships if they demonstrate a power base difference such as this.

Jacobi (1991) addressed the concern for women and students of color attending predominantly white institutions within higher education. Because the leadership of these institutions is traditionally white males, minority students and females may have less access to social support. This was similar to Noe’s (1988) first barrier of the lack of access to informational networks. Such situations could potentially create feelings of alienation and isolation within the institutional environment. In some cases, females and minority students could possibly experience subtle or even overt forms of discrimination (racism or sexism).

In fact, Davis (2007) listed racism as a barrier for minority students in developing mentoring relationships within higher education. She stated, “Racism at traditionally White institutions may be a key contributor to the lack of strong mentorship and sponsorship for racial minority graduate students” (p. 219). She indicated different forms of racism that could be present among these institutions. Overt forms of racism refer to the public display of harmful acts toward individuals or groups based on race. Covert forms of racism are the non-public or discrete harmful acts toward individuals or groups based on race. Institutional racism refers to the intentional or unintentional issues that arise within the culture of the institution that have a negative impact on the minority population in relation to the majority population. Similarly, Davis outlined societal racism, which takes into account what role society played in determining how a person’s race may be viewed.

These potential barriers to mentoring add to other factors that may impact college success. Similar to the reports of the lack same gender mentoring opportunities for women (Noe, 1988), minorities may face the same difficulties in finding a mentor of the same race (Davis, 2005). Furthermore, it is more likely that minority students attended inner-city high schools and are first generation college students (Jacobi, 1991; Santos & Reigadas, 2005). Both of these attributes are related to academic issues and higher attrition rates in high school (Santos & Reigadas). Many of these students are considered to be at-risk due to being academically underprepared to perform at the college level. These factors may add to the feelings of isolation at the institution.

It is evident that mentoring relationships are helpful to minority students (Thile & Matt, 1995). Like cross-gender between men and women, cross-race mentoring was a topic of discussion among the literature. Santos and Reigadas (2005) found that students with the same ethnic mentors exhibited a greater likelihood of meeting consistently with their mentors. As a result, these students perceived their mentors to be more helpful in the advancement of their personal and career development. Likewise, Davis (2007) reported that minority students who were mentored by non-white individuals expressed higher levels of inspiration and engagement in their mentorships.

While the literature (e.g., Campbell & Campbell, 2007; Davis, 2007) indicated that there are benefits to having a mentor of the same gender and race, it is not a necessity for having a helpful and beneficial mentoring relationship. Rather, it is the quality of the mentor and mentee relationship that matters most (Lee, 1999; Santos & Reigadas, 2005). The assumption is that mentoring is most effective when the mentor and mentee are matched based on their similar backgrounds and interests (Campbell & Campbell). In fact, there may be some benefits to having a mentoring relationship with a member of the opposite sex or race. Lee indicated that faculty race was not as important as the quality of interaction among mentorships among African American students at a predominantly white college. African American students indicated they would rather have a white faculty mentor within their academic field as opposed to having an African American faculty mentor of a different academic field. Students put an emphasis on their academic field as opposed to race.

According to Davis (2005), some institutions create formal mentoring programs to allow women and minorities to participate in mentorships. These programs have been implemented by colleges and universities to improve the retention and graduation rates of underrepresented groups (Campbell, 2007; Campbell & Campbell, 2007; Santos & Reigadas, 2005). The purpose is to allow all students to experience the benefits of mentoring relationships. However, the effects of these types of programs may vary. Mentoring programs can be diverse and may have little in common (Jacobi, 1991). Additionally, they may differ in their goals and objectives. These factors add to the overall problem with mentorship. What could be mentoring at one institution may be different at another.

Spiritual Impact

A search through the literature (e.g., Daloz, 1986; Kram, 1985; Levinson et al., 1978; Zachary, 2005) did not produce a set of spiritual functions. Instead, the literature (e.g., Daloz, 1987; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1980; Zachary) supported that mentoring relationships have typically been utilized for academic, professional, and personal development. Those institutions that claim a religious denomination (e.g., Nazarene institutions) may be interested in knowing whether or not these mentorships have a distinct spiritual focus. Ma (2003) stated, “Historically, one of the main purposes of Christian higher education has been to develop godly young people of character to serve God through obedience to God’s calling and faithfulness to their vocations” (p. 322).

In fact, many colleges and universities include the goal of developing and fostering young men and women of godly character to serve God and the world within their mission statements (Ma, 2003). How do such institutions assess whether or not they were meeting this goal? Is this happening through mentoring relationships? More specific to this study, to what extent are spiritual functions used in the mentoring relationships with university personnel at Nazarene higher education institutions? The literature (e.g., Cannister, 1999; English, 1998; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Kram, 1985; Johnson & Ridley, 2004) described the mentoring relationship for career, academic, and personal development. It stands to reason that there is the potential for an impact on spiritual development through mentoring relationships.

From the student standpoint, it is evident that college is a stage in life that prompts interest in spiritual issues. The Higher Education Research Institute (2004) at the University of California, Los Angeles conducted a survey of 112,232 students entering college (attending 236 colleges and universities) that assessed the spiritual development of undergraduate students during the college years. Results from the surveys indicated that 80% of entering college students surveyed had an interest in spirituality. Additionally, 79% said they believed in God, 81% attended religious services, and 69% prayed on a regular basis. The results also indicated that more than 69% claimed that they wanted their college experience to enhance their self-understanding, 67% said that they wanted their school to help with the development of personal values, and 48% claimed they wanted their college experience to aid them in the expression of spirituality.

Almost 50% of students desired help from the college to express their spirituality. According to Braskamp (2007), students expect to advance their spiritual development during their college experience. Because this expectation of growth is present among the students, relationships with faculty, staff, and administration provide a good opportunity to aid in religious development (Braskamp).

Moreover, as a part of a multi-year research project to assess spiritual development, the Higher Education Research Institution (HERI, 2006) conducted similar survey research on 40,670 faculty at 421 colleges and universities across the nation to assess their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors toward spirituality and higher education. The results of the survey indicated that four in five faculty (81%) believed themselves to be a spiritual person. Sixty-four percent of faculty considered themselves to be a religious person (at least to some extent) and 61% reported that they prayed or meditated. Faculty obviously indicated a sense of spirituality. The question is whether or not this comes out in the relationships with students. The HERI survey indicated that while faculty acknowledged their own spirituality and religious beliefs, they appeared to be hesitant in expressing this to students. The following quote was taken from the findings of this survey (HERI):

> When it comes to the place of spirituality in higher education, we find considerable division of opinion within the faculty. For example, when asked whether ‘colleges should be concerned with facilitating students’ spiritual development,’ only a minority of faculty (30%) agree. This is consistent with the finding, also mentioned earlier, that most college juniors report that their professors have never encouraged discussion of spiritual or religious matters, and never provide opportunities for discussing the meaning or purpose of life (p. 9).

The HERI (2006) did distinguish between the types of colleges represented in the study. The college types consisted of public universities, private universities, public colleges, nonsectarian colleges, two-year colleges, Roman Catholic colleges, and other religious colleges. The scores on spirituality varied among these institutions. The other religious colleges were identified as Baptist, mainline Protestant-affiliated, or Evangelical institutions. Sixty-four percent of the faculty in this category reported high scores on the Spirituality Scale compared to only 33% of faculty in the public universities. It should be noted that the faculty in the other religious colleges represented the highest level of agreement with the concept that colleges and universities should be engaged in the facilitation of students’ spiritual development. The results indicated that faculty from the “other religious colleges” scored 68% resulting in the highest level of agreement as opposed to faculty from the “public universities” at 18% as the lowest levels of agreement. This finding may be important to this study as it investigates student perceptions of spiritual functions of mentoring at Nazarene higher education institutions.

If faculty agreed that the college or university should be engaged in the facilitation of students' spiritual development, then they may be more likely to engage in spiritual functions of mentorship.

Gribbin (2002) investigated students and mentors at a small Christian institution. Both facilitated (formal) and non-facilitated (informal) mentoring of students were examined using a qualitative methodology. Ethnographic interviews were conducted with 24 mentees (college students) and their mentors. The mentors included faculty, staff, and upper-class students at a Christian liberal arts college in the Midwest. The results of the study indicated that non-facilitated mentoring was viewed more positively than facilitated mentoring. However, both mentors and mentees viewed the mentorships positively in spite of being in facilitated or non-facilitated mentoring relationships. Through the results of the interviews, mentors indicated that they grew personally.

The mentors also indicated that they felt a responsibility for their own spiritual lives in order to give and share effectively with their student mentees. Gribbin (2002) acknowledged the mentoring relationship as a potential source of spiritual outcomes. Christian colleges or universities often focus on the development of the whole person. The spiritual side of an individual was included in this holistic approach. Gribbin stated:

> Although Christian college administrators must be concerned with the total development of students, perhaps thinking and behaving Christianly has been overlooked. Whether or not godly men and women are graduating from Christian liberal arts institutions should be questioned. The role of mentoring in the development of students must be examined. (p. 4)

Cannister (1999) did just that by investigating the impact of faculty mentoring on the spiritual well-being of late adolescents. The sample consisted of randomly selected students during their first year of college at a Christian university. Students were split into an experimental group (*n* = 95) that took part in a freshmen seminar program where they were in small classes with a mentor and a control group (*n* = 105), which consisted of new students that did not take part in the freshmen seminar experience. Surveys were administered to both sets of students early (pretest) in their freshman year and again at the end (posttest) of their freshmen year to assess whether there was any impact on their spiritual well-being. Additionally, the surveys were used to explore the perceptions of the interactions between the mentors and students.

The results of Cannister's (1999) pretest found that the students in the control group (those who did not experience the freshman seminar) had slightly higher mean scores on spiritual well-being than those in the experimental group (those who participated in the freshman seminar with a mentor). The differences in the scores were not significant. However, the posttest scores were much different. The spiritual well-being scores of the students participating in the freshman seminar program (with an assigned mentor) increased while those who did not participate in the program decreased.

Moreover, as a part of the survey, students in both groups were asked to identify a faculty member that best fit the description of a mentor. Students in the seminar group who indicated a faculty person outside of their assigned mentor were asked to answer survey questions according to their choice. In other words, it did not have to be their assigned mentor. The results of the surveys indicated that the students in the freshman seminar, as compared to those not in the seminar, perceived more support in their interactions with mentors. Furthermore, students in the freshman seminar reported that they perceived their leader (or other faculty member) was concerned about many aspects of their well-being as opposed to just academics. This study affirmed Gribbin's (2002) claim that the role of mentoring should be examined regarding the development of students.

As a final note on the spiritual impact of college students, the literature cautioned the use of the term "spiritual" (Hancock, Bufford, Lau, & Ninteman, 2005; Ma, 2003). There is a need to define this term. Just as it was difficult to define mentoring, finding a universal definition of spirituality was challenging. As stated by Hancock and colleagues, "As universities and various Christian organizations increasingly seek to assess spirituality, there remains a pervasive lack of clarity about what spirituality is and how spiritual growth can be measured" (p. 129). For the purpose of this study, the use of the term "spiritual" represented a religious Christian connotation. It was used to determine whether or not university personnel exhibited religious behaviors or communicated in a religious way that impacted undergraduate students.

Conclusions

This chapter examined theoretical and empirical literature on mentoring by discussing the definitions, functions, nature of the relationship, types of mentoring relationships, benefits, negative outcomes, race and gender, and the spiritual impact of mentorship. A search through the literature did not produce a universal definition of mentoring in higher education. Instead, it produced a broad understanding of mentorship as a helpful, developmental, and personal relationship.

There are many implications for such a relationship within the academic, business, and youth setting. Mentors are viewed as guides and counselors that promote the mentee's success by demonstrating such qualities as support, encouragement, friendship, and acceptance as they mature or transition into a different phase of life (i.e., career or college). Kram (1985) identified specific functions within the mentoring relationship that has deeper implications than just academic or career success. Career functions are specific to advancement or transition within an organization. Psychosocial functions are roles within the relationship that meet personal needs.

Kram's (1980) functions have been cited frequently within the research (e.g., Davis, 2005; Erdem & Ozen, 2008; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson & Ridley, 2004; Luna & Cullen, 1998; Mullen, 2007; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Young & Perrewe, 2004). Her mentoring functions are specific to the work environment. A search through the literature did not produce a study that investigated the extent to which these functions were demonstrated by Nazarene university personnel with undergraduate students. Furthermore, valuable information may be gleaned from investigating the perceived importance of such functions as it applies to undergraduate students' mentoring relationships with university personnel. Absent within the literature was a set of spiritual functions within the mentoring relationship in higher education.

While it may be assumed that spiritual functions exist within the personal development of a student through mentoring relationships, this study attempted to assess whether or not there are specific spiritual functions exhibited by university personnel at select Nazarene higher education institutions. The literature supports the theory that young adults enter college with expectations that they will develop emotionally and spiritually (HERI, 2004). Additionally, a higher percentage (68%) of faculty within Christian universities agreed that colleges and universities should be engaged in the facilitation of students' spiritual development (HERI, 2006). These factors, in addition to the proven benefits of such relationships, provided a reason for investigating the extent to which mentoring functions were exhibited by university personnel. Moreover, it opened the door to question the perceived importance of such functions within the mentoring relationships with undergraduate students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify the extent to which the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions were present among the mentoring relationships of university personnel and traditional undergraduate students at select Nazarene higher educational institutions. Furthermore, the perceived importance of such functions were of interest to this study with an emphasis on investigating a set of spiritual functions as being a unique feature of this investigation. This chapter presents the methodology used in this study. It explains the quantitative methodology, population, data collection procedures, analytical methods, and limitations of the study. The study was driven by the following research questions:

1. What are undergraduate students' perceptions of who serves as a mentor among university personnel?
2. To what extent were the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions utilized in the mentoring relationships for undergraduate students at Nazarene higher educational institutions?
3. What was the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions among undergraduate mentees?

Research Design

It was determined that a descriptive research process was an effective means of addressing the research questions. For the purpose of this study, descriptive data were collected using self-report methods. Specifically, a survey was developed to collect data. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2005), survey research can be characterized by collecting information about one or more groups for the purpose of assessing specific characteristics, opinions, and attitudes through asking questions and analyzing their answers. It was determined that a cross-sectional survey was the best method for assessing the mentoring relationships between university personnel and traditional undergraduate students. A cross-sectional survey is where data are collected from a selected group of participants during a single period of time (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006).

The data were quantitative in nature as there were a predetermined set of variables to research. Because the goal of this study was to investigate who served as mentors for undergraduates, the extent to which mentoring functions existed in these relationships, and the perceived importance of such functions among select NHEIs, it was determined that survey research would be the most effective means to collect data for each institution. The advantages of survey research are efficiency, cost effectiveness, and collecting data from larger samples (Gay et al., 2006). The collection of data from a larger sample was the most important factor in considering sampling students from multiple sources. Participants were given the survey with structured items requiring them to select the proper response.

Population

The populations for this study were undergraduates from four institutions of higher education affiliated with the Church of the Nazarene. These four Nazarene institutions were chosen out of eight Nazarene Colleges and Universities within the United States. Four were chosen to participate in this study due to their central locality within the United States. This was done to limit cultural issues that could impact the results of this study.

Institution A was located in the upper Midwest region and had the largest enrollment of all the universities surveyed with a total population of 4,521 students for the 2008-2009 school year (Dr. E. LeBron Fairbanks, personal communication, May 12, 2009). Out of the total number of students enrolled, 3,028 of those were classified as undergraduate students. There were 1,901 female and 1,127 male students that represented the total undergraduate student population at Institution A. The ethnic breakdown of this institution was largely White/Non-Hispanic at 82% (*n* = 2495) of the undergraduate student population, followed by Black/Non-Hispanic students at 11% (*n* = 336). Hispanic students represented 4% (*n* = 133) of the population, while 1% (*n* = 42) of the students were classified as Asian/Pacific Island. Students that were classified as Non-resident Alien (*n* = 20), American Indian/Alaskan Native (*n* = 3), and unclassified (*n* = 0) completed the ethnic breakdown of the undergraduate population for institution A.

Institution B was also located in the upper Midwest region of the United States and had the second largest total population (*n* = 2,558) of students for the 2008-2009 school year (Dr. E. LeBron Fairbanks, personal communication, May 12, 2009). There were 2,090 total students that were classified as undergraduate students. Female students represented approximately 60% (*n* = 1251) of the undergraduate population while male students were 40% (*n* = 839). Similar to the prior institution, Institution B had a predominantly White/Non-Hispanic undergraduate population listed at approximately 90% (*n* = 1878). Black/Non-Hispanic students followed representing approximately 5% (*n* = 99), while those students who were unclassified were at 2% (*n* = 49). Students classified as Hispanic followed representing 1% (*n* = 26) of the undergraduate population while a similar number was represented for students listed as Asian/Pacific Island at 1% (*n* = 21). Those students classified as Non-resident Alien (*n* = 11) and American Indian/Alaskan Native (*n* = 6) completed the ethnic breakdown of Institution B.

Institution C was located in the central Midwest region of the United States and had a total student population of 1,743 for the 2008-2009 school year (Dr. E. LeBron Fairbanks, personal communication, May 12, 2009). The undergraduate student population was 1,305 students with females representing approximately 57% (*n* = 749) and males representing 43% (*n* = 556) of that number. Similar to the prior two institutions, the ethnic breakdown of Institution C was largely classified as White/Non-Hispanic representing approximately 82% (*n* = 1067) of the total population. The remaining 18% of the undergraduate student population was made up of the students classified as Black/Non-Hispanic (*n* = 133), Hispanic (*n* = 46), Unclassified (*n* = 20), Asian/Pacific Island (*n* = 17), Non-resident Alien (*n* = 14), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (*n* = 8).

Finally, Institution D was located in the southeastern United States and had a total of 2,366 students enrolled for the 2008-2009 school year (Dr. E. LeBron Fairbanks, personal communication, May 12, 2009). Those students classified as undergraduate students accounted for 1,271 of the total population with females representing 56% (*n* = 717) and males representing 46% (*n* = 554) of that number. Those students classified as White/Non-Hispanic accounted for the highest percentage of undergraduate students at 82% (*n* = 1038). Black/Non-Hispanic students were the second highest percentage at 10% (*n* = 128) followed by those undergraduate students that were unclassified at 2% (*n* = 30). The final 6% of undergraduate students consisted of Hispanic (*n* = 29), Asian/Pacific Island (*n* = 21), Non-resident Alien (*n* = 18), and American Indian/Alaskan Native (*n* = 7) to conclude the ethnic demographics of undergraduate students at Institution D.

The population for this study included traditional undergraduate students (male and female) between the ages of 17 and 23 years of age from the four select Nazarene higher education institutions. To narrow the population further, students within the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division of each institution were chosen as the sample. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Division included majors such as Behavioral Sciences, Criminal Justice (also Criminology), Sociology, Social Work, and Psychology. This particular division was chosen with the mindset that mentoring opportunities may exist.

Electronic surveys were sent out to a total of 214 male and 448 female traditional undergraduate students in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division at the four selected Nazarene institutions (*n* = 662). The breakdown of each university was diverse. Institution A represented the largest sample with 271 students receiving the survey (males = 81, females = 190) which represented approximately 9% of the total population of undergraduate students. Institution B was the second largest sample with 210 students receiving the survey (males = 83, females = 127) which represented approximately 10% of the total population of undergraduate students. The third largest sample was Institution C with a total of 104 students receiving the survey (males = 35, females = 69) representing approximately 8% of the total undergraduate population. Finally, 77 students received the survey at Institution D (males = 15, females = 62) representing approximately 6% of the total undergraduate population.

Demographical information was collected on all subjects participating in the study. Age, gender, ethnicity, denominational affiliation, field of study, and current classification were all of interest in this study can be found in Table 1 (see Appendix B).

Data Collection Procedures

In order to answer the three research questions, a survey was created to collect data. The survey was developed electronically for the purpose of emailing a link to traditional undergraduate students. Authorization was sought and received from each of the Nazarene institutions used in the study prior to the distribution of the survey (see Appendix C).

Upon receiving approval to conduct research, the Chairs of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Divisions at each institution were contacted for all research requests. Each Chair formulated a list of all email addresses for traditional undergraduate students (between the ages of 17 and 23) claiming a major within the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division. Email was chosen as the data collection method as all participants possessed a university email address. The list included the name of the student, email address, and major. The specific majors that were requested were Behavioral Sciences, Criminal Justice, Sociology, Social Work, and Psychology.

It should be noted that not all of these majors existed among the selected Nazarene institutions. The Behavioral Science Major was distinct to Institution D. Institution D was the only university to offer all five of the majors within their Social and Behavioral Sciences Division. Institution C included the majors of Criminology, Sociology, and Psychology. Institutions A and B included the majors of Criminal Justice, Sociology, Social Work and Psychology within their Social and Behavioral Sciences Division.

Email distribution lists were created by major for each institution (e.g., Psychology Majors). An email was sent to each student in the designated majors asking their participation in the completion of the survey (see Appendix D).

An electronic survey was designed to answer the three research questions (see Appendix E). An Informed Consent was created outlining the potential risks and efforts to maintain confidentiality (see Appendix F). Participants were informed that their responses would be kept confidential. Upon reading this form, participants were required to answer yes or no to the following statement, “I voluntarily agree to participate in the following study.” Those who answered yes were allowed to continue. Those who answered no were forwarded to the end of the survey thanking them for their consideration.

As an added incentive for participating in the study, participants were asked if they wanted to participate in a drawing for a $50 gift certificate. Subjects were informed through email correspondence that they could enter a drawing for the gift card by filling out the survey. Participants were prompted to answer yes or no to the following statement, “Indicate if you would like to be entered in a drawing for a fifty dollar gift certificate." Subjects were not required to enter the drawing. All that answered yes were asked to give their email address for the sake of notifying the recipient of the gift certificate. The winner was selected at random.

The first research question investigating who, among university personnel, served as a mentor for traditional undergraduate students was assessed by identifying a definition of mentorship and asking students to identify which university personnel member(s) fit the description of this relationship. This particular question was important due to not knowing the prevalence of informal mentoring relationships within higher education (Campbell, 2007). Additionally, it may be taken for granted that most of the mentoring comes from faculty members who advise students (Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007). The results of this question could provide insights into the prevalence of mentorship with undergraduate students within the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division of select NHEI.

Students were asked to read the provided definition of mentoring and select from a list of options for potential mentors. The definition was inspired by Kram's (1985) description of the mentoring relationship. The following definition was used for the purpose of this study:

> Mentoring can be described as a relationship between a more experienced and knowledgeable adult (mentor) and a younger, more inexperienced adult (mentee) with the purpose of helping the younger person as they find maturity and enter the world of work. A mentor assists the mentee by providing support, direction, and counsel as he or she achieves this task.

Upon reading this definition, students were asked to select from 11 options: Administrator, academic advisor, athletic coach, chaplain, peer, professor, resident assistant, resident director, staff personnel, other, and an option for having no mentor.

Respondents could choose more than one option to answer this question as there may be more than one university personnel member who served as a mentor. This allowance was intentional based on the understanding that the research on mentoring is beginning to investigate the idea of a mentoring network as opposed to a single mentoring relationship (Higgins & Kram, 2001; Johnson et al., 2007). It may be that traditional undergraduate students may have more than one developmental relationship among university personnel that provide mentoring functions.

Students responding with the “other” option were allowed to specify who served as a mentor. The goal was to allow for students to include other university personnel that were not included as an option on the survey. Additionally, the option for “no mentor” was provided. Students could select, “I do not have a college or university personnel member that serves as my mentor,” if none of the options fit the description of mentoring provided. Because this survey was investigating the extent to which mentoring functions existed within the mentoring relationships between traditional undergraduate students and university personnel, those students selecting the “no mentor” response were automatically guided to the end of the survey.

The second research question focused on the extent to which career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions were present in the mentoring relationships between traditional undergraduate students and university personal was investigated by having respondents select one of four responses for each function. Subjects were asked to select their most important mentoring relationship from the prior question. In other words, after selecting from the list of potential mentors, participants would now select one of those options (a university personnel member) to answer the rest of the questions. Each career, psychosocial, and spiritual function was answered on a rating scale.

A brief description of each mentoring function was given. These functions were based off of Kram's (1985) mentoring functions. The career functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments were the first set of functions on the survey. The following statement was used to instruct the participants, "Think of your most significant mentoring relationship among the university personnel. Using this relationship, give an appropriate response to the extent that your most significant mentoring relationship demonstrates the following functions." Participants were asked to rate (1 = Always, 2 = Frequently, 3 = Seldom, 4 = Never) the extent to which the career functions were demonstrated within their most important mentoring relationship with a university personnel member.

The second set of mentoring functions was analyzed in the same way. The psychosocial functions of role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Kram, 1985) followed the career functions. A description of each function was provided and participants were asked to respond to the following instructions, "Give an appropriate response to the extent that your most significant mentoring relationship (with a college or university personnel member) demonstrates the following functions." Participants were instructed to use a rating scale (1 = Always, 2 = Frequently, 3 = Seldom, 4 = Never) to indicate the extent to which their most important mentoring relationship with a university personnel member demonstrated the psychosocial functions.

Finally, the third set of mentoring functions was investigated using the same rating system. Descriptions for the spiritual functions of discipleship, spiritual accountability, spiritual advising, and prayer were included. Respondents were asked to rate each function (1 = Always, 2 = Frequently, 3 = Seldom, and 4 = Never) based on the extent to which each was demonstrated in the mentoring relationship (most important) with a university personnel member.

The third research question of the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions was investigated by having participants select one of three responses for each function. The following statement was used to instruct subjects, “Keeping in mind your most significant mentoring relationship with a college or university personnel member, rate the following mentoring functions according to their importance for your development.” Just as respondents used their most important mentoring relationship to answer the extent to which each function was demonstrated, they would now use the same relationship to rate the importance of these functions.

The career functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments (Kram, 1985) were each described. These were the same descriptions used to investigate the second research question. Participants were asked to use their most important mentoring relationship with a university personnel member to rate each career function based on their perceived importance for their development. The rating scale was a three point scale (1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, and 3 = Not Important).

The psychosocial functions of role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Kram, 1985) were investigated in the same way. The same descriptions were provided as in research question two. Participants were asked to keep in mind their most important mentoring relationship (with a university personnel member) while rating each psychosocial function according to their perceived importance for their development. The rating was a three point scale (1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, and 3 = Not Important).

Finally, the spiritual functions of discipleship, spiritual accountability, spiritual advising, and prayer were investigated in the same way. The same descriptions were used from research question two to explain each function. Respondents were instructed to keep their most important mentoring relationship with a university personnel member in mind when rating these functions. The same rating scale was used (1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, and 3 = Not Important) to investigate the perceived importance of each function on respondents' development.

Analytical Methods

This descriptive study was designed to investigate the extent and importance of mentoring functions in the mentorship of traditional undergraduate students at NHEI by University personnel. To determine statistical significance, the data were analyzed quantitatively. According to Salkind (2008) statistical significance is defined as, "the degree of risk you are willing to take that you will reject the null hypothesis when it is actually true" (p. 158).

The analysis was distinct for each of the research questions. The results of the first research question regarding who among university personnel were serving as a mentor to traditional undergraduate students were analyzed using a frequency of occurrence. This method of analysis allowed for data to be collected on multiple university personnel who could be serving as mentors for traditional undergraduate students as opposed to solely professors and advisors. This was important because it may be taken for granted that professors and advisors are the only university personnel members participating in mentoring relationships (Johnson et al., 2007).

The data collected for research question two regarding the extent to which the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions were present in students' most important mentoring relationships was analyzed using one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs). Salkind (2008) stated, "The technique is called analysis of variance because the variance due to differences in performance is separated into variance that's due to differences between individuals within groups and variance due to differences between groups" (p. 202). As a result, the two types of variance are compared to one another. One-way ANOVAs were chosen to analyze the data for question two because two or more groups (e.g., the current classification of students) were being tested and these groups were being compared on their average performance (i.e., response on the extent to which the mentoring function of sponsorship occurred within their most important mentoring relationship). A post hoc comparison using a Tukey HSD was utilized for comparing three or more groups to see where there were differences.

Finally, data were collected for question three regarding the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions in student's most important mentoring relationship with a university personnel member. Those data were analyzed using chi-square analysis. Salkind (2008) stated, "Chi-square is an interesting nonparametric test that allows you to determine if what you observe in a distribution of frequencies would be what you would expect to occur by chance" (p. 263). The data collected from research question three were analyzed to determine if the responses happened by chance. Significant findings at the .05 level or below would indicate that the null hypothesis could be rejected for the results of research question three; therefore, the results would indicate a difference in the frequency of responses regarding the importance of the mentoring functions within the mentoring relationship with University personnel.

Limitations

As with any research investigation, there were limitations that should be noted.

1. This study was quantitative by design but should have included qualitative interviews and focus groups to help with the triangulation of data. More information should have been collected on the mentoring functions and the university personnel who were considered as mentors. Much of the research on mentoring was quantitative in design by using survey research (Johnson et al., 2007). Qualitative features could help to broaden the results of the study.
2. It should be noted that this research was limited to the perspective of the mentee or protégé (traditional undergraduate students) as opposed to the actual mentor. This is a dyadic relationship that is only being told from one side. These responses by the students are subjective and may not match the perspective of the university personnel member. For instance, it could be that the university personnel member would believe that he or she always demonstrated a particular mentoring function, whereas, the student may have the opinion that the same university personnel member seldom exhibited the same function.

3. The research on the mentoring functions was also limited to only selecting university personnel members. It should not be assumed that students who selected the response of “I do not have a college or university personnel member that serves as my mentor” are mentor-less. It could be that there are mentoring opportunities outside of the university that students take advantage of (e.g., pastor, supervisor, employers).
4. There were also some limitations on the response from the survey. While the response (*n* = 366) from the overall sample (*n* = 662) was relatively healthy at approximately 55%, the majority of respondents were female. Out of the 366 respondents, 77% (*n* = 282) were female compared to the 23% (*n* = 84) of male responses. This makes it difficult to generalize the results.
5. Further limitations on the response to the survey were indicated by the ethnicity demographic. Out of the 366 respondents, 92% (*n* = 337) of those chose “White/Non-Hispanic” for their ethnicity. The next highest response of 3% (*n* = 12) were from students that chose “Hispanic” for their ethnicity. The students who chose the “Asian/Pacific Island” option followed at 2% (*n* = 7), while those who chose the “Black/Non-Hispanic” response were at 2% (*n* = 6), followed by the 1% (*n* = 4) of students that chose the “Unclassified” response. Each of the four Nazarene institutions chosen for this particular study had an undergraduate student population that was predominantly white (i.e., 80% and above for those students classified as White/Non-Hispanic).
6. There were some respondents who did not fully complete the survey. A total of 366 respondents began the survey with approximately 96% (*n* = 351) completing

it from start to finish and answering all of the questions. That left roughly 4% (*n* = 15) of the people who exited the survey at some point without answering all of the necessary questions for completion.

7. This study was also limited to investigating the prevalence and perceived importance of specific mentoring functions with traditional undergraduate students. Absent from this study was the actual identification of which university personnel member students label as their most important mentoring relationship.
8. Another limitation in the research was the use of the “other” category. The respondents were asked to specify who was serving as their mentor. There was no way to determine the connection between the respondent and the person specified. For example, a family member listed as “other” could also have been a university employee.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to determine the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentoring relationships between university personnel and undergraduate students at select Nazarene higher education institutions (NEHI). Mentoring relationships have long been viewed as a positive helping relationship between faculty and students; however, there is little known about prevalence and nature of such relationships within higher education (Jacobi, 1991; Johnson, 2007). Kram (1980) identified specific psychosocial and career functions through her research on mentoring within the workplace.

These functions provided a framework to investigate the existence of such functions within the mentoring relationships of university personnel and traditional undergraduate students at NEHI. Several key factors were investigated: faculty and other university personnel who were considered to be mentors for traditional undergraduate students, the perceived utilization of mentoring functions in the mentoring relationships between university personnel and traditional undergraduate students, and the perceived importance of those functions within the mentoring relationship.

Additionally, a gap existed within the literature on the presence of a specific set of spiritual mentoring functions between university personnel and traditional undergraduate students. Instead, only the career and psychosocial functions were cited as the common mentoring functions demonstrated by a mentor (Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985; Mullen, 2007). Providing a specific set of spiritual mentoring functions was a unique feature of this study.

In summary, answers were sought for the following research questions:

1. What are undergraduate students' perceptions of who serves as a mentor among university personnel?
2. To what extent were the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions utilized in the mentoring relationships for undergraduate students at Nazarene higher educational institutions?
3. What was the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions among undergraduate mentees?

This chapter is divided into three different sections. The first section includes the findings of the study. The second section includes the conclusions of the research. The third section consists of the implications and recommendations for further attention in this area.

Findings

A survey was created to collect data (see Appendix E). A definition of mentoring was provided to clarify the meaning of mentorship. This definition was inspired by Kram's (1985) description of the mentoring relationship. Based on Kram's definition of mentoring, the following definition was used for the purpose of this study:

> Mentoring can be described as a relationship between a more experienced and knowledgeable adult (mentor) and a younger, more inexperienced adult (mentee) with the purpose of helping the younger person as they find maturity and enter the

> world of work. A mentor assists the mentee by providing support, direction, and counsel as he or she achieves this task.

Students' Perceptions of Who Serves as a Mentor among University Personnel

The researcher surveyed traditional undergraduate students at four different NHEI to investigate the perceptions of who they considered to be their mentors based on the provided definition of mentoring. To narrow the population, only students within the Behavioral Sciences Division were utilized for this study.

Subjects were given 11 different university personnel mentor options to choose from that fit the definition that was provided. Those options included administrator, academic advisor, athletic coach, chaplain, peer, professor, resident assistant, resident director, staff personnel, other, and an option for having no mentor. In an effort to investigate the Higgins and Kram (2001) perspective that mentoring may exist more in a network rather than only one significant relationship, students were allowed to select more than one option that fit the mentoring definition.

The survey data were analyzed quantitatively using a frequency of occurrence. Of the 11 mentoring position options, the top five the respondents selected were: professor (*n* = 195), Academic Advisor (*n* = 154), Peer (*n* = 130), Resident Assistant (*n* =62), and Resident Director (*n* = 61) (see Appendix G).

The Extent Mentoring Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships

The goal of the second research question was to assess students' perceptions of the extent to which career (sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments), psychosocial (role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship), and spiritual functions (discipleship, spiritual advising, spiritual accountability, and prayer) were utilized in the mentoring relationships with university personnel. Using the same survey, students were asked to give the appropriate response to how often their most important mentoring relationship with a university personnel member demonstrated the provided mentoring functions. They could choose between the following options for each function: 1 = Always, 2 = Frequently, 3 = Seldom, 4 = Never.

A series of one-way ANOVAs was performed to compare each of the demographical categories with the responses for each of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual mentoring functions. Those demographical categories included gender, age, ethnicity, denominational affiliation, college or university, field of study, and current classification. No statistically significant differences were found for the first demographical category of gender on each mentoring function (see Appendix H).

The second demographical category of age was compared on each of the responses given on the perceived extent to which the mentoring functions were utilized. One-way ANOVAs were run and yielded similar results. No statistically significant differences were found between age and the responses given on the mentoring functions (see Appendix I).

A comparison between ethnicities on each of the responses of the mentoring functions demonstrated mixed results. One-way ANOVAs were run but no statistically significant differences were found for the majority of the mentoring functions. However, a statistically significant difference was found between the ethnicities and the responses to the career mentoring function of protection, F (4, 306) = 3.45, $p < .05$. To further delineate the statistically significant difference between groups, a Tukey HSD test was conducted and showed that those students that selected the unclassified category were statistically significantly different on their responses to the mentoring function of protection than those students who were categorized as White, Non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Island, $p < .05$ (see Appendix J).

The demographical category of denomination was also compared on the career, psychosocial, and spiritual mentoring functions using one-way ANOVAs. The results for this comparison had mixed results. There were no statistically significant findings for the majority of mentoring functions when compared to denomination; however, this comparison did yield a statistically significant finding for the career mentoring function of Exposure and Visibility, F (1, 309) = 5.305, $p < .05$ (see Appendix K).

One-way ANOVAs were used to compare colleges or universities with on each of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual mentoring functions. This comparison yielded mixed results. No statistically significant differences were found with the career functions, psychosocial functions, and three of the spiritual functions. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the college or university and the spiritual mentoring function of Spiritual Accountability, F (3, 302) = 2.85, $p < .05$. A Tukey HSD test was conducted to further delineate the statistically significant difference among the groups. No statistically significant differences were found between the groups. However, Institution A and Institution D were the closest to being significantly different at .086 (see Appendix L).

Students’ field of study or major were also compared on their responses for the utilization of mentoring functions within their most important mentor relationship with university personnel. More specifically, students within the Behavioral Sciences Division of each of the NHEIs were compared on their responses for the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentoring. Within this division were majors such as Behavioral Sciences, Criminal Justice, Psychology, Sociology, Social Work, and Other. This comparison yielded mixed results. No statistically significant differences were found the psychosocial and spiritual functions.

There was a statistically significant difference between the traditional undergraduate students’ responses to the field of study and the career mentoring functions of Exposure and Visibility, F (5, 305) = 4.22, $p < .05$, and Challenging Assignments, F (5, 305) = 3.47, $p < .05$. A follow-up Tukey HSD test was conducted and showed a statistically significant difference between the students that selected the major of Psychology with those who chose Criminology and Social Work when compared to their responses for the Exposure/Visibility mentoring function, $p < .05$. Similarly, a Tukey HSD test showed a statistically significant difference between Psychology majors and other majors for the Challenging Assignments mentoring function, $p < .05$ (see Appendix M).

Finally, the demographical category of current classification was compared using one-way ANOVAs on the responses for each of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions. This comparison yielded mixed results. No statistically significant differences were found for the psychosocial and spiritual mentoring functions.

There was a statistically significant difference between traditional undergraduates’ responses to the current classification category and the career mentoring function of Sponsorship, F (3, 307) = 4.29, $p < .05$. A follow-up Tukey HSD test was conducted and showed a statistically significant difference between freshmen and seniors on their response to the career mentoring function of Sponsorship, $p < .05$ (see Appendix N).

The Perceived Importance of Mentoring Functions among Undergraduate Students

The goal of the third research question was to assess the perceived importance of each mentoring function within traditional undergraduate students' most important mentoring relationship with a university personnel member. The same survey was used to investigate this research question. Moreover, the same descriptions of each mentoring function were utilized for this section of the survey. Students were asked to select the response that was most appropriate for each mentoring function. They could choose between the following options for each function: 1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, and 3 = Not Important.

The data were analyzed using chi-square analysis. The responses to each career mentoring function were compared and all were statistically significant, $p < .001$. See Table 24.

Table 24

Chi-Square Analysis on Perceived Importance of Career Functions

	Very Important		Important		Not Important		
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	X^2
Sponsorship	135	44.6	142	46.9	26	8.6	83.78
Exp./Vis.	159	52.5	122	40.3	22	7.3	99.47

df = 2. (table continues)
**p* < .001.

Table 24 (continued)

Chi-Square Analysis on Perceived Importance of Career Functions

	Very Important		Important		Not Important		
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	X^2
Coaching	220	72.6	79	26.1	4	1.3	238.16
Protection	119	39.3	142	46.9	42	13.9	54.32
Challenging As.	153	50.5	129	42.6	21	6.9	97.90

df = 2.
**p* < .001.

Similarly, the data pertaining to the psychosocial mentoring functions were analyzed using chi-square analysis. The responses to each of these mentoring functions were compared and all were statistically significant, *p* < .001. See Table 25.

Table 25

Chi-Square Analysis on Perceived Importance of Psychosocial Functions

	Very Important		Important		Not Important		
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	X^2
Role Modeling	236	78.1	64	21.2	2	0.7	292.00
Accep/Confirm.	229	75.8	71	23.5	2	0.7	269.05

df = 2. (table continues)
**p* < .001.

Table 25 (continued)

Chi-Square Analysis on Perceived Importance of Psychosocial Functions

	Very Important		Important		Not Important		
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	X^2
Counseling	201	66.6	97	32.1	4	1.3	192.96
Friendship	188	62.3	105	34.8	9	3.0	159.42

df = 2.
**p* < .001.

Finally, chi-square tests were used to compare the responses of traditional undergraduate students on the perceived importance of each spiritual function. Each function was statistically significant, $p < .001$. See Table 26.

Table 26

Chi-Square Analysis on Perceived Importance of Spiritual Functions

	Very Important		Important		Not Important		
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	X^2
Discipleship	191	63.2	87	28.8	24	7.9	141.31
Spiritual Acc.	155	51.3	104	34.4	43	14.2	62.47

df = 2. (table continues)
**p* < .001.

Table 26 (continued)

Chi-Square Analysis on Perceived Importance of Spiritual Functions

	Very Important		Important		Not Important		
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	X^2
Spiritual Adv.	168	55.6	108	35.8	26	8.6	100.95
Prayer	117	38.7	121	40.1	64	21.2	20.11

df = 2.
**p* < .001.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentoring relationships between university personnel and undergraduate students at select Nazarene higher education institutions (NEHI). The utilization of these functions and the investigation of a set of spiritual functions were also assessed. A body of research on the topic of mentoring was examined to support this study. It yielded mixed results. The following conclusions were derived:

1. Research question one, “What are undergraduate students’ perceptions of who serves as a mentor among university personnel?”, revealed that 86.3% of traditional undergraduate students selected a university personnel member or “other” as a mentor. Only 13.7% of students indicated that they did not have a university personnel member who served as their mentor. These results lend credence to Jacobi’s (1991) perspective that organizational characteristics may

impact the prevalence of mentoring. One could conclude that the high percentage of students who claimed to have a university personnel member as their mentor was due to the size and mission of the Nazarene institutions. Smaller class sizes and a Christian emphasis may impact the degree to which university personnel are able to mentor students.

2. The results of research question one also illustrate that professors are not the only university members serving as mentors for traditional undergraduate students. According to Johnson et al. (2007), it should not be taken for granted that professors and advisors are the only university personnel members who serve as mentors. This study illustrates that other university members (including peers) are involved with the mentorship of traditional undergraduate students.
3. The findings of research question two, “To what extent were the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions utilized in the mentoring relationships for undergraduate students at Nazarene higher educational institutions?”, offered mixed results. Statistical significance was found between demographical categories and some of the career and spiritual mentoring functions. First, a significant difference was found when comparing the ethnicities on the career mentoring function of protection. The students that selected the “unclassified” category were statistically significantly different from the students who selected “White, Non-Hispanic”, “Hispanic”, and “Asian/Pacific Island.” It may be concluded that the “unclassified” students did not feel like they needed protection or did not feel like they received protection from their mentor(s).

4. Another statistically significant finding from research question two was the demographical category of denomination and the career mentoring function of Exposure/Visibility. One may conclude that Nazarene students may experience more opportunities for exposure and visibility because of the familiarity within the Nazarene denomination as a whole when compared to other denominations. Similarly, university personnel who attend the same Nazarene church may provide additional opportunities to exhibit mentoring functions when compared to students who attend a church outside of the Nazarene denomination.
5. Research question two also revealed a statistically significant difference between the demographical category of college or university and the spiritual mentoring function of spiritual accountability. Region may play a role in this result. Institution D located in the southeastern part of the United States, located in what is known as the Bible Belt, was expected to be more conservative and legalistic; however, institution A, located in the upper Midwest, was actually more conservative and legalistic.
6. The results for research question two also revealed a statistically significant difference between student responses to the demographical category of field of study (major) and their responses to the career functions of exposure and visibility and challenging assignments. Because of the higher number of Psychology majors at each institution, there may be a discrepancy between the number of opportunities for these students when compared to the smaller number of students in a different major. In other words, the smaller the program, the more likelihood

the mentor will provide opportunities for exposure and visibility and challenging assignments.

7. Another statistically significant finding resulting from research question two was revealed upon comparing the demographical category of current classification with student responses to the career mentoring function of sponsorship. The statistical difference occurred between freshmen and seniors. The longevity of the relationship for seniors as compared to freshmen may account for this difference.
8. The third research question, “What was the perceived importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions among undergraduate mentees?”, revealed statistical significance on all of the mentoring functions. The majority of students consider all of the elements of career functions to be important for their career development.
9. Another statistically significant finding for research question three revealed that most students believed that each facet of the psychosocial mentoring domain was integral in their mentoring relationships.
10. Research question three also indicated statistical significance on all spiritual functions. Most students believed that spiritual functions were vital to their mentoring relationships.

Implications and Recommendations

Given the results of this study, the scholarly literature on mentoring has been expanded. The following implications and recommendations should be considered:

1. This study was limited to the students within the Behavioral Sciences Division of each of the NHEIs. Additional research is recommended that would investigate a larger sample of the student body within each institution.
2. It is also recommended that all Nazarene institutions be included for future study to assess the mentorship of traditional undergraduate students as a whole across the nation.
3. A comparison study is recommended for students within NHEIs and other public and private colleges and universities. Such research may shed light on whether or not the results of this study are unique only to Nazarene institutions.
4. The results of this study indicated a number of different university personnel members that were listed as mentors for traditional undergraduate students. It should not be taken for granted that only professors and advisors are mentoring students. The leadership of these colleges or universities should take the time to define mentorship operationally within their communities and work to train university personnel on how to utilize the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions with students while also maintaining healthy boundaries. Moreover, a means to evaluate the effectiveness of such relationships is crucial in determining their place in academia.
5. The results of this study showed traditional undergraduates' perceptions on the utilization and importance of each of the mentoring functions. Future research should be conducted on the perceptions of university personnel and their views on the utilization and importance of these functions. While students claimed

university personnel members to be their mentor, it should not be assumed that the university personnel members claim to be mentors.

6. As students indicate that the mentoring functions are important to their development, colleges and universities should put more of an emphasis on training for the mentorship of traditional undergraduate students. Students should have clear expectations and boundaries for mentoring relationships with university personnel members.
7. The career mentoring functions of sponsorship, exposure and visibility, protection, and challenging assignments were statistically significant when compared to the demographical categories. Implications for further research are warranted to further explore the cause of such differences.
8. A unique feature of this study was to introduce a specific set of spiritual mentoring functions. The results of these functions were statistically significant and revealed that they were being utilized in the mentoring relationships with university personnel. Furthermore, most students indicated that they were important or very important to their development. Additional research is needed to assess whether or not this is a unique feature of mentorship within a Christian setting.
9. Finally, survey research was conducted to collect data. Long-term research is needed on the mentoring relationships with traditional undergraduate students. Further information on the utilization and importance of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions may be revealed through long term evaluation.

REFERENCES

Allen, S. L. (2006). Mentoring: The magic partnership. *Canadian Operating Room Nursing Journal, 24*(4), 30-2, 37-8. Retrieved December 16, 2008, from ProQuest Medical Library database.

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2007). Overview and introduction. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. (pp. 3-6). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Allen, T., Eby, L., & Lentz, E. (2006). The relationship between formal mentoring program characteristics and perceived program effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*(1), 125-153. Retrieved January 23, 2009, from ProQuest Psychology Journals database.

Allen, T. D., & Poteet, M. L. (1999). Developing effective mentoring relationships: Strategies from the mentor's viewpoint. *The Career Development Quarterly, 48*(1), 59-73. Retrieved December 16, 2008, from Wilson Education Abstracts database.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Russell, J. E. A. (2000). Protégé selection by mentors: what makes the difference? Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(3), 271-282. Retrieved December 16, 2008 from Research Library Core database.

Allen, T. D., Rhodes, J. E., & Eby, L. T. (2007). Definition and evolution of mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. (pp. 7-20). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Bennetts, C. (2002). Traditional mentor relationships, intimacy and emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 15*(2), 155-170. Retrieved July 25, 2008, from the Education Research Complete database.

Braskamp, L. A. (2007). The religious and spiritual journey of college students. In D. Jacobsen and R. H. Jacobsen (Eds.), *The American University in a Postsecular Age: Religion and Higher Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brass, D. J. (1985). Men's and women's networks: A study of interaction patterns and influence in an organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, *28*(2), 327. Retrieved January 19, 2009, from Business Module database.

Busch, J. W. (1985). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentors' perceptions. *American Educational Research Journal*, *22*(2), 257-265.

Campbell, C. D. (2007). Best practices for student-faculty mentoring programs. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. (pp. 325-343). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Campbell, T. A., & Campbell, D. E. (2007). Outcomes of mentoring at-risk college students: gender and ethnic matching effects. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *15*(2), 135-148.

Cannister, M. W. (1999). Mentoring and the spiritual well-being of late adolescents. *Adolescence*, *34*(136), 769-79. Retrieved January 3, 2009, from Wilson Education Abstracts database.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(3), 619.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Clark, R. A., Harden, S. L., & Johnson, W. B. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training: Results of a national survey. *Teaching of Psychology*, *27*(4), 262-8. Retrieved January 3, 2009, from Wilson Education Abstracts database.

Cunningham, S. (1998). Who's mentoring the mentors? The discipling dimension of faculty development in Christian higher education. *Theological Education*, *34*(2), 31-49. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from ATLA Religion database.

Daloz, L. A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Davis, A. L. (2005). *An investigation of formal mentoring relationships and programs: A meta-analysis.* Ph.D. dissertation, City University of New York, United States -- New York. Retrieved December 6, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database.

Davis, D. J. (2007). Access to academe: The importance of mentoring to black students. *Negro Educational Review*, *58*(3), 217-231,279. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from Education Module database.

Day, A. (2006). The power of social support: Mentoring and resilience. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 14*(4), 196-198. Retrieved December 19, 2008, from Wilson Education Abstracts database.

Donald, J. C. (2007) *The feasibility of effective online mentoring of school principals.* Ed.D. dissertation, Liberty University, United States -- Virginia. Retrieved December 30, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database.

Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A.. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(5), 539. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from Research Library Core database.

English, L. M. (1998). *Mentoring in Religious Education.* Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Erdem, F., & Ozen, A. J. (2008). Mentoring—A relationship based on trust: Qualitative research. *Public Personnel Management, 37*(1). Retrieved July 25, 2008, from the Education Research Journal database.

Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of proteges versus non-proteges. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *10*(4), 309. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from Research Library Core database.

Ferrari, J. R. (2004). Mentors in life and at school: Impact on undergraduate protégé perceptions of university mission and values. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 12*(3). Retrieved March 12, 2008 from the Academic Search Premiere database.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Gribbin, K. J. (2002). *Undergraduate students' perceptions of the effects of facilitated and non-facilitated mentoring.* Ph.D. dissertation, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, United States -- Illinois. Retrieved January 22, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database.

Guetzloe, E. (1997). The power of positive relationships: Mentoring programs in the school and community. *Preventing School Failure, 41*, 100-4. Retrieved December 16, 2008, from Wilson Education Abstracts database.

Hancock, T. E., Bufford, R. K., Lau, B., & Ninteman, N. (2005). Attempting valid assessment of spiritual growth: A survey of Christ-centered living. *Christian Education Journal*, *2*(1), 129-153. Retrieved January 24, 2009, from ProQuest Education Journals database.

Hansford, B., & Ehrich, L. C. (2006). The principalship: How significant is mentoring? *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(1), 36-52. Retrieved January 6, 2009, from ProQuest Education Journals database.

Higher Education Research Institute (Los Angeles, Calif.). (2004). *Spirituality in higher education A national study of college students' search for meaning and purpose*.

Los Angeles, California: Higher Education Research Institute; Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

Higher Education Research Institute (Los Angeles, Calif.). (2006). *Spirituality and the professoriate A national study of faculty beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors*. Spirituality in higher education. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.

Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. Academy of Management. *The Academy of Management Review*, *26*(2), 264-288. Retrieved December 23, 2008, from Business Module database.

Hoffman, A. J., & Wallach, J. (2005). Effects of mentoring on community college students in transition to university. *The Community College Enterprise, 11*(1), 67-78. Retrieved January 3, 2009, from ProQuest Education Journals database.

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(4), 505-532. Retrieved April 28, 2008 from the Proquest Educational Journal database.

Johnson, W. B. (2003). A framework for conceptualizing competence to mentor. *Ethics & Behavior*, *13*(2), 127-151. Retrieved April 28, 2008 from the Proquest Education Journal database.

Johnson, W. B. (2007). Student-faculty mentorship outcomes. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.)*, The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. (pp. 190-210). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Johnson, W. B., & Ridley, C. R. (2004). *The Elements of Mentoring.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, W. B., Rose, G., & Schlosser, L. Z. (2007). Student-faculty mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. (pp. 49-69). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kalbfleisch, P. J., & Davies, A. B. (1993). An interpersonal model of participation in mentoring relationships. *Western Journal of Communication, 57,* 399-415. Retrieved July 25, 2008, from the Education Research Complete database.

Keller, T. E. (2007). Youth mentoring. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 23-47). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kram, K. E. (1980). *Mentoring processes at work: Developmental relationships in managerial careers.* Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, United States -- Connecticut. Retrieved January 17, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 608. Retrieved December 23, 2008, from Business Module database.

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

Kuhn, T., & Padak, G. (2006). From the co-editors: On mentors and mentoring (mentors mentoring mentees). *NACADA Journal, 26*(2), 2-3. Retrieved March 12, 2008, from the Education Research Complete database.

Laing, 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), 271-88. Retrieved January 3, 2009, from Research Library Core database.

Lee, W. Y. (1999). Striving toward effective retention: The effect of race on mentoring African American students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *74*(2), 27-43. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from Wilson Education Abstracts database.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical Research: Planning and design* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Levinson, D. J, Darrow, N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The Seasons of a Man's Life.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Luna, G., & Cullen, D. L. (1995). *Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed.* Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Luna, G., & Cullen, D. L. (1998). Do graduate students need mentoring? *College Student Journal*, *32*(3), 322-30. Retrieved March 14, 2008, from the Academic Search Premier database.

Ma, S. Y. (2003). The Christian college experience and the development of spirituality among students. *Christian Higher Education*, *2*(4), 321-339. Retrieved January 21, 2009, from the Research Library Core database.

Maistre, C. L., Boudreau, S., & Paré, A. (2006). Mentor or evaluator? Assisting and assessing newcomers to the professions. *Journal of Workplace Learning: What a difference workplace learning makes*, *18*(6), 344-354. Retrieved January 10, 2009, from ProQuest Education Journals database.

Mee-Lee, L., & Bush, T. (2003, December). Student mentoring in higher education: Hong Kong Baptist University. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 11*(3), 265-271. Retrieved March 12, 2008, from the Academic Search Premiere database.

Mullen, C. A. (2007). Naturally occurring student-faculty mentoring relationships. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. (pp. 119-138). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Nagda, A. B, Gregerman, S. R., Jonides, J., Von Hippel, & Lerner, J. S. (1998). Undergraduate student-faculty research partnerships affect student retention. *The Review of Higher Education, 22*(1), 55-72. Retrieved May 15, 2008, from the Jstor database.

Noe, R. A. (1988). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review, 13*(1), 65. Retrieved December 16, 2008, from Business Module database.

O’Leary, V. E. (1974). Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. *Psychological Bulletin*, *81*(11), 809. Retrieved January 19, 2009, from Research Library Core database.

Pando, I., Jr. (1993). *The relationship between mentoring and career advancement of ethnic minority men and women serving as presidents, vice-presidents and deans in California's community colleges.* Ed.D. dissertation, University of La Verne, United States -- California. Retrieved December 12, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1979). Interaction effects in Spady's and Tinto's conceptual models of college dropout. *Sociology of Education, 52*(4), 197-210. Retrieved May 15, 2008, from Jstor database.

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Hibel, J. (1978). Student-faculty interactional settings and their relationship to predicted academic performance. *Journal of Higher Education, 49*(5), 450-463. Retrieved May 15, 2008, from Jstor database.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(4), 939-951. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from Business Module database.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(4), 529-550. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from Research Library Core database.

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*(6), 1177-1194. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from Business Module database.

Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1999). Gender differences in expected outcomes of mentoring relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(4), 957-971. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from Business Module database.

Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1999). Burden or blessing? Expected costs and benefits of being a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(4), 493-509. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from Research Library Core database.

Ramani, S., Gruppen, L., & Kachur, E. K. (2006). Twelve tips for developing effective mentors. *Medical Teacher*, *28*(5), 404-408. Retrieved March 14, 2008, from the Academic Search Premier database.

Salkind, N. J. (2008). *Statistics for People Who (think they) Hate Statisics* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Santos, S. J., & Reigadas, E. T. (2005). Understanding the student-faculty mentoring process: Its effects on at-risk university students. *Journal of College Student Retention*, *6*(3), 337-357. Retrieved March 12, 2008, from the Proquest Educational Journals database.

Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(2), 169. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from Research Library Core database.

Sosik, J. J., Lee, D., & Bouquillon, E. A. (2005). Context and mentoring: Examining formal and informal relationships in High Tech Firms and K-12 Schools. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *12*(2), 94-108. Retrieved December 24, 2008, from Education Module database.

Terrion, J. L., & Leonard, D. (2007). A taxonomy of the characteristics of student peer mentors in higher education: findings from a literature review. *Mentoring &; Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *15*(2), 149-164.

Thile, E. L., & Matt, G. E. (1995). The ethnic mentor undergraduate program: A brief description and preliminary findings. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *23*, 116-26. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from Wilson Education Abstracts database.

Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1994). Role of protege personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(3), 688. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from Business Module database.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *NCES projections of education statistics to 2012*. Washington, DC: Author.

Warren, E. S. (2005). Future colleague or convenient friend: The ethics of mentorship. *Counseling & Values, 49*(2), 141-146. Retrieved March 17, 2008, from the Proquest Educational Journals database.

Young, A. M., & Perrewe, P. L. (2004). The role of expectations in the mentoring exchange: An analysis of mentor and protégé expectations in relation to perceived support. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 16*, 103-126.

Zachary, L. J. (2005). *Creating a Mentoring Culture: The organization's guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zey, M. G. (1991). *The Mentoring Connection: Strategic alliances in corporate life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Appendix A

57 Elements of Mentoring

According to Johnson and Ridley (2004), the following elements are key to good mentoring.

What Excellent Mentors Do: Matters of Skills

1. Select Your Protégés Carefully
2. Know Your Protégés
3. Expect Excellence (and Nothing Else)
4. Affirm, Affirm, Affirm, and Then Affirm Some More
5. Provide Sponsorship
6. Be a Teacher and a Coach
7. Encourage and Support
8. Offer Counsel in Difficult Times
9. Protect When Necessary
10. Stimulate Growth with Challenging Assignments
11. Give Protégé Exposure and Promote Their Visibility
12. Nurture Creativity
13. Provide Correction—Even When Painful
14. Narrate Growth and Development
15. Self-Disclosure When Appropriate
16. Accept Increasing Friendship and Mutuality
17. Teach Faceting
18. Be an Intentional Model
19. Display Dependability

Traits of Excellent Mentors: Matters of Style and Personality

20. Exude Warmth
21. Listen Actively
22. Show Unconditional Regard
23. Tolerate Idealization
24. Embrace Humor
25. Do Not Expect Perfection
26. Attend to Interpersonal Cues
27. Be Trustworthy
28. Respect Values
29. Do Not Stoop to Jealousy

Arranging the Mentor—Protégé Relationship: Matters of Beginning

30. Carefully Consider the “Match”
31. Clarify Expectations
32. Define Relationship Boundaries
33. Consider Protégé Relationship Style
34. Describe Potential Benefits and Risks
35. Be Sensitive to Gender
36. Be Sensitive to Race and Ethnicity

37. Plan for Change at the Outset
38. Schedule Periodic Reviews and Evaluations

Knowing Thyself as a Mentor: Matters of Integrity

39. Consider the Consequences of Being a Mentor
40. Practice Self-Care
41. Be Productive
42. Make Sure You Are Competent
43. Hold Yourself Accountable
44. Respect the Power of Attraction
45. Accept the Burden of Power
46. Practice Humility
47. Never Exploit Protégés

When Things Go Wrong: Matters of Restoration

48. Above All, Do No Harm
49. Slow Down the Process
50. Tell the Truth
51. Seek Consultation
52. Document Carefully
53. Dispute your Irrational Thinking

Welcoming Change and Saying Goodbye: Matters of Closure

54. Welcome Change and Growth
55. Accept Endings
56. Find Helpful Ways to Say Goodbye
57. Mentor as a Way of Life

Appendix B

Demographical Data on Participants

Table 1

Demographic Variables for the Four Nazarene Higher Educational Institutions (NHEI)

	Institution A		Institution B		Institution C		Institution D	
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Age								
17 years old	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3
18 years old	11	7.0	10	9.0	6	11.3	2	4.5
19 years old	33	20.9	22	19.8	9	17.0	9	20.5
20 years old	43	27.2	19	17.1	15	28.3	16	36.4
21 years old	54	34.2	31	27.9	11	20.8	8	18.2
22 years old	12	7.6	17	15.3	11	20.8	8	18.2
23 years old	5	3.2	12	10.8	1	1.9	0	0.0
Gender								
Male	40	25.3	31	27.9	10	18.9	3	6.8
Female	118	74.7	80	72.1	43	81.1	41	93.2
Ethnicity								
White, Non-Hispanic	141	89.2	107	96.4	48	90.6	41	93.2
Black, Non-Hispanic	4	2.5	1	0.9	0	0.0	1	2.3
Hispanic	7	4.4	2	1.8	3	5.7	0	0.0

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Demographic Variables for the Four Nazarene Higher Educational Institutions (NHEI)

	Institution A		Institution B		Institution C		Institution D	
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Ethnicity								
Am. Indian/Al. Native	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Island	5	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5
Non-residential/Foreign	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unclassified	1	0.6	1	0.9	2	3.8	0	0.0
Denomination								
Nazarene	68	43.0	49	44.1	28	52.8	28	63.6
Other	90	57.0	62	55.9	25	47.2	16	36.4
Field of Study (Major)								
Behavioral Sciences	1	0.6	0	0.0	5	9.4	2	4.5
Criminology	29	18.4	16	14.4	6	11.3	2	4.5
Psychology	67	42.4	37	33.3	24	45.3	15	34.1
Sociology	8	5.1	17	15.3	11	20.8	0	0.0
Social Work	47	29.7	36	32.4	2	3.8	25	56.8
Other	6	3.8	5	4.5	5	9.4	0	0.0

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Demographic Variables for the Four Nazarene Higher Educational Institutions (NHEI)

	Institution A		Institution B		Institution C		Institution D	
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Current Classification								
Freshman	24	15.2	24	21.6	9	17.0	9	20.5
Sophomore	44	27.8	22	19.8	13	24.5	12	27.3
Junior	50	31.6	29	26.1	18	34.0	13	29.5
Senior	40	25.3	36	32.4	13	24.5	10	22.7

Appendix C

Authorization from Nazarene Higher Education Institutions

Institution A

Tom,

The IRB has approved your application. A hard copy of this approval will be mailed to you.

You may work with your adviser and press ahead. :)

[redacted]

Institution B

Tom,

[redacted] IRB reviewed your application entitled, "The Impact of career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentoring on undergraduate students" and approved it.

As part of our IRB procedures, we let [redacted] cabinet-level personnel know of requests for research that studies the [redacted] community so that site permission may be granted at that administrative level. I will forward to you the communication from Lannette [redacted] who is [redacted] VP of Student Development. She assented to giving you site permission, plus she is interested in your research results should you wish to share them with her.

Should there be any changes to your study, please notify [redacted] IRB in writing. This approval is valid for one year from today's date.

The IRB wishes you success in your research endeavors and in getting that doctorate!

Joyce

[redacted]

Institution C

Tom, I was able to secure the Dean's approval yesterday. You will want to contact our registrar James [redacted] for the list of students. He can be reached at [redacted]

Earl

[redacted]

Institution D

Dear Thomas Middendorf;

Your IRB Application as written has been approved. You may begin collecting data. A formal letter of approval will be sent in the near future.

*Only one comment was made (which does not impact IRB approval): One of the committee members wanted to make sure that with a mass email, that people know to not hit reply to everyone for anonymity. If you have any questions, don’t’ hesitate to let me know.

[redacted]

Appendix D

Example Emails to Participants

First Email Administration

Dear [redacted] Psychology Major,

My name is Tom Middendorf and I am conducting doctoral research on the **mentoring relationship among students (in the Behavioral Sciences Division) and university personnel** at selected Nazarene institutions.

Attached is a link to a survey that will take about **5-7 minutes** to complete. Your completion of the survey will give you an option to enter a drawing for a **$50 gift card**.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=nWeOGplfD63wdUR7R0ySUA_3d_3d

Please take a few moments to complete the following survey. Your contribution to this research is much appreciated!

Sincerely,

Tom Middendorf

Second Email Administration

Dear [redacted] Psychology Major,

I need your help! Please consider taking the following survey for students in the Behavioral Sciences Division. The results of this survey are being used in doctoral research on the **mentoring relationships of undergraduate students and university personnel**.

The survey will take approximately **5-7 minutes** and gives an option to sign up for a drawing for a **$50 gift card** for your participation.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=nWeOGplfD63wdUR7R0ySUA_3d_3d

Thank you to all that have participated thus far! **If you have already taken the survey, you DO NOT have to complete it again**.

Your contribution to research is much appreciated!

Tom

Third Email Administration

[redacted] Psychology Majors,

If you **HAVE NOT** filled out the following survey, please consider doing so as your responses are being used for doctoral research on the mentoring relationships of undergraduate students (in the Behavioral Sciences Division) and university personnel. This is the last chance to participate in the study!

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=nWeOGplfD63wdUR7R0ySUA_3d_3d

You DO NOT have to take the survey again if you've already done so. Thank you to all that have participated in the study thus far.

The survey will take approximately **5-7 minutes** to complete and gives you the option to enter a drawing for a **$50 gift card** for participating in the study.

Your contribution to research is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Tom Middendorf

Appendix E

Mentor Functions Survey

Ed.D Program Questionnaire

Please check the appropriate response for each question:
Age: ___ **Gender:** ___Male ___Female

Ethnicity: ___White, Non-Hispanic ___Black, Non-Hispanic ___Hispanic ___American Indian/Alaskan Native ___Asian/Pacific Island ___Nonresidential (foreign) ___Unclassified

Denominational Affiliation: ___Nazarene ___Other

College or University: ___Institution A ___Institution B ___Institution C ___Institution D

Field of Study: ___Behavioral Science ___Criminal Justice (Criminology) ___Psychology ___Sociology ___Social Work ___Other (Please specify:______________________)

Current Classification: ___Freshman ___Sophomore ___Junior ___Senior

Please read the following statement and answer the questions that follow:
Mentoring can be described as a relationship between a more experienced and knowledgeable adult (mentor) and a younger, more inexperienced adult (mentee) with the purpose of helping the younger person as they find maturity and enter the world of work. A mentor assists the mentee by providing support, direction, and counsel as he or she achieves this task.

Based on the above definition of mentoring, please mark the appropriate box or boxes that best describes your mentor(s). You may choose more than one if necessary.

Consider the following university personnel members. Mark an X in the box or boxes that best describes your mentor(s). You may choose more than one if necessary.

	X
Administrator (i.e. President, Provost, Vice President, Deans, Directors)	
Academic Advisor	
Athletic Coach	
Chaplain	
Peer	
Professor	
Resident Assistant	
Resident Director	
Staff Personnel (i.e. Administrative Assistant, financial aid advisor, admissions counselor, library assistant, etc.)	
I do not have a university personnel member that serves as my mentor.	
Other (Please give a title or description): ______________________________	

Choose the most significant mentoring relationship among the university personnel. Using this relationship, give an appropriate response to the extent that your most significant mentoring relationship demonstrates the following functions. Mark an X in the box for each of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual mentoring functions.

CAREER FUNCTIONS

	Always	Frequently	Seldom	Never
Sponsorship—My mentor sponsors me by demonstrating a public support of my skills and knowledge by advocating for me.				
Exposure/visibility—My mentor helps me in the networking with other professionals in my field of interest.				
Coaching—My mentor gives me positive and negative feedback on skills and performance that helps to develop my potential.				
Protection—My mentor has intervened in situations where I was ill-equipped to handle certain situations.				
Challenging Assignments—My mentor delegates difficult assignments or projects to me that stretch my knowledge and skills.				

PSYCHOSOCIAL FUNCTIONS

	Always	Frequently	Seldom	Never
Role Modeling—My mentor demonstrates behaviors, attitudes, values and/or skills that I desire to emulate.				
Acceptance/confirmation—My mentor provides support, respect, and encouragement which gives me self-confidence and helps me to feel good about myself.				
Counseling—My mentor provides a platform for my self-exploration by listening and offering personal advice as I attempt to resolve personal and professional issues.				
Friendship—My mentor demonstrates a personal caring and intimacy that goes beyond the requirements of his or her job.				

SPIRITUAL FUNCTIONS

	Always	Frequently	Seldom	Never
Discipleship—My mentor shares religious values and beliefs (i.e., personal testimony, scripture, other religious readings) that influence my faith.				
Spiritual Accountability—My mentor provides positive and negative feedback concerning my commitment to faith.				
Spiritual Advising—My mentor is a sounding board for my personal and/or sensitive issues (i.e., faith, hardships, relationships).				
Prayer—My mentor is a person that I pray with.				

Keeping in mind your most significant mentoring relationship with a college or university personnel member, rate the following mentoring functions according to their IMPORTANCE for your development. Respond by marking an X for each of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual mentoring functions.

CAREER FUNCTIONS

	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Sponsorship—My mentor sponsors me by demonstrating a public support of my skills and knowledge by advocating for me.			
Exposure/visibility—My mentor helps me in the networking with other professionals in my field of interest.			
Coaching—My mentor gives me positive and negative feedback on skills and performance that helps to develop my potential.			
Protection—My mentor has intervened in situations where I was ill-equipped to handle certain situations.			
Challenging Assignments—My mentor delegates difficult assignments or projects to me that stretch my knowledge and skills.			

PSYCHOSOCIAL FUNCTIONS

	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Role Modeling—My mentor demonstrates behaviors, attitudes, values and/or skills that I desire to emulate.			
Acceptance/confirmation—My mentor provides support, respect, and encouragement which gives me self-confidence and helps me to feel good about myself.			
Counseling—My mentor provides a platform for my self-exploration by listening and offering personal advice as I attempt to resolve personal and professional issues.			
Friendship—My mentor demonstrates a personal caring and intimacy that goes beyond the requirements of his or her job.			

SPIRITUAL FUNCTIONS

	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Discipleship—My mentor shares religious values and beliefs (i.e., personal testimony, scripture, other religious readings) that influence my faith.			
Spiritual Accountability—My mentor provides positive and negative feedback concerning my commitment to faith.			
Spiritual Advising—My mentor is a sounding board for my personal and/or sensitive issues (i.e., faith, hardships, relationships).			
Prayer—My mentor is a person that I pray with.			

Appendix F

Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Investigator: Tom Middendorf, doctoral candidate for Ed. D. at Olivet Nazarene University, (tmiddend@olivet.edu).

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Olivet Nazarene University. The University requires that you give your consent to participate in this project. A basic explanation of the project is written below.

If you then decide to participate in the project, please check the appropriate response at the bottom of this page.

1. **Nature and Purpose of the Project:** The purpose of this study is to investigate the extent of career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentoring within the relationships of undergraduate students and university personnel at selected Nazarene higher education institutions. Moreover, the study aims to assess students' perceptions of the importance of these functions within their mentoring relationships with university personnel. Results from the study may give an indication of who, among university personnel, are serving as mentors for undergraduate students.

2. **Explanation of Procedures:** A case study using mixed model methodology will be conducted on undergraduate students in four selected Nazarene Higher Education Institutions (Mid-America, Mount Vernon, Olivet, and Trevecca) to determine the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions in their mentoring relationships with university personnel. More specifically, students in the Behavioral Sciences Division of these institutions will be the target population.

   A one-time survey will be administered to students to investigate what university personnel serve as mentors to traditional undergraduate students. The data will be analyzed quantitatively using a frequency of occurrence and average of means. Additionally, the survey will investigate the extent of the career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions within the mentoring relationships with university personnel. Responses will be compared and analyzed using a one-way ANOVA. Finally, students will be asked to determine the importance of career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions of mentorship with university personnel. Data will be analyzed using a chi-square analysis.

3. **Discomfort and Risks:** There are no known factors that would cause discomfort and risk with this study.

4. **Benefits:** The prevalence of mentoring within higher education is unknown. The data from this study may give an indication of the prevalence of mentoring among Nazarene higher education institutions.

Results from this study may indicate the preferred career, psychosocial, and spiritual functions exhibited by university personnel in their mentoring relationships with undergraduate students. Such information may be used for training mentors for future success.

Moreover, results may indicate who, among university personnel, are serving as mentors for undergraduate students. Results may help with the potential recruitment of mentors in the future.

Lastly, results will add to the research on the mentoring relationships in higher education by studying a specific set of spiritual functions. Little is included within the research on spiritual functions. Results could indicate the need for a more concerted effort to include a spiritual focus in mentoring relationships with students.

5. **Confidentiality:** Confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study. A student's name will not be included with the results.

6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:** Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

______________________________________ ______________

Signature of Participant Date

Indicate if you would like to be entered in a drawing for a $50 gift certificate.

Yes ___ No___

(If yes, please include email in space below)

______________________________________ ______________

Email Address Date

Appendix G

Table 2: Mentor Selection Responses

Table 2

Frequency of Occurrence and Average of Means for University Personnel as Mentors

University Personnel	*n*	%
Administrator	20	5.5
Academic Advisor	154	42.1
Athletic Coach	34	9.3
Chaplain	18	4.9
Peer	130	35.5
Professor	192	52.5
Resident Assistant	62	16.9
Resident Director	61	16.7
Staff Personnel	41	11.2
No College or University Mentor	50	13.7
Other	33	9.0
Total	795	

Appendix H

Tables 3-5: Comparisons of Mentoring Functions by Gender

Table 3

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Gender

	Gender	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Sponsorship	Male	76	2.07	0.85	0.39	0.53
	Female	235	2.00	0.85		
	Total	311	2.01	0.85		
Exp./Vis.	Male	76	2.08	0.83	2.46	0.12
	Female	235	2.26	0.86		
	Total	311	2.21	0.85		
Coaching	Male	76	1.62	0.73	2.59	0.11
	Female	235	1.77	0.74		
	Total	311	1.74	0.74		
Protection	Male	76	2.29	1.02	0.02	0.90
	Female	235	2.31	1.00		
	Total	311	2.30	1.00		
Challenging As.	Male	76	1.91	0.87	0.10	0.75
	Female	235	1.94	0.86		
	Total	311	1.94	0.86		

df = 1, 309.

Table 4

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Gender

	Gender	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Role Modeling	Male	76	1.43	0.57	1.56	0.21
	Female	230	1.35	0.50		
	Total	306	1.37	0.52		
Accep./Confirm.	Male	76	1.41	0.52	0.11	0.74
	Female	230	1.38	0.59		
	Total	306	1.39	0.57		
Counseling	Male	76	1.54	0.66	0.41	0.52
	Female	230	1.60	0.73		
	Total	306	1.58	0.72		
Friend	Male	76	1.45	0.64	0.63	0.43
	Female	230	1.52	0.68		
	Total	306	1.50	0.67		

df = 1, 304.

Table 5

Extent that Spiritual Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Gender

	Gender	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Discipleship	Male	76	1.67	0.70	0.66	0.42
	Female	230	1.60	0.70		
	Total	306	1.61	0.70		
Spiritual Acc.	Male	76	2.14	0.89	0.28	0.60
	Female	230	2.21	1.01		
	Total	306	2.20	0.98		
Spiritual Adv.	Male	76	1.88	0.83	0.73	0.39
	Female	230	1.98	0.91		
	Total	306	1.96	0.89		
Prayer	Male	76	2.64	1.04	0.00	0.96
	Female	230	2.65	1.05		
	Total	306	2.65	1.05		

df = 1, 304.

Appendix I

Tables 6-8: Comparisons of Mentoring Functions by Age

Table 6

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Age

	Age	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Sponsorship	17	1	2.00		1.43	0.20
	18	25	2.12	0.78		
	19	61	2.20	0.91		
	20	74	2.08	0.91		
	21	94	1.87	0.79		
	22	40	1.83	0.84		
	23	16	2.13	0.72		
	Total	311	2.01	0.85		
Exp./Vis.	17	1	2.00		0.68	0.67
	18	25	2.04	0.98		
	19	61	2.30	0.92		
	20	74	2.30	0.74		
	21	94	2.19	0.88		
	22	40	2.05	0.75		
	23	16	2.31	1.01		
	Total	311	2.21	0.85		
Coaching	17	1	2.00		0.49	0.82
	18	25	1.76	0.83		
	19	61	1.84	0.80		
	20	74	1.70	0.70		
	21	94	1.73	0.76		
	22	40	1.60	0.63		
	23	16	1.81	0.66		
	Total	311	1.74	0.74		

df = 6, 304.

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Age

	Age	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Protection	17	1	3.00		0.15	0.99
	18	25	2.28	0.94		
	19	61	2.33	1.09		
	20	74	2.27	0.97		
	21	94	2.29	0.97		
	22	40	2.30	1.04		
	23	16	2.44	1.09		
	Total	311	2.30	1.00		
Challenging As.	17	1	2.00		0.74	0.61
	18	25	2.20	0.91		
	19	61	1.97	0.91		
	20	74	2.00	0.79		
	21	94	1.85	0.93		
	22	40	1.83	0.75		
	23	16	1.88	0.81		
	Total	311	1.94	0.86		

df = 6, 304.

Table 7

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Age

	Age	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Role Modeling	17	1	1.00		0.20	0.98
	18	25	1.44	0.51		
	19	58	1.38	0.52		
	20	73	1.37	0.49		
	21	93	1.37	0.57		
	22	40	1.35	0.53		
	23	16	1.31	0.48		
	Total	306	1.37	0.52		
Accep./Confirm.	17	1	2.00		0.91	0.49
	18	25	1.24	0.44		
	19	58	1.50	0.60		
	20	73	1.40	0.57		
	21	93	1.37	0.60		
	22	40	1.35	0.53		
	23	16	1.38	0.50		
	Total	306	1.39	0.57		
Counseling	17	1	2.00		0.46	0.84
	18	25	1.52	0.87		
	19	58	1.66	0.69		
	20	73	1.66	0.80		
	21	93	1.53	0.65		
	22	40	1.53	0.64		
	23	16	1.56	0.73		
	Total	306	1.58	0.72		

df = 6, 299.

(table continues)

Table 7 (continued)

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Age

	Age	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Friend	17	1	2.00		1.44	0.20
	18	25	1.56	0.71		
	19	58	1.48	0.71		
	20	73	1.67	0.77		
	21	93	1.43	0.60		
	22	40	1.38	0.54		
	23	16	1.38	0.62		
	Total	306	1.50	0.67		

df = 6, 299.

Table 8

Extent that Spiritual Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Age

	Age	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Discipleship	17	1	2.00		0.31	0.93
	18	25	1.64	0.64		
	19	58	1.55	0.73		
	20	73	1.62	0.68		
	21	93	1.59	0.74		
	22	40	1.73	0.72		
	23	16	1.63	0.62		
	Total	306	1.61	0.70		
Spiritual Acc.	17	1	2.00		0.54	0.78
	18	25	2.16	0.90		
	19	58	2.31	1.06		
	20	73	2.22	1.00		
	21	93	2.15	0.96		
	22	40	2.03	0.97		
	23	16	2.44	0.96		
	Total	306	2.20	0.98		
Spiritual Adv.	17	1	2.00		0.44	0.85
	18	25	1.72	0.74		
	19	58	1.91	0.94		
	20	73	2.01	0.91		
	21	93	1.96	0.83		
	22	40	2.05	1.04		
	23	16	2.00	0.89		
	Total	306	1.96	0.89		

df = 6, 299. (table continues)

Table 8 (continued)

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Age

	Age	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Prayer	17	1	3.00		0.64	0.70
	18	25	2.60	0.96		
	19	58	2.72	1.01		
	20	73	2.67	1.07		
	21	93	2.51	1.05		
	22	40	2.75	1.06		
	23	16	2.94	1.24		
	Total	306	2.65	1.05		

df = 6, 299.

Appendix J

Tables 9-12: Comparisons of Mentoring Functions by Ethnicity

Table 9

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Ethnicity

	Ethnicity	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Sponsorship	White	284	2.02	0.85	0.30	0.88
	Black	6	2.00	0.89		
	Hispanic	11	1.91	0.83		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.67	0.52		
	Unclassified	4	2.00	1.41		
	Total	311	2.01	0.85		
Exp./Vis.	White	284	2.21	0.86	0.92	0.45
	Black	6	2.50	0.55		
	Hispanic	11	1.91	0.83		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	2.17	0.75		
	Unclassified	4	2.75	0.96		
	Total	311	2.21	0.85		
Coaching	White	284	1.74	0.74	1.30	0.27
	Black	6	1.50	0.55		
	Hispanic	11	1.64	0.67		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.67	0.52		
	Unclassified	4	2.50	1.29		
	Total	311	1.74	0.74		
Protection	White	284	2.30	1.00	3.45	.009*
	Black	6	2.33	0.82		
	Hispanic	11	2.09	0.94		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.83	0.75		
	Unclassified	4	4.00	0.00		
	Total	311	2.30	1.00		

df = 4, 306. (table continues)
*p < .05.

Table 9 (continued)

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Ethnicity

	Ethnicity	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*P*
Challenging As.	White	284	1.94	0.85	1.39	0.24
	Black	6	1.67	0.82		
	Hispanic	11	1.64	0.92		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	2.00	1.10		
	Unclassified	4	2.75	0.96		
	Total	311	1.94	0.86		

df = 4, 306.

**p* < .05.

Table 10

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Ethnicity

	Ethnicity	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*P*
Role Modeling	White	279	1.37	0.53	0.38	0.82
	Black	6	1.17	0.41		
	Hispanic	11	1.36	0.51		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.50	0.55		
	Unclassified	4	1.50	0.58		
	Total	306	1.37	0.52		
Acc./Confirm.	White	279	1.39	0.58	0.65	0.63
	Black	6	1.17	0.41		
	Hispanic	11	1.36	0.51		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.33	0.52		
	Unclassified	4	1.75	0.50		
	Total	306	1.39	0.57		
Counseling	White	279	1.59	0.73	0.24	0.92
	Black	6	1.50	0.55		
	Hispanic	11	1.55	0.52		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.33	0.52		
	Unclassified	4	1.50	0.58		
	Total	306	1.58	0.72		
Friend	White	279	1.50	0.68	0.44	0.78
	Black	6	1.67	0.52		
	Hispanic	11	1.36	0.51		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.33	0.52		
	Unclassified	4	1.75	0.50		
	Total	306	1.50	0.67		

df = 4, 301.

Table 11

Extent that Spiritual Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Ethnicity

	Ethnicity	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*P*
Discipleship	White	279	1.61	0.70	1.01	0.40
	Black	6	2.00	0.89		
	Hispanic	11	1.64	0.81		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.33	0.52		
	Unclassified	4	2.00	0.00		
	Total	306	1.61	0.70		
Spiritual Acc.	White	279	2.21	0.98	0.94	0.44
	Black	6	2.50	1.05		
	Hispanic	11	2.09	1.04		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.50	0.84		
	Unclassified	4	2.25	0.96		
	Total	306	2.20	0.98		
Spiritual Adv.	White	279	1.97	0.91	1.00	0.41
	Black	6	2.17	0.75		
	Hispanic	11	1.82	0.75		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	1.33	0.52		
	Unclassified	4	2.25	0.50		
	Total	306	1.96	0.89		
Prayer	White	279	2.65	1.04	1.31	0.27
	Black	6	2.83	1.17		
	Hispanic	11	2.73	1.10		
	Asian/Pac. Island	6	2.00	0.89		
	Unclassified	4	3.50	1.00		
	Total	306	2.65	1.05		

df = 4, 301.

Appendix K

Tables 12-14: Comparisons of Mentoring Functions by Denomination

Table 12

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Denomination

	Denomination	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Sponsorship	Nazarene	147	2.02	0.85	0.02	0.88
	Other	164	2.01	0.85		
	Total	311	2.01	0.85		
Exp./Vis.	Nazarene	147	2.10	0.82	5.31	.022*
	Other	164	2.32	0.87		
	Total	311	2.21	0.85		
Coaching	Nazarene	147	1.71	0.71	0.25	0.62
	Other	164	1.76	0.76		
	Total	311	1.74	0.74		
Protection	Nazarene	147	2.24	0.96	1.15	0.29
	Other	164	2.36	1.03		
	Total	311	2.30	1.00		
Challenging As.	Nazarene	147	1.88	0.79	1.27	0.26
	Other	164	1.99	0.92		
	Total	311	1.94	0.86		

df = 1, 309.
**p* < .05.

Table 13

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Denomination

	Major	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Role Modeling	Nazarene	146	1.36	0.55	0.18	0.68
	Other	160	1.38	0.50		
	Total	306	1.37	0.52		
Acc./Confirm.	Nazarene	146	1.34	0.57	2.46	0.12
	Other	160	1.44	0.57		
	Total	306	1.39	0.57		
Counseling	Nazarene	146	1.55	0.69	0.50	0.48
	Other	160	1.61	0.74		
	Total	306	1.58	0.72		
Friend	Nazarene	146	1.49	0.69	0.03	0.86
	Other	160	1.51	0.65		
	Total	306	1.50	0.67		

df = 1, 304.

Table 14

Extent that Spiritual Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Denomination

	Major	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Discipleship	Nazarene	146	1.58	0.67	0.59	0.45
	Other	160	1.64	0.73		
	Total	306	1.61	0.70		
Spiritual Acc.	Nazarene	146	2.16	0.92	0.29	0.59
	Other	160	2.23	1.04		
	Total	306	2.20	0.98		
Spiritual Adv.	Nazarene	146	1.92	0.88	0.55	0.46
	Other	160	1.99	0.91		
	Total	306	1.96	0.89		
Prayer	Nazarene	146	2.64	0.99	0.05	0.83
	Other	160	2.66	1.10		
	Total	306	2.65	1.05		

df = 1, 304.

Appendix L

Tables 15-17: Comparisons of Colleges or Universities on Mentoring Functions

Table 15

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by College or University

	University	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Sponsorship	A	138	1.96	0.86	0.37	0.77
	B	98	2.03	0.86		
	C	43	2.05	0.84		
	D	32	2.13	0.83		
	Total	311	2.01	0.85		
Exp./Vis.	A	138	2.25	0.87	1.34	0.26
	B	98	2.28	0.86		
	C	43	2.12	0.76		
	D	32	1.97	0.86		
	Total	311	2.21	0.85		
Coaching	A	138	1.70	0.73	0.78	0.51
	B	98	1.76	0.75		
	C	43	1.67	0.64		
	D	32	1.91	0.86		
	Total	311	1.74	0.74		
Protection	A	138	2.25	1.02	1.20	0.31
	B	98	2.45	1.05		
	C	43	2.14	0.94		
	D	32	2.28	0.81		
	Total	311	2.30	1.00		
Challenging As.	A	138	2.02	0.92	1.91	0.13
	B	98	1.97	0.90		
	C	43	1.72	0.63		
	D	32	1.75	0.72		
	Total	311	1.94	0.86		

df = 3, 307.

Table 16

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by College or University

	University	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Role Modeling	A	137	1.34	0.48	0.97	0.41
	B	95	1.44	0.60		
	C	43	1.30	0.51		
	D	31	1.35	0.49		
	Total	306	1.37	0.52		
Acc./Confirm.	A	137	1.38	0.57	0.62	0.60
	B	95	1.44	0.60		
	C	43	1.30	0.56		
	D	31	1.39	0.50		
	Total	306	1.39	0.57		
Counseling	A	137	1.55	0.65	1.52	0.21
	B	95	1.67	0.82		
	C	43	1.42	0.59		
	D	31	1.68	0.79		
	Total	306	1.58	0.72		
Friend	A	137	1.50	0.65	0.51	0.68
	B	95	1.49	0.73		
	C	43	1.42	0.55		
	D	31	1.61	0.72		
	Total	306	1.50	0.67		

df = 3, 302.

Table 17

Extent that Spiritual Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by College or University

	University	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Discipleship	A	137	1.50	0.65	2.25	0.08
	B	95	1.74	0.76		
	C	43	1.65	0.65		
	D	31	1.68	0.75		
	Total	306	1.61	0.70		
Spiritual Acc.	A	137	2.06	0.92	2.85	.037*
	B	95	2.34	1.04		
	C	43	2.09	0.95		
	D	31	2.52	1.03		
	Total	306	2.20	0.98		
Spiritual Adv.	A	137	1.87	0.85	1.73	0.16
	B	95	2.09	1.00		
	C	43	1.84	0.69		
	D	31	2.10	0.94		
	Total	306	1.96	0.89		
Prayer	A	137	2.52	1.03	1.33	0.26
	B	95	2.77	1.08		
	C	43	2.74	1.05		
	D	31	2.74	1.00		
	Total	306	2.65	1.05		

df = 3, 302.
**p* < .05.

Appendix M

Tables 18-20: Comparison of Mentoring Functions by Major

Table 18

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Field of Study (Major)

	Major	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*P*
Sponsorship	Other	16	1.88	0.81	2.15	0.06
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.50	1.29		
	Criminology	45	1.93	0.81		
	Psychology	121	2.18	0.89		
	Sociology	32	1.78	0.79		
	Social Work	93	1.91	0.79		
	Total	311	2.01	0.85		
Exp./Vis.	Other	16	2.25	0.93	4.22	0.001*
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.50	0.58		
	Criminology	45	1.89	0.71		
	Psychology	121	2.45	0.85		
	Sociology	32	2.00	0.92		
	Social Work	93	2.11	0.83		
	Total	311	2.21	0.85		
Coaching	Other	16	1.31	0.12	1.75	0.12
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.25	0.48		
	Criminology	45	1.71	0.11		
	Psychology	121	1.80	0.06		
	Sociology	32	1.66	0.15		
	Social Work	93	1.74	0.08		
	Total	311	1.74	0.04		
Protection	Other	16	2.19	1.11	1.38	0.23
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.25	1.26		
	Criminology	45	2.16	0.95		
	Psychology	121	2.49	0.98		
	Sociology	32	2.19	1.03		
	Social Work	93	2.19	0.99		
	Total	311	2.30	1.00		

df = 5, 305. (table continues)

**p* < .05.

Table 18 (continued)

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Field of Study (Major)

	Major	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*P*
Challenging As.	Other	16	1.38	0.62	3.47	0.005*
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.50	0.58		
	Criminology	45	1.93	0.72		
	Psychology	121	2.12	0.92		
	Sociology	32	1.72	0.96		
	Social Work	93	1.85	0.81		
	Total	311	1.94	0.86		

df = 5, 305.
*p < .05.

Table 19

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Field of Study (Major)

	Major	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Role Modeling	Other	16	1.31	0.48	1.12	0.35
	Beh. Sciences	4	1.75	0.96		
	Criminology	45	1.42	0.54		
	Psychology	120	1.41	0.51		
	Sociology	31	1.26	0.45		
	Social Work	90	1.32	0.54		
	Total	306	1.37	0.52		
Acc./Confirm.	Other	16	1.19	0.40	1.00	0.42
	Beh. Sciences	4	1.50	0.58		
	Criminology	45	1.44	0.55		
	Psychology	120	1.43	0.59		
	Sociology	31	1.26	0.45		
	Social Work	90	1.38	0.61		
	Total	306	1.39	0.57		
Counseling	Other	16	1.31	0.48	1.25	0.28
	Beh. Sciences	4	1.50	0.58		
	Criminology	45	1.69	0.70		
	Psychology	120	1.63	0.74		
	Sociology	31	1.39	0.56		
	Social Work	90	1.59	0.76		
	Total	306	1.58	0.72		
Friendship	Other	16	1.44	0.63	0.52	0.76
	Beh. Sciences	4	1.50	0.58		
	Criminology	45	1.44	0.55		
	Psychology	120	1.58	0.75		
	Sociology	31	1.42	0.56		
	Social Work	90	1.47	0.66		
	Total	306	1.50	0.67		

df = 5, 300.

Table 20

Extent that Spiritual Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Field of Study (Major)

	Major	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Discipleship	Other	16	1.50	0.63	2.04	0.07
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.00	0.82		
	Criminology	45	1.64	0.77		
	Psychology	120	1.73	0.73		
	Sociology	31	1.65	0.61		
	Social Work	90	1.44	0.64		
	Total	306	1.61	0.70		
Spiritual Acc.	Other	16	2.25	0.93	0.71	0.62
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.50	0.58		
	Criminology	45	2.13	0.97		
	Psychology	120	2.31	1.07		
	Sociology	31	2.10	0.87		
	Social Work	90	2.09	0.93		
	Total	306	2.20	0.98		
Spiritual Adv.	Other	16	1.75	0.86	1.34	0.25
	Beh. Sciences	4	1.50	0.58		
	Criminology	45	1.91	0.85		
	Psychology	120	2.09	0.95		
	Sociology	31	1.74	0.68		
	Social Work	90	1.93	0.90		
	Total	306	1.96	0.89		
Prayer	Other	16	2.56	1.03	1.08	0.37
	Beh. Sciences	4	2.75	0.96		
	Criminology	45	2.62	1.05		
	Psychology	120	2.81	1.06		
	Sociology	31	2.61	1.05		
	Social Work	90	2.48	1.03		
	Total	306	2.65	1.05		

df = 5, 300.

Appendix N

Tables 21-23: Comparison of Mentoring Functions by Current Classification

Table 21

Extent that Career Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Classification

	Classification	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Sponsorship	Freshmen	58	2.28	0.87	4.29	.006*
	Sophomores	73	2.14	0.89		
	Juniors	91	1.93	0.84		
	Seniors	89	1.82	0.76		
	Total	311	2.01	0.85		
Exp./Vis.	Freshmen	58	2.21	0.95	2.30	0.08
	Sophomores	73	2.26	0.82		
	Juniors	91	2.22	0.80		
	Seniors	89	2.17	0.88		
	Total	311	2.21	0.85		
Coaching	Freshmen	58	1.95	0.83	0.41	0.75
	Sophomores	73	1.66	0.71		
	Juniors	91	1.75	0.75		
	Seniors	89	1.65	0.66		
	Total	311	1.74	0.74		
Protection	Freshmen	58	2.41	0.99	1.20	0.31
	Sophomores	73	2.22	1.02		
	Juniors	91	2.30	0.99		
	Seniors	89	2.30	1.01		
	Total	311	2.30	1.00		
Challenging As.	Freshmen	58	2.19	0.93	2.31	0.08
	Sophomores	73	1.86	0.75		
	Juniors	91	1.93	0.89		
	Seniors	89	1.83	0.86		
	Total	311	1.94	0.86		

df = 3, 307.

*p < .05.

Table 22

Extent that Psychosocial Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Classification

	Classification	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Role Modeling	Freshmen	55	1.44	0.57	1.01	0.39
	Sophomores	72	1.35	0.48		
	Juniors	90	1.41	0.56		
	Seniors	89	1.30	0.49		
	Total	306	1.37	0.52		
Acc./Confirm.	Freshmen	55	1.42	0.57	0.79	0.50
	Sophomores	72	1.44	0.58		
	Juniors	90	1.40	0.65		
	Seniors	89	1.31	0.47		
	Total	306	1.39	0.57		
Counseling	Freshmen	55	1.65	0.80	0.52	0.67
	Sophomores	72	1.63	0.74		
	Juniors	90	1.58	0.73		
	Seniors	89	1.52	0.62		
	Total	306	1.58	0.72		
Friend	Freshmen	55	1.58	0.71	2.27	0.08
	Sophomores	72	1.61	0.74		
	Juniors	90	1.50	0.69		
	Seniors	89	1.36	0.53		
	Total	306	1.50	0.67		

df = 3, 302.

Table 23

Extent that Spiritual Functions were Utilized in Mentoring Relationships by Classification

	Classification	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Discipleship	Freshmen	55	1.69	0.77	0.71	0.55
	Sophomores	72	1.53	0.65		
	Juniors	90	1.66	0.71		
	Seniors	89	1.60	0.70		
	Total	306	1.61	0.70		
Spiritual Acc.	Freshmen	55	2.25	1.02	0.30	0.82
	Sophomores	72	2.18	1.00		
	Juniors	90	2.24	1.00		
	Seniors	89	2.12	0.94		
	Total	306	2.20	0.98		
Spiritual Adv.	Freshmen	55	1.96	0.88	0.88	0.45
	Sophomores	72	1.82	0.83		
	Juniors	90	2.04	0.90		
	Seniors	89	1.98	0.94		
	Total	306	1.96	0.89		
Prayer	Freshmen	55	2.64	0.97	0.30	0.83
	Sophomores	72	2.56	1.06		
	Juniors	90	2.69	1.08		
	Seniors	89	2.70	1.06		
	Total	306	2.65	1.05		

df = 3, 302.