

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

12-2003

A comparative analysis of mentoring as a socializing strategy among law faculty.

Ray Kennard Haynes 1963-
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Haynes, Ray Kennard 1963-, "A comparative analysis of mentoring as a socializing strategy among law faculty." (2003). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 591.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/591>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MENTORING AS A SOCIALIZING STRATEGY
AMONG LAW FACULTY

By

Ray Kennard Haynes

B.A., Utica College of Syracuse University, 1987
M.Ed., University of Louisville, 1997

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

College of Education and Human Development
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

December 2003

Copyright 2003 by Ray K. Haynes

All rights reserved

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MENTORING AS A SOCIALIZING STRATEGY
AMONG LAW FACULTY

By

Ray Kennard Haynes
B.A., Utica College of Syracuse University, 1987
M.Ed., University of Louisville, 1997

A Dissertation Approved on

November 11, 2003

by the following Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Joseph Pentosko, Dissertation Director

Dr. Mike Boyle

Dr. Michael Cuyjet

Professor Samuel Marcossou

Dr. Carolyn Rude-Parkins

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother and mentor, Norma Angela Haynes,
and to my beautiful wife Enid Trucios-Haynes.

Mom, you have given me precious life and shown me how to live it.

Enid, you make living life joyful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my dissertation director, Dr. Joseph Petrosko for his insight, guidance and commitment. I also thank my dissertation committee members Dr. Mike Boyle, Dr. Michael Cuyjet, Professor Samuel Marcossou, and Dr. Carolyn Rude-Parkins for their comments, insight and patience throughout this process. To my wife Enid and my sons Alexander and Maxfield, thanks for your patience; you collectively do to me what springtime does to the cherry trees. Thank you!

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MENTORING AS A SOCIALIZING STRATEGY AMONG LAW FACULTY

Ray Kennard Haynes

November 11, 2003

This dissertation used a comparative analysis approach to determine mentoring's ability to socialize law faculty. Specifically, it sought to examine the efficacy of formal and informal mentoring in socializing law faculty to their respective institutions. A Mentoring Questionnaire was developed to determine the occurrence of mentoring, the distinctions between the various forms of mentoring, and law faculty perceptions of the effectiveness of the various forms of mentoring received. The Organizational Socialization Questionnaire measured socialization along six dimensions of People, Performance Proficiency, Politics, Language, History and Organizational Goals and Values and was used to determine socialization differences among mentored and non-mentored faculty and tenured and non-tenured faculty.

Socialization differences were examined by comparing mentored faculty to non-mentored faculty, formally mentored faculty to informally mentored faculty, tenured faculty to non-tenured faculty, male faculty to female faculty and majority faculty to minority faculty. Results of this dissertation indicate there are differences between mentored and non-mentored faculty. Differences were also found between senior level non-mentored and junior level mentored faculty. These differences are discussed along with their

implications and conclusions are drawn. The dissertation ends with recommendations for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Purpose of the Study	
B. Significance of the Study	
C. Statement of the Problem	
D. Research Questions	
E. Research Hypotheses	
F. Theoretical Framework	
G. Limitations	
H. Delimitation	
I. Assumptions	
J. Definitions of Terminology	
K. Summary	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	40
A. Introduction	
B. Social Learning Theory and Mentoring as Adult Learning	
C. History of Mentoring	
D. Mentoring's Conceptualizations, Definitions & Distinctions	
E. Mentoring Functions and Benefits	
F. Organizational Socialization	
G. Empirical Studies of Mentoring in Business Environments	
H. Empirical Studies of Mentoring in Academic Environments	
I. Law Schools and Their Faculties	
J. Summary	

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	69
A. Introduction	
B. Research Hypotheses	
C. Research Design	
D. Description of Participants	
E. Instrument	
F. Mentoring Questionnaire	
G. Organizational Socialization Questionnaire	
H. Demographic Questionnaire	
I. Pilot Test of Instrument	
J. Data Collection	
IV. THE SURVEY FINDINGS AND RESULTS.....	82
A. Introduction	
B. The Sample and Data Collection	
C. Description of Respondents	
D. Sample Representativeness	
E. Gender	
F. Minority Status	
G. Position of Respondent	
H. The Mentoring Questionnaire Findings	
I. Summary of Mentoring Questionnaire	
J. The Organizational Socialization Questionnaire Findings	
K. Hypotheses and Results	
L. Summary of Results	
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	110
A. Introduction	
B. Rationale for the Study	
C. Integration and Implications of Findings	
D. Recommendations for Future Research	

REFERENCES	121
APPENDIX A: Preamble and Survey.....	131
APPENDIX B: American Association of Law Schools' Table of Gender and Ethnicity Composition of American Law Faculty.....	140
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	141

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Gender, Ethnicity & Age of Respondents ($N=298$)	84
2. Law Faculty Educational Background and Current Position ($N=298$).....	85
3. Law Faculty Teaching Experience ($N=298$)	86
4. Number and Percentage of Law School Professors by Gender.....	87
5. Number and Percentage of Law School Professors by Minority Status	89
6. Number and Percentage of Law School Professors by Professional Rank	89
7. Types of Mentoring Among Respondents ($N=298$).....	91
8. Frequency Distribution for Where Mentoring Occurred ($N=298$)	91
9. Frequency Distribution Ratings on Formal Mentoring ($N=298$).....	92
10. Frequency Distribution Ratings on Informal Mentoring ($N=298$)	92
11. Frequency Distribution on Mentoring Currently Being Received ($N=298$).....	93
12. Descriptive Statistics for 10 Aspects of Mentoring.....	94
13. Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients for the Six OSQ Subscales	96
14. Descriptive Statistics on OSQ for Two Groups of Senior Faculty: Hypothesis 1	100
15. OSQ Scales for Hypothesis 1: Comparing 2 Faculty Groups	101
16. Hypothesis 2: Mean Scores on OSQ for Two Types of Mentoring Received by Junior Faculty	103
17. Hypothesis 3: Mean Scores for Mentored Junior and Non-Mentored Senior Faculty	104

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

But mentors are more than simply isolated individuals who enter our lives, “intervene,” and depart. Rather, they are creations that emerge out of particular demands our lives make on us. When they do their work well, they help us to see not only the tasks before us but also the broader context that give those tasks meaning. (Daloz, 1986, p.211).

Historical accounts (Cameron, 1978; Dalton, Thompson, & Price, 1977; Fagenson, 1988; Kram, 1983; Kram and Isabella, 1985; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson & McKee, 1978; Spilerman, 1977) and relatively recent research literature have identified mentoring as an essential mechanism in fostering career development for employees in business and industry as well as academic organizations (Burke, McKeen & McKenna, 1993; Gaskill, 1993; Pollock, 1995; Reid, 1994). According to Merriam (1983), the literature on mentoring can be divided into three primary categories: (a) mentoring in adult growth and development; (b) mentoring in business and industry; and (c) mentoring in academic environments. The impetus for the present study stems from recent research on mentoring in business settings and academic environments. Regardless of the organizational environment, mentoring is viewed as a developmental relationship that fosters an employee’s growth and advancement in a chosen profession (Kram, 1985b).

What is the nature of these mentoring relationships, and how do they manifest? Douglas (1997) suggests that mentoring relationships are generally informal, naturally occurring in the workplace, and often involve a less experienced employee and a senior employee. McCauley and Young (1993) further delineate the nature of developmental relationships in organizations as informal on-the-job interactions where several helping behaviors take place such as coaching, counseling, sponsoring, skill-building, mentoring, preparation for advancement and role modeling. Mentoring is one example of an on-the-job informal developmental relationship where senior managers provide assistance to younger, less experienced managers (Kram & Bragar, 1991). Although these developmental relationships, including mentoring, have historically been informal in nature, new technology, changing demographics, a shrinking labor market and fierce competition have served to decrease the prevalence of informal developmental relationships (Flynn, 1995; Gaskill, 1993; Kram & Bragar, 1991; Murray & Owen 1991; Zey, 1988).

If informal mentoring and other informal developmental relationships produce such admirable support and helping behaviors benefiting the individuals and organizations involved, then it is clear why many organizations have adopted mentoring as a human resource development initiative. Organizations have sought to expand the benefits of these informal developmental relationships by instituting formal mentoring programs and other formal developmental relationships that are distinguished from the informal developmental relationships in that these are programs managed by the organization (Douglas, 1997). According to Gunn (1995), mentoring programs proliferated in the mid-1980's because the laudable support behaviors occurring within

them sparked many efforts within numerous organizations to improve the promotion and retention of women and minorities. Mentoring programs have since evolved in the 1990's to serve a wider variety of corporate agendas such as succession-planning, where organizations can groom future leaders (Gunn, 1995).

Are these mentoring programs effectively serving corporate agendas, organizational agendas, as well as the individuals involved with them? According to Atkinson (1996), the last 20 years have produced a flurry of popular commentary endorsing mentoring, without reservation, as a career advancement tool. Some of this popular commentary has led to specious advice heralded as scientific. Individuals and organizations must discern from the popular literature which advice on mentoring to use and which to discard. Naturally, there are reports discussing why some mentoring programs succeed and others fail. Gunn (1995) provided a "mentoring do's and don'ts" list that implies why some mentoring programs encounter success and others failure. According to Gunn (1995), organizations should present mentoring as a business imperative with top management support. Organizations should not limit the programs to certain groups (women and minorities) because it may cause such groups to be stigmatized as beneficiaries of special treatment. Gunn (1995) suggested that organizations should spell out to mentors and mentees what to expect and not expect from the mentoring relationship. In addition, organizations should not promote the program as a path to promotion. Gunn (1995) listed several specific instances where mentoring programs failed because of larger organizational issues such as reengineering and the promotion or attrition of senior executives who championed the mentoring program.

Despite these instances of mentoring program failure, others have touted the benefits of mentoring in organizations. James and Elman (1990) described the individual and organizational benefits of mentoring to include employee development, increased motivation, improved job performance, bolstering and sustaining the organizational culture, and increased retention rates. Similarly, Wright and Werther (1991) asserted that protégés' benefits from mentoring included career advancement, feedback, increased confidence, sponsorship and support. Wright and Werther (1991) also suggested that the organizational benefit from mentoring translated to the effective use of human resources.

Purpose of the Study

Does mentoring work well in socializing employees into an organization? This question begs a more probing question. Does formal mentoring work as well as informal mentoring in fostering career development and the socialization of employees in business and academic settings? Inherent in the latter question is an acknowledgement that mentoring in contemporary organizations can occur formally and informally. Even still, answers to such broad questions are likely to be confusing because research in this area is limited (Carden, 1990; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Dreher & Ash, 1990). Individuals and organizations seeking answers to these questions will encounter a body of literature providing commentary that ranges from a strong endorsement of mentoring (Alleman & Gray, 1986; Bernstein & Kaye, 1986; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Phillips-Jones, 1983; Zey, 1985, 1988) to outright detraction of mentoring in business and industry (Clawson, 1980, 1985; Keel, Buckner & Bushnell, 1987; Kram 1985a, 1985b, 1986; Merriam, 1983). As a result, definitive answers to such broad questions are not yet possible.

According to Chao et al. (1992), research on mentoring has produced fragmented results on key issues that provide context and meaning to the mentoring literature. Similarly, Carden (1990) suggested that mentoring research is fragmented because of conceptual and methodological limitations such as varied definitions of mentoring, reliance upon retrospective accounts of mentoring from protégés, and small sample sizes restricted to single organizational settings. These factors make cohesion and a theory-based synthesis of the mentoring literature difficult to achieve. Chao et al. (1992) delineated three key issues that are essential to a contextual and meaningful understanding of the mentoring phenomenon. The three key issues are: (a) the type of mentoring relationship; specifically, is it formal or informal? (b) the functions served by the mentor; did the mentor have one specific role or did he/she have a series of roles and responsibilities?, and (c) the mentoring outcomes, specifically, what benefits did the mentor and mentee derive from engaging in the mentoring relationship?

This study will examine two of the three key issues identified to alleviate some of the fragmentation in the mentoring research literature. The two key issues to be examined are: (a) the type of mentoring relationship, and (b) the outcomes of the mentoring relationship. It is important to distinguish between the two types of mentoring occurring in business and academic settings because they may involve different dynamics (Chao et al., 1992). This distinction will lead to a higher level of understanding of the mentoring phenomenon. Moreover, it is plausible that the different dynamics associated with formal and informal mentoring may differentially affect the outcome benefits associated with each form of mentoring. This study is needed because it seeks to link formal and informal mentoring to career-benefit outcomes. In addition, it examines

whether each form of mentoring and its respective dynamics differentially affects career-benefit outcomes. According to Dreher and Ash (1990), very little empirical research has been conducted to examine the linkages between mentoring experiences and career-benefit outcomes. In fact, much of the research on mentoring has focused on the nature of the mentoring process (Dreher & Ash, 1990). Kram and colleagues provided a solid foundation for understanding the mentoring process at work. Kram's research established that mentors provided career-related support functions and psychosocial support functions to their mentees (Kram, 1983, 1985b; Kram & Isabella, 1985). Kram (1983) also discovered that a mentor played numerous roles in providing career and psychosocial support to mentees in an organization. According to Kram (1983), a mentor providing career support to a mentee might engage in any or all of the following behaviors: coaching, protecting, challenging and sponsoring the mentee. Similarly, a mentor providing psychosocial support to a mentee may provide feedback, serve as a role model, act as friend and counselor, and offer positive regard and acceptance (Kram, 1983). In summary, mentors demonstrate, explain and model; and mentees, observe, question and explore (Kaye & Jacobson, 1996).

The contemporary empirical research literature on mentoring can be characterized as offering a guarded and limited endorsement of mentoring as a career advancement tool (Atkinson, 1996). This cautious, limited endorsement comports with the fragmentation in mentoring research described by Carden (1990), and, Chao et al. (1992). This study is needed because it will lessen the fragmentation in mentoring research by examining whether formal and informal mentoring produces the perceived career benefit of organizational socialization. Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, and Gardner (1994)

view organizational socialization as a process where an employee learns the content and process associated with a particular role in an organization. Organizational socialization is a critical career-benefit outcome because there is a significant amount of evidence suggesting that socialization experiences can affect personal and role outcomes (Jones, 1986). Since socialization experiences can affect personal and role outcomes, it is plausible to suggest that the lives of individuals and the functioning of organizations can be impacted based upon the socialization strategies and tools used by organizations. This belief provides the basis for this present researcher's attempt to further establish linkages between the two types of mentoring occurring in organizations and the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization.

At this juncture, it is necessary to provide clarifying distinctions to the socialization concept which includes the specific area of organizational socialization. Socialization generally refers to the process in which an individual enters a social structure such as an organization (Hall, 1987). The field of socialization has specialized to produce researchable areas such as careers, occupational socialization, and organizational socialization (Gross, 1975; Hall, 1987). According to Hall (1976), "The career is the individually perceived sequence of attitudes and behaviors associated with work-related experiences and activities over the span of the person's life." (p.4) The other two areas of socialization, occupational socialization and organizational socialization, require further distinction in order to provide context for the present research.

According to Frese (1982), occupational socialization refers to the changes that occur in a person as a result of their job. Organizational socialization is different from

occupational socialization because it has broader concerns. Organizational socialization is not just concerned with changes occurring in the individual as a result of their job, it is also a social learning process involving the two types of players, the target and the agents of socialization (Hall, 1987). Put another way, organizational socialization involves the individual being socialized, as well as the organization attempting to socialize its employees. In the context of the present research, the researcher is interested in the impact of mentoring, as an organizational development intervention in socializing law faculty at the American Bar Association's (ABA) approved law schools. Organizational socialization and its distinctions and processes will be further discussed in chapter 2.

The purpose of this research is to examine mentoring's impact on the organizational socialization of law school faculty. Further, this study attempts to contribute to the development of a primary measure of organizational socialization by using Chao et al.'s (1994) six dimensions of organizational socialization as the primary means of collecting data on the socialization of law faculty within the law school setting. The objective of this study is to determine whether mentoring is an effective organizational development and human resource socializing process for faculty at ABA approved law schools. According to the Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools (2001), there are 184 ABA approved law schools in the United States. Confidential surveys were administered to measure mentoring benefits by examining the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization. Organizational socialization was established as a career-benefit outcome based upon the work of Chao et al. (1992); Fagenson (1989); Hunt and Michael (1983); Kanter (1977); and Levinson et al. (1978). This study's findings will be reported and discussed based upon an analysis of the data

obtained. In addition, the implications of this study will be addressed along with recommendations for future research. What follows next are sections addressing the significance of the study, the statement of the problem, the research hypotheses, the theoretical framework, the limitations of the study, the delimitation of the study, the assumptions of the study, and definitions of central terms.

Significance of the Study

According to Caldwell and Carter (1993), organizations in business and industry have experienced profound changes within the last decade of the past century. These changes stem from global, societal and economic trends that have permanently changed the workforce and the ways in which it is developed (Caldwell & Carter, 1993; Galpin, 1996; Harvey & Brown, 1996). A hallmark of these changes is the new reality that many organizations and their employees have been forced to operate in a global business environment where organizational instability and employee insecurity resulting from constant change have become the rule rather than the exception (Caldwell & Carter, 1993; Galpin, 1996; Moore, 1996; Schellenberg, 1996; Zey, 1988). For purposes of this research, the researcher defines organizational instability as entropy within the organization resulting from a basic need to adapt to changes within the business and academic environments. These changes include global competition, changing labor force demographics, technological innovation, downsizing, reengineering, and organizational renewal. The term entropy refers to the notion in physics that every organized system will break down, run down, or fail if it is not maintained. The socialization of employees is one process that contributes to the maintenance of organizations. In this study, the researcher defines employee insecurity as a prevailing sense of concern for career with

the organization brought about by organizational instability. This new reality occurring in today's organizations has shattered traditional notions of organizational structure and culture.

Change is the name of the game in management today. Market, product, and competitive conditions are rapidly changing. They are downsizing, reengineering, flattening structures, going global, and initiating more sophisticated technologies. However, in many organizational changes, such as downsizing, there are often unintended effects or consequences on the productivity of individual work units. (Harvey & Brown, 1996, p.30)

In response, some organizations have followed the growing trend towards decentralization (Gaskill, 1993). These organizations have eliminated their centralized, bureaucratic hierarchical structures and replaced them with flat and ostensibly simple structures that have altered employment relationships throughout the workforce (Moore, 1996). These fundamental changes in organizational structure and culture distinguish today's organizations from those of the past; and have altered the ways in which organizations develop their employees by reducing opportunities for informal developmental relationships (Gaskill, 1993; Kram & Bragar, 1991; Murray & Owen, 1991; Zey, 1988). Informal mentoring can be categorized as an informal developmental relationship.

Up until the late 1970's, informal mentoring played a significant role in developing employees in organizations (Russell, 1991). This was significant because organizations and their employees were not subject to some of the global competitive pressures present in today's business environment. According to Phillips-Jones (1983),

organizations were much more stable entities where employee development took place in an informal manner. Phillips-Jones (1983) has suggested that two individuals would simply form a mentoring relationship without any pressure to do so from the organization. These informal mentoring relationships are no longer prevalent in today's business environment because of competitive pressures and prevailing instability brought about by labor shortages, industry consolidation, technology and innovation, changing demographics, and issues of diversity and equity that stem from these changing demographics (Caldwell & Carter, 1993; Kram & Bragar, 1991, Murray & Owen, 1991; Zey, 1988). Whitley, Dougherty and Dreher (1991) offer additional evidence that change and organizational instability may have caused mentoring to evolve from formal manifestations to informal manifestations. They suggest that "because of the pace of organizational change and frequency of individual career transitions, career-oriented mentoring is probably easier for some employees than the longer term developmental, interpersonal mentoring (p. 220)" which usually manifest informally.

In efforts to overcome global, economic and competitive challenges, many organizations have been forced to renew themselves. According to Atkinson (1996), these organizations have decentralized and radically restructured their internal processes to gain internal operating efficiency and external competitive advantages. In doing so, many organizations have moved from a position of stable entity to one characterized by constant change and the relentless pressure to remain competitive. Rubow and Jansen (1990) reported that organizations will survive these competitive pressures in the 1990s and beyond by recruiting, and promoting competent employees. One means of enhancing an organization's competitive advantage is through the use of human resources

development initiatives with the objectives of attracting, socializing, developing, and retaining the best and brightest employees regardless of gender and ethnicity (Chao et al., 1994; Gunn, 1995; Murraray & Owen, 1991; Rubow & Jansen, 1990). Mentoring is a human resource development initiative that helps to achieve these objectives.

“Contemporary companies use mentoring not only for recruitment and retention, but for staff development, affirmative action, and career advancement as well” (Rubow and Jansen, 1990, p. 50).

Meeting the objectives of attracting, developing and retaining the best and brightest employees in a business environment filled with competitive pressures is not an easy task. According to Kram and Bragar (1991); Murray and Owen (1991) and, Zey 1988, organizations and their human resource development practitioners must overcome economic and societal challenges that produce fierce competition, labor shortages, and changing demographics. In addition, organizations must also deal with cross-cultural issues stemming from a workforce that is increasingly becoming more diverse (Zey, 1988).

Much of the previous discussion on change and its effects have been focused on organizations in the business sector of industry. It is now necessary to address how change is impacting academic institutions including law schools. In one critical respect, academic institutions and business organization share a commonality in that they are both dealing with change as they try to remain viable and relevant in the 21st century. How is change manifesting in academic environments, and what are the dimensions and challenges associated with change in academic institutions? According to Finkelstein, Seal and Schuster (1998) “American colleges and universities are positioned at the

leading edge of a remarkable transformation as higher education enters upon--some would say lurches into--an era of cascading technological changes and increasingly intense competition for funding. But nowhere is the change more emphatic than in the composition of the new entrants into the faculty” (p.xi).

While changing technology and faculty composition are prominent changes occurring in academic institutions, it is necessary to note that there are other significant developments occurring within academic institutions that put at risk traditional features of academic life and create faculty insecurity. Finkelstein et al. (1998) cogently describe these changes as follows:

- a. The assessment movement, launched with vigor during the previous decade, continues to gain momentum and signals to the faculty that they are to be held more strictly accountable for what they do and for the results of their efforts.
- b. The academic labor market has been a strong buyers market for several decades in most fields. The current market continues to constrain access for aspirant faculty and to limit mobility for existing faculty.
- c. Tenure, a virtually unassailable centerpiece of academic convention for decades, readily withstood the scrutiny that followed the turbulent 1960's. Yet it has recently come under renewed attack; the prospect looms that one state legislature or governing board may decide to strike tenure a lethal blow and that an ensuing domino effect may follow.
- d. Expectations by the faculty, by most accounts, have risen steadily, as institutions and their patrons stress “productivity”. The prevailing buyers market in turn enables institutions to avoid renewing non-tenured faculty with reasonable

assurance that that the departed can be readily replaced with new prospects eager to please.

- e. Institutions of higher education, anxious about preserving a measure of flexibility amid the uncertainties of a rapidly changing environment and driven to be ever more cost conscious, have increasingly resorted to making non-tenure track appointments. As a consequence the number of part-time and off-track full-time appointments appears to be expanding rapidly relative to that of “traditional “ full-time, tenured or tenurable appointments.
- f. Faculty compensation, which has increased steadily in terms of real (adjusted) salaries throughout the previous decade, in 1990-91 suffered its first decline in nine years, experienced similar declines for 1992-93 and 1996-97, and has hovered near or below the break-even point for the first seven years of this decade.
- g. Reliable data about the faculty role in governance are scarce, particularly concerning whether the principle of “shared governance” is being eroded. Yet anecdotal evidence abounds about “top down management” styles and institutional strategic decisionmaking (sic) that relegate the faculty to a more peripheral role (pp. 1-2).

A review of the various dimensions of change occurring in academic institutions suggest that academic institutions are facing some of the same challenges that business organization are dealing with in relation to change. Similar to business institutions, academic institutions are grappling with challenges associated with changing technology, changing faculty demographics, issues of accountability, the need for results, budgetary

constraints, salary compression, and a fundamental reengineering of traditional academic operating structures such as tenure and faculty governance. These changes occurring within academic institutions portend organizational instability and employee insecurity within academic environments.

The present research is aimed at understanding the mentoring phenomenon as a socializing tool for law faculty in contemporary academic environments where change is ostensibly ubiquitous. An understanding of mentoring's relationship to organizational socialization within the context of change will help to reduce fragmentation in the mentoring research literature. Moreover, at a pragmatic level, it may help academic administrators and human resource development practitioners to design and develop effective mentoring programs in business and academic environments. Justification for this study comes from the understanding that an organization's competitive advantage in the world of business rests primarily with the collective talent of its employees. Therefore, it is critical that organizations, including academic institutions, utilize employee development programs that are effective insofar as these programs add value to the employees and ultimately the organization. This study is significant because it seeks to determine the effectiveness of mentoring, as a socializing tool for law faculty at ABA approved law schools. Further, it is significant because its findings contribute to a growing body of knowledge that will ultimately determine mentoring's effectiveness as an employee development initiative and a socializing tool.

Research on mentoring in organizations has succeeded in understanding key characteristics of the mentoring phenomenon. The phases of mentoring have been established (Kram, 1983). The role of the mentor has been sufficiently defined (Levinson

et al., 1978; Noe, 1988; Tack & Tack, 1986) and several studies have established the outcomes of mentoring (Fagenson, 1988, 1989; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Whitely et al., 1991). This research success, while significant, highlights the need for further empirical research on mentoring and its variations. Research must now examine the distinctions between formal and informal mentoring programs since both programs continue to exist in today's organizations (Murray & Owen, 1991; Wright & Werther, 1991; Zey, 1985, 1991). The research spotlight must now keenly focus on formal mentoring since its rise and prevalence in today's organizations have diminished opportunities for informal mentoring (Gaskill, 1993; Kram & Bragar, 1991; Murray & Owen, 1991; Zey, 1988). Research should seek to understand the impact of formal mentoring programs on individual employees who engage in formal mentoring relationships and the organizations that use these programs as human resource development initiatives. Research must also determine whether formal mentoring programs are more effective than informal mentoring programs in producing career and psychosocial benefits for mentees in organizations where continuous change, organizational instability and employee insecurity are a reality.

The fundamental difference between formal and informal mentoring programs can be found in how the mentoring relationship is initiated. According to Chao et al. (1992), informal mentoring occurs in a spontaneous manner where the mentor and mentee take interest in each other and a relationship develops. It is not managed, structured or formally recognized as part of an organization's human resources development initiative (Chao et al., 1992). In contrast, formal mentoring programs are an integral part of an organization's human resource development initiatives. Thus the

organization plays an active role in structuring and managing such programs (Chao et al., 1992).

This study is significant because it will empirically evaluate the effectiveness of formal mentoring, as compared to informal mentoring by examining perceived career-benefit outcomes to mentored law faculty at ABA approved law schools where change and its socialization consequences are ongoing. This comparative evaluation is significant because prior to the 1980's mentoring was for the most part informal and restricted to white males (Kanter, 1977; Levinson et al., 1978; Russell, 1991; Sheehy, 1976) and women and minorities were generally excluded from these informal developmental relationships. Cook (1977) reported on a study conducted at Yale University which essentially found that nearly every man who achieved corporate success in his early to mid-adult life had one or more informal mentors. In contrast, however, Reid (1994) reported that in the glass ceiling study, a lack of mentoring impeded women and minorities from attaining upper level management positions. Gunn (1995) wrote that formal mentoring programs were created with the objectives of improving the promotion and retention of women and minorities. Despite these efforts, there is strong opposition to formal mentoring programs (Clawson, 1980, 1985; Hurley, 1988; Keel, Buckner and Bushnell, 1987; Kram, 1985a, 1985b, 1986; Levinson et al., 1978) which suggests that formal mentoring is not as effective as informal mentoring programs because formal mentoring programs are essentially legislated or engineered to replicate informal mentoring relationships. Findings from this study, which directly compare law professors' perceptions of formal and informal mentoring, could contribute to the debate

regarding the use of formal and informal mentoring in business and industry as well as academic environments.

This study has additional significance because it compares the perceived career benefits of the formally mentored and the informally mentored law faculty to non-mentored law faculty. This comparison is significant because it adds another level of scrutiny that can be used to further distinguish the benefits of formal mentoring and informal mentoring. Moreover, comparisons of the perceived career benefit of organizational socialization to formally mentored law faculty, informally mentored law faculty, and non-mentored law faculty have yet to receive adequate attention in the research literature (Chao et al., 1992). This study additionally has significance for organizations and academic institutions using mentoring programs. Organizations and academic institutions can use the findings from this research to make more informed decisions on whether mentoring in either form serves its human resource development needs. In addition, the data obtained from this research may indicate whether organizational socialization as a career-benefit outcome is most strongly linked with a particular form of mentoring. For example, if it is found that informal mentoring is strongly linked to organizational socialization among law faculty mentees, then the organization may choose to further understand the informal mentoring functions that are linked to organizational socialization. If these informal mentoring functions are understood, then it is plausible that these mentoring functions can be replicated in a formal mentoring program or used to modify an existing mentoring program to make it more effective. Ultimately, data obtained from this research will contribute to the body of literature by providing empirical data which establish that formal mentoring is more

effective in producing the career related benefit outcome of organizational socialization than informal mentoring or vice versa.

At a pragmatic level, this study will have significance for the law-teaching academy and academic institutions in general because it seeks to lessen the politicization of knowledge associated with hiring, socialization and retention of law faculty. To date, research is yet to be conducted on mentoring as an antecedent of organizational socialization for law professors within the academy. An examination of law review articles, newspaper articles, journal articles and, reports issued by the American Bar Association (ABA), and the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) suggest that American law schools continue to struggle with the task of attracting and retaining minority and female faculty in tenure-track positions (Bell, 1994; Chambers, 1990; Delgado & Bell, 1989; Merritt & Reskin, 1997; White, 1996). In addition, other legal scholars have highlighted the challenges of recruiting and retaining faculty at American law schools by asserting that gender and ethnicity biases continue to distort the process of hiring faculty at American law schools (Feagins, 1994; Paulsen, 1993). Essentially, some law faculty deeply believe that the law faculty hiring process is skewed toward providing advantages to female and minority candidates, thus creating disadvantages for majority male candidates. The collective angst stemming from points of view on either side of this issue portends continued difficulty for American law schools as they try to attract, socialize and retain law faculty. Moreover, this conflict serves to politicize the process associated with the hiring of tenure-track law professors. If one were to take a purely objective view of the American law-teaching academy prior to the 1960's, one would have no choice but to conclude that non-majority groups and women were all but

nonexistent in tenure-track positions at accredited law schools (Delgado & Bell, 1989). Law schools have made significant strides since the 1960's but many would argue that more needs to be done to attract and retain women and minorities in tenure-track positions at American law schools.

One outcome of the improved socialization of employees in business and academic settings is the increased retention of employees and a reduction of turnover resulting from a lack of socialization. There is evidence that suggests that an employee's socialization experiences can affect personal and role outcomes within an organizational context (Jones, 1986). In addition, there is a significant body of research data establishing links between the early socialization experiences of employees and employee turnover (Louis, 1980). As Finkelstein et al. (1998) points out, the most profound changes are occurring in the demographic composition of new faculty entrants into academic institutions. One would not find it difficult to imagine the myriad of socialization issues these academic institutions and their new faculty members will face as they attempt to vertically integrate new faculty entrants.

Law schools, in particular, are grappling with these changes as more women and people of color enter the law-teaching academy, and there is a corresponding rise in the turnover and attrition of women and people of color in the law-teaching academy. According to White (2001), there was a 1% increase in minority faculty during the 6 year period beginning in the 1994-95 academic year and ending with the 1999-2000 academic year. In the 1994-95 academic year, minority faculty represented 12.8 % of the law-teaching academy. In the 1999-2000 academic year minority faculty represented 13.8% of the law-teaching academy (White 2001). The picture is ostensibly more encouraging

for women. According to White (2001), women faculty increased their representation in the law-teaching academy during the same 6 year period from 28.5 % in the 1994-95 academic year to 31.5 % in the 1999-2000 academic year. This change represented a 3% increase in female representation in the law-teaching academy.

Although these increases are somewhat encouraging, the turnover and attrition rates for women and people of color present a more troublesome picture. In one of the few probing studies examining the hiring of women and minorities on law faculties, Chused (1988) found the following with respect to turnover. In the 6 year period from 1981-87, turnover among tenure and tenure-track positions was at 22.3%. The turnover data, when broken down by race, showed that 7.5 % of white tenured professors left the law-teaching profession as compared with 16.7% of black professors who left law teaching. These numbers are quite significant given the comparatively small numbers of black law professors in law teaching. In a more recent review of the extant empirical research on legal education, Ogloff, Lyon, Douglass and Rose (2000) found that the data from empirical studies suggests that:

Not only did tenured African American law teachers leave the profession at a higher rate than tenured non-minorities, but they did so more frequently for reasons other than death or retirement. This difference was significant if all minority law teachers were combined into one group (i.e., tenured African American law teachers) and compared to non-minority tenured law teachers (Ogloff et al., p.36).

In summarizing, this study is significant because it will examine mentoring's impact as a socializing process for law faculty. It should be noted that the researcher

intentionally chose to study mentoring as a socializing tool within the law professoriate. The researcher believes that law schools and their professors are essentially the gatekeepers to the infrastructure (laws) of our society. Law professors serve a vital societal function by producing the nation's lawyers.

It should need no emphasis that the lawyer is today, even when not himself a "maker" of policy, the one indispensable advisor of every responsible policy-maker of our society – whether we speak of a head of a government, department or agency, of the executive of a cooperation or labor union, of the secretary of a trade or other private association, or even of the humble independent enterpriser or professional man. As such an advisor the lawyer, when informing his policy-maker of what he can or cannot legally do, is, as policy-makers often complain, in an unassailably strategic position to influence, if not create, policy.

(Lasswell and McDougal, 1943, p. 208.)

As a consequence, it is important to know and understand how law professors are socialized, and whether the socialization process is sensitive to and reflective of the diversity present within our society. The findings obtained from this study can significantly affect how mentoring occurs, and what forms of mentoring are used to socialize law faculty. The findings will have additional significance given the ostensible commitment to further diversify law faculties at American law schools.

As long as our society remains multi-ethnic and multicultural-more of a vibrant spring bouquet of flowers than a melting pot-racially integrated faculties can help ensure that our educational institutions remain relevant, that they are fully equipped to prepare their diverse student bodies for life and work in communities

in which racial and other differences often permeate social, political and legal questions (White, 1996, p.2).

Determining how mentoring impacts the socialization of tenure-track law faculty especially as it relates to the retention of new law faculty entrants who are increasingly women and minorities will contribute significantly to reducing the tensions associated with the hiring and retention of law faculty regardless of race or gender. The researcher believes that the findings from this present study will build further understanding of mentoring as a socializing process for law faculty and employees in business and academic settings. Employees who are well socialized improve retention rates and reduce turnover because they are not inclined to leave their respective organizations.

Statement of the Problem

Contemporary business and academic environments are subject to continuous change that has produced organizational instability and employee insecurity (Caldwell & Carter, 1993; Galpin, 1996; Harvey & Brown, 1996; Moore, 1996; Schellenberg, 1996). This prevailing sense of organizational instability and employee insecurity has coincided with a marked increase in the use of formal mentoring programs as an employee development initiative (Carden, 1990; Gunn, 1995; Kram & Braggar, 1991; Murray & Owen, 1991; Zey, 1988). Are these formal mentoring programs as effective as the informal mentoring programs they are attempting to replicate? The problem is that much of what we know about mentoring may no longer be true or applicable in the context of today's business environment where continuous change contributes to organizational instability and employee insecurity. The fundamental difference between formal and informal mentoring is that informal mentoring has historically occurred in stable

environments where organizational instability and employee insecurity were not at issue (Atkinson, 1996; Murray & Owen, 1991).

This problem is significant because the occurrence and proliferation of formal mentoring programs were fueled by numerous anecdotal accounts and few scholarly and empirical examinations of the effectiveness of informal mentoring relationships (Douglas, 1997; Merriam, 1983). According to Carden (1990), the research literature on mentoring is fragmented because conceptual and methodological issues are yet to be resolved into a coherent data-based theoretical framework. Chao et al. (1992) have suggested that the mentoring literature is suffering from fragmentation precisely because research has not adequately distinguished between formal and informal mentoring. Despite the lack of extensive and sound empirical support for formal mentoring and the fragmentation in the mentoring literature in general, formal mentoring continues to be used as a human resource development program (Gunn, 1995; Murray & Owen, 1991; Rubow & Jansen, 1990). Organizations such as IBM, Federal Express, and Merrill Lynch have initiated formal mentoring programs as an employee development initiative (Kram, 1986). In addition, Laporte (1991b) reports that Apple Computer and Procter and Gamble established formal mentoring programs to facilitate the advancement of women and minorities to upper levels of management within these respective companies.

Given the lack of a coherent data-based theoretical framework for mentoring, this recent use and reliance upon formal mentoring programs to develop employees in organizations may be premature and even may be a detriment to the employees and organizations involved with formal mentoring programs, because the benefits and pitfalls of formal mentoring programs have not yet been firmly established. As a result, formal

mentoring programs may not yield anticipated results and even may negatively affect the attraction, development and retention of employees in an organization.

According to Matthes (1991), relatively few formal mentoring programs established in organizations have succeeded. This is in part due to the forced pairings of mentor and mentee that occur in formal mentoring programs. It is believed that such forced pairings contravene the intended meaning of mentoring that began formally but evolved as an informal process. This violation of mentoring's traditional meaning warrants a comparative investigation where the effects of formal mentoring can be determined in relation to informal mentoring.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research is to examine formal and informal mentoring as antecedents of organizational socialization among law faculty at ABA approved law schools where change and its socialization issues are an ever-present part of the law school milieu. The career-benefit outcome of interest in this study is organizational socialization. Two principal research questions guide the hypotheses of this study. They are:

1. Are there differences between mentored and non-mentored tenured and tenure-track law faculty with respect to the perceived career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization?
2. Is formal mentoring perceived as being more effective than informal mentoring and/or no mentoring in producing the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization among tenured and tenure-track law faculty?

The first research question will produce findings specific to the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization for mentored versus non-mentored tenured and tenure-track law faculty. This question will produce another level of understanding of the career related benefits of mentoring because it examines and compares the perceived career benefit-outcome of organizational socialization in law faculty who have been formally mentored, informally mentored or both formally and informally mentored to law faculty who have not received any form of mentoring. These findings will help to determine the extent to which formal mentoring, informal mentoring, a combination of both formal and informal mentoring, and no mentoring is related to higher levels of organizational socialization. Comparisons can be made and differences can be discerned regarding the various forms (formal, informal, a combination of both formal and informal and no mentoring) of mentoring and their relationship to organizational socialization in the ranks of tenured and tenure-track law faculty.

The second research question provides academic institutions, specifically law schools and their associated human resource development administrators, with the law faculty's perspective on the effectiveness of formal and informal mentoring by directly comparing the two forms of mentoring and their perceived effectiveness in socializing tenured law faculty. This information will be useful to university and law school administrators because it helps them to understand whether formal mentoring is perceived as being more effective in socializing law faculty than informal mentoring or vice versa. Business organizations, universities, law schools, and their employees would benefit by knowing if one form of mentoring is more effective than the other in producing the career benefit of organizational socialization for its employees.

Information about the differences between formal and informal mentoring could be of significant value to organizations and academic institutions seeking to attract, develop and retain their employees. The information could enable an organization to make an informed decision about what type of mentoring program (formal or informal) to establish, if any at all, based upon the perception of its employees. This information may also cause the organizations and academic institutions to modify and improve their existing mentoring programs or to discontinue them. Additionally, findings from this research question can help organizations and academic institutions avoid developing and instituting human resource development programs without the perspective and input of their employees who are considered key stakeholders in any human resource development program.

This research question also examines the efficacy of the various forms of mentoring (formal, informal) in producing organizational socialization in tenured and tenure-track law faculty. The data obtained from this question may be most relevant to law faculty, administrators and human resources practitioners because tenure-track law faculty, more so than tenured law faculty, are likely to be in the midst of the socialization process because they generally are newcomers to a law faculty or they hold junior positions on a law faculty.

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses are proffered and will be tested in order to answer the two principal research questions, and to achieve the purpose of the study.

- H1 Mentored tenured law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty.
- H2 Informally mentored tenure-track law faculty will perceive that they achieve greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than formally mentored tenure-track law faculty.
- H3 Mentored tenure-track law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty.
- H4 Tenured law faculty will report higher levels of organizational socialization than non-mentored tenure-track law faculty.
- H5 Male law faculty will perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than female law faculty.
- H6 Caucasian/Majority law faculty will perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than Non-Caucasian/Minority faculty.

Theoretical Framework

According to Olian, Carroll, and Giannantonio (1993), a significant portion of the writings on mentoring are anecdotal with relatively little emphasis on theory. This study will use Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory as a broad explanatory base for the mentoring phenomenon occurring in today's organizations. Social Learning Theory provides a framework for understanding how human behavior is learned. According to Bandura (1977a), a large proportion of human behavior is learned through observation. By observing others, an individual can develop an approximate sense of appropriate

behaviors and how to perform them. According to Noe (1988), several components of Social Learning Theory, such as modeling and vicarious reinforcement have been successfully used in business and industry to develop managers. The work of Kram (1985b), Levinson et al. (1978), and Zey (1985) illustrated the effective use of modeling, a component of Social Learning Theory in teaching work-related interpersonal skills to developing managers.

In many respects, senior managers who are mentors model desired corporate behavior so that their young developing mentee managers can directly observe and learn the desired corporate behavior. This observational learning is useful because one can learn what to do without committing grave errors or costly mistakes. Avoiding such mistakes and errors in the world of business is critical because these mistakes can result in an abrupt end to a person's career. In some respects mentoring relationships are based upon observational learning where the mentor in an organization could be viewed as a producer of behavior for the mentee to observe and learn.

Bandura's Social Learning Theory provides a solid foundation for linking the phenomenon of mentoring to the process of organizational socialization. Louis (1980b) defines organizational socialization as a process wherein an individual or employee learns to value the norms, expertise, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential to assuming an organizational role and functioning as a member of the organization. Modeling and vicarious reinforcement are two principal components of Social Learning Theory and these processes are used by mentors to facilitate the socialization of employee mentees in organizational settings.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. The first limitation is the fact that this study uses a causal-comparative research methodology to explore the relationships between mentoring and organizational socialization. According to Gall, Borg and Gall (1996), causal-comparative research enables the simplest quantitative approach to examining the cause-and-effect relationships between variables. In this study, the research will examine the cause-and-effect relationship between mentoring and organizational socialization, however, the researcher may not be able to definitively establish that mentoring is the sole cause of organizational socialization. The second limitation inherent in this study may be race and ethnicity related. Law professorships at American law schools have been traditionally majority male dominated. As a consequence, there is a strong likelihood that this study's population will be largely comprised of Caucasian males. Moreover, since the researcher will draw the stratified random sample from the total population of 184 American Bar Association approved law schools; the researcher has no way of controlling whether the sample population is representative of the overall racial and ethnic diversity contained in the law-teaching academy. According to the American Association of Law Schools Statistics Report (2001), the year 1999-2000, all minority faculty accounted for 13.6% of the law-teaching academy.

The distinction between non-mentored and informally mentored law faculty poses another limitation for this study. Law faculty in this study will be given an operational definition of informal mentoring that will be subject to interpretation and recollection. Law faculty in this study may have to recall and interpret whether they were involved in a mentoring relationship and determine what type (formal or informal) of relationship it

was. It is plausible to suggest that law faculty may not recall being in a mentoring relationship.

Secondly, it is conceivable that law faculty may misinterpret the operational definition of informal mentoring and choose to respond to the survey as non-mentored law faculty even though they may have received informal mentoring. The opposite may also occur where the law faculty chooses to answer the survey as an informally mentored person even though he/she has never received informal mentoring. The researcher has no control over a respondent law faculty's interpretation of the various operational definitions of mentoring and, as a consequence, the sample size between the formally mentored, the informally mentored and the non-mentored may vary based upon law faculty interpretation.

A third limitation arises from the use of Chao et al.'s (1994) Organizational Socialization Questionnaire. The Organizational Socialization Questionnaire was developed from a longitudinal study of professionals who reported careers in engineering, management and law. The Organizational Socialization Questionnaire and its content domains were not developed using a population of law professors. Despite these limitations, the promise of discerning perceived differences between formal mentoring, informal mentoring and no mentoring among law faculty at ABA approved law schools will be of significant value to the research literature, law schools, universities and any employee seeking to get involved in a mentorship program.

Delimitation

This study has several delimitations that restrict its scope. Several of these delimitations stem from the fact that this study will be conducted using a stratified

random sample of ABA approved law schools where permission must be granted to conduct the study. This reality limits the focus of the study to areas deemed permissible by each law school. In addition, the researcher has agreed to comply with all laws and regulations governing the operations of each law school. In this study, the researcher will seek permission to study mentoring at each law school by examining its perceived career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization to formally mentored, informally mentored and non-mentored law faculty.

The socialization domain is complex and multi-faceted. Researchers in socialization have produced empirical studies that span the life-span developmental psychology continuum from areas of infancy and childhood through the area of gerontology. This present research is restricted to socialization that occurs in an organizational setting. There are two types of socialization phenomena occurring in organizations, occupational socialization and organizational socialization. This study is restricted to the organizational socialization phenomenon because the researcher is interested in the impact of organizationally sanctioned human resource interventions that are intended to socialize individual employees into an organizational setting. The researcher is not interested in occupational socialization because this area of socialization has a focus that is restricted to jobs or occupations. Additionally, this study will determine which mentoring program (formal or informal) is perceived as being more effective to law faculty. This is not a study of the content and nature of the mentoring construct. The researcher is simply attempting to determine whether mentoring in all its forms produces organizational socialization in law faculty.

This is not a study about career success nor does it not equate the achievement of tenure status with career success. This study simply uses the distinctions of tenured faculty and non-tenured faculty for comparative purposes relevant to the research questions. This study is not attempting to determine tangible career-benefit outcomes, such as salary increases and job promotions, for mentored versus non-mentored employees. This type of research is beyond the scope of this study and would involve issues of confidentiality where the researcher must obtain special permission. Another delimitation of this study is that it does not examine the perceptions of the mentors or their mentoring behaviors. Such a study would require in-depth interviews with law faculty which would require additional time and resources since law faculty in the study are located at different law schools that are geographically dispersed. This study is further delimited because it does not examine organizational and cultural factors that may affect mentoring and other employee development initiatives within the respective law schools. In addition, this study will not examine the design, structure and operational nuances of the formal or informal mentoring programs at the law schools contained in the sample.

It should be noted that although this study will be conducted in an academic setting, specifically law schools, the findings of this present research will not be limited solely to academic environments but will also be generalizable business environments. It has been well established that mentoring is a human resource development tool used in both business and academic environments. In addition, organizational socialization is an issue that is relevant to organizations and employees in both business and academic environments. These are obvious reasons supporting the generalizability of the findings

of this study to the business environment. A more compelling reason supporting the generalizability of the findings from this study to business environments can be found in the literature which suggest that in many respects, business and academic institutions are facing some of the same challenges (changing technology, changing employee demographics, budgetary constraints and issues of accountability) that can impact how well employees are socialized into an organization. Although the above listed delimitations serve to restrict the scope of the study, it is believed that this study's findings on mentoring and its perceived career benefit of organizational socialization will be of significant value to the research literature, law schools, universities and organizations and individuals within business and industry considering engaging in mentoring relationships as part of a socialization strategy.

Assumptions

This study rests upon two principal assumptions. First, it assumes that the law schools under study are subject to some degree of instability brought about by the economic and competitive pressures of today's business and academic environments. These economic and competitive pressures result from changes in global, societal and economic trends that have impacted the workforce (Caldwell & Carter, 1993; Galpin, 1996; Harvey & Brown, 1996; Moore, 1996). Examples of these trends are competition, decentralization, downsizing, reengineering, labor shortages, and cross-cultural issues stemming from a more diverse workforce (Kram & Braggar, 1991; Murray & Owen, 1991; Zey, 1988). Second, this study assumes that in academic environments the tenure process for non-tenured faculty may contribute to job insecurity. Additionally, the growing significance of post tenure review may also contribute to faculty job insecurity

on the whole. As a consequence, socialization issues are prevalent in law schools. According to Chao et al. (1994), “Socialization is not only an important issue for organizational newcomers, but it is important for established organizational members as well.” (p.742).

Since this study will use surveys to obtain its data, it is assumed that self-administered surveys will yield valid and reliable data relevant to the research questions. However, as Fowler (1993) reported, there are potential disadvantages to using self-administered surveys to collect data. One potential disadvantage is the fact that the researcher is not present to exercise quality control to ensure that the study’s participants are carefully answering all questions in the survey. An additional concern regarding self-administered surveys is the issue of social desirability in measuring subjective states and self-perceptions. According to Fowler (1995), social desirability is a blanket term used to describe research respondents’ tendency to distort answers to survey and other research questions. Respondents are generally inclined to make themselves look good or avoid looking bad. In addition, research respondents may view some of the questions asked in the survey as a threat. In such instances, it is very easy to understand their inclination to distort answers to research questions rather than giving accurate answers. In this study, the researcher will make every attempt to ensure that the surveys used will produce valid and reliable data.

Definitions of Terminology

The following definitions are offered to provide context and meaning to this study. Most of these definitions are generally derived from the research literature on mentoring, however, additional definitions of non-mentoring terminology are also

provided because they are germane to mentoring in the business environment and academic environment.

Career-Benefit Outcomes:

Benefits derived from having a career with the organization. These benefits include career mobility/opportunity, job satisfaction, and organizational socialization. In this study it is assumed that mentoring is related to these career-benefit outcomes as established by several researchers (Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson, 1988; Kanter, 1977; and Levinson et al., 1978).

Career-Related Functions:

These functions are performed by the mentor and are intended to advance the career of the mentee. These functions may include providing sponsorship, exposure, visibility, coaching, protection and challenging assignments to mentees (Kram, 1983).

Employee Insecurity:

Employees' sense of concern and fear about career and future with the organization brought about by prevailing change and challenges associated with new position or role within the organization.

Formal Mentoring Program:

A program designed and developed by the organization to facilitate structured mentoring relationships where experienced organizational members provide career and psychosocial development to lesser-experienced organizational members.

Informal Mentoring:

A naturally occurring relationship based on attributes, attraction and, similar interests, where experienced organizational members provide career and psychosocial support to lesser-experienced organizational members.

Mentee:

This term is often used interchangeably with protégé and signifies the recipient of a mentor's aid.

Mentor:

An experienced productive senior organizational member who facilitates the career and psychosocial development of a younger less experienced colleague (Levinson et al., 1978; Kram, 1985b).

Mentoring:

Mentoring is a complex, interactive process, occurring between individuals of differing levels of experience and expertise that incorporates interpersonal or psychosocial development, career, and/or educational development, and socialization functions into the relationship. This one-to-one relationship is itself developmental and proceeds through a series of stages which help to determine both the conditions affecting and the outcomes of the process (Carmin, 1988, p.10).

Organizational Instability:

Entropy occurring within organizations resulting from a basic need to adapt to changes within the business and academic environment. These changes include global competition, technological innovation, downsizing, reengineering and organizational renewal.

Organizational Socialization:

“Organizational socialization is the process by which an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member”

(Louis, 1980b, p. 229-230).

Protégé:

“From the French verb proteger, to protect, for the one who is the recipient of the mentor interest” (Carruthers, 1993, p. 9).

Psychosocial Functions:

These functions are performed by the mentor and are intended to foster positive self-image, confidence and competence in the mentee. These functions may include role modeling, acceptance, confirmation, counseling and friendship to mentees (Kram, 1983).

Tenured Professors:

Professors who have earned a contractual employment appointment with no specified end date at a particular university or academic institution. The tenured appointment is therefore an appointment of an indefinite term and can only be terminated in accordance with reasons and procedures specified by the contract.

Tenure-Track Professors:

Junior professors who enter into a contractual employment relationship with a university or academic institution with the expressed understanding that they would be eligible for a tenured appointment upon satisfactorily completing a probationary period as a junior or non-tenured faculty member.

Summary

In summary, business and academic institutions are similarly subjected to change that impact organizational stability, and in turn, the career security of employees who work in these institutions. Institutions must renew themselves if they are to remain viable in the midst of change. The crux of renewal requires the replacement of old and departing organizational members with younger and newer members. In doing so, organizations must train, develop, and socialize their new members. The process of training, developing and socializing new organizational members can take many forms. Mentoring, both formal and informal, is one process used to socialize employees. This study specifically examines mentoring as a tool for socializing law faculty at ABA approved law schools. This researcher found a lack of sound empirical research on mentoring within the context of change. Moreover, the researcher has found a lack of research on the distinctions between formal and informal mentoring and their efficacy in producing the related career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization. This study is warranted because it attempts to contribute to our understanding of mentoring's relationship to organizational socialization. Additionally it attempts to establish the efficacy of one form of mentoring (formal mentoring and informal mentoring) over the other in producing the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine formal and informal mentoring as antecedents of organizational socialization among tenured and non-tenured law faculty at ABA approved law schools. The review of the literature relevant to this study is divided into six sections. Five of the six sections are germane to the mentoring phenomenon. The first section addresses social learning theory and its relationship to mentoring as an adult learning strategy. The second section discusses the mentoring phenomenon by providing a detailed discussion of the history, evolution, conceptualizations, definitions and distinctions of mentoring, and concludes with a discussion of mentoring functions. The third section discusses mentoring benefits in general. It further provides a review of organization socialization, the mentoring benefit specifically under examination in this study. The fourth section reviews the empirical literature on mentoring in business environments. The fifth section addresses the empirical literature on mentoring in academic settings. The sixth and final section of this chapter addresses the characteristics of law schools and their faculty.

Social Learning Theory and Mentoring as Adult Learning

Merriam and Caffarella (1991) state, "Social learning theories contribute to adult learning by highlighting the importance of social context and explicating the process of

modeling and mentoring” (p.139). Although the mentoring literature has proliferated within the past three decades, very little work has been done on the theoretical foundations of mentoring (Zagumny,1993). In light of this theoretical deficit, this study uses social learning theory to provide broad explanatory power for the mentoring praxis. According to Bandura (1977a), “Social learning theory approaches the explanation of human behavior in terms of a continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral and environmental determinants” (p. vii). This interaction of person, behavior and environment became known as Bandura’s triadic reciprocity (Hamilton and Ghatala, 1994). Modeling is one essential attribute of social learning theory. Bandura (1977a; 1977b; 1986) described modeling’s integral role in learning behavior as the opportunity to observe someone else model desired behavior. This opportunity affords the learner the ability to form ideas of how response components should be structured and combined to produce the new behavior. Simply put, Bandura said that people learn from their vicarious observation of other people. This ability to learn through observation has tremendous utility and value in organizational settings because people can learn what to do, and more importantly, what not to do in high stakes professional environments and organizational settings. According to Hergenhahn (1988), observational learning is facilitated by four distinct processes: (a) attention, (b) retention, (c) behavior rehearsal, and (d) motivation. The learner essentially has to attend to a behavior, store the behavior, practice the behavior based on cognitive representations, and exhibit the behavior in response to the appropriate motivations.

Modeling and mentoring facilitate adult learning through observation (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991; Cunningham & Eberle, 1993). With respect to the mentoring

phenomenon, it is not necessary to view mentoring and modeling as separate and distinct processes. Instead, mentoring should be construed a cluster of complex helping and support behaviors that include modeling as a tool to facilitate the learning and psychosocial development of adults facing significant transitions in an organizational setting. According to Daloz (1986), it is at these transitional junctures where the mentoring praxis may be of significant value. Daloz (1986), cogently expresses the value of mentoring in the following manner:

But while mentors are surely stars in the drama, the part they play varies in important ways according to the particular transition faced by the protagonist. Since most of us make a number of changes throughout our lives, it is not surprising that on reflection, we may recall a number of mentors. Some remain for years, some for only a few months; sometimes the relationship is intense, sometimes purely instrumental; and though perhaps mentors seem more plentiful in our earlier years, often they appear in less conventional form later on. Yet always, if we are to call them mentor, they helped us through a transition of some sort. And if the relationship has been positive, we have grown from it in some way, for the idea of growth is inextricable from the idea of mentor. (p.210)

History of Mentoring

History offers us many examples of mentoring relationships (Carden, 1990; Murray & Owen, 1991; Phillips-Jones 1983). The term mentor originated from Greek mythology. In *The Odyssey*, Homer informs us that Odysseus appointed Mentor, his friend and trusted advisor to serve as guardian, teacher, advisor, friend, and surrogate father to his son Telemachus. It should be noted that the guidance and development of

Telemachus was not solely Mentor's charge. Instead, Athena, the goddess of wisdom and arts would at times disguise herself as Mentor and dispense wisdom and advice to Telemachus. Such historical accounts can lead one to conclude that Telemachus was left in good hands; benefiting from the advice of man and goddess. According to Murray and Owen (1991), Homer's account in *The Odyssey* illustrates one of the first attempts to facilitate mentoring. Moreover, it was a relatively sophisticated attempt because it utilized not only the male, Mentor, but it also sought the wisdom and guidance of the female goddess, Athena. The Athena-Telemachus mentoring relationship was perhaps one of the first recorded instances of a cross-gender mentoring relationship. Given Athena's role in the mentoring of Telemachus it is appropriate to add mother figure and dispenser of wisdom to the roles and responsibilities of Mentor (Carruthers, 1993).

In Ancient Greece it was customary to pair a young man with an older male. Such pairings created the general expectation that a paired young man would emulate the values of his mentor. The mentor in most instances was the close friend or relative of the young man's father. Since the facilitated pairing of Telemachus and Mentor, the passage of time has produced other famous mentoring pairs such as Plato and Aristotle, Aristotle and Socrates (Gaedeke, 1994); Merlin and young King Arthur (Gerstein, 1985); Sir Thomas More and Professors Linacre and Grocyn, Rembrandt and Peeter, and Darwin and Professor Hudson (Head and Gray, 1988). In more modern times, mentoring has produced other famous pairings. An example of a modern day famous mentoring dyad is Margaret Mead and Gail Sheehy (Carruthers, 1993).

Historically, mentoring has played a significant role in the continuity and evolution of art, craft and commerce (Murray & Owen, 1991). Examples of mentoring

contributions can be found in craft guilds that originated in the Middle Ages. According to Murray and Owen (1991), societies in the Middle Ages used mentoring to structure and develop the professions of merchant and lawyer. Promising young men would be apprenticed to a master; these young men would live with the master, work hard, progress to a journeyman and finally become masters themselves. These new masters had an instilled sense of generativity and would give back to their respective professions by taking on new apprentices and mentoring them. This instilled sense of generativity, renewed, perpetuated, and maintained the quality and integrity of each profession. Murray and Owen (1991) also assert that the master-apprentice relationship evolved into the employee-employer relationship with the advent of the industrial societies. This transformation to the employee-employer relationship produced a new focus on profits rather than the generative focus that tried to maintain quality, integrity, and tradition in the professions. According to Murray and Owen (1991), “What benefited the master no longer benefited the apprentice. Lower wages and longer work hours eventually give birth to the unions. The turbulent era of worker against management was born” (p.8).

Mentoring’s Conceptualizations, Definitions & Distinctions

There are two schools of thought governing the existence of mentoring in business and industry. The first school of thought relies on the belief that mentoring can be designed and created. The second school of thought rests on the assumption that mentoring can only occur naturally (Murray & Owen, 1991). For purposes of this study, the distinction between the first school of thought and the second is simply a distinction between formal mentoring and informal mentoring. Mentoring, as it has evolved through the ages, has suffered from conceptual and definitional problems (Carmin, 1988;

Carruthers, 1993; Chao et al., 1992; Merriam, 1983). The American Heritage Dictionary (1985) defines Mentor as a wise and trusted counselor or teacher. An examination of mentoring's conceptualizations in organizational settings suggest a wide degree of variance in the concept prompting numerous definitions. According to Merriam's (1983) critical review of the mentoring literature, "Mentoring appears to mean one thing to developmental psychologists, another thing to business people and, a third thing to those in academic settings" (p.169). Despite this wide degree of variance for the mentoring concept, most mentoring conceptualizations fall into one of two categories: (a) those that stress professional development and protection, and (b) those that emphasize both professional and personal development of the mentee (Carruthers, 1993).

Several scholars focusing on adult development have sought to elucidate the conceptual complexities of mentoring. Two scholars in particular seem to have been pivotal in creating the two distinct conceptual categories as outlined by Carruthers. Kanter (1977) wrote that the mentor is a person of significant power who helps the protégée climb the organizational ladder through patronage. The mentor, according to this conceptualization, fights for the protégé and provides assistance to the protégé. In many instances the protégé gains indirect power by being associated with the mentor (Kanter, 1977). Kanter's mentoring conceptualization focuses on the professional development of the protégé. At the other end of the mentoring continuum is the more elaborate mentoring conceptualization offered by Levinson et al. (1978) that not only includes professional development but personal development as well. According to Levinson et al. (1978), mentoring is a necessary ingredient in adult development. "The mentor relationship is one of the most complex, and developmentally important, a man

can have in early adulthood” (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 97). This focus on the professional and personal development requires the mentor to take on roles such as teacher, advisor, and sponsor in a work setting. This mentoring conceptualization, in contrast to Kanter’s (1977) conceptualization, highlights the fact that Levinson et al. (1978) viewed mentoring as a holistic process that prepared the protégé not only for professional success but also for personal success in a social world. Cook (1977) quotes Dr. Braxton McKee, a physician who describes the mentoring relationship in a manner that comports with Levinson et al.’s conceptualization.

For the younger man, the mentor represents a point of development that is higher than his own and to which he himself aspires. The mentor is in this sense, a parental figure and yet he is also a friend. He is someone who, by his attitude, more or less says to the younger man. ‘Here is the world of which I am a part and into which I invite you to become my peer and colleague.’ (p.82)

Since there are two conceptual schools of thought on mentoring in organizational settings, the scholarly and popular literature has produced several definitions of mentoring. For purposes of this research, the researcher chose to highlight mentoring definitions relevant to only business settings and academic environments. “The Dictionary of Occupational Titles (1987) as cited in Carden (1990, p.275) classifies ‘mentoring’ as a highly complex people-related skill, involving comprehensive concern for life-adjustment behavior”. According to Phillips-Jones (1982), “In modern-day terms, mentors are influential people who significantly help you reach your major life goals” (p.21). Hunt and Michael (1983) defined mentoring as involving unique emotional, interpersonal, support and advising. Meyers (1992) posits that “mentoring is

the process... in which less-experienced technicians, managers, and professionals are formally and informally assigned to mature and highly qualified individuals in similar occupations... for purposes of obtaining knowledge (cognitive learning) and or to develop non-cognitive abilities such as leadership and decision-making” (p.755).

Cunningham and Eberle (1993) define mentoring as career modeling where advice and guidance are dispensed in support of another’s career and training.

Mentoring definitions in academic environments appear to be less robust than those in business environments. Knox (1974) suggests that mentoring is the process of planning and guiding adult learning. Schmidt and Wolfe (1980) see mentors in academic environments as playing three roles: (a) role model, (b) information provider, and (c) door opener. Merriam (1983) holds the position that in academic environments, “the mentor is a friend, guide, counselor, but above all, a teacher” (p. 169). Since this study is restricted to the mentoring literature in business and academic environments, two definitions come to the fore as elucidating and conveying the nature of mentoring in business and academic environments. First Carmin (1988) offers the following definition:

Mentoring is a complex, interactive process occurring between individuals of differing levels of experience and expertise that incorporates interpersonal or psychosocial development, career and/or educational development, and socialization functions into the relationship. (p.10)

Healy and Wilchert (1990), researchers in education, define mentoring as:

A dynamic, reciprocal relationship in a work environment between an advanced incumbent (mentor) and a beginner (protégé) aimed at promoting the career development of both. (p.17)

Healy and Wilchert (1990) further suggest that mentoring's primary objective is that the protégé transforms in identity from that of understudy to that of self-directing colleague. With deference to parsimony, this study uses the Carmin (1988) definition because it sufficiently spans the mentoring conceptualization in both business and academic environments.

As was stated previously, there are two schools of thought on mentoring. The first school of thought subscribes to the notion that mentoring can be designed and created. The second school of thought rests on the assumption that mentoring can only occur naturally (Murray & Owen, 1991). This distinction between engineered mentoring and naturally occurring mentoring is essentially a distinction between formal and informal mentoring. For purposes of this study, formal mentoring is a program designed and developed by the organization to facilitate structured mentoring relationships where experienced organizational members provide career and psychosocial development to lesser-experienced organizational members. Informal mentoring, on the other hand, is a naturally occurring relationship based on attributes, attraction and similar interests, where experienced organizational members provide career and psychosocial support to lesser-experienced organizational members. A paradox exists with respect to the genesis and evolution of mentoring. One could say that the Mentor-Telemachus dyad represented one of the first instances of formal mentoring because it was essentially arranged by Odysseus, the father of Telemachus. Through the ages, mentoring's evolution appears to

have transformed from formal or arranged relationships to mentoring relationships that were informally manifested in organizational settings. How did this evolution come about, and why are there two separate schools of thought touting the benefits of one form (formal vs. informal) of mentoring over the other. Chao et al. (1992) offers one explanation:

Informal mentorships grow out of informal relationships and interactions between senior and junior organizational members. The relationship may be based on work or non-work issues. From these interactions, protégés may prove themselves to be worthy of extra attention that a mentorship would demand. Mentors often select protégés with whom they can identify and with whom they are willing to develop and devote attention. (p.621)

Perhaps this explanation underscores why mentoring relationships evolved to manifest informally (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Phillips-Jones, 1983; Pollock, 1995; Reid, 1994; Roche, 1979). Despite mentoring's evolution to informality, prevailing trends suggest that mentoring in organizational settings is becoming more formal or structured in order to meet the challenges associated with societal and marketplace changes (Flynn, 1995; Gaskill, 1993; Murray and Owen, 1991; Pollock, 1995; Zey, 1988).

Mentoring Functions and Benefits

Kram (1983) holds the view that the mentor serves a variety of career development and psychosocial functions that support, guide, and advise the young adult during his/her development. Naturally the mentoring relationship changes over time as the young adult develops, and as a consequence, the need for some mentoring functions may diminish while others are heightened. Kram (1983) defines psychosocial functions

as functions performed by the mentor and are intended to foster positive self-image, confidence and competence in the mentee. Psychosocial functions may include role modeling, acceptance, confirmation, counseling and friendship to mentees. Kram (1983) further defines career-related functions as functions performed by the mentor and are intended to advance the career of the mentee. Career-related functions may include providing sponsorship, exposure, visibility, coaching, protection and challenging assignments to mentees (Kram, 1983). According to Pollock (1995), two researchers (Kram, 1983 & Missirian, 1982) established phases of the mentoring protégé relationship (MPR) and assigned mentor functions to the respective phases. Kram's (1983) model outlined four phases where either career and/or psychosocial mentoring functions are provided. The four phases are: (a) initiation; (b) cultivation; (c) separation; and (d) redefinition (Kram, 1983). In the initiation phase, the mentor essentially provides career support functions. During cultivation, the mentor initially provides career support functions and gradually provides psychosocial functions towards the end of the cultivation phase. The separation phase is characterized by a marked reduction in the career and psychosocial support functions for the protégé. Finally, the redefinition phase manifests in the mentor offering occasional support functions (Pollock, 1995).

Missiran's (1982) model has three phases: (a) initiation, (b) development, and (c) termination. In the initiation phase the mentor provides career support. The development stage is where the mentor begins to provide a broad range of career and psychosocial support functions. During the termination stage, the mentor support is limited and may only involve psychosocial support. Noe (1988) translates career and psychosocial support into specific functions. According to Noe:

Career functions include those aspects of the mentoring relationship that prepare the protégé for advancement. These functions include nominating the protégé for desirable projects, lateral moves, and promotions (sponsorship); providing the protégé with assignments that increase visibility to the organizational decision makers and exposure to future opportunities (exposure and visibility); sharing ideas, providing feedback, and suggesting strategies for accomplishing work objectives (coaching); reducing unnecessary risks that might threaten the protégé's reputation (protection); and providing challenging work assignments (challenging assignments). Psychosocial functions enhance the protégé's sense of competence, identity, and work-role effectiveness. These functions include serving as a role model of appropriate attitudes, values, and behavior for the protégé (role model); conveying unconditional positive regard (acceptance and confirmation); providing a forum in which the protégé is encouraged to talk openly about anxieties and fears (counseling); and interacting informally with the protégé at work (friendship) (p.459).

These mentoring functions characterize the breadth and depth of career development and psychosocial support that benefit protégés in a mentoring relationship. Anderson and Shannon (1988), researchers in education, distill the myriad of mentoring functions into five broad categorical headings under which most mentoring behaviors can be categorized. The five category headings are teaching, sponsoring, encouraging, counseling and befriending.

How do these career development and psychosocial support functions benefit protégés, mentors and the organizations where mentoring occurs? Moreover, how are

these benefits described and characterized? For the mentor, the literature suggests that mentoring benefits are generativity and the opportunity to share one's time and expertise (Dalton et al., 1977; Levinson et al., 1978). The organization benefits from mentoring because mentoring is a form of succession management where future leaders are prepared (Zaleznik, 1977). With regards to the protégé mentoring benefits, the literature suggests that mentoring increases work effectiveness (Kram, 1985), job success (Henning & Jardim, 1977; Lundig, Clements, & Perkins, 1978; Roche 1979; Stumpf & London, 1981), higher pay (Roche, 1979), career satisfaction and performance (Levinson et al., 1978; Burke, 1984; Riley & Wrench, 1985; Fagenson, 1988; Zey 1988; Noe 1991), commitment and self image (White, 1970), career mobility (Scandura, 1992), and socialization (Kanter, 1977; Levinson et al., 1978; Feldman, 1981; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993).

Organizational Socialization

Since this study only focuses on mentoring as an antecedent of the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization for law faculty protégées at ABA approved law schools, it is necessary to examine the literature germane to organizational socialization. Not unlike the mentoring phenomenon, research on organizational socialization has suffered significantly from construct limitations and definitional problems (Chao et al., 1994; Feldman, 1976). Socialization is generally defined as the process of acquiring new behaviors, attitudes, and values essential for assuming a role in an organization (Fisher, 1986; Schein, 1968; Van Maanen, 1976; Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). For definitional purposes of this research, "organizational socialization is the process by which an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected

behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member (Louis, 1980b, p. 229-230). This definition distinguishes organizational socialization from occupational socialization, a related but more limited field within the socialization domain. Occupational socialization is generally concerned with the changes that occur in a person as a result of their job or occupation (Volpert, 1975 as cited in Frese, 1982). According to Smith and Rogers (2000), occupational socialization is based on the premise that differences naturally occurring within individuals will disappear as they are socialized to an occupation or job. Prevailing trends suggest a waning of research in the area of occupational socialization. This is in part due to the fact that much of the research on occupational socialization has been abandoned or has been incorporated into the domain of organizational socialization.

A key word search of “occupational socialization” in ERIC, an educational data base containing journal articles, books, theses, curricula, conference papers, and standards and guidelines indicated that from 1966 to date, there are a total of 134 documents addressing the topic of occupational socialization. Most of these documents addressed the socialization of schools’ teachers, schools’ administrators, secretaries, hairdressers, police cadets and exotic dancers. Moreover these documents appeared to be focused solely on the changes that occur in the individuals associated with these vocations. A similar search was done in ERIC using the keyword “organizational socialization”; the results from that search indicated that a total of 48 documents addressed the topic of organizational socialization. In perusing these documents, the researcher concluded that many of them were confined to the socialization of school teachers and administrators and were not germane to the focus of the present research.

The researcher performed another search in ABI/Inform, a database containing peer reviewed journal articles within industry. The researcher believed that this was a more appropriate database because this study involved data in academic settings. The focus of the study and the areas to be examined relate to management, human resource development, organizational development and organizational behavior. The findings from this search using the key word “occupational socialization” yielded a total of 13 articles dating from the early 1980’s to present. The same search using the keyword “organizational socialization” yielded a total of 74 articles all of which were published in peer reviewed journals.

Organizational socialization is a complex construct spanning several domains of organizational behavior and, as a consequence, researchers have chosen to focus on specific aspects of organizational socialization. Caplow (1964) studied the acquisition of new self-images, connections and involvements in the socialization process. Van Mannen (1976) focused on examining the relinquishing of preexisting attitudes, values and behavior during socialization, while Schein (1968) focused on socialization as the learning of organizational rules and objectives. According to Morrison (1993), research on socialization can be categorized according to three approaches. The first approach is the focus on newcomer progression through various socialization stages. The limitation of this approach is that it does not provide insight as to how changes occur during socialization. The second approach focuses on the various socialization tactics used by organizations. One limitation of this approach is that it represents newcomers as simply reactive participants in a socialization process and does not account for pro-activity and differences among participants in the socialization process (Morrison, 1993). Mentoring

is considered an organizational development intervention or socialization tactic that promotes organizational socialization (Feldman, 1989; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). The third approach focuses on cognitive processes that enable newcomers to organizations to make sense of and cope with their new environments (Falcione & Wilson, 1988). This approach is limited because it also portrays the participants in the socialization process as reactive rather than proactive. Hall (1976) views socialization as producing new values, attitudes, self-identity components or sub identities. Hall (1987) describes the career as a “bundle” of socialization experiences associated with the various work-related roles that one might assume during his/her working life. This notion that socialization is ongoing and pervades an individual’s career from high school through retirement aligns with Glaser and Strauss’s (1971) view that regardless of previous socialization, each role change will require some form of socialization. The perspective that socialization is an ongoing process is critical because this study assumes that non-tenured and tenured law faculty will be subject to socialization issues that result from change. According to Van Maanen (1978), socialization is most evident when a person first joins an organization, is promoted or demoted. It is less evident when an experienced organizational member undergoes a role change. Correspondingly, it is assumed that non-tenured tenure-track law faculty will have more socialization issues than tenured faculty.

As previously stated, research on organizational socialization has been subject to construct and definitional limitations (Chao et al., 1994; Feldman, 1976). Despite these limitations, several relatively recent empirical studies have attempted to address content and process issues germane to organizational socialization. Jones (1986) investigated the relationship between the socialization tactics used by the organization for newcomers and

role and personal outcomes. Jones also examined the effects of newcomer self-efficacy on role orientation. Jones found that a combination of individual and organizational factors mediated the adjustment of newcomers to an organization. Specifically, it was found that newcomers with the innovative role orientation were significantly and negatively related to institutional methods of socialization. Additionally it was found that institutionalized socialization tactics produced greater personal outcomes such as satisfaction and commitment. It was also found that the level of newcomer self-efficacy moderated the effects of socialization on role orientation. Ostroff and Kozlowski (1992) investigated newcomer information acquisition strategies on knowledge and socialization outcomes. It was found that newcomers differentially used a variety of organizational sources for knowledge and socialization purposes. Specifically, Ostroff and Kozlowski found that newcomers observed others, their supervisors, and co-workers in order to obtain information. Newcomers primarily use this information for task and role-related matters. It was also found that over time, newcomers extended their knowledge from their work group to broader knowledge of task and role. Newcomers use observation and experimentation as strategies for knowledge acquisition. Newcomers also used their supervisors as information sources for task and role information. Moreover they used supervisors for positive socialization outcomes.

Morrison (1993) used a longitudinal study to examine the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. Morrison's findings suggest that when newcomers proactively seek out information they can facilitate the socialization process even in the context of organization sanctioned socialization processes. In a study that spans both the mentoring and organizational socialization domains, Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993)

investigated the effects of mentoring relationships on the learning process of organizational newcomers during early organizational socialization experiences. This study is pivotal in that it advances the efficacy of mentoring. The study found that mentored newcomers had different patterns of information acquisition than non-mentored newcomers. Mentored newcomers tended to observe their mentors and others while non-mentored newcomers relied on observing co-workers for information regarding their new role and setting. A significant finding in this study was mentored newcomers learned more about organizational issues and practices than non-mentored newcomers. Chao et al. (1994) attempted to address the organizational socialization construct deficit by creating and defining content dimensions of the socialization domain. These socialization content domains were then used to determine relationships between understanding specific features of a job/organization and the process and outcomes of socialization. This study is particularly significant because it resisted the temptation to conveniently restrict the conceptualization of socialization as only a newcomer issue. The basic tenets of organizational socialization theory suggest that socialization is a life long process that manifests as one's career unfolds (Feldman, 1989; Morrison & Hock, 1986; Van Maanen, 1976; 1984).

In their study, Chao et al. (1994) developed six socialization dimensions:

(a) performance proficiency, (b) politics, (c) language, (d) people, (e) organizational goals/values and (f) history. These socialization dimensions were then used to develop a 34-item questionnaire that was supported by a factor analysis from 594 professionals.

The 34-item questionnaire was then used to examine the socialization process by comparing three groups of respondents: (a) those who did not change jobs, (b) those who

changed jobs within their organization, and (c) those who changed jobs and organizations. Chao et al.'s (1994) findings suggest that the respondent groups showed significantly different response patterns. Specifically, respondents who did not change jobs were least like the respondents who changed jobs and organizations. Organizational changers showed the most significant changes across all six socialization dimensions. Respondents who only changed jobs were right in the middle of respondents who did not change jobs and those who changed both jobs and organizations. This study is significant because it also found small increases in all six socialization dimensions for respondents who did not make significant changes. This finding supports Shein's (1971) original hypothesis suggesting that socialization is an ongoing process that occurs throughout one's career. This study uses Chao et al.'s (1994) socialization scale to assess mentoring's effect on socialization of law faculty at ABA approved law schools.

Empirical Studies of Mentoring in Business Environments

Merriam (1983) suggests research on mentoring in business settings produced the largest number of published articles and data based studies of the mentoring phenomenon. This fact still holds true today. This section addresses the significant empirical studies examining the career-benefit outcomes of mentoring in business environments. Fagenson (1989) examined mentoring's effect on levels of satisfaction, career mobility/opportunity, recognition, security, and promotion rate among mentored and non-mentored men and women in high and low level positions at a large company. Fagenson (1989) found that mentored employees reported more satisfaction, career mobility/opportunity, recognition and higher promotion rates than non-mentored employees. An additional finding was that protégés' views of their job/career situations

were not affected by their gender or level. In another study, Dreher and Ash (1990) investigated linkages between mentoring experiences and the outcome variables of income, promotion, and perceptions of compensation outcomes for managerial and professional men and women who were graduates of two business schools. Their findings suggest that individuals involved with extensive mentoring relationships obtained more promotions, higher incomes, and perceived being more satisfied with the salary and benefits than individuals who were not involved with mentoring relationships or had less extensive mentoring relationships.

Thomas (1990) conducted a study examining the influence of race on protégés experiences of forming developmental relationships among black and white managers at a large public utility company in the northeastern United States. Thomas found that white protégés rarely had developmental relationships with persons of another race. On the other hand, black protégés appeared to form 63% of their developmental relationships with whites. This study also found that blacks were more inclined to form relationships outside the formal lines of authority and outside their departments. Moreover, same-race relationships provided significantly more psychosocial support than cross-race relationships.

Scandura (1992) examined the link between mentoring's vocational and psychosocial support and career mobility outcomes for mentored manufacturing managers at a large high-tech Midwestern manufacturing facility. Findings from this study indicated that vocational and psychosocial support was related to managers' salary and promotions. Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher (1992) studied correlates of career mentoring among Masters of Business Administration (MBA) and Bachelors of Science

and Business Administration (BSBA) graduates at three universities. The findings stemming from this research suggest that younger graduates with higher socioeconomic status backgrounds were more likely to receive career oriented mentoring. It was also found that managers reported more mentoring than professionals. Gender was found to be unrelated to the amount of career mentoring received. Chao et al. (1992) examined the effects of formal and informal mentorships on career-related and psychosocial functions among alumni of a large Midwestern university and a small private institute. Additionally, all groups of respondents were compared along three outcome measures: organizational socialization, job satisfaction, and salary. Chao et al.'s findings suggest that protégés in informal mentorships reported that they received more career support from their mentors and larger salaries than protégés in formal mentorships. Protégés in informal mentorships also reported more favorable outcomes than formal protégés. Outcomes for protégés in formal mentorships were on the whole not significant from the other two groups.

Koberg, Boss, Chappell, and Ringer (1994) studied the correlates and outcomes of mentoring among professional and managerial employees at a large hospital. It was found that individual, group, and organizational attributes influenced mentoring. Moreover, group and organizational variables influenced mentoring more so than did individual variables. Koberg et al. (1994) also found that mentoring increased with organizational rank, leader approachability and group differences. Mentoring decreased as a protégé's tenure increased. Other significant findings of this study were that men received more mentoring than women; minorities received more mentoring than whites.

Overall, mentoring was associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of work alienation.

Riley and Wrench (1985) conducted a definitional study of mentoring among women lawyers. The study employed a more stringent definition of mentoring. The study found that women lawyers who defined their mentoring relationships with the more stringent definition of mentoring perceived themselves as more successful and satisfied with their career than women lawyers with a more loosely conceived definition of mentoring. The results suggest that a robust conceptualization of mentoring is necessary for capturing the nuances of true mentoring relationships and that true mentors add value to the lives and careers of women lawyers.

Empirical Studies of Mentoring in Academic Environments

Since this study examines mentoring as an antecedent of organizational socialization, this section reviews empirical studies on mentoring and higher education faculty development. A review of the literature germane to higher education faculty development suggests that there is a substantial body of evidence supporting mentoring's efficacy in promoting faculty and administrator development. However, few empirical studies have focused solely on faculty development (Merriam, 1983; Merriam, Thomas and Zeph, 1988). According to Perna, Lerner and Yura (1995), the database of empirical studies of mentoring in peer-reviewed journals have not substantially increased. Despite this lack of empirical studies examining mentoring and faculty development in academic settings, below is a review of findings from several significant studies that were conducted.

Blackburn, Chapman and Cameron (1981) surveyed mentor professors regarding their most successful protégés, the mentorship role, and their careers. Blackburn et al. found that mentors were strongly inclined to nominate protégés whose careers were very similar to their own. Moreover it was found that male mentors were particularly predisposed to mentoring female protégés or they were more frequently sought out by female protégés. Additionally, Noe (1988), in a study of educators, examined the influence of several variables (protégé characteristics, gender composition of the mentoring dyad, the quality of the mentoring relationship, and the amount of time spent with the mentor) on career and psychosocial benefits gained by the protégé. Noe's findings confirmed that protégés received more psychosocial benefits than career benefits from their assigned mentors. One unexpected finding was that older protégés reported receiving more career support from their mentors although they spent less time with their mentors than did younger protégés. It was also found that protégés with high levels of educational attainment received more career support from their mentors. Additionally, women protégés reported receiving more psychosocial support from their mentors.

Williams and Blackburn (1988) conducted a factor analytic study examining perceived relationship attributes and productivity of nursing faculty. Four mentoring categories were examined: (a) role-specific modeling/teaching, (b) encouraging, (c) organizational socialization, and (d) advocating. In this study, only role-specific modeling/teaching was linked to nursing faculty research productivity. In similar research, Sands, Parson and Duane (1991) conducted a factor analytic study to examine the functions and the effects of mentoring on faculty at a large public university. Findings from this study indicated that 72% of the faculty reported that they were

mentored at some point during their career. Fifty percent of the faculty sample reported being mentored as a graduate student. Findings from this study also indicate that protégés had more male mentors than female and women were more likely to mentor women. The factor analysis yielded 29 mentor functions. Other findings from this study suggest that women were more inclined to view guide and information source functions as necessary mentor characteristics. Faculty who came from a tradition of mentoring in graduate schools viewed intellectual guide functions as ideal in mentoring relationships.

Eastman and Williams (1993), in a national study, surveyed full-time tenure-track agricultural education faculty at four-year institutions on eleven objective measures of academic success. Two of the measures were incidence of mentoring and quality of mentoring. Eastman and Williams (1993) found that 94% of faculty had received mentoring from more than one person during their career. Mentors were typically white males at least eight to twenty years older than the protégé. Additional findings suggest that the frequency of mentoring was greatest during graduate school and at the assistant professor level. The quality of mentoring had a significant but weak positive correlation with objectives measures of success (grants received and masters students advised). Mentoring quality was also found to have a modest positive correlation with position and career satisfaction.

Law Schools and Their Faculties

Since the present study seeks to examine mentoring as an antecedent of organizational socialization among law faculty at ABA approved law schools, it is necessary to obtain a fundamental understanding of the law school environment and their faculties. In this section, the researcher attempts to discuss the findings from studies that

have examined law schools, law professors and the law school environment. Despite an exhaustive search, the research in this area is quite sparse. According to Ogloff et al. (2000) there is a lack of hard data about the principal group of participants in legal education, the law teacher. Within this limited base of research on legal education, there are two noteworthy studies that have been conducted in the past two decades. Fossum (1980), in association with the American Bar Association, studied approximately the entire population of law professors ($n=3,780$) who were tenured or on a tenure track. The Fossum study used the American Association of Law Schools directory to access the universe of American law professors. The findings of the Fossum study were limited to basic demographics and academic characteristics of law professors. As a consequence, information relevant to law professors' values and attitudes are unavailable and studies that might provide insights on characteristics of law professors are yet to be conducted.

The second study, conducted by Borthwick and Schau (1991), was essentially a follow-up to the Fossum study. The focus and methodology of Borthwick and Schau's study was for all intents and purposes the same as the Fossum study except that Borthwick and Schau drew their sample utilizing every seventh professor in The American Association of Law Schools directory. This sampling strategy produced a sample equivalent to 15% ($n=872$) of the law professor population. Because the methodology and focus of both studies were the same it is convenient and relatively easy to compare the results of each study and highlight any of the changes that did occur during the 13-year time span between each study.

Ogloff et al.'s (2000) review of both empirical studies of law professors suggests the following. First, that the overwhelming majority of law professors are white males.

Ogloff, et al. (2000) report that in the Fossum study, the 1975-76 sample of law professors was predominantly white (96% were white with 93% being male between the ages of 30 and 50) and male. They also reported that the Borthwick and Schau 1986-1987 sample produced demographics which indicated that 80% of full-time law professors were male and that although the numbers of women and minorities were increasing, the law-teaching profession was still dominated by white males. Second, in regards to academic pedigree, law professors exhibit striking homogeneity with respect to academic achievement and graduating institution. Ogloff et al. (2000) report that the findings from both empirical studies indicate the majority of law professors graduated from one of the top twenty law schools in America and these top twenty law schools only accounted for 15% of the nations accredited law schools. Within the 1975-76 sample of law professors, 60% graduated from the top twenty law schools. The percentage of law professors graduating from top twenty law schools remained relatively the same in the 1988-89 sample with 54% of law professors earning their law degrees from top twenty law schools.

Ogloff et al. (2000) highlight additional characteristic that enable one to become a law professor. They note that participation on a law review and membership in Order of the Coif are indicators of high academic achievement and stellar scholarship. Fossum (1980) found that 48% of law professors held a position on law review. A regression analysis performed in the Fossum (1980) study suggest that law schools of origin and achievement of high academic honors were the two most accurate predictors of a law professor aspirant earning his/her first tenure-track appointment on a law faculty. Ogloff et al. (2000) also report that earning an advanced degree in law (LL.M. or S.J.D.) and

serving as a judicial clerk did increase a person's chances of securing a tenure-track position on a law faculty. This was especially true for individuals graduating from law schools ranked below the nations' top twenty. A significant finding resulting from comparing the Fossum (1980) study and the Borthwick and Schau (1991) study was that the proportion of law professors who had completed a judicial clerkship doubled between the 1975-76 sample and the 1988-89 sample. This suggest that more recent law graduates tend to clerk before assuming a tenure-track position on a law faculty.

Finkelstein et al. (1998) reported the extent to which American faculty demographic profiles have changed in very recent years is unprecedented. How do these changes manifest in the law-teaching academy? A historical prospective suggest that women appear to have had a relatively small presence in law professorships and up until the early 1970's, women accounted for 8% of law professorships at American law schools (Ogloff et al., 2000). In another study examining the hiring of women and minorities on American law school faculties, Chused (1988) found that in general, law school faculties were slightly more integrated by both race and gender in the 1986-87 academic year than the 1980-81 academic year. According to Chused (1988), in the 1986-87 academic year, female faculty comprised 20% of the full-time law professorships compared to 13.7% in the 1980-81 academic year. The picture was somewhat less rosy for minority faculty in 1986. Chused (1988) reports that black faculty comprised only 3.7% of the law-teaching academy in the 1986-87 academic year. This percentage was slightly higher than the 2.8% figure reported in the 1980-81 academic year. For Hispanic law professors, there was an increase from .5% to 1% for the same period. "In 1986-87, a typical law school had thirty one members, including

those teaching in classroom and clinics, or holding positions as head librarians or academic deans. Of these 31 people, 27 taught in classrooms, two taught in clinics, one was dean and one ran the library; 30 were white and one was black, Hispanic, or other minority; 26 were men and five were women” (Chused, 1988, p.1).

It is informative and interesting to be able to compare the evolution of the law-teaching academy from one decade to another as several of the previously addressed studies have done. It is necessary to now turn to the state of the law-teaching academy in contemporary times. An understanding of the racial and ethnic demographics of today’s law-teaching academy would be useful especially in view of the fact that Finkelstein et al. (1998) suggest that the composition of new entrants into the higher education academy is undoubtedly the most profound change occurring in academic institutions.

White (2001) reported that for the academic year 1999-2000, the total percentage of women faculty at American law schools was 31.5 %. This figure represents all of the various faculty positions an individual can hold within a law school. With respect to minorities, the total percentage of minority faculty in the 1999-2000 academic year was 13.6%. From a comparative standpoint it appears as though women and minorities are increasing their representation on American law faculties. This finding is significant for two reasons. First, it supports Finkelstein et al.’s (1998) pronouncement that there are marked changes occurring in the composition of American higher education academy. Second, these changes signal the reality that law schools will need to socialize new faculty who may be different in gender and ethnicity from what most people have come to accept as traditional law faculty.

Summary

A review of the relevant literature and the various studies on mentoring, organizational socialization, and the characteristics of law faculty revealed the following.

1. The mentoring construct and phenomenon still has utility in today's organizations. However, attempts to study the mentoring phenomenon have been plagued with construct definitional problems and methodological issues. Despite this reality, progress has been made in understanding the benefits of mentoring. These mentoring benefits contribute to the career advancement and psychosocial development of protégés. The literature does not adequately address the distinctions between formal mentoring and informal mentoring and their efficacy in socializing employees to an organization. Moreover, the researcher has found that there is a research deficit with respect to the role mentoring plays in socializing a changing workforce where immigrants, women and minorities are rapidly increasing their representation in business and industry.
2. The organizational socialization literature has construct definitional problems, and methodological issues that prevent a systematic understanding of organizational socialization. As a consequence, research attempting to develop and validate a primary measure of the organizational socialization construct is needed.
3. The law-teaching academy, once a homogenous bastion of learned males, is now becoming a heterogeneous academy where diversity and its socialization consequences present opportunities for inquiry as law schools, as well as other academic institutions and business organizations, grapple with renewal.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter is comprised of seven sections that present the methods and procedures that were used to conduct this study. The first section begins with a review of the study's purpose. The second section provides a list of the study's hypotheses. The third section addresses the research design. The fourth section describes the population of the study. The fifth section of this chapter addresses the instrument used in this study. It discusses the development of the scales and their reliability and validity. The sixth section of this chapter addresses the data collection procedures. The seventh and final section of this chapter addresses the method of data analysis.

The purpose of this research is to examine formal and informal mentoring as antecedents of organizational socialization among tenured and non-tenured law faculty at ABA approved law schools.

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were tested in order to achieve the purpose of this study:

- H1 Mentored tenured law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty.

- H2 Informally mentored tenure-track law faculty will perceive that they achieve greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than formally mentored tenure-track law faculty.
- H3 Mentored tenure-track law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty
- H4 Tenured law faculty will report higher levels of organizational socialization than non-mentored tenure-track law faculty.
- H5 Male law faculty will perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than female law faculty.
- H6 Caucasian/Majority law faculty will perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than Non-Caucasian/Minority faculty.

Research Design

The researcher used a causal-comparative design to structure and execute this study. According to Gall et al. (1996) the causal-comparative design is appropriate because it allows the discovery of possible cause and effect relationships. This research sought to determine the relationship between the various forms of mentoring and organizational socialization among law faculty at ABA approved law schools. The framework for this research was built using three areas of focus:

1. A historical review of mentoring, and its use in business and academic environments.
2. A theoretical review of Social Learning Theory that provides an explanatory base for the mentoring phenomenon.

3. A review of organizational socialization, its distinctions and attributes in the domain of human socialization.

Description of Participants

As of February 2001, there were a total of 185 ABA approved law schools. This total includes 184 law schools and the Judge Advocate General's School. Of the 184 ABA approved law schools, six were approved conditionally (Official Guide to the ABA-Approved Law Schools 2002 ed.). The target population of this study was comprised of law professors from 178 of the 184 ABA approved law schools. The researcher elected to omit the six ABA conditionally approved institutions from the target population. According to White (2001) there are 8,827 full-time law professors at the 184 ABA approved law schools. Of this total, 32.5% of the law teachers are women, and 13.8 % of law teachers belong to a minority group of which 7.8 % are minority men and 6.1 % are minority women. Non-minority men comprise 59.8 % of law teachers and non-minority women account for 26.3% of law teachers.

The position of law professor can be divided into several categories based upon seniority. Those categories are: (a) *Assistant Professor of Law*; (b) *Associate Professor of Law*; and (c) *Professor of Law*. According to Merrick and Reskin (1997) the titles of "Assistant Professor", "Associate Professor", and "Professor" usually represent tenure-track or tenured status within the academy. Generally within a law faculty, the entry-level position of a law faculty is Assistant Professor of Law. An Assistant Professor of Law generally is eligible for promotion to the position of Associate Professor of Law and then ultimately to Professor of Law, the most senior position in a law faculty except for Professor of Law Emeritus.

Law faculties are also divided into two distinct categories: (a) tenured law faculty and (b) tenure-track law faculty. Generally junior faculty members (Assistant Professors of Law) are associated with the tenure-track/non-tenured rank and senior faculty members (Associate Professors of Law and Professors of Law) are associated with the tenured rank. It should be noted that a law faculty might not solely be restricted to professorships in the tenured and non-tenured ranks. Clinical faculty, Adjunct faculty and, Lecturers in Law generally augment the number of teachers on law faculties. These additional faculties usually have term contracts and are not eligible for tenure. The researcher acknowledges these distinctions, but will only focus on tenured and tenure-track law professors in structuring the present research's hypotheses. According to Merritt and Reskin (1997) tenure-track law professors occupy influential and important positions that shape both the development of the next generation of lawyers and legal doctrine. Additionally, tenured and tenure-track law professors are more prominent stakeholders in a law school environment because they have voting privileges that contribute to governance and culture of their respective law schools whereas law teachers in the other categories do not.

Instrument

In efforts to achieve parsimony, this study used one instrument containing three questionnaires: (a) the Mentoring Questionnaire, (b) Chao et al.'s (1994) Organizational Socialization Questionnaire and (c) the Demographics Questionnaire. The first part of the instrument consisted of a Mentoring Questionnaire designed to capture data on the occurrence of mentoring within a period of time, distinctions between the different forms of mentoring, and the perceived effectiveness of the various forms of mentoring received.

The second part of the instrument consisted of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire, which was designed to capture data on the six factors of Organizational Socialization. The third and final part of the instrument consisted of a demographic questionnaire that captured data for descriptive purposes. According to Hinkle, Wiersma and, Jurs (1994) descriptive statistics are used to categorize, summarize, and describe numerical data. Respondents were asked to first respond to questions on the Mentoring Questionnaire and then respond to questions on the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire. Respondents completed the survey by filling out the Demographics Questionnaire.

Mentoring Questionnaire

The Mentoring Questionnaire, developed by the researcher, was designed and developed using Fowler's (1995) principles for the design and evaluation of survey questions. Fowler (1995) advocated a protocol using three principal forms of survey question evaluation activities. The three forms are (a) focus group discussions, (b) intensive individual reviews, and (c) field pre-testing. The researcher used a combination of two forms of survey evaluation activities (focus group discussion and field pre-testing) as advocated by Fowler (1995) to refine and finalize the development of the instrument to be used in this research. Specifically, the researcher sought the input of specific members of a law faculty to obtain their insight and input as to the quality and relatedness of the instrument. Additionally, the researcher pilot tested the instruments used in this research at the Brandeis School of Law of the University of Louisville to obtain information on readability and appropriateness of the instrument to law faculty. More will be said about the pilot test later on in this chapter. In light of these efforts, it is

important to note however, that the Mentoring Questionnaire's purpose and intent is to solicit data on the occurrence of mentoring, the distinctions between the various forms of mentoring, and law faculty perceptions of the effectiveness of the various forms of mentoring they received. The Mentoring Questionnaire does not purport nor was it designed to measure mentoring content or the mentoring construct.

Organizational Socialization Questionnaire

Chao et al.'s (1994) Organizational Socialization Questionnaire, measures six factors of organizational socialization. The six factors are Performance Proficiency, Politics, Language, People, Organizational Goals and Values, and History. Chao et al.'s (1994) questionnaire was initially developed with 39 items. A five-point Likert scale was used and responses to the questionnaire were collected from 780 first-year respondents who were drawn from an independent sample of 5,460 full-time, employed college students. Chao et al. (1994) performed a confirmatory factor analysis on the independent sample and as a result the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire was further reduced to 34 items. In regards to the reliability and validity of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire, Chao et al.'s (1994) exploratory factor analysis supported the six *a priori* dimensions of socialization. According to Chao et al. (1994) the reliabilities of the six dimensions measured by Cronbach's coefficient alpha, were acceptable, yielding estimates of .78 or greater. Results suggest that Chao et al.'s Organizational Socialization Questionnaire is a useful measure of organizational socialization within specific content areas.

Demographics Questionnaire

The Demographics Questionnaire consisted of questions about position titles, time in current position, time affiliated with current institution, time in the law-teaching career, educational attainment, gender, race and ethnicity. These questions were designed to enable the researcher to describe the sample population and to make comparisons to the population at large.

Pilot Test of Instrument

The researcher conducted a pilot test of the instrument used in the research at the Louis D. Brandeis School of Law at the University of Louisville. The pilot population consisted of 32 ($N=32$) full-time tenured or tenure-track law professors. The purpose of the pilot was to test the research instrument for readability and appropriateness to law faculty.

The researcher used the following methodology for collecting data from the pilot participants:

1. A letter was sent to the Dean of the Louis D. Brandies Schools of Law advising her of the researcher's intent to pilot test the instrument used in this present research.
2. Individually addressed packets containing the instrument along with the appropriate informed consent preamble, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope for returning the completed instrument was submitted to the Dean's office of the Louis D. Brandeis School of law for distribution to the participant tenured and tenure-track law faculty. Participants will be given three weeks to complete and return the instrument.

3. Blanket broadcast e-mails will be sent to all pilot participants at the end of the first and second weeks after the survey had been distributed; reminding them to complete and return the survey.
4. At the end of the three week period, when all of the instruments were returned from the pilot-test participants, the researcher analyzed the data obtained from the pilot participants and used the information obtained to refine the research instrument.

Data Collection

This study used a causal-comparative research methodology. The researcher used a confidential survey as principal means of collecting data for this study. According to Gall et al. (1996) the purpose of a survey is to collect data from sample participants so that generalizations can be made about the population that the sample participants represent. The researcher used a stratified random sampling process to select the sample of law schools in this study and then conveniently selected their associated faculty members as research participants. A stratified random sample requires the researcher to first identify subgroups with characteristics in a population. The researcher must then randomly draw individuals or elements from each subgroup (Gall et al., 1996). In this study, the researcher created a stratified random sample of law schools based upon the distinguishing criteria of public versus private law schools. This is a useful distinction because it provided the researcher additional avenues to add context and meaning to the data obtained with respect to mentoring and organizational socialization. For instance one might infer that private law schools and their faculty might exhibit higher levels of organizational socialization than public law schools because private law schools are more

well endowed, resource rich and can direct funds to support programs to foster the socialization of their law faculty or vice versa.

As was previously stated in an earlier section of this chapter describing the research participants, there are 178 ABA approved law schools, six conditionally approved law schools, and the Judge Advocate's General school that comprise a total of 185 ABA approved law schools. The sample of participants for this present research was drawn from the 178 law schools with full approval from the ABA. According to the Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2002 Edition, the 178 ABA approved law schools can be categorized as either public or private institutions. Based upon this categorization, there are 101 private ABA approved law schools and 77 public ABA approved law schools for a combined total of 178 ABA approved law schools. The researcher selected a stratified random sample from the universe of 178 ABA approved law schools using the following process. First, the researcher categorized the universe of ABA approved law schools according to their public or private institutional status. Second, the researcher used a table of random numbers to randomly draw a 25% sample of private ABA approved law schools. This means that the researcher randomly selected 25 of the 101 private ABA approved law schools. Third, the researcher repeated the procedure using a table of random numbers to randomly draw a 25% sample of public ABA approved law schools. This process resulted in the random selection of 19 of the 77 public ABA approved law schools. In total, the research sample was comprised of 44 randomly selected public and private ABA approved law schools. The law faculties associated with each of the 44 randomly selected public and private ABA approved law schools were conveniently chosen as the study's participants by selecting them from the

Association of American Law Schools Directory of Law Teachers, 2001-2002. This directory provides the names, position title, and contact information for all law professors associated with ABA approved law schools.

The sample selection procedure used in this study had the effect of stratifying and randomizing the selection of the study participants because each law school and their associated faculty within the universe of ABA approved law schools and law faculties have a relatively equal chance of being selected in the study's sample population. The researcher chose to use a 25% sample from each category (public and private) of law schools. The researcher believed that this sample size was appropriate because it conformed to generalized sample size principles in educational and survey research. According to Fowler (1993), "The size of a population from which a sample is drawn has virtually no impact on how well that sample is likely to describe the population. A sample of 150 people will describe a population of 15,000 or 15 million with virtually the same degree of accuracy, assuming that all other aspects of the sampling design and the sampling procedures remain the same" (pp.33-34). Based upon this information, the researcher believed that a 25% sample from the universe of 178 ABA approved law schools ($n = 44$) was more than adequate for purposes of data analysis with the express purpose of describing characteristics of the population of ABA approved law schools and their associated law faculties. In addition, the law faculties associated with the 44 sample participant ABA approved law schools constituted an approximate total of 1,176 ($n = 1,176$) randomly selected law professors from a universe of 8,827 ($N = 8,827$) full-time law professors at the 178 ABA approved law schools. In percentage terms, this meant the research sample population would be comprised of 19% of all full-time law

professors associated with the 178 ABA approved law schools. According to Fowler (1993) this sample size is more than adequate for purposes of generalizing findings from the sample population to the population at large. In addition, Seymour Sudman as cited in Gall et al. (1996) suggests that in survey research, the convention is that data should be collected from a minimum of 100 research participants in each major subgroup and 20 to 50 participants in each minor subgroup. In this present research the researcher intentionally chose to use the largest sample possible. The researcher subscribes to the general rule in quantitative research which advises to use the largest sample possible because it increases the likelihood that measured variables in the sample population will be reflected in the population at large.

Survey packets that included a coded survey, and informed consent preamble along with self-addressed stamped return envelopes were mailed to each research participant. In addition, the researcher sent a separate letter to the Deans of each of the 45 participating ABA approved law schools outlining the purpose and objectives of the present research and urging each Dean to encourage their faculty to complete and return their surveys. It was expected that this separate letter to the Deans of the 45 participating law schools would provide significant value in ensuring that law faculty in the sample population would not ignore the survey. The expected net effect of this letter to the Deans would be a high survey response rate. In further efforts to ensure a high survey response rate, the researcher sent broadcast reminder e-mails to the study's participants regardless of whether they did or did not respond to the survey. The broadcast e-mails simply reminded participants to complete and return their surveys. The reminder e-mails also provided information to non-responding research participants on how to obtain

another survey if a participant had misplaced his/her survey. The intended targets of the broadcast e-mail were non-responding participants. It was hoped that participants who had already completed and returned their surveys would understand the intent of the reminder e-mails and simply choose to ignore them.

The purpose of sending separate letters to the Deans of each participating law school and coded surveys was to help ensure an appropriate response rate for the study. According to Gall et al. (1996) coding surveys can improve response rates because coding allows the researcher to do follow-ups for non-responding research participants. This process of coding surveys is not completely anonymous; however, the researcher made every effort to the extent permitted by law to protect the confidentiality of the research participants. The researcher examined the literature for information that might establish an appropriate response rate for this study; however, since there are so few studies on law professors and none of this kind, the literature was silent in providing an appropriate response rate. There are general guidelines in social science research to establish an appropriate response rate. According to Babbie (1998), a response rate of 50% is adequate, 60% is good and 70% is very good for analyzing and reporting findings. The researcher had hoped to achieve a 50% response rate for the present research.

The researcher is an independent graduate student with no affiliation to the law-teaching academy. This information is significant because the few studies that were conducted on law professors; were either conducted in conjunction with or by the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law schools. Most law professors are members of either of these associations and as a consequence, they have more of a compelling interest to respond to the surveys associated with these associations

rather than that of an independent doctoral student. Despite this possibility, the researcher made every effort to obtain a high response rate and to ensure that confidentiality is maintained in this research.

Method of Analysis

Multiple regression analysis (Pedhazur, 1997) was planned to test each of the six major null hypotheses of this study. There are six separate scores that measure organizational socialization. Thus, there are six sub-hypotheses to be tested for each major hypothesis. To protect against inflation of Type I error rate, the Bonferroni procedure (Stevens, 2001) was used to lower the significance level for the six sub-hypotheses under each major hypothesis. Under this procedure, the significance level for each sub-hypothesis would be $.05/6 = .0083$.

In all major hypotheses described below, the dependent variables will be the six sub-scores measuring organizational socialization.

In addition, descriptive statistics were reported on all variables associated with this study. The descriptive statistics and demographic data gleaned from this study was used to compare key variables (gender, ethnicity and, tenure status) within the sample population to the known distribution of these key variables within the law-teaching academy.

CHAPTER IV

THE SURVEY FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the survey data obtained, an analysis of the sample in order to determine its representativeness of the population from which it is drawn, and the results of the study based upon its hypotheses and the inferential statistical analyses applied to the data. First, a description of the sample and the data collection procedures is presented. Second, a discussion of the survey and the descriptive statistics yielded from responses to the survey are provided for purposes of comparing the research sample to the population of American law professors. The third and final section of this chapter presents the results and analysis associated with each of the six hypotheses of this study.

The Sample and Data Collection

The sample is comprised of law professors on faculty at 44 of the 178 public and private American Bar Association Approved Law Schools. The position of law professor is divided into several categories based upon tenure-track status and seniority. Generally, there are three categories associated with the position of law professor: (a) Assistant Professor of Law, (b) Associate Professor of Law, and (c) Professor of Law. The position of Assistant Professor of Law has the least seniority and is likely to be non-tenured.

The position of Professor of Law conversely, has the most seniority and is likely to be tenured. The position of Associate Professor of Law is generally more senior than that of the Assistant Professor of Law however, the Associate Professor of Law may or may not have tenure at a particular law school.

The sample of 44 public and private law schools represents 25% of all American Bar Association approved public and private law schools. There are a total of 178 private and public law schools that are unconditionally approved by the American Bar Association. Of the 178 unconditionally approved American Bar Association law schools, there are 101 private law schools and 77 public law schools. The research sample was created by randomly selecting 25 private law schools from the universe of 101 private law schools and 19 public law schools from the universe of 77 public law schools. This stratified random sample represents 25% of all fully approved American Bar Association law schools. It contained law schools located in all of the major regions (Northeast, Midwest, South and West) of the contiguous United States.

Description of the Respondents

Data were collected through a survey (see Appendix A) mailed to 1,176 law professors associated with the sample 44 public and private American Bar Association Approved law schools around the nation. The survey comprised three questionnaires. Questionnaire I asked respondents to determine the type and quality of mentoring they received. Questionnaire II asked respondents to answer a variety of questions relevant to their socialization experiences as law faculty. Questionnaire III asked respondents to provide demographic information for descriptive purposes. Of the 1,176 surveys mailed there were 298 usable surveys returned for a response rate of 25%. The demographic

data from Questionnaire III is presented first to determine sample representativeness to the population of law professors.

Table 1

Gender, Ethnicity and Age of Respondents (N=298)

	<i>(n)</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	182	61.5
Female	114	38.5
<i>Ethnicity</i>		
Black/African-American	24	8.3
Asian-American/Pacific Islander	8	2.8
White	239	82.4
Hispanic/Latino	12	4.1
Native American	2	.7
Other	5	1.7
<i>Age at time of survey (years)</i>		
29 or less	2	.7
30-39	44	14.9
40-49	83	28.0
50-59	124	41.9
60 or over	43	14.5

Note. Numbers do not total to 298 for each variable because of missing data.

According to Table 1, males represented the majority of the sample. Whites accounted for 82.4% of the sample with Minorities and Other accounting for the remainder of the sample; Black/African-American had the second highest representation at 8.3%. With respect to age, most law professors in the sample reported being between 50 and 59 years of age.

Table 2 presents a second set of demographic data about law faculty training and current position.

Table 2

Law Faculty Educational Background and Current Position (N=298)

<i>Educational Background</i>	(n)	%
JD	164	55.6
JD, LLM	62	21
JD, SJD	4	1.4
JD & Other Masters Degree	44	14.9
JD & Other Doctoral Degree	21	7.1
<i>Current Position Title</i>		
Tenure-track Assistant Professor	32	10.8
Tenure-track Associate Professor	19	6.4
Tenured Associate Professor	27	9.1
Tenured Professor	213	72.0
Other Tenured Professor	5	1.7

Note. Numbers do not total to 298 for each variable because of missing data.

Table 2 shows that most law professors, have JD (Juris Doctorate) degrees.

Additionally, Table 2 shows that 72%, of the respondents were Tenured Full-Professors.

Table 3 illustrates the final set of demographic data for this study. It shows data related to law faculty career experience.

Table 3

Law Faculty Teaching Experience (N=298)

<u>Time in Law Teaching</u>	(n)	%
Less than 1 year	5	1.7
1-2 years	8	2.7
3-5 years	23	7.8
6-10 years	38	12.9
11-15 years	51	17.3
16 or more years	170	57.6
<u>Time at Current Law School</u>		
Less than 1 year	7	2.4
1-2 years	19	6.4
3-5 years	46	15.5
6-10 years	42	14.2
11-15 years	45	15.2
16 or more years	137	46.3
<u>Time in Current Position</u>		
Less than 1 year	14	4.7
1-2 years	30	10.1
3-5 years	61	20.6
6-10 years	48	16.2
11-15 years	43	14.5
16 or more years	100	33.8

Note. Numbers do not total to 298 for each variable because of missing data.

According to Table 3, a majority of law faculty respondents, 57.6% have been teaching 16 years or more. Table 3 also shows that most respondents 46.3% have been with their current institution for 16 years or more. With respect to time in current position, Table 3 illustrates that 33.8% of respondents have been in their current position for 16 years or more. Respondents who have been in their current position for 3 to 5 years represent the second largest group in the sample.

Sample Representativeness

Tables 1 through 3 presented the demographic variables from subjects of this study. A discussion of the representativeness of the sample to the population of American law professors is now warranted. Appendix B presents a table obtained for the Association of American Law Schools' (AALS) web site (www.aals.org) containing demographics data for the entire population of American law teachers. This AALS table facilitates a direct comparison of the research sample's demographic data to the demographic data associated with the law teaching population. The researcher compared the numbers of persons responding to this study with the population of all law school professors in the United States. Comparisons were made on three key variables: gender, ethnicity, and position (faculty level). These are important variables in any educational research study, but even more so in the present study because these are independent variables in the hypotheses that were tested.

Gender

The first comparison involved gender. Table 4 shows the number and percentage of males and females among all U.S. law schools and in the study sample.

Table 4

Number and Percentage of Law School Professors by Gender

	<u>All U.S.</u>	<u>Survey Sample</u>
Male	6125 77.6%	182 61.5%
Female	1765 22.4%	114 38.5%

Note. Data for "All U.S." were obtained from the AALS website (www.aals.org).

The percentage of females in the study sample, 38.5%, exceeded the percentage of females among all U. S. law school professors, 22.4%. This was statistically significant in a chi-square test of independence, $\chi^2(1, N = 8186) = 42.04, p < .01$. However, the national data provided gender percentages for each of the professorial ranks. Thus, further analyses were pursued to locate where the gender differences were greatest.

At the level of Assistant Professor, the percentage of females for the U.S. population (49.4%) and the percentage for the study sample (53.1%) were relatively similar and not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 629) = 0.16, p > .05$. In addition, at the level of Associate Professor, the percentage of females for the U.S. population (49.4%) and the percentage for the study sample (46.5%) were similar and not statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 1217) = 1.08, p > .05$. However, at the Professor level, the percentage of females for the U.S. population (22.9%) was significantly exceeded by the percentage for the study sample (33.0%), $\chi^2(1, N = 4757) = 11.94, p < .05$. In summary, the gender representation of the study sample was similar to all U.S. law school professors for two out of three ranks that were part of the study.

Minority Status

An additional comparison involved ethnic status. Table 5 shows the number and percentage of minorities and whites among all U.S. law schools and in the study sample. The data for "All U. S." was after the subtraction of the survey sample cases.

Table 5

Number and Percentage of Law School Professors by Minority Status

	<u>All U.S.</u>	<u>Survey Sample</u>
Minority	833 15.0%	51 17.6%
White	4738 85.0%	239 82.4%

Note. Data for “All U.S.” were obtained from the AALS website (www.aals.org).

The percentage of minority persons in the study sample, 17.6%, was not significantly different than the percentage of minority persons among all U. S. law school professors, 15.% ($\chi^2(1, N = 5861) = 1.49, p > .05$).

Position of Respondent

The final demographic comparison involved position of respondent, i.e., professorial level. Table 6 shows the number and percentage of professors by rank among all U.S. law schools and in the study sample. The data for “All U. S.” was after the subtraction of the survey sample cases.

Table 6

Number and Percentage of Law School Professors by Professorial Rank

	<u>All U.S.</u>		<u>Survey Sample</u>	
	<u><i>n</i></u>	<u>%</u>	<u><i>n</i></u>	<u>%</u>
<i>Professor</i>	4326	71.9	213	73.2
<i>Associate Professor</i>	1125	18.7	46	15.8
<i>Assistant Professor</i>	565	9.4	32	11.0

Note. Data for “All U.S.” were obtained from the AALS website (www.aals.org).

The percentages of professors, associate professors, and assistant professors in the study sample were not significantly different than the percentages among all U. S. law school professors, ($\chi^2 (2, N = 6307) = 2.07, p > .05$).

In summary, a comparative analysis of the research sample for its representativeness to the law professor population suggest that it is appropriate to conclude that the research sample is representative of the demographic associated with American law professor population on three variables. The three variables are Gender, Race and Ethnicity (minority and non-minority), and Position Titles. In these demographic variables, the research sample closely represented the American law professor population. It is evident that, although there is some variance between the research sample demographics and the population demographics on three variables, the variances were slight. This conclusion is significant because these demographic categories (Gender, Race and Ethnicity, and Position Title) played a significant role in structuring the hypotheses associated with this research.

The Mentoring Questionnaire Findings

The Mentoring Questionnaire asked respondents to answer questions regarding their mentoring experiences. The first six items solicited responses regarding mentoring type, mentoring quality and present involvement status with mentoring. Tables 7 through 11 provide frequency distributions for these six items. According to Table 7, 55.1% of respondents were informally mentored. Only 3.1% of respondents reported being formally mentored. Non-mentored respondents accounted for 21.8% of all respondents. A new category was created for respondents who reported that they had received both

formal and informal mentoring; respondents in this category represented 20.1% of all respondents.

Table 7

Types of Mentoring Among Respondents (N =298)

<i>Mentoring Type</i>	<i>(n)</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Informal Mentoring</i>	162	55.1
<i>Formal Mentoring</i>	9	3.1
<i>Non-Mentoring</i>	64	21.8
<i>Mentoring (Formal & Informal)</i>	59	20.1

Note. Numbers do not total to 298 because of missing data.

Table 8 shows that 71.8% of respondents received their mentoring at their current Law School. Respondents who received mentoring at a prior law school accounted for 25.5%.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution for Where Mentoring Occurred (N=298)

<i>Place Where Mentoring Occurred</i>	<i>(n)</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Current Law School</i>	158	71.8
<i>Prior Law School</i>	56	25.5
<i>Institution Other Than Law School</i>	3	1.4
<i>Current and Prior Schools</i>	3	1.4

Note. Numbers do not total to 298 because of missing data.

The third item of the Mentoring Questionnaire required respondents to rate the effectiveness of formal mentoring on a five-point Likert scale. As can be seen in Table 9, a slight majority of respondents (56.2%) reported that the formal mentoring they received was effective.

Table 9

Frequency Distribution Ratings on Formal Mentoring (N = 298)

<i>Ratings of "The formal mentoring I received was effective"</i>	<i>(n)</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	8	7.6
<i>Disagree</i>	24	22.9
<i>Undecided</i>	14	13.3
<i>Agree</i>	42	40.0
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	17	16.2

Note. Numbers do not total to 298 because of missing data.

The fourth Mentoring Questionnaire item asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of informal mentoring on a five point Likert scale. Table 10 shows that respondents who agreed and strongly agreed represented 81.7% of all respondents.

Table 10

Frequency Distribution Ratings on Informal Mentoring (N = 298)

<i>Ratings of "The informal mentoring I received was effective"</i>	<i>(n)</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	7	3.1
<i>Disagree</i>	15	6.6
<i>Undecided</i>	20	8.7
<i>Agree</i>	127	55.5
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	60	26.2

Note. Numbers do not total to 298 because of missing data.

The fifth Mentoring Questionnaire item asked respondents to indicate whether they were currently being formally mentored and the sixth item asked respondents to indicate whether they were currently being informally mentored. Table 11 shows that 14.3% of respondents were currently involved in a formal mentoring relationship; as compared to 36.4% of respondents who indicated that they were currently involved in an informal mentoring relationship. It should be noted that a majority of respondents said that they were not involved in either form of mentoring.

Table 11

Frequency Distribution on Mentoring Currently Being Received (N = 298)

<i>Mentoring Type</i>	<i>(n)</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Currently Being Formally Mentored</i>		
No	190	84.8
Yes	32	14.3
Undecided	2	.9
<i>Currently Being Informally Mentored</i>		
No	136	59.6
Yes	83	36.4
Undecided	9	3.9

Table 12 presents descriptive statistics of the Mentoring Questionnaire. These items solicited information regarding respondents' characterization of the various forms of mentoring, knowledge of the types of mentoring occurring in their law schools, and their personal preferences regarding mentoring. Respondents used a five-point Likert scale from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. A relatively high proportion of respondents agreed that some of their colleagues had informal mentoring currently or in the past ($M=4.21$). In addition, a high percentage of respondents stated that Informal

mentoring was currently going on ($M = 4.18$). Conversely, a relatively low proportion of respondents believed that formal mentoring was more effective than informal mentoring ($M = 2.55$). Moreover, an even smaller proportion of respondents indicated that they had no interest in being mentored either formally or informally.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for 10 Aspects of Mentoring

<i>Aspects of Mentoring</i>	<i>(M)</i>	<i>(SD)</i>
I have received career support but would not call it mentoring.	3.22	1.18
I have received psychosocial support but would not call it mentoring.	2.93	1.16
Formal mentoring is more effective than informal mentoring at my law school or prior law school.	2.55	1.04
Some of my colleagues have formal mentors at my law school or prior law school.	3.34	1.27
Some of my colleagues have informal mentors at my law school or prior law school.	4.20	.65
There is a formal mentoring program at my current law school.	3.01	1.49
Informal mentoring is occurring at my current law school.	4.17	.72
I prefer(ed) being formally mentored.	2.66	.98
I prefer(ed) being informally mentored	3.65	.89
I have/had no interest in being mentored formally or informally	1.95	.93

Note. Items were rated on five-step Likert scale, from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.

Summary of Mentoring Questionnaire

A review of the data obtained from the Mentoring Questionnaire, items M1 through M6, suggest that a majority of respondents (55%) were informally mentored. A small minority of respondents (3.1%) was formally mentored and 21.8% of respondents received no mentoring at all. In addition, 20.1% of respondents indicated that they had received both formal and informal mentoring. The data suggest that most of the mentoring was occurring at respondents' current institutions. A total of 56.2% of respondents clearly thought that the formal mentoring they received was effective, as compared to 81.7% of respondents who clearly believed that the informal mentoring they had received was effective. The data suggest that a majority of respondents were not currently involved in any form of mentoring. Therefore, a minority of respondents were involved with mentoring and, of that group, 14.3% were involved in formal mentoring as compared to 36.4% who were involved with informal mentoring.

A summary of the data associated with the Mentoring Questionnaire suggest that respondents, on average, either disagreed or were undecided as to whether formal mentoring is more effective than informal mentoring. Thus, there is no clear indication that formal mentoring is perceived to be more effective than informal mentoring. Responses suggested that respondents were aware that both forms of mentoring were occurring at their institutions. However, there was greater awareness that informal mentoring was occurring more so than formal mentoring. For example, respondents were undecided as to whether or not their law school has a formal mentoring program, but were quite sure that there is an informal mentoring program at their law school. Data revealed that respondents have a clear preference for informal mentoring. The mean and

standard deviation associated with item M14 was 2.66 and .98 respectively. Furthermore, respondents are interested in mentoring and would engage in a mentoring program at their institutions. The question is type: what type of mentoring program, formal or informal? Based on the data obtained it is plausible to conclude that respondents would choose to engage in an informal mentoring program over a formal mentoring program.

The Organizational Socialization Questionnaire Findings

This study used Chao et al.'s (1994) Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ) to solicit data from the research respondents on their socialization experiences. The Organizational Socialization Questionnaire is multidimensional in nature. This simply means that each dimension may relate to a different aspect of socialization and that achieving socialization in one area does not necessarily mean that one has achieved socialization in another area. The Chao Organizational Socialization Questionnaire has six dimensions or sub-scales: (a) History, (b) Language, (c) Politics, (d) People, (e) Organizational Goals and Values, and (f) Performance Proficiency. Table 13 shows the results of descriptive statistics and reliability analyses.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients for the Six OSQ Subscales

<u>Organizational Socialization Subscales</u>	<u>Number of Items</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Cronbach's Alpha</u>
<i>History</i>	5	20.56	3.37	.80
<i>Language</i>	5	21.53	2.96	.76
<i>Politics</i>	6	24.43	3.44	.78
<i>People</i>	6	22.67	3.93	.81
<i>Organizational Goals & Values</i>	7	25.51	4.80	.85
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	5	21.63	2.84	.79

History

This Organizational Socialization Questionnaire subscale entitled History contains five items. These five items solicit information from respondents regarding the organization's traditions, mores, and ceremonies. It is believed that such knowledge helps an individual discern what types of behaviors are appropriate for specific situations in organizational settings. The Cronbach alpha for the History subscale was .80.

Language

The Language subscale of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire consists of five items. These items assess respondents' knowledge of their profession's language, technical jargon, and acronyms. A plausible argument can be made that learning and understanding the language of an organization or profession is the initial step in the socialization process. Language is the medium through which communication takes place. In organizational settings, an understanding of the language of the organization or profession fosters effective interpersonal communications. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .76.

Politics

The Politics subscale of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire contains six items. According to Chao et al. (1994), socialization in organizational politics enables the individual to gain access to formal and informal networks within the organization and augments an individual's understanding of the organization's power structure. This scale had a Cronbach alpha of .78.

People

The People subscale of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire contains six items. These items relate to the establishment of productive and gratifying work relationships with colleagues and other organizational members. Inherent in this process is the view that finding and developing relationships with the right organizational member will almost always enhance or speed up the socialization of a new entrant to the organization. The Cronbach alpha for this subscale was .81.

Organizational Goals and Values

The Organizational Goals and Values Subscale of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire contains seven items that are germane to learning organization specific goals and values. Shein (1968) posits that socialization requires that organizational members understand and maintain organizational rules and principles that support and perpetuate the organization. In essence, organizational goals and values connect an individual to the organization. This subscale's Cronbach alpha was .85.

Performance Proficiency

The Organizational Socialization Questionnaire's Performance Proficiency subscale has five items that relate to defining how well an individual has learned the roles and responsibilities of the job. Performance is an essential ingredient for success on the job. An individual must at least have the requisite skill level and knowledge to perform a job. The ability to perform aids the socialization process. Inability to perform will render socialization unnecessary. This subscale produced a Cronbach alpha of .79.

Hypotheses and Results

Results for Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that mentored tenured law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty.

The original Hypothesis 1 required an averaging of two groups among the senior faculty, those who were formally mentored and those who were informally mentored. For example, the average *History* scale score of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire would be created for senior faculty (averaging *Formally Mentored* and *Informally Mentored*). The resulting average was then to be contrasted with the average *History* scale score of non-mentored faculty. However, the data revealed that only a small number of senior faculty ($n = 5$) was formally mentored. A much larger number of faculty members were informally mentored ($n = 134$). Averaging the two means would have meant equally weighting them, which was not appropriate given the large difference in sample sizes.

Thus, the data analysis was changed to reflect the numbers of cases that were received. The variable *form of mentoring received* was dichotomized. The two categories were: (a) mentored, consisting of those who received either formal or informal mentoring ($n = 139$), and (b) non-mentored ($n = 59$). Since the independent variable was a dichotomy and there were six dependent variables, an appropriate statistical analysis to address the research hypothesis was a multivariate independent samples *t*-test (Stevens, 2002). Table 14 below shows means and standard deviations for the Organizational Socialization scales for the two groups of senior faculty.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics on OSQ for Two Groups of Senior Faculty: Hypothesis 1

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Mentored</u> (n = 139)		<u>Non-mentored</u> (n = 59)	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<i>History</i>	4.25	.62	4.10	.68
<i>Language</i>	4.43	.50	4.33	.55
<i>Politics</i>	4.16	.52	4.10	.52
<i>People</i>	3.88	.54	3.52	.78
<i>Organization Goals & Values</i>	3.76	.64	3.39	.80
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	4.43	.45	4.41	.59

It was found that there were significant differences between the means of the two faculty groups, Hotelling's trace statistic = .097, $F(6, 191) = 3.09$, $p < .008$.

Organizational Socialization scales were examined individually, with independent sample t -tests, to determine the source of the statistical difference. Two scales showed differences. On the scale *People*, it was found that the mean score of the mentored faculty ($M = 3.88$) exceeded the mean of non-mentored faculty ($M = 3.52$), $t(196) = 3.75$, $p < .0001$. On the scale *Organizational Goals and Values*, it was found that the mean score of the mentored faculty ($M = 3.76$) exceeded the mean of non-mentored faculty ($M = 3.39$), $t(196) = 3.75$, $p < .000$.

On item 1 of the mentoring questionnaire, a relatively large number of faculty marked both option 1 (*Informal Mentoring*) and option 2 (*Formal Mentoring*). A new category was created to accommodate those cases. However, these cases were not considered in the previous analysis. Since the individuals marked both options and did receive some form of mentoring, additional analyses were performed that included these

cases. The numbers of senior faculty for these analyses were: (a) Faculty Mentored in Some Way ($n = 182$), and (b) Non-mentored Faculty ($n = 59$). As Table 15 indicates, the two scales showed differences. On the scale *People*, it was found that the mean score of Mentored faculty ($M = 3.90$) exceeded the mean of Non-Mentored faculty ($M = 3.52$), $t(196) = 3.75$, $p < .0001$. On the scale *Organizational Goals and Values*, it was found that the mean score of Mentored Faculty ($M = 3.74$) exceeded the mean of Non-Mentored Faculty ($M = 3.39$), $t(196) = 3.38$, $p < .0001$. All other OSQ scales showed no significant differences between the two faculty groups.

Table 15

OSQ Scales for Hypothesis 1: Comparing 2 Faculty Groups

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Mentored^a</u> (<u>$n = 182$</u>)		<u>Non-mentored</u> (<u>$n = 59$</u>)	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<i>History</i>	4.24	.58	4.09	.68
<i>Language</i>	4.39	.49	4.33	.55
<i>Politics</i>	4.16	.51	4.10	.52
<i>People</i>	3.90	.57	3.52	.78
<i>Organization Goals & Values</i>	3.74	.63	3.39	.80
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	4.41	.59	4.41	.45

^a Category includes faculty who were mentored in some way.

Results for Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that informally mentored tenure-track law faculty will perceive that they achieve greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than formally mentored tenure track law faculty. The original

Hypothesis 2 required contrasting two groups of the junior faculty, those who were formally mentored and those who were informally mentored. However, the number of junior faculty who responded to the questionnaire was not large. Furthermore, only a small number of junior faculty ($n = 3$) were formally mentored. A larger number were informally mentored ($n = 27$). Contrasting the two means would have not been appropriate, given the large difference in sample sizes.

In an effort to address Hypothesis 2, given the numbers of subjects available, an alternative analysis was performed. This consisted of redefining the junior faculty into two groups, each having a sufficient n to make comparisons possible. The first group consisted of *Informally Mentored Faculty* ($n = 27$). The second group consisted of *Formally Mentored Faculty* ($n = 3$) added to faculty who marked both formally and informally mentored ($n = 16$). It was reasoned that members of this new group ($n = 19$) would have experienced some aspects of formal mentoring.

In summary, the variable *form of mentoring received* was dichotomized. The two categories were: (a) *Informally Mentored* ($n = 27$), and (b) *Formally Mentored* plus both *Formally and Informally Mentored* ($n = 19$). Since the independent variable was a dichotomy and there were six dependent variables, an appropriate statistical analysis to address the research hypothesis was a multivariate independent samples t -test (Stevens, 2002).

Table 16 shows mean scores on the six scales that were compared. It was found that there was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups, Hotelling's trace statistic = .196, $F(6, 39) = 1.27$, $p = .292$. It should be noted however, that this analysis does not directly address Hypothesis 2. Addressing Hypothesis 2

directly would have required a comparison between formally mentored junior faculty and informally mentored junior faculty; this was not possible given the limitations of the research sample.

Table 16

Hypothesis 2: Mean Scores on OSQ for Two Types of Mentoring Received by Junior Faculty

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Informally Mentored</u> (<i>n</i> = 27)		<u>Formally Mentored & Formal + Informally Mentored</u> (<i>n</i> = 19)	
	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>
<i>History</i>	3.48	.78	3.63	.57
<i>Language</i>	3.72	.80	3.98	.67
<i>Politics</i>	3.65	.68	3.58	.51
<i>People</i>	3.56	.62	3.74	.58
<i>Organization Goals & Values</i>	3.33	.55	3.60	.54
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	3.63	.70	3.92	.53

Results for Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that mentored tenure-track law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty. Hypothesis 3 required contrasting two groups of faculty: junior level (tenure track) faculty who were mentored either formally or informally, and senior level (tenured) faculty who have not been mentored. The two categories were: (a) junior faculty who were mentored in some way (*n* = 30), and (b) senior faculty who were not mentored (*n* = 58). Since the

independent variable had two groups and there were six dependent variables, an appropriate statistical analysis to address the research hypothesis was a multivariate independent samples *t*-test (Stevens, 2002). Table 17 shows mean scores on the six scales that were compared. It was found there was a significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups, Hotelling's trace statistic =.394, $F(6, 81)=5.31, p < .001$.

Table 17

Hypothesis 3: Mean Scores for Mentored Junior and Non-mentored Senior Faculty

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Junior Level and Mentored</u> (<i>n</i> = 30)		<u>Senior Level and Non-mentored</u> (<i>n</i> = 58)	
	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>
<i>History</i>	3.50	.75	4.12	.66
<i>Language</i>	3.74	.77	4.34	.55
<i>Politics</i>	3.61	.66	4.10	.53
<i>People</i>	3.52	.66	3.54	.77
<i>Organization Goals & Values</i>	3.34	.56	3.40	.80
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	3.64	.72	4.41	.60

Organizational Socialization scales were examined individually, with independent sample *t*-tests, to determine the source of the statistical difference. Four scales showed differences. On the scale History, it was found that the mean score of senior non-mentored faculty ($M = 4.12$) exceeded the mean of junior mentored faculty ($M = 3.50$), $t(86) = - 3.95, p < .0001$. On the scale Language, it was found that the mean score of senior non-mentored faculty ($M = 4.34$) exceeded the mean of junior mentored faculty

($M=3.74$), $t(86) = -4.24$, $p < .0001$. On the scale Politics, it was found that the mean score of senior non-mentored faculty ($M = 4.10$) exceeded the mean of junior mentored faculty ($M=3.61$), $t(86) = -3.75$, $p < .0001$. Finally, on the scale Performance Proficiency it was found that the mean score of senior non-mentored faculty ($M = 4.41$) exceeded the mean of junior mentored faculty ($M=3.64$), $t(86)=-5.28$, $p < .0001$.

Results for Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 states that tenured law faculty will report higher levels of organizational socialization than non-mentored tenure-track law faculty. Hypothesis 4 required contrasting two groups of faculty: junior level (tenure track) faculty who had not been mentored, and all senior level (tenured) faculty, both mentored and not mentored. The two categories were: (a) junior faculty who were not mentored ($n=5$), and (b) all senior faculty ($n=240$). Since the independent variable had two groups and there were six dependent variables, an appropriate statistical analysis to address the research hypothesis was a multivariate independent samples t -test (Stevens, 2002). However, it should be noted that there was a large discrepancy in the numbers of persons in the two groups; a very small number of junior faculty were not mentored. Table 18 shows mean scores on the six scales that were compared. It was found there was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups, Hotelling's trace statistic $=.029$, $F(6, 238)=1.16$, $p =.327$.

Table 18

Hypothesis 4: Mean Scores for Junior Non-mentored Faculty and Senior Faculty

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Senior Level faculty</u> (n=240)		<u>Junior Level and Non-mentored</u> (n=5)	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<i>History</i>	4.21	.60	3.96	1.10
<i>Language</i>	4.38	.50	4.48	.65
<i>Politics</i>	4.15	.52	4.03	.84
<i>People</i>	3.81	.64	3.70	.94
<i>Organization Goals & Values</i>	3.66	.70	4.00	1.05
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	4.42	.49	4.52	.50

Results for Hypothesis 5

Male law faculty will perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than female law faculty. Hypothesis 5 required contrasting two groups of faculty: male faculty and female faculty. The two categories were: (a) male faculty ($n = 182$), and (b) female faculty ($n = 114$). Since the independent variable had two groups and there were six dependent variables, an appropriate statistical analysis to address the research hypothesis was a multivariate independent samples t -test (Stevens, 2002). Table 19 shows mean scores on the six scales that were compared. It was found there was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups, Hotelling's trace statistic = .032, $F(6, 289) = 1.54$, $p = .166$.

Table 19

Hypothesis 5: Mean Scores for Faculty by Gender

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Male</u> (<i>n</i> = 182)		<u>Female</u> (<i>n</i> = 114)	
	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>
<i>History</i>	4.17	.65	3.98	.68
<i>Language</i>	4.36	.56	4.20	.61
<i>Politics</i>	4.13	.51	3.96	.63
<i>People</i>	3.82	.62	3.70	.71
<i>Organization Goals & Values</i>	3.65	.68	3.57	.72
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	4.37	.49	4.23	.67

Results for Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 stated that Caucasian/Majority law faculty will perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than Non-Caucasian/Minority faculty. Hypothesis 6 required contrasting two categories of faculty; the two categories were: (a) “other ethnicity” faculty (*n* = 59), and (b) white faculty (*n* = 239). Since the independent variable had two groups and there were six dependent variables, an appropriate statistical analysis to address the research hypothesis was a multivariate independent samples *t*-test (Stevens, 2002). Table 20 shows mean scores on the six scales that were compared. It was found there was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups, Hotelling’s trace statistic = .027, $F(6, 291) = 1.30$, $p = .258$.

Table 20

Hypothesis 6: Mean Scores for Faculty by Ethnicity

<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Other Ethnicity</u> (<i>n</i> = 59)		<u>White Ethnicity</u> (<i>n</i> = 239)	
	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>
<i>History</i>	3.99	.66	4.12	.67
<i>Language</i>	4.24	.52	4.31	.60
<i>Politics</i>	3.99	.55	4.08	.57
<i>People</i>	3.59	.73	3.82	.63
<i>Organization Goals & Values</i>	3.51	.76	3.65	.68
<i>Performance Proficiency</i>	4.30	.57	4.32	.57

Summary of Results

Table 21 below summarizes, in brief form, the results of testing the six null hypotheses of the study. Results are presented in terms of what significant effects were found based upon the study's hypotheses.

Table 21

Results of Six Hypotheses Testing Differences on Six Subscales of the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire

<u>Hypotheses</u>	<u>Faculty Groups comprising levels of independent variables</u>	<u>Results</u>
Hypothesis 1	Mentored vs. Non-mentored	Mentored faculty had higher mean scores than non-mentored faculty on the OSQ subscales of People and Organizational Goals and Values.
Hypothesis 2	Informally Mentored vs. Formally mentored + Formally and Informally Mentored	There was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups on any of the OSQ subscales.
Hypothesis 3	Junior Level and Mentored vs. Senior Level and Non-mentored	Senior level non-mentored faculty had higher mean scores on the OSQ subscales of History, Language, Politics and Performance Proficiency.
Hypothesis 4	Junior level and Non-mentored vs. Senior Level	There was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups on any of the OSQ subscales.
Hypothesis 5	Male vs. Female	There was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups on any of the OSQ subscales.
Hypothesis 6	Other Ethnicity (Minority) vs. White Ethnicity (Majority)	There was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups on any of the OSQ subscales.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the findings of this study, consider the implications of the findings as they relate to mentoring research, draw conclusions, and provide suggested direction for future research. First, this chapter presents a summary discussion of the rationale for the study and its methodology. Second, it presents a summary and discussion of the findings based upon the two research questions and the six hypotheses that formed the study's basis. Third, a link is constructed between the findings of the Mentoring Questionnaire and the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire and the findings from both questionnaires are integrated and implications and conclusions are drawn. Fourth and finally, recommendations for future research are offered.

Rationale for the Study

Chapters 1 and 2 of this study established that there has been a lack of understanding of the role mentoring plays in socializing employees to organizations. Factors such as increasing organizational change and increasing diversity-related demographic changes have further contributed to this lack of understanding. In addition, past research on mentoring has not addressed the distinctions between formal mentoring and informal mentoring and their efficacy in socializing employees to organizations.

This study attempted to address a portion of the deficit in mentoring research by examining the efficacy of both types of mentoring (Formal and Informal) in socializing law faculty to their institutions. A total of 1,176 surveys were mailed to a stratified random sample of law professors associated with 45 public and private American Bar Association approved law schools located in the contiguous United States. Of the 1,176 surveys mailed, 298 surveys were returned and analyzed for a response rate of 25%.

Findings by Research Questions & Research Hypotheses

Two research questions were asked in this study:

1. Are there differences between mentored and non-mentored tenured and tenure-track law faculty with respect to the perceived career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization?
2. Is formal mentoring perceived as being more effective than informal mentoring and/or no mentoring in producing the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization among tenured and tenure-track law faculty?

Results are listed below by hypothesis and appropriate linkages are made to each research question:

The first hypothesis was that mentored tenured law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty. The results obtained from the multivariate independent samples *t*-test showed that mentored faculty had higher mean scores on the OSQ subscales of People and Organizational Goals and Values.

Finding significant differences for the subscales of People and Organizational Goals and Values is interesting and note worthy. The OSQ People subscale relates to the establishment of satisfying interpersonal work relationships with other organizational members. The ability to connect with people is a defining theme that is common within the organizational socialization literature (Feldman, 1976, 1981; Fisher, 1986; Louis, 1980b, and Schein, 1968). Mentoring in either form (formal or informal) can be viewed at a minimum as the establishment of one interpersonal relationship between the mentor and mentee. The important point however, is that people who have the ability to connect with the right individual or individuals within an organizational setting will invariably be much more socialized to the organization than people who do not have this ability.

The OSQ Organizational Goals and Values subscale relates to the learning and understanding of specific organizational goals and values. According to Feldman (1981) this learning involves understanding group norms, unspoken rules and informal networks. Additionally, the learning of organizational goals and values links the mentee or junior faculty member to the broader organization. It is plausible to conclude that individuals who understand their organization's goals and values in addition to their specific role will be much more socialized than an individual who does not. This result offers partial support for Hypothesis 1 because there were no significant differences between faculty groups on the other OSQ subscales. Moreover, in regards to research question 1, this result does indicate organizational socialization differences between mentored and non-mentored faculty.

The second hypothesis was that informally mentored tenure-track law faculty will perceive that they achieve greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than formally mentored tenure-track law faculty.

The results obtained from the multivariate independent samples *t*-test showed that there were no significant differences on any of the OSQ subscales. The result of this analysis provides no support for Hypothesis 2. This lack of support for Hypothesis 2 directly addresses research question 2 by showing that there are no differences between formal mentoring and informal mentoring in producing the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization.

The third hypothesis was that mentored tenure-track law faculty (both formally and informally mentored) will perceive greater levels of organizational socialization within their respective law schools than non-mentored tenured law faculty. The results obtained from the multivariate independent samples *t*-test showed that senior-level, non-mentored faculty had higher mean scores on the OSQ subscales of History, Language, Politics and Performance Proficiency as compared to junior-level mentored faculty. This result does offer support for Hypothesis 3, however, there was a significant difference in the opposite direction. Senior-level, non-mentored faculty exhibited higher organizational socialization levels than their mentored junior colleagues. This finding qualifies the answer to research question 1, because it indicates that there are organizational socialization differences between the mentored and non-mentored but those differences may be attributed to professorial rank rather than mentoring. It should be noted that this finding could be construed as negating the efficacy of mentoring

(Formal and Informal) in producing organizational socialization; however, this may not be the case.

As was previously stated, the research on organizational socialization is also limited by construct definition and development problems. This result highlights the organizational socialization construct problem wherein organizational socialization researchers are split into two camps. The first camp construes socialization along temporal dimensions such as length of time on the job and organizational tenure. According to this definition, a new entrant to an organization will invariably be less socialized than a seasoned veteran of the organization. According to Chao et al. (1994) this construction does not address the content and process of socialization. The second camp of researchers subscribes to the notion that socialization involves the content and processes associated with learning. Consequently, socialization can occur throughout one's life, and that it is not necessarily associated with job and organizational tenure.

The result associated with the third hypothesis can be explained by the socialization construct definition that links socialization to time on the job or organizational tenure thus supporting the first camp of organizational socialization researchers (see Gomez-Mejia, 1983; Van Maanen, 1975). A strong argument can be made that in each of the OSQ subscales where significant differences exists (History, Language, Politics and Performance Proficiency) there is a time variable that could mediate how well one is socialized. For example, senior non-mentored faculty have longer organizational tenure therefore they will have a greater sense of organizational history; specifically with respect to traditions, customs, myths and rituals. The same holds true for Language, it is appropriate to suggest that because senior non-mentored

faculty have longer organizational tenure, they would have a better understanding of the language associated with the profession, including organization specific slang, acronyms and jargon. With respect to Politics, it is plausible to suggest that because senior non-mentored faculty have longer organizational tenure, they would have a better understanding of organizational politics; specifically an understanding of the formal and informal organizational networks used to get things done. Similarly, because senior non-mentored faculty have longer organizational tenure, it is conceivable that they would have a better understanding of the tasks associated with their jobs and that they would also achieve proficiency at performing those tasks.

The fourth hypothesis was that tenured law faculty would report higher levels of organizational socialization than non-mentored tenure-track law faculty. The results obtained from the multivariate independent samples *t*-test showed that there were no significant differences on any of the OSQ subscales. As a consequence Hypothesis 4 was not supported. This result might also be explained using one of the construct definitions in socialization research. For example, because this hypothesis was not supported, it is plausible to suggest that the socialization of law faculty is not linked to job or organizational tenure. In addition, the lack of support for this hypothesis may further suggest that socialization is linked to learning, which occurs throughout the stages of one's career. In this instance, tenured or senior law faculty may be dealing with socialization or re-socialization issues just as tenure-track or junior law faculty may be dealing with socialization issues.

Hypothesis 5 was that male law faculty would perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than female law faculty. It was found that there was no

significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups. As a result

Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

Hypothesis 6 was that Caucasian/Majority law faculty would perceive higher levels of organizational socialization than Non-Caucasian/ Minority faculty. It was found that there was no significant difference between the means of the two faculty groups. As a result, Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Integration and Implications of Findings

The general purpose of this study was to examine the efficacy of mentoring in producing the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization for law faculty at ABA approved law schools. Results from the Mentoring Questionnaire are linked where appropriate to the results from the Organizational Questionnaire to further explain the findings for the two research questions and six hypotheses. According to the findings from the mentoring questionnaire, Informal Mentoring is the predominant choice of mentoring currently occurring at most ABA-approved law schools and formal mentoring programs are virtually non-existent at ABA approved law schools. One possible explanation for this finding is that most ABA approved law schools have not sanctioned or devoted any organizational resources to creating Formal Mentoring programs within their institutions. The demographics associated with this present research confirm previous mentoring research: law school faculties are similar to other organizations and institutions where the senior members (those who would serve as mentors) were predominantly white and male. As a consequence, organizational mentoring manifested informally and was restricted to white males (Kanter, 1977; Levinson et al., 1978; Russell, 1991; Sheehy, 1976).

Law schools appear to be fundamentally different from other organizations in their response to 21st century imperatives stemming from demographic diversity. Contemporary organizations other than law schools have developed formal mentoring programs and other human resource development strategies to aid in the socialization of new or junior employees including those of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. This appears to not be the case for law schools operating in contemporary times. In regards to racial and ethnic diversity, law schools and their faculties have made progress and are gradually becoming more diverse. However, despite this increased diversity, law schools appear to rely upon informal mentoring as the preferred mentoring method for socializing new and junior faculty. Given the exclusive and restrictive history of informal mentoring, does this continued reliance upon informal mentoring mean that non-majority faculty members are excluded from the mentoring process? Moreover, are law schools missing out on an opportunity to socialize non-majority faculty by not developing formal mentoring programs in addition to the existing informal mentoring programs? The findings from the mentoring questionnaire section of this study seem to indicate that law schools may be missing opportunities to create and provide formal mentoring programs to individuals who might be excluded from informal mentoring. Among respondents 55.1% were mentored informally as compare to 3.1% who were mentored formally.

The two questions stated above are important because this study's data on the perceived efficacy of the two types of mentoring (formal and informal) in producing the career-benefit outcome of Organizational Socialization reveal that there was no clear indication as to whether formal mentoring was more effective than informal mentoring. This finding was clearly supported by the findings from Hypothesis 2 showing no

significant differences on the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire between tenure-track faculty who were formally mentored and tenure-track faculty who were informally mentored. As a consequence, it is plausible to conclude that law schools should develop formal mentoring programs and provide unrestricted access to all junior faculty regardless of gender, race and ethnicity. Presently, the data from this study suggests that there are few, if any, organizationally sanctioned formal mentoring programs at American law schools. Law schools and their administrators should create and develop formal mentoring programs with unrestricted access. By doing so, they will convey a high level of sensitivity and awareness that not every new or junior-level faculty member, regardless of race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, may have access to informal mentoring relationships. Moreover, if law schools were to create formal mentoring programs, this would establish and signal a commitment to fostering the socialization of all new faculty regardless of gender, race and ethnicity.

Before concluding this section, the researcher finds it necessary to revisit a limitation that may affect the generalizability of the study's findings. The limitation is that this study has a relatively small sample size. As was previously stated, Babbie (1998) suggests that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analyzing and reporting findings. This research despite repeated efforts to boost the response rate, only achieved a 25 % response rate. In light of this response rate, the researcher subjected the data to sample representativeness analysis to determine if the research sample was representative of the American law professoriate. Chi-square tests of independence did confirm that the research sample was representative of the American law professor population in all demographic areas except for females with the rank of professor. It was found that

females with the rank of professor were over represented in the research sample population by 11%. However, there are additional demographic variables that could not be studied, because data related to them were unavailable from the database of the Association of American Law Schools. Additionally, the relatively small *N* for the independent variable of formal mentoring may not provide the statistical power to uncover real differences regarding the efficacy of formal mentoring and informal mentoring in producing the career-benefit outcome of organizational socialization.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon the findings of this study, more research should be focused on establishing the efficacy of both types (formal mentoring and informal mentoring) of mentoring in producing career-benefit outcomes. Prevailing trends suggest that formal mentoring and informal mentoring programs will continue to be used by organizations seeking to socialize their new and or junior members. Therefore, it is essential that research is focused on understanding the experiences of those who engage in mentoring relationships from an outcomes perspective. What are the outcomes for mentors? What are the outcomes for protégés? From a methodological standpoint, research should continue to focus on comparing and contrasting the efficacy of mentoring in producing a variety of career-benefit outcomes. Several critical career-benefit outcomes worthy of inquiry are: organizational tenure, organizational commitment, and position power.

Increasing demographic diversity presents another area for future mentoring research. In this vein, research should attempt to verify the various roles mentors assume in diversified mentoring relationships. According to Ragins (1997) women and minorities have different workplace experiences as compared to their white male

organizational counterparts. Research should seek to compare and contrast diversified or heterogeneous mentoring relationships with homogeneous mentoring relationships.

Additionally research should attempt to isolate and understand minority perspectives on the efficacy of one form of mentoring (formal mentoring) over another (informal mentoring), for instance, in an all minority organization, would most members of that organization prefer formal mentoring over informal mentoring or vice versa? Presently the answer to this question is obscured because most organizations are somewhat multicultural and minority organizational members may be dealing with a forced choice if they choose to engage in organizational mentoring. In other words, institutional constraints may cause them to have to engage in a formal mentoring program with a majority mentor. Moreover, there are few minorities in senior positions who might serve as mentors or the majority mentor of choice may already be engaged and inundated with mentoring requests. Research aimed at providing answers to the question of the preferred type of mentoring would create significant progress towards eliminating some of the methodological problems associated with mentoring research. Another diversity related area ripe for mentoring research relate to the issues of tokenism, social isolation and institutional isolation; research should attempt to understand how mentoring might reduce the negative experiences associated with these circumstances?

REFERENCES

- Alleman, E., & Gray, W. (1986). Design productive mentoring programs. (info-line Monograph). *American Society for Training & Development*.
- Anderson, S., & Shannon, A. L. (1988). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38-42.
- Atkinson, S. M. (1996). *Career Mentoring and its alternatives during radical organizational change: An adult education perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Babbie, E. (1998). *The practice of social research* (8th ed.). Boston, Massachusetts: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bandura, A. (1977a). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1977b). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bell, D. (1994). *Confronting authority: Reflections of an ardent protestor*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Bernstein, B., & Kaye, B. (1986). Teacher, tutor, colleague, coach. *Personnel Journal*, 65(11), 44-51.
- Blackburn, R.T., Chapman, D.W. & Cameron, S. M. (1981). Cloning in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 15(4), 315-327.
- Borthwick, R. J., & Schau, J. R. (1991). Gatekeepers of the profession: an empirical profile of the nations law professors. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, 25, 191-237.
- Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. *Group and Organization Studies*, 9, 253-272.

- Burke, R. J., McKeen, C. A., & McKenna, C. (1993). Correlates of mentoring on organizations: the mentor's perspective. *Psychological Reports, 72*, 883-896.
- Caldwell, B. J., & Carter, E. M. A. (Eds.). (1993). *The return of the mentor: Strategies for workplace learning*. London. Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Cameron, S. M. (1978, March). *Women in academia: Faculty sponsorship, informal structures, and career success*. Paper presented at annual AERA Meetings, Toronto Canada.
- Caplow, T. (1964). *Principles of organization*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World.
- Carden, A. D. (1990). Mentoring and adult career development: The evolution of a theory. *The Counseling Psychologist, 18*(2), 275-299.
- Carmin, C. N. (1988). Issues in research on mentoring: Definitional and methodological. *International Journal of Mentoring, 2*(2), 9-13.
- Carruthers, J. (1993). The principles and practices of mentoring. In J. Caldwell & E. M. A. Carter (Eds.), *The return of the mentor: Strategies for workplace learning* (pp. 9-24). London. Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Chambers, M. (1990). Hiring policy stirs judge's quiet protest. *National Law Journal, 12*, 13.
- Chao, G.T., O'Leary-Kelly, A.M., Wolf, W., Klein, H. J. & Gardner, P. D. (1994). Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(5), 730-743.
- 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*, 619-636.
- Chused. R. H. (1988). The hiring and retention of minorities and women on American law school faculties. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, December*, 537-556.
- Clawson, J. (1980). Mentoring in managerial careers. In C. Derr (Ed.), *Work, family and the career: New frontiers in theory and research* (pp. 144-165). New York: Prager.
- Clawson, J. (1985). Is mentoring necessary? *Training and Development Journal, 39*(4), 36-39.
- Cook, M. F. (1977). Is the mentor relationship primarily a male experience? *Personnel Administration, 29*, 82-86.

- Cunningham, J. B. & Eberle, T. (1993). Characteristics of the Mentoring experience: A qualitative study. *Personnel Review*, 22(4), 54-56.
- Daloz, L. A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring: Realizing the transformational power of adult learning experiences*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P. H., & Price, R. L. (1977). The four stages of professional careers: A new look at performance by professionals. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19-42.
- Delgado, R. & Bell, D. (1989). Minority law professors' lives: the Bell Delgado survey. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, Spring, 349.
- Douglas, C. A. (1997). *Formal mentoring programs in organizations: An annotated bibliography*. Greensboro, North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Dreher G. G., Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 539-546.
- Eastman, K., & Williams, D. L. (1993). Relationship between mentoring and career development of agricultural education faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 34(2), 71-76.
- Falcione, R. L., & Wilson, C.E. (1988). Socialization processes in organizations. In G.M. Goldhaber & G.A. Barnett (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp.151-169). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1988). The power of a mentor: Protégés and non-protégés perceptions of their own power in organizations. *Groups & Organization Studies*, 13, 182-194.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job of protégés versus no protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 309-320.
- Feagins, K. (1994). Wanted—diversity: white heterosexual males need not apply. *Widner Journal*, 4 1.
- Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 433-452.
- Feldman, D. C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organizational members. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 309-318.

- Feldman, D. C. (1989). Socialization, resocialization and training: Reframing the research agenda. In I.L. Goldstein (Ed.), *Training and development in organizations* (pp. 376-416). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: and integrative review. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management*, (vol. 4 pp. 101-145). Greenwich CT: JAI Press.
- Flynn, G. (1995). Group mentoring solves personality conflicts. *Personnel Journal*, 74(8), 22.
- Fossum, D. (1980). Law professors: A profile of the teaching branch of the legal profession. *American Bar Foundation Research Journal*. 3, Summer, 501-555
- Fowler, F. J. (1993). Survey research methods. (2nd ed.). *Applied social research methods series* (vol. 1). Newbury, Park California: Sage Publications.
- Fowler, F. J. (1995). Improving survey questions. *Applied social research methods series* (vol. 38). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Frese, M. (1982). Occupational socialization and psychological development: An underemphasized research perspective in industrial psychology. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 55, 209-224.
- Gaedeke, A.R. (1994). Mentoring. *Managers Magazine*, 69(11) 31.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, New York: Longman Publishers.
- Galpin, T. J. (1996). *The human side of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Gaskill, L. R. (1993). A conceptual frame work for the development, implementation, and evaluation of formal mentoring programs. *Journal of Career Development*, 20(11), 147-160.
- Gerstein, M. (1985). Mentoring: An age old practice in a knowledge-based society. *Journal of Counseling and Development* 64, 156-157.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A. L. (1971). *Status passage*. Chicago, IL: Aldine
- Gomez-Mejie, L.R. (1983). Sex differences during occupational socialization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 492-499.

- Gross, E. (1975). Patterns of organizational and occupational socialization. *The Vocation Guidance Quarterly*, 140-149.
- Gunn, E. (1995). Mentoring: The democratic version. *Training*, 32(8), 64-67.
- Hall, D. T. (1976). *Careers in organizations*, Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Hall, D.T. (1987). Careers and socialization. *Journal of Management*, 13, 301-321.
- Hamilton, R. & Ghatala, E. (1994). *Learning and instruction*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Harvey, D. & Brown, D. R. (1996). *An experiential approach to organizational development* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Healy, C. C., & Welchert, A. J. (1990). Mentoring relations: A definition to advance research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9), 17-21.
- Head, F. & Gray, M. M. (1988). The legacy of mentor: Insights into western history, literature and the media. *International Journal of Mentoring*, 2, 26-33.
- Henning, M., & Jardim, A. (1977). *The managerial woman*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hergenhahn, B. R. (1988). *An Introduction to theories of learning* (3rd ed.) Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1994). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hunt, D. M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(3), 475-485.
- Hurley, D. (1988). The mentor mystique. *Psychology Today*, 22(5), 38-43.
- James, W. A. & Elman, N. A. (1990). Organizational benefits of mentoring. *Academy of Management Executive*, 4(4), 88-94.
- Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(2), 262-279.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kaye, B., & Jacobson, B. (1996). Reframing mentoring. *Training & Development*, 50(8), 44-47.

- Keel, R., Buckner, K., & Bushnell, S. (1987). Formal mentoring programs are no panacea. *Management Review*, 76(2), 67-68.
- Knox, A.B. (1974). Higher education and lifelong learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 7, 13-23.
- Koberg, C. K., Boss, R. W., Chappell, D., & Ringer, R. C. (1994). Correlates and consequences of protégé mentoring in a large hospital. *Group and Organization Management*, 19(2), 219-239.
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 608-625.
- Kram, K. E. (1985a). Improving the mentoring process. *Training and Development Journal*, 39(4), 40-43.
- Kram, K. E. (1985b). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Kram, K. E. (1986). Mentoring in the workplace. In D. Hall & Associates (Eds.), *Career development in organizations* (pp. 160-201). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kram, K. E., & Bragar, M. C. (1991). Development through mentoring: A strategic approach. In D. Montross & C. Shinkman (Eds.), *Career development: Theory and practice* (pp. 221-254). Springfield IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 110-132.
- Laporte, S. B. (1991b). 12 companies that do the right thing. *Working Woman*, January, 57-59.
- Lasswell H. D., & McDougal, M. S. (1943). Legal education and public policy: Professional training in the public interest. *Yale Law Journal*, 52 203-217.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., M. H., Levinson, & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine Books
- Louis, M. R. (1980b). Surprise and sense making: What new comers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.
- Lundig, F. S., Clements, C. E., & Perkins, D. S. (1978). *Everyone who makes it has a mentor*. Harvard Business Review, 56, 89-101.

- Matthes, K. (1991). *Corporate mentoring: Beyond the blind date*. Human Resource Focus, 68 23.
- McCauley, C. P., & Young D. P. (1993). Creating developmental relationships: Roles & Strategies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3(3), 219-230.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 161-173.
- Merriam, S. B., Thomas, T. K., & Zeph, C. P. (1988). Mentoring in higher education: What we know now. *Review of Higher Education*, 11(2), 199-210.
- Merriam, S.B., & Caffarella, R.S. (1991). *Learning in adulthood*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merritt, D.J., & Reskin, B.F. (1997). Sex, race and credentials: the truth about affirmative action in law faculty hiring. *Columbia Law Review*, (March).
- Meyers, D. W. (1992). *Human resources management: Principles and practice* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Commerce Clearing House Inc.
- Missirian, A. K. (1982). *The corporate connection: Why executive women need mentors to reach the top*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Moore, T. S. (1996). *The disposable workforce: Worker displacement and employment instability in America*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 173-183.
- Morrison, R. F., & Hock, R. R. (1986). Career building: Learning from cumulative work experience. In D. T. Hall (Ed.), *Career development in organizations* (pp. 236-274). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Murraray, M., & Owen, M. A. (1991). *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: How to facilitate an effective mentoring program*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 457-479
- Ogloff, J, R, P., Lyon, D. R. Douglas, K. S., & Rose, V. G. (2000, December) More than "learning to think like a lawyer:" The empirical research on legal education. *Creighton Law Review*.
- Olian, J. D., Carroll, S. J., & Giannantonio, C. M. (1993). Mentor reactions to protégés: An experiment with managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 266-278.

- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: the role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 849-874.
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 170-183.
- Paulsen, M.S. (1993). Reverse discrimination and law school faculty hiring: the undiscovered opinion. *Texas Law Review, 71*, 993.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research* (3rd ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.
- Perna, F. M., Lerner, B. M., & Yura, M. T. (1995). Mentoring and career development among university faculty. *Journal of Education, 177*, 2, 31-43.
- Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). *Mentors and protégés*. New York: Arbor House.
- Phillips-Jones, L. L. (1983). Establishing a formalized mentoring program. *Training and Development Journal, 2*, 38-42.
- Pollock, R. (1995). A test of conceptual models depicting the developmental course of informal mentor-protégé relationships in the work place. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46*, 144-162.
- Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: a power perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 22*, 482-521.
- Reid, B. A. (1994). Mentorships ensure equal opportunity. *Personnel Journal, 73*, 122-123.
- Riley, S., & Wrench, D. (1985). Mentoring among women lawyers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15*, 374-386.
- Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 57*, 14-28.
- Rubow, R., & Jansen, S. (1990). A corporate survival guide for the baby bust. *Management Review, 79*(7), 50-52.
- Russell, J. E. (1991). Career development in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 38*, 237-287.
- Sands, R. G., Parson, L. A., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring in a public university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 62*, 174-193.
- Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169-174.

- Schein, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the professional management. *Industrial Management Review*, 9, 1-16.
- Schein, E. H. (1971). The individual, the organization, and the career: A conceptual scheme. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 401-426.
- Schmidt, J., Wolfe, J. (1980). The mentor partnership: Discovery of professionalism. *NASPA Journal*, 17, 45-51.
- Scheehy, G. (1976). *Passages: Predictable crises of adult life*. New York, NY: E. P. Dutton & Company.
- Schellenberg, K. (1996). Taking it or leaving it. *Work and Occupations*, 23(2), 1-14.
- Smith, A., & Rogers, V. (2000). Ethics-related responses to specific situation vignettes: Evidence of gender-based differences and occupational socialization. *Journal of Business Ethics; Dordrecht*, (Nov).
- Spillerman S. (1977). Careers, labor market structure, and socio-economic achievement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(3), 551-593.
- Stevens, J. (2001). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Mahawah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Stumpf, S. A., & London, M. (1981). Management promotions: individual and organizational factors influencing the decision process. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 339-349.
- Tack, W. L., & Tack, L. (1986). Don't ignore seasoned managers--The case for management cycling. *Sloan Management Review*, 27, 63-70.
- The American heritage dictionary*. (2nd College edition). (1985). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Thomas, D. A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorships): An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 479-492.
- Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of work, organization and society* (pp. 76-130). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19-36.

- Van Maanen, J. (1984). Doing things in old ways: The chains of socialization. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), *College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences* (pp.211-247). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Towards a theory of organizational socialization. In B.M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior*, (vol.1 pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- White, R. A. (1996). Racial integration of legal education: Making progress and redoubling efforts. *Association of American Law Schools Newsletter*, (March).
- White, R. A. (2001). Association of American Law Schools Statistical Report on Law School Faculty and Candidates for Law Faculty Positions 2000-2001. www.aals.org/statistics/index.html, September, 2001.
- Whitely W., Dougherty T. W. & Dreher G. F. (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 331-351.
- Whitely W., Dougherty T. W. & Dreher G. F. (1992). Correlates of career-oriented mentoring for early career managers and professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 141-154.
- Williams, R., & Blackburn, R. T. (1988). Mentoring and junior faculty productivity. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 27, 204-209.
- Wright, R. G., & Werther, W. B., Jr. (1991). Mentors at work. *Journal of Management Development*, 10(3), 25-32.
- Zagumny, M. J. (1993). Mentoring as a tool for change: A social learning perspective. *Organizational Development Journal*, 11(4), 43-48.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, 6, 539-549.
- Zey, M. (1985). Mentor programs: Making the right moves. *Personnel Journal*, 64(2), 53-57.
- Zey, M. G. (1988). A mentor for all. *Personnel Journal January*, 46-51.
- Zey, M. G. (1991). *The mentor connection: Strategic alliances in corporate life*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

APPENDIX A



UNIVERSITY of LOUISVILLE
dare to be great

■ DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP,
FOUNDATIONS AND HUMAN
RESOURCE EDUCATION

College of Education
and Human Development
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky 40292

Office: 502-852-6667
Fax: 502-852-4563

January 15, 2003

Dear Law Professor:

You are invited to participate in this research study sponsored by the Department of Leadership Foundations and Human Resource Education. The purpose of this study is to determine mentoring's relationship to organizational socialization (helping new members of an organization to learn the ropes in assuming an organizational role) among law faculty at American Bar Association approved law schools.

Approximately 1,700 law professors are invited to participate in this research. I invite you to complete the attached Law Faculty Mentoring and Organizational Socialization Questionnaire which asks you to provide information about your mentoring and socialization experiences during the early stages of your law teaching career. Please respond to each question based upon your best recollection of your mentoring and socialization experiences as a junior law faculty member.

This is survey research that will be conducted during the next 3 weeks, and law professors from law schools around the nation were randomly (all law professors had an equal chance of being selected) selected to participate. Completing the questionnaire should take approximately 30 minutes. The information you provide in response to this survey is confidential and the researcher will make every reasonable effort to the extent permitted by law to protect its confidentiality. There are no foreseeable risks or penalties for your participation in this study. There may be potential benefits for institutions and individuals involved in human resource development efforts to recruit and retain law faculty. Potential benefits from this study may be a heightened understanding of the role of mentoring socializing law faculty to their respective institutions and the reduction of law faculty turnover.

Please remember your participation in this study is voluntary. By completing and mailing the instrument in the enclosed envelope, you are agreeing to participate. You may refuse to participate, however, your participation is important because the findings from this research could contribute to further understanding the socialization process for law teachers.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to call Dr. Tim Hatcher at (502) 852-0610 or Ray K. Haynes at (502) 327-8569. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please call the University of Louisville Human Subjects Committee office at (502) 852-5188. This is an independent committee composed of faculty and staff of the University of Louisville and its affiliated hospitals. The Human Subjects Committee has oversight of all studies involving human subjects.

Your time and attention is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tim Hatcher
Associate Professor
Principal Investigator

Ray K. Haynes
Doctoral Candidate
Co-Investigator

ATTENTION: This is time sensitive information. Please return your completed survey in the enclosed postage paid self-addressed envelope by 04/01/03.

Law Faculty Mentoring and Organizational Socialization Questionnaire

The information you provide in response to this survey is confidential and will be used solely for research purposes. No information obtained from this survey will be shared with anyone associated with your institution. This research is subject to all applicable rules and regulations as set forth by the University of Louisville's Human Subjects Committee.

Instructions

Ray K. Haynes, a doctoral candidate at the University of Louisville, is conducting this survey research. The attached survey is comprised of three questionnaires. First, there is a Mentoring Questionnaire. It asks you to determine the kind of mentoring you received as a junior faculty member at your current law school or a prior law school. The researcher recognizes that a range of possibilities exist with respect to your mentoring and socialization experiences. Some of you may be at the beginning stages of your law teaching careers and you may be involved in mentoring relationships as junior faculty at your current law schools and/or a prior law school. Others of you may be in the middle stage or later stage of your law teaching career and may have received mentoring during the early stage of your law teaching career at your current law school and/or a prior law school.

Irrespective of the stage of your law-teaching career, the Mentoring Questionnaire asks you to recollect your mentoring and socialization experiences as junior faculty to the best of your ability. Operational definitions of the various kinds of mentoring (Formal Mentoring, Informal Mentoring, and Non-Mentoring) are provided so that you can refer to these definitions as you respond to the items on the Mentoring Questionnaire. These definitions are intended to help you understand what mentoring is and to determine which form of mentoring you may have received.

Second, you are invited to respond to each item on the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire; it is comprised of a total of thirty-four (34) items. An operational definition of Organizational Socialization is provided with the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire for your reference so that you can familiarize yourself with the term's meaning and context as you respond to each question on the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire.

Third and finally, you are invited to respond to each item on the Demographics Questionnaire. The items on the Demographics Questionnaire are designed to help the researcher describe the study population at large. Please note that this is a confidential survey and as a research participant, you have not been asked to identify yourself. All data obtained from this research will be reported in aggregate form and no individual research participant's data or individual institution's data will be reported.

Please return only the survey by 04/01/03. Return to:

Ray K. Haynes
3005 Derington Ct.
Louisville, KY 40241

Mentoring Questionnaire

Mentoring Operationally Defined

Informal Mentoring: A naturally occurring relationship based on attributes, attraction and similar interests, where an experienced organizational member provided career and psychosocial support to you as a lesser-experienced organizational member.

Formal Mentoring: A program designed and developed by the organization to facilitate structured mentoring relationships where an experienced organizational member provided career and psychosocial development to you as lesser-experienced organizational member.

Non-Mentoring: Never having any involvement in a formal or informal mentoring relationship where an experienced organizational member provided career and psychosocial development to you as a lesser-experienced organizational member.

Please indicate the type of mentoring you received as a junior faculty member at your current law school or a prior law school by circling the appropriate number listed below.

1. What form of mentoring did you receive?	Informal Mentoring	Formal Mentoring	Non-Mentoring
	1	2	3

If you selected option 3 (Non-Mentoring), please skip question #'s 2-6.

2. Where did you receive your mentoring?	Current law school	Prior law school	Institution other than law school
	1	2	3

3. The formal mentoring I received was effective.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5

4. The informal mentoring I received was effective.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5

5. I am currently in a formal mentoring relationship as a mentee/protege.	No	Yes	Undecided		
	1	2	3		

6. I am currently in an informal mentoring relationship as a mentee/protege.	No	Yes	Undecided		
	1	2	3		

Mentoring Questionnaire (cont.)

7. I have received career support but would not call it mentoring.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have received psychosocial support but would not call it mentoring.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
9. Formal mentoring is more effective than informal mentoring at my law school or prior law school.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
10. Some of my colleagues have formal mentors at my law school or prior law school.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
11. Some of my colleagues have informal mentors at my law school or prior law school.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
12. There is a formal mentoring program at my current law school	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
13. Informal mentoring is occurring at my current law school	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
14. I prefer(ed) being formally mentored	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
15. I prefer(ed) being informally mentored	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
16. I have/had no interest in being mentored formally or informally	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5

Please complete the **Organizational Socialization Questionnaire** by reading each item and circling the appropriate number that describes your level of agreement with each item. Please answer questions based upon your current law school experience.

Organizational Socialization Questionnaire

Organizational Socialization: "organizational socialization is the process by which an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member" (Louis, 1980b, p. 229-230).

Questionnaire Items	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1. I have learned how things "really work" on the inside of this law school.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I know very little about the history behind my work group/law school.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I would be a good representative of my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I do not consider any of my coworkers as my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have not yet learned "the ropes" of my job.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I have not mastered the specialized terminology and vocabulary of my law teaching trade/profession.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I know who the most influential people are in my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have learned how to successfully perform my job in an efficient manner.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I am not familiar with my law school's customs, rituals, ceremonies, and celebrations.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I am usually excluded in social get-togethers given by other people in the law school.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The goals of my law school are also my goals.	1	2	3	4	5

Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (cont.)

Questionnaire Items	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
12. I have not mastered my law school's slang and special jargon.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Within my law school/work group, I would be easily identified as "one of the gang."	1	2	3	4	5
14. I know the law school's long-held traditions.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I do not always understand what the law school's abbreviations and acronyms mean.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I believe that I fit in well with my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I do not always believe in the values set by my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I understand the specific meanings of words and jargon in the law teaching trade/profession.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I have mastered the required tasks of my job.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I understand the goals of my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I would be a good resource in describing the background of my work group/law school.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I have not fully developed the appropriate skills and abilities to successfully perform my job.	1	2	3	4	5

Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (cont.)

Questionnaire Items	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
23. I do not have a good understanding of the politics in my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I understand what all of the duties of my job entail.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I would be a good example of an employee who represents my law school's values.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I am not always sure what needs to be done in order to get the most desirable work assignments in my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I am usually excluded in informal networks or gatherings of people within the law school.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I have a good understanding of the motives behind the actions of other people in the law school.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I am familiar with the history of my law school.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I understand what most of the acronyms and abbreviations of the law teaching trade/profession mean.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I am pretty popular in the law school.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I can identify the people in the law school who are most important in getting the work done.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I believe most of my coworkers like me.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I support the goals that are set by my law school.	1	2	3	4	5

Demographics Questionnaire

A. Indicate your current position: Please circle the # associated with the appropriate response.					
	01.	Tenure-track Assistant Professor			
	02.	Tenure-track Associate Professor			
	03.	Other Untenured Professor			
	04.	Tenured Associate Professor			
	05.	Tenured Professor			
	06.	Other Tenured Professor			
	07.	Other			
B. Indicate your years of employment with your current Law School.					
01	Less than 1 year.	03.	3-5 years.	05.	11-15 years
02	1-2 yrs.	04.	6-10 years.	06.	More than 15 years
C. Indicate your years of total employment in law teaching.					
01	Less than 1 year	03	3-5 years	05	11-15 years
02	1-2 years	04	6-10 years	06	More than 15 years
D. Indicate your years in your current position.					
01	Less than 1 year	03.	3-5 years	05.	11-15 years
02	1-2 years	04.	6-10 years	06.	More than 15 years
E. Indicate your educational background.					
01	JD				
02	JD, LLM				
03	JD, SJD				
04	JD & Other Masters degree (e.g. M.A., M.S., M.Ed., MPHA, MBA)				
05	JD & Other Doctoral or professional degree (e.g., Ph.D., MD, Ed.D., DDS)				
F. Indicate your age.					
01	29 or less	03	40 to 49	05	60 or over
02	30 to 39	04	50 to 59		
G. Indicate your gender.					
01	Male	02	Female		
H. Indicate your race or ethnic group.					
01	Black or African-American	05	Hispanic/Latino		
02	Asian-American or Pacific Islander	06	Native American		
03	White	07	Other		
04	Asian or Pacific Islander				

Thank you for completing this survey. Your time and effort is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX B

American Association of Law Schools' Table of Gender and Ethnicity Composition of American Law Faculty

TABLE 1A and All Faculty in the 2000-01 Directory of Law Teachers	Total Number	Percent Women	Number With Ethnic	Percent Missing Ethnic	Percent Minority	Percent Minority Men	Percent Minority Women	Percent Non-Min Men	Percent Non-Min Women
Deans	184	12.5	172	6.5	8.1	7.0	1.2	80.8	11.0
Assoc. Deans, No Prof. Title	167	55.1	148	11.4	15.5	6.1	9.5	38.5	45.9
Assoc. Deans, With Prof. Title	277	29.2	270	2.5	11.9	7.8	4.1	63.0	25.2
Asst. Deans, No Prof. Title	376	69.4	299	20.5	22.7	7.4	15.4	24.4	52.8
Asst. Deans, With Prof. Title	19	57.9	19	0.0	26.3	10.5	15.8	31.6	42.1
Head Librarians (Directors)	180	52.2	167	7.2	9.6	4.2	5.4	44.9	45.5
Professors	4539	22.9	4256	6.2	11.4	7.6	3.8	68.9	19.7
Assoc. Professors	1171	46.5	1095	6.5	24.1	12.4	11.7	40.4	35.5
Asst. Professors	597	49.4	510	14.6	26.5	11.6	14.9	35.5	38.0
Visiting Profs. (at any rank)	183	42.1	117	36.1	15.4	9.4	6.0	43.6	41.0
Lecturers and Instructors	572	66.1	450	21.3	12.2	2.9	9.3	31.6	56.2
Deans and Profs. Emeriti	808	6.6	716	11.4	3.2	2.9	0.3	90.6	6.1
ALL FACULTY	9073	32.5	8219	9.4	13.8	7.8	6.1	59.8	26.3

Source: www.aals.org/statistics/index.html

The AALS *Directory of Law Teachers, 2000-2001* includes demographic information on the 9,073 full-time faculty members of 184 law schools. The 162 AALS member and 22 fee-paid law schools include all of the law schools on the approved list of the American Bar Association. Table 1A, above, shows the gender and minority composition of that group within 12 faculty title categories. The first column shows the "total number" of faculty in each of the title groups and the second column indicates the percentages of those numbers that are women. The numbers with ethnic/racial information available are shown in the third column and the percentages with missing ethnic data are shown in the fourth column. The minority and minority-gender percentages are calculated in terms of the faculty for whom ethnic/racial information is available.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Ray K. Haynes

ADDRESS: 3005 Derington Court
Louisville, KKY 40241

DOB: May 28, 1963

EDUCATION & TRAINING:

B.A., Psychology
Utica College/Syracuse University
1987

M.Ed., Occupational Training & Development
University of Louisville
1997

Candidate for Ph.D. in Educational Leadership & Organizational
Development
University of Louisville
Expected December 2003

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

7/2003 – Present: University of Louisville
College of Education & Human Development
Louisville, KY.

Instructor

- Teaching graduate and undergraduate courses in Human Resource Development and Organizational Development
- Advising Graduate students

11/2001 – Present: Haynes Consulting Group
Louisville, KY

Designing and implementing organizational effectiveness interventions to Fortune 500 and smaller organizational client organizations. Clients include Coca-Cola Enterprises and Springco Industries.

8/1999 – 9/2001: Development Dimensions International

Atlanta, GA. and Louisville, KY.

Senior Organizational Effectiveness Consultant

Responsible for:

- Leading, scoping and managing multiple client engagements
- Designing and developing training & development programs, business process reengineering and change management interventions within client organizations
- Improving business performance by aligning people within business strategy: content expertise in Socio-technical Systems, Competency-based Organizations, Selection & Assessment, Performance Management, Multi-rater Assessment & Feedback, Leadership Development and Succession Planning.

3/1998 – 7/1999: General Electric Appliance Park

Louisville, KY

Organizational & Leadership Development Consultant, The Leadership Development Center

Responsible for:

- Delivering the Business and Cultural Priorities training for the CEO of General Electric's Appliance Division to 3,000 exempt employees.
- Development and execution of organizational development interventions including leadership development and New Manager Training for General Electric Appliances.
- Facilitating Diversity Awareness seminars and workshops throughout the General Electric Appliances Division
- Planning and implementing General Electric Appliances New Hire Orientation program.

3/1996 – 2/1998: General Electric Appliances

Appliance Park, Louisville, KY.

Organizational Development Specialist, Purchasing, Quality and Manufacturing

Responsible for:

- Design and development of organizational effectiveness interventions to support the needs of unionized hourly work teams throughout General Electric's Appliance Park.
- Facilitating Work Team Steering Committee and structuring Appliance Park's Work Teams.
- Instructional design and development of specialized courses to support work team development
- Delivering classroom instruction
- Facilitating workouts

- Coaching an hourly manufacturing team consisting of eighteen individuals.
- Providing written and oral work team development status reports to key business leaders.
- Leading and participating in strategic work team development discussions with key business leaders and external consultants.
- Planning, implementation and evaluation of courses developed to support work teams.

Specific Accomplishments Were:

- Developed training module: Effective Presentations for Six Sigma
- Developed training module: Managing Diversity
- Developed Team Effectiveness Assessment for Chicago Plant Operations
- Authored the Appliance Park Work Team Handbook
- Developed and produced GEA's communication video series for Six Sigma Quality Initiative.
- Facilitated successful workouts for Refrigeration, Tooling Development Center, and Information Technology.

1994 – 1995: University of Louisville

Louisville, KY.

Graduate Research Assistant, Division of Transitional Studies
Performed academic research for Director of the Division of Transitional Studies.

1992 – 1993: Bachner, Tally, Polevoy & Misher

New York, NY.

Managing Clerk

- Managed the process of moving over 2,000 litigation matters through New York State courts and the federal court system.
- Supervised a staff of two clerks.

1991 – 1992: Kreindler & Relkin, P.C.

New York, NY.

Managing Clerk

Managed the process of moving over 600 litigation matters through New York State courts and the federal court system.

1988 – 1991: Kaufmann, Gildin & Carlin

New York, NY.

Legal Assistant/Paralegal

Managed firm's litigation cases and performed legal research.

1987 – 1989: Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center

New York, NY.

Accounting/Records Assistant, Research Finance Department

Managed the grant funding process for Memorial Sloan Kettering Institute's research activity.

AFFILIATIONS: The American Management Association
The American Society for Training & Development
Association for Quality and Participation

AWARDS: **8/2002 – Present: Southern Region Education Board**
Dissertation Year Fellow
A one-year fellowship awarded to deserving doctoral students