Professional Development in Doctoral Education: The Perceptions of Faculty Mentoring on the Formation of Senior Student Affairs Leaders

Author: Michael Cassell Mason

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/1832

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

BOSTON COLLEGE

Lynch School of Education

Department of
Educational Leadership and Higher Education

Higher Education Administration

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN DOCTORAL EDUCATION:
THE PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY MENTORING ON THE
FORMATION OF SENIOR STUDENT AFFAIRS LEADERS

Dissertation
by

MICHAEL CASSELL MASON

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

May 2011

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN DOCTORAL EDUCATION: THE PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY MENTORING ON THE FORMATION OF SENIOR STUDENT AFFAIRS LEADERS

Michael Cassell Mason

Dissertation Director   Karen D. Arnold, Ph.D.

Abstract

Student affairs models exist on every United States college and university campus and serve as an integral part of the undergraduate student experience. However, very little research has been conducted on students in Higher Education Administration doctoral programs and the preparation of Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) for leadership in student affairs. This study investigated the perceptions of mentoring relationships between faculty mentors and doctoral student protégés and the socialization of these students into becoming senior leaders in student affairs. Kram's (1985) theory, which identifies the psychosocial and career aspects of mentoring in organizational development, serves as the lens to examine these relationships.

The participants in this study consisted of five faculty mentors and eight of their former students who are now current Senior Student Affairs Officers. Results included four major themes, identified by both the mentors and the SSAOs, comprising the major aspects of the mentoring relationships. In addition, the faculty mentors felt that they did not particularly prepare students for these senior level positions, as there were no specific or intentional discussions about the role itself. However, the former students believed their doctoral mentoring was good preparation for the SSAO role, as they learned about university structures, governance, political climates and other aspects of senior leadership.

Given these findings, it is recommended that there be a stronger emphasis be placed upon the SSAO socialization component of the doctoral program. Recommendations such as the addition of "mentors of practice," a student apprenticeship component similar to Arts & Sciences doctoral programs, and an increased faculty awareness of their impact upon students as mentors are suggested to enhance the doctoral student experience.

<u>Acknowledgements</u>

This doctoral process signifies one of the most challenging, yet rewarding, experiences of my personal and professional life. And I would not have achieved this accomplishment without the help of many, many people. During my research on mentoring and its many faces, I realized that I have been blessed to have many mentors throughout my life. Many stem from my Jesuit undergraduate education at Loyola College in Maryland (now Loyola University, MD) and include Dr. Susan Donovan, Rev. Tim Brown, S.J., Rev. Dr. J-Glenn Murray, S.J., and Rev. John Brunett, S.J.

During my time at Harvard University as an Administrative Fellow, I would like to thank Dr. Jim Stiles, Dr. Mary Grassa O'Neill, Dr. Cathy Ayoub, Teresa Malonzo and my fellow Fellows. A special thanks to GSE Librarian John Collins.

At Boston College, many faculty and staff were supportive during my master's and doctoral programs including Dr. Jerry Starratt, Dr. Irwin Blumer, Dr. Diana Pullin, Dean of the Lynch School of Education Rev. Joe O'Keefe, S.J., Dr. Ted Youn, and Dr. Pat McQuillan. Special thanks to Fran Loftus, who first hired me in the Practicum Office. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Ana Martinez Aleman for her ability to help me think about higher education within a philosophical context. I would also like to thank the members of my Dissertation Committee: Dr. Heather Rowan-Kenyon for her warmth and encouragement and Dr. Patrick Rombalski for his openness and enthusiasm for taking me on as his first doctoral dissertation student. Most of all, thanks and gratitude to Dr. Karen Arnold who took me under her wing when my first advisor left the program, for inviting back into the fold when I had strayed and for pushing me to give just a little bit more until the very end! Thank you to the faculty mentors who participated in this study and

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Introduction

Altbach (2004) states that traditionally "the doctorate was the quintessential research degree, aimed at preparing students for a career in academic, or in some fields, applied research" (p. 4). Given that foundation, doctoral students graduate intending to produce and advance the knowledge of their given discipline. According to the website of the Association of American Universities (2010):

> Doctoral education in the U.S. has become a combination of study and apprenticeship. Along with taking courses and seminars, doctoral students work with faculty mentors in teaching and research. The primary purpose of doctoral students' teaching and research activities is to enable them to acquire an understanding of teaching and research techniques. At the end of their course of study, they are required to demonstrate that they can do independent research that advances the frontiers of knowledge.
>
> (Understanding Doctoral Education in the U.S. pdf, p.1)

Many students enter doctoral programs with the specific intent of joining the professoriate through a clear set of experiences that include coursework, teaching assistantships, dissertation research and the final defense. Others, however, enter doctoral programs in professional fields. For example, doctoral students enter Higher Education Administration with the goal of remaining in applied administrative and practitioner roles in student affairs but progressing to the most senior level of this profession.

A large body of literature on doctoral education and the professional formation of doctoral students within the last fifteen to twenty years focuses on preparing students for

the professoriate (Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, 2001; Golde & Dore, 2001; Kuh, 1997; Nyquist & Woodford, 2000). Pursuing a tenure-track faculty position at a research institution requires a newly minted doctoral recipient to simultaneously engage in multiple roles. Institutions expect the faculty they hire to be effective teachers, competent researchers, and active participants in academic life (Adams, 2002). Yet, according to these studies, a number of concerns have surfaced regarding the lack of quality within doctoral education, mainly that doctoral students were not adequately trained for faculty careers (Golde and Dore, 2001, p. 5). One area that was identified to improve doctoral student preparation was the relationship between the faculty mentor and the student protégé.

What is it about mentoring that provides such advantages to doctoral students? Researchers studying faculty mentoring programs for doctoral students have reported many benefits to protégés, including advantages in job placement, research skills, research productivity and self-efficacy, and collaborative publications (Kram, 1985; Paglis, Green, & Bauer, 2006; Rose, 2003; Terrell & Wright, 1988 as cited in Noonan, Ballinger & Black, 2007).

But does what we know about mentoring doctoral students and its outcomes apply to all doctoral students? Most research in this area has been conducted in the Arts and Sciences on doctoral students preparing to become professors. In these studies, students from a specific content area were matched with a faculty mentor from that same content area. Yet, what of doctoral students who are experienced professionals and preparing for non-faculty positions in vastly different areas from their faculty mentor? Are the

relationship and its dynamics the same as those in the Arts and Sciences? Does this relationship help prepare doctoral students for what they will do professionally?

To study these questions, I examined a particular type of non-faculty doctorate, specifically the Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration with an emphasis on student affairs. This served as a good example of an applied field and it also had implications for the university as a whole, as graduates work in academic settings, but not in the classroom. What do we know about student affairs that might affect what Ph.D. students need for professional preparation and how mentoring might work in their area? How does the profession itself see the status of or the need for a doctorate?

Given this, I studied the mentoring relationship between faculty mentors and their former doctoral students who are current Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs). They were examined in order to learn the perceptions of faculty mentors and SSAOs regarding whether the mentoring relationship helped to socialize and prepare students for the role of SSAO. This was done so that my readers, professors in higher education administration doctoral programs and policy makers can gain insight into the impact of mentoring and how to improve that aspect of the doctoral experience in preparation for roles in applied fields.

Before delving into the role of SSAOs, it important to examine the context of their profession; specifically the naissance and progression of the field. In the next section, I will examine the history of Student Affairs as an applied field within higher education.

History of Student Affairs

The field of Student Affairs has experienced a transformation during its existence in higher education. From various early models that included "Student Personnel" to "Student Services" and "Student Affairs," the knowledge and functions of this field have expanded from their early practices of faculty housemasters overseeing student housing issues and other non-academic activities to becoming a more specialized aspect of a student's overall undergraduate learning experience.

In its early stages, as documented in "The Student Personnel Point of View, 1937" by the American Council on Education Studies (1937), Student Affairs was a service to the academic mission and purpose of higher education and was served by faculty members. In the infancy of Student Affairs, the faculty member was invited to contribute non-academic information to a student's history:

> Instruction itself involves far more than the giving of information on the part of the teacher and its acceptance by the student. Instructors should be encouraged to contribute regularly to student personnel records such anecdotal information concerning students as is significant from the personnel point of view. (p. 43).

Twelve years later, the American Council on Education Studies (1949) published a revised version of "The Student Personnel Point of View, 1949." In this version, "the concept of education was broadened to include attention to the student's well-rounded development-physically, socially, emotionally, and spiritually- as well as intellectually". (p. 17). During this time, Student Affairs was given more validity, became its own department or division within the university structure, and focused more on how students develop holistically as individuals and as a group. This vision emphasizes a more

intentional collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs in the overall development of students: "If….faculty and administration work closely together in achieving common objectives, curricular and co-curricular, the learning of socially desirable processes is thereby enhanced" (p. 21).

Nearly forty years later, "A Perspective on Student Affairs, 1987," described the sweeping change in higher education and how that change directly impacted the function and purpose of Student Affairs. In particular, it describes how a host of internal and external stakeholders (alumni, parents, legislators, potential employers and others) held higher education institutions accountable for how well students were educated. These stakeholders also demanded that students graduated with an increased number of skills and abilities. Institutions responded by adding Student Affairs functions that met these demands and made institutions more complex. During this time, the demographics of the student population also changed. The majority of single-sex institutions became coeducational, and female students generally outnumbered male students. In addition, students of non-traditional age returned to college.

Given these changes, Student Affairs assisted institutions in these changing conditions by providing services and programs consistent with students' needs and the institutional mission (A Perspective on Student Affairs, 1987, p. 8). As part of this new movement, the guiding principles for the field of Student Affairs' included the importance of the institution's academic mission, the uniqueness of each student's individuality, and the emphasis that learning is affected by a student's internal and external environments, both on and off campus. Student Affairs also achieved these goals by making many contributions to the daily operation of the institution. Among them are

playing a role in making decisions and governing the institution, managing the human and financial resources of student affairs, and advocating for student participation in that governance.

By reflecting on the overall history of student affairs, it shows increasing professionalization and specialization while maintaining the core value of students' holistic growth and development. Given this, SSAOs need technical expertise, the legitimacy of a terminal academic degree, wide knowledge across many dimensions of the student experience, and a wide arrange of executive skills sets and abilities regarding organizational and administrative environments.

How Does Student Affairs Function?

Depending upon the type and size of institution, SSAOs find themselves managing various Student Affairs models. It is important for SSAOs to understand these models, the skills needed to manage them, and how these models function within the context of the institution.

Whitt (2005) states that a major function of Student Affairs is to serve the educational mission of the institution with the ideal goal of promoting "seamless" collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs activities. This occurs when Student Affairs professionals engage students in active learning, set and communicate high expectations for student learning, and forge educational partnerships that advance student learning, according to American College Personnel Association/College Student Educators International (1997).

There are three basic models that serve as a foundation for Student Affairs programs at colleges and universities in the United States. The first is a Student Services model. Ender (1996) describes it as one in which learning outside of the classroom, sometimes referred to as extracurricular, seeks to meet the basic needs of students as they matriculate (p.8). It generally contains a variety of services that help students, but these services are largely disparate and loosely coupled. This model usually is not grounded in a big-picture perspective of how all the services contribute holistically to the student's learning experience.

The second is a Student Development model. This model takes into consideration the developmental tasks or markers that students experience throughout their undergraduate experience. Manning, Kinzie and Schuh (2006) describe this model as one where offices under the umbrella of Student Affairs are intent on providing a more cohesive learning experience for students with an emphasis on activities outside of the classroom. These experiences are guided by the psychosocial theory of student growth, with the recognition that the learning that occurs in the classroom is the domain of faculty (pp. 13-14). Although this model takes a more global view of student development, it still separates the student experience into academic and non-academic components.

The third model is known as Student Learning. This model views a student's education as holistic and includes hallmarks such as:

> (a)complex cognitive skills such as reflection and critical thinking; (b) an ability to apply knowledge to practical problems encountered in one's vocation, family, or other areas of life; an understanding and appreciation of human differences; (d) practical competence skills (e.g., decision making, conflict resolution); and (e) a

coherent integrated sense of identify, self-esteem, confidence, integrity, aesthetic

sensibilities, and civic responsibility.

(http://www.myacpa.org/sli_delete/sli.htm)

This model also holds that learning is continuous, no matter where the student may be.

Learning and personal development occur through transactions between students and

their environments. These environments include student affairs staff, faculty, and

physical environments. Lastly, student affairs programs using this model are created with

specific and purposeful student development and learning outcomes. This third model is

seen as the ideal for colleges and universities, as it is the most inclusive and looks at the

development of students physically, mentally, emotionally and intellectually.

In looking at these various models, doctoral students need to be prepared for

student affairs programs of all sizes, in various types of institutions with various

administrative structures. It is important for doctoral programs to stress that as SSAOs,

students need knowledge of standard student affairs models, but as practitioners they also

need to be flexible, as all colleges and universities have individual institutional cultures

which provide a context for how student affairs functions within and influences that

particular culture.

Research Questions

Providing leadership for this complex component of higher education is the role

of the Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO). This individual usually has held a number

of positions in Student Affairs, gained considerable knowledge about student

development and higher education, and has risen through the ranks of leadership. The

paths leading to these applied fields are not as prescribed as positions in the professoriate, since students enter these doctoral programs with a greater variety of higher education experiences (residence life, admissions, etc.) to reach their goal as a senior level officer; thus they graduate from their programs to serve in a variety of positions and institutions. One question about this path to senior leadership that has not yet been explored is the connection between the mentoring received in one's Higher Education/Student Affairs doctoral program and the preparation for senior leadership. As has been seen in studies regarding doctoral programs in the Art and Sciences, and programs such as Preparing Future Faculty, mentoring helps to prepare doctoral students for their future professional roles. Given this, it is interesting to see if such mentoring in Higher Education Administration doctoral programs yields the same effect.

Research on mentoring in an academic environment shows that it has three primary purposes: 1) to transmit formal disciplinary knowledge and technical skills (Reskin, 1979); 2) to initiate students into the rules, values and ethics of their discipline; and 3) to bolster their protégé's confidence in themselves through encouragement and praise. (Lyons & Scroggins, 1990). This is important to students' socialization, as it helps to provide a sense of identity regarding the role itself and the knowledge and skills to perform in the role effectively. Given this process of mentoring within the context of higher education, this study will focus upon the faculty member as mentor and the role he or she played in preparing doctoral students for the senior level of leadership in Student Affairs. In looking at the overall purpose of this research, this study seeks to examine two major research questions:

1. How do faculty mentors perceive how their mentoring relationship with their former doctoral student protégés helped to socialize them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs?

2. How do former doctoral student protégés perceive how their mentoring relationship with their faculty mentor socialized them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs?

Mentoring Exemplars in the Academy

The passing on of knowledge and skills in an academic discipline is an important outcome of a doctoral student being mentored by a faculty member. One specific academic discipline that provides an exemplary mentoring model for its doctoral students is science. The scientist's individual prestige is based primarily upon his or her own 'academic lineage' and collaborative work and training within the laboratory. In regard to this lineage, tracing the branches of one's academic family tree provides evidence of all those who came before. In addition to having been mentored, scientists continue to promote themselves after their doctoral training and raise their own status, by acting as mentors to highly talented protégées. In turn, their protégés go on to mentor other highly talented protégés, thus continuing this academic lineage.

Harriet Zuckerman (1996) conducted a study on Nobel Prize winners in science; among other aspects, she examined the formation of their mentoring relationships, essentially who mentored the Nobel Laureates and who the Laureates went on to mentor. As she states "To some extent, students of promise can choose masters with whom to work and masters can choose among cohorts of students who present themselves for

study. This process of bilateral assertive selection is conspicuously at work among the ultra-elite of science" (p. 104). Zuckerman's focused on two elements: 1) the process, including mentoring, through which scientists became elites within their field; and 2) the scientific stratification between the Nobel elite and their non-Nobel elite colleagues. She pre-tested her interview protocol on a small sample of science faculty from Columbia University. From this pre-test, Zuckerman found that the Nobel Laureate members of the faculty interviewed were the most intriguing, as they were the most descriptive about their induction into the field and their training experiences as an apprentice. From these experiences, she specifically focused her investigation on the stratification within science and the development of knowledge from one generation of scientists to the next.

As the Zuckerman study and others show, it is usually the case that the mentors and doctoral students are both in the same discipline and are able to discuss and pass along the academic knowledge needed to continue creating knowledge within that discipline. According to Tenner (2004), "the graduate mentor is not only advising a person; he or she is also perpetuating a legacy or a succession of ideas, methods and values" (p. B9). In this process, the role of the faculty mentor is crucial, as the mentor functions as a sounding board and helps in deconstructing experiences, helping doctoral students to create a larger perspective of the role they will soon enter.

In looking at doctoral programs, how does mentoring affect doctoral students and career advancement for those who come from different academic backgrounds than their mentor and who plan to enter an applied field as a practitioner? In the next section, I will identify various types of knowledge received and needed in other applied professional fields.

Focus of the Study

Much has been written on entrants to the profession of student affairs, student affairs-related graduate programs, and attrition from the field (Brown, 1987; Komives & Kuh, 1988; Tull, 2006; Young, 1985). Another body of literature describes mid-career level student affairs professionals and their career decision to either leave the field or continue to progress within it (Johnsrud & Rosser, 1996; Johnsrud, Heck & Rosser, 2000; Rosser & Javinar, 2003). Prior to this body of knowledge, the 1980's yielded several articles that explored the role of senior level student affairs professionals, commonly known as Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs), and their professional lifespan within the field (Kinninck & Bollheimer, 1984; Lawing, Moore & Groseth, 1982; Priest, Alphenaar & Boer, 1982; Shay, Jr., 1984). Within this particular body of literature, there is a subset regarding the graduate preparation and career paths of SSAOs that recommends further study (Arnold, 1982; Bloland, 1979; Holmes, 1982; Kuh, Evans & Duke, 1983; Rickard, 1982, 1985).

Although we know mentoring is important for pre-faculty doctoral students, to date no one has specifically studied the career preparation of future Student Affairs senior leaders through the mentoring relationship between faculty mentors and doctoral candidates within Higher Education Administration doctoral programs. In particular, no specific study has focused on the perception of how faculty mentoring impacts that career preparation, if at all. Carpenter and Stimpson (2007) cite Malaney's (2002) discussion of Higher Education Administration programs and practitioners in Student Affairs. According to Malaney (2002), faculty members must regularly review the

content of their courses and ensure that students gain the theoretical and practical knowledge needed in the field:

> As faculty members, we need to constantly reexamine the core knowledge and skill requirements we expect our students to know upon graduation, and we need to study this from two perspectives: our graduate faculties and practitioners in the field. (p. 134)

With this as a reality, how effective are faculty members in Higher Education Administration program in helping to prepare doctoral students with various facets of student affairs experience to become senior leaders within their field? Are faculty mentors able to help doctoral students process their prior experiences to draw on the tacit knowledge they need to succeed as practitioners? This qualitative study gives voice to current senior Student Affairs leaders who have benefited from mentoring relationships with an exemplary faculty members. Through this relationship, I have examined the nature and scope of a mentor's impact on the protégé's preparation for senior leadership within a doctoral program.

     As the mentoring experiences between faculty mentors and former doctoral students had already occurred, participants were asked to reflect back upon their perceptions of those mentoring relationships. The overall research design is qualitative and explored two research questions:

> 1. How do faculty mentors perceive how their mentoring relationship with their former doctoral student protégés helped to socialize them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs?

2. How do former doctoral student protégés perceive how their mentoring relationship with their faculty mentor socialized them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs?

The study employed semi-structured, open-ended interviews exploring five faculty mentors and eight of their former doctoral students who are current SSAOs. This sample yielded rich data regarding the socialization process of doctoral students in Higher Educational Administration programs, specifically how faculty mentors help students make meaning of their doctoral student experiences in preparation for entering the role of SSAO.

Theoretical Rationale

As already stated, faculty must play key roles as teachers and mentors for doctoral students in Higher Education Administration programs. Ideally, in their work with doctoral students, faculty mentors provide advice on how to advance to senior levels of leadership requiring an advanced degree. The theoretical rationale for this study is based on the mentoring research of Kram (1983, 1985). Kram's research yielded two major aspects that are fostered by mentoring: career functions and psychosocial functions. Career functions include sponsorship, coaching, protection, and providing exposure, visibility, and challenging assignments. Psychosocial functions, include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling and friendship (Chandler & Kram, 2007). Kram also identified four stages in the life cycle of a mentoring relationship: "initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. Her research further highlighted how relationships and their content vary according to the protégé's life stage."(Chandler &

Kram, 2007, p. 6). In this study, I applied Kram's research, primarily conducted in the context of organizational development, within the context of Higher Education Administration doctoral programs. Again, my purpose is to assess the perceptions that both mentors and protégés have about mentoring doctoral students and the perceived impact of that mentoring upon their preparation as senior leaders in Student Affairs.

According to Chandler and Kram (2007), Kram's original work began with researching pairs of mentors and protégés; she found that individuals may, in fact, receive support from a set or "constellation" of developmental relationships including peer relationships. Kram's findings can also be applied to the careers of a senior leaders who have been engaged in many professional roles and thus had many supervisors and colleagues who contributed to their current skill set. For the purposes of this study, however, I did not focus on multiple mentors, but solely on one of the constellation of developmental relationships: the doctoral program faculty members who served as mentors and their influence on current senior leaders in Student Affairs.

Another important component of this study is examining the socialization process of doctoral students into the role of SSAO. Weidman, Twale and Stein (2001) describe socialization in this way: "It becomes a continuum of experiences, with some experiences being commonly and uniformly felt by students and others perceived differently by students with different characteristics. Each step along the journey has particular significance, becomes a rite of passage, or adds important people and information to the mix" (p. 5). Weidman, Twale and Stein (2001) believe that "socialization in graduate programs is a nonlinear process during which identity and role commitment are

developed through experiences with formal and informal university culture as well as personal and professional reference groups outside academe" (p. 36).

Penner (2001) cites specific elements in the mentoring relationship between a faculty mentor and protégé. These elements include initiation, time frame, formality, intensity, reciprocity, agenda and medium of communication between those in the mentoring relationship. The relationship of faculty mentoring is important to graduate students not only because of the knowledge and skills they learn, but also because of the many additional aspects of professional socialization and personal support that are needed to facilitate success in graduate school and beyond (Green & Bauer, 1995). Faculty mentors symbolize the gateway from student status to academic professional. In this regard, the mentor appears as an immediate and powerful figure, holding many of the keys to their protégé's future (Barger & Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983).

Significance of the Study

This study is needed for a number of reasons. One merit of this study is that it solely focuses upon doctoral students in Higher Education Administration doctoral programs and how the faculty mentors in those programs help prepare students for the role of senior leadership. It examines the assumption that all doctoral students fit the literature based on those who wish to become faculty members, despite significant differences in student background, career aspirations and matches with curriculum and faculty expertise. It is important to investigate this aspect because it may provide insights into the level of significance that faculty mentoring holds in the socialization process of students into the role of SSAO and whether or not faculty mentors see this as a

responsibility. According to Johnson, Koch, Fallow and Huwe (2000), mentoring has generally been shown to have positive effects on protégé performance and overall success in organizational and educational settings. Benefits to protégés include more rapid career advancement, higher rates of compensation, greater career opportunity, and enhanced professional identity (Fagenson, 1989; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997; Kram, 1988; Wilde & Schau, 1991). Insights in this area can prove to be very valuable, as they provide guidance for faculty and help them understand the impact of their relationships with doctoral students during this critical period in their education.

In addition, this study examined the relevance of research and theory on doctoral students who enter applied fields of study. Through this study, the perceptions of the effects of faculty mentoring on a former doctoral student's professional identity as an SSAO and their job performance were also investigated. My results will contribute to that body of knowledge.

A second merit is that the results of this study will add to the growing knowledge about improving the quality of doctoral education. Over the last fifteen years, various policy discussions have addressed the quality of doctoral education in the United States and how well these programs prepare students to enter the workforce. This study adds more data to those discussions, specifically regarding the entry of doctoral students into roles of senior leadership in Higher Education Administration.

A third merit of this study is that its findings may provide a practical and effective mentoring model. This model may used to inform institutional policy regarding the purpose and structure of future mentoring programs for doctoral students, as "policy studies provide information that helps governmental, institutional, or organizational

authorities develop programs or make policy decisions" (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, pp. 17-18).

Definitions

This study uses the term "Higher Educational Administration". It specifically refers to the subset of doctoral programs in Higher Educational Administration, Educational Leadership and Student Affairs that focus on the conceptual understanding and administration of colleges and universities. In addition, I use the term "SSAO," an acronym for Senior Student Affairs Officer. In many colleges and universities, the terms Dean of Students, Vice President of Student Affairs or Senior Student Affairs Officer are used to refer to the most senior student affairs officer. Within this study, the terms "SSAO" and "Senior Student Affairs leader" will be used interchangeably to refer to those with the titles listed above.

Within this study, the word "protégé" refers to the current SSAO who was a former doctoral student of the faculty mentor. "Mentor" for the purposes of this study will be the faculty member identified by the SSAO who also served as the SSAO's dissertation chair. The mentor may have served as a faculty member during the protégé's coursework or as the protégé's dissertation chair, but also helped the protégé discern career options and how to reach the next step of his or her career.

Overview of Study

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. In Chapter One, I have introduced the problem to be examined. In Chapter Two, I review the literature connected to mentoring in general and the mentoring/socialization of doctoral students in Higher

Education doctoral programs. In Chapter Three, I describe the design of the study and report the results of the pilot study. In Chapter Four, I present my findings, based on the data collected, as well as their similarities and differences. Finally, in Chapter Five, I summarize my findings, discuss their relevance to the future of mentoring within Higher Education administration/Student Affairs doctoral programs and make recommendations for further applications regarding this area of study.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The literature I reviewed for this dissertation was drawn from the disciplines of organizational behavior, social psychology, sociology, law, medicine and higher education. These fields all contribute valuable information on the areas of mentoring, career development and management and the profession of student affairs administration. I reviewed and analyzed the available literature to determine what the current researchers have not yet addressed regarding mentoring doctoral students as a form of career preparation and professional development for the role of senior student affairs officer.

Mentoring: Definitions and Background

As faculty mentorship of doctoral students is an important element in the development of future practitioners in applied fields, it is important to examine the origin and context of mentoring itself. The concept of mentoring dates back to ancient Greek mythology. In Homer's *Odyssey,* as Odysseus encountered heroic challenges and adventures, the character Mentor served as surrogate father and counselor to Odysseus' son Telemachus. Mentor guided, protected and educated Telemachus, introduced him to other leaders and prepared him to assume his own leadership responsibilities (Gaffney, 1995, p. 18). Taken from this myth, and described in Chapter 1, the term *mentor* generally indicates teacher, adviser, sponsor, counselor and role model (Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985, Levinson et al., 1978). According to Trevino (2010), mentors differ from advisors, people "with career experience who are willing to share their experience" **(p. 1).**

Mentors take a different role, as they "go beyond advising by including support and nurture of graduate students." Trevino (2010) writes further:

It is a supportive professional relationship that develops and changes as the student progresses through the academic program. At first [protégés] need information about graduate school and the department; later the emphasis will shift to professional issues. In general, mentors help integrate students into the academic and professional culture of the discipline.

(Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu /~grdschl/ mentoring. php)

The term *protégé*, also as described in Chapter 1, and derived from the French verb 'proteger' (to protect), means 'a person guided and helped especially in the furtherance of a career by another, more influential person' (Auster, 1984). The protégé receives knowledge and skills, support, protection, and promotion (Mincemoyer & Thompson, 1998, p. 1).

Campbell and Campbell (2000) have found that the literature on mentoring is not driven or dominated specifically by theory; rather, efforts have been directed at determining what forms of mentoring exist and the similarities and differences among these various models of mentoring. "Mentoring is very complex, and subject to widely differing and even conflicting interpretations. Yet, there are some general objectives included in the mentoring interpretations: mentoring aims to facilitate and enhance learning, growth and development of the mentee (protégé)" (Fullerton, 1998, p. 3).

Mentoring is also shaped and defined according to the context in which it takes place. According to Kelly and Schweitzer (1999), who view mentoring within a corporate context, generally mentors are those who are chronologically older in age and who share

knowledge and experience with those who are chronologically younger. They share this knowledge and experience with the goal of helping to foster specialized skills and abilities in the protégé. This definition is applicable in a corporate setting, but this assumption dismisses the possibility of a younger mentor who has more experience within a given field and an older protégé who may be switching into a new career later in life. For example, in K-12 education, a chronologically younger classroom teacher with several years of experience may mentor a chronologically older protégé who is entering teaching after a long career in private industry.

One of the leading researchers in the area of mentoring is Kram (1985). According to Dougherty and Dreher (2007):

> Kram (1985) is the most often cited source for a definition of mentoring in the workplace. The traditional mentor is considered to be a senior individual who provides guidance and assistance to a more junior individual (the protégé). Kram's analysis of qualitative data led to two broad categories of mentoring functions provided to a protégé: career and psychosocial functions. (p. 74)

Career functions occur when the mentor provides interest in and opportunity for the protégé's professional growth. Career functions include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments (Lankau and Scandura, 2007, p. 99). According to Kram, the first four of these functions provide opportunities for protégés to advance in their given field, but the last provides the opportunity to build skills and allow protégés to maximize their advancement opportunities. According to Lankau and Scandura (2007), Kram also suggested that mentors play a critical role in the learning process by designing assignments and

providing ongoing support and critical feedback on performance. It is this structural role

relationship that enables the mentor to provide sponsorship, coaching, and exposure-and-

visibility to help a junior colleague navigate effectively in the organizational world

(Kram, 1985).

Psychosocial functions also take place within the personal dynamics of the

mentoring relationship. Kram (1985) observed that these functions shape the quality of

the interpersonal relationship; they include activities such as role-modeling, acceptance

and confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Lankau & Scandura, 2007). These are

"more personal aspects of a relationship that tend to enhance a protégé's sense of

professional competence and identity" (Dougherty & Dreher, 2007, p.74). again,

according to Lankau and Scandura (2007):

> Kram specifically stated that through a conscious modeling process, the protégé
>
> learns approaches, attitudes, and values held by his or her mentors. This learning
>
> then shapes the protégé's own style, values, and professional identity. Kram
>
> highlighted how counseling behaviors, serving as a sounding board, sharing
>
> personal experiences, and helping resolve problems through feedback, enable the
>
> protégé to cope with personal problems more directly. (pp. 98-99)

These definitions previously described may not adequately serve the purposes of

this dissertation study. Most of the mentoring models and definitions discussed thus far

are one-sided: an older person with more experience in a certain field imparts his or her

wisdom to a younger, less experienced person. Yet this often is not necessarily the case

with faculty mentors and their doctoral student protégés in certain doctoral programs in

higher education. In practice-based doctoral programs, such as in higher education

administration programs, doctoral students are adults who come with many years of experience and are either closer in age to, or older than, their professors. In the next section I focus on mentoring models specifically in higher education, and the mentoring definitions that follow will be more closely aligned with the needs of doctoral students.

The Context of Mentoring in Higher Education

Mentoring relationships generally take the form of dyads, but Parks' (2000) claims that an alternative model is just as effective. Mentoring teams or **"mentoring communities"** (p. 134) are composed of a protégé and various mentors whom the protégé consults according to their various skills and areas of expertise. This network also serves as a community of confirmation and contradiction that is essential to the practice of making meaning out of one's life experiences (Parks, 2000). For doctoral students engaged in the early stages of their professional development, encompassing questions may**,** as Parks would describe**,** challenge their perspectives, reveal gaps in knowledge, and prompt answers from protégés that provide meaning. Some of these questions may include:

- What kind of professional do I really want to become?
- In what type of institution and professional life do I wish to invest myself?
- Will my actions in the areas of policy and practice make any real difference in the bigger scheme of the field and my career long term?
- What constitutes meaningful work in the academy?

Another form of mentoring that meets the needs of some underrepresented doctoral students is co-mentoring. It replaces the hierarchical model in traditional mentoring with one that focuses on mutual empowerment and learning (Laslett &

Thorne, 1997). Bona, Rinehart and Volbrecht (1995) turn away from a notion of

mentoring as indicating a presumption of superiority over the other, resist the idea that

mentoring is only initiated by the mentor. They also claim that the benefits of a

mentoring relationship flow two ways and that it might be seen as co-mentoring, where

roles change depending on circumstances (Power, 2000, p. 1). According to Bona et. al.

(1995),

> Our conception of co-mentoring is rooted in a feminist tradition that fosters an
>
> equal balance of power between participants, seeks to integrate emotion into
>
> the academic professional experience, and values paid and unpaid work……
>
> Each person in a co-mentoring relationship has the opportunity to occupy
>
> the role of teacher and learner, with the assumption being that both individuals
>
> have something to offer and gain in the relationship (p. 119).

McGuire and Reger (2003) argue that while co-mentoring is valuable for all

academics, particular benefits may come to members of underrepresented groups, such as

white women, people of color, older academics, and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and

transgender people (p. 54). Research on mentoring these underrepresented groups will be

presented later in this chapter.

Bronfenbrenner (1993) describes mentoring through the developmental lens of the

social sciences; he sees the mentor's as assisting in building the protégé's skill set. As a

result of this interaction, an important relational aspect of the relationship begins to form.

Darling, Hamilton and Hames (2005) note that guidance is provided in various ways such

as demonstration, support, and challenge over a given period of time. Throughout this

process, mentor and protégé develop a bond that includes the qualities of respect, identification with one another, and loyalty to one another.

The nature of a mentoring relationship may also vary in its origin. Redman (1990) holds that one relationship may be officially defined as such at its outset because it was created through a structured and formal matching process; meanwhile, another mentoring relationship may be more informal and recognized as such at its conclusion, as some types of mentoring relationships are more organic, occurring naturally (Ellinger, 2002). According to Bennetts (2002):

> Traditional mentoring relationships are those intimate learning alliances
> that happen natural…They are usually named as mentoring relationships, after the
> fact, when individuals are appreciated and honored by learners for what
> they have done. This directly contrasts with formally organized mentoring, where
> individuals are named as mentors by others, in anticipation of what they might
> do. (p. 157)

Research on formal mentoring frequently focuses on a comparison to informal mentoring, with major comparative studies investigating the association between the type of mentor (formal or informal) and the functions (career or psychosocial) provided (McGowan, 2004). Yet whether mentoring is formal or informal, it is important to note the existence of a power dynamic, as the mentor possesses more knowledge about a given content area and has considerable influence on shaping the protégé's experiences.

Kram (1985) defines a mentoring relationship as having two primary functions: career and psychosocial. Kram's original work focused on mentors and protégés within an organizational setting. Although her research on the cognitive and affective aspects of

the mentoring relationship is widely used, McGowan (2004), says that Kram's sample only included Caucasian men and women. It is important to note that Kram's work only focused upon a restricted sample of the population; later, in this chapter I will examine how career and psychosocial aspects are (or are not) applied to protégés other than Caucasian men and women.

According to Kram (1985), career functions are aspects of the relationship that enhance learning the culture of a particular organization or environment and preparing for advancement within it. McGowan (2001) describes the career function process as one where protégés enter into new arenas; their mentors are guiding them on the journey, connecting them with valuable resources, and introducing them to key organizational players.

Psychosocial functions are aspects that enhance a sense of competence, clarity of identity, and effectiveness in a professional role (Kram, 1985). For example, Parks (2000) believes that dialogue is a crucial component of the mentoring relationship. As the mentor provides advice to his or her protégé, advice is only significant if it helps the protégé makes sense, or meaning, of the experience. Within the dynamics of this relationship, there are no guarantees that the mentor and protégé may see eye to eye on specific issues, as the guidance and experience of the mentor usually provides the protégé with perspectives that differ from the protégé's life experience. Yet, this dissonance in perspectives is positive: it allows the protégé to reflect upon the discussion with or advice given by the mentor. Dalcourt (2002) describes this difference in perspective as actually facilitating the psychosocial growth of the protégé.

Regarding the origin, or initiation, of a mentoring relationship, mentors and protégés may be paired together through either formal or informal means. Within formally structured mentoring relationships, in which mentors and protégés are intentionally matched together, the evolution of the ideal mentoring relationship occurs in four phases (Blake-Beard, O'Neill & McGowan, 2007; Kram, 1988). In the initiation phase, both mentor and protégé have preconceived ideas regarding the nature of the relationship. As the two learn more about each other, the protégé begins to feel support and respect from the mentor. It is also during this introductory period that career development aspects of the relationship begin to emerge. Job expectations, institutional culture and other professional aspects are also discussed at this time.

During the cultivation phase, the psychosocial aspects of the relationship are fostered as an emotional bond between mentor and protégé deepens, and the professional and personal rewards are greatest for both individuals. Within this stage, the protégé develops the most under the mentor's counseling and guidance and the mentor experiences a sense of generativity. In addition, the career and psychosocial aspects function simultaneously within the relationship.

Through the separation phase of the relationship, the protégé becomes less in need of or dependent upon the constant guidance of the mentor. The protégé begins to develop a sense of independence and relies less upon the relationship, as his or her psychosocial and career needs are being met. This period of transition can be difficult and requires understanding from both the mentor and protégé as their roles are changing.

As the last phase, redefinition, originates, the relationship evolves from a mentor/

protégé relationship into one where both may view the other as peer and colleague. The mentoring relationship is no longer needed as it once was, and each person may consult the other for advice and perspective on an as-needed basis.

Although these phases serve as guidelines for mentoring relationships, it is important to note that they may not occur in the order described here. In addition, the phases of these relationships may vary due to many factors, including the environment in which they take place, the personalities of both parties, and the level of mentoring needed or desired by the protégé. Butcher (2006) states that there is no singularly defined approach to this type of relationship:

> There is no single formula for good mentoring; mentoring styles and activities are as varied as human relationships. Different students will require different amounts and kinds of attention, advice, information and encouragement. Some students will feel comfortable approaching their mentors; others will be shy, intimidated, or reluctant to seek help. A good mentor is approachable and available. (p. 1)

A growing body of research from the corporate and career development realm argues that mentoring is related to positive outcomes for the protégé and the organization such as greater commitment, better socialization, better performance, higher salaries, and promotions (Chao, Walz & Gardner, 1992; Dougherty & Dreher, 1997; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Green and Bauer, 1995; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson & Scandura, in press; Kram, 1983, 1985; Scandura, 1992; Zuckerman, 1977). In terms of mentoring benefits, it may be quite natural to immediately consider how the relationship benefits the protégé, but the mentor also benefits. In a study on the mentoring relationships between faculty and students in

graduate schools of education, Busch (1985) found several adult developmental advantages for those who choose to act as mentors. The list includes "emotional satisfaction (Kahnweiler & Johnson, 1980), technical assistance and psychological wellbeing (e.g. Ferriero, 1982), growth of the mentor's reputation (e.g. Kanter, 1977) and rejuvenation and creativity (Levinson, 1978)" (Busch, p. 258). In reference to the growth of the mentor's reputation and career, Allen, Poteet and Russell (2000) found that mentors who have a potential for success seek out protégés who are possess that same potential. This type of pairing benefits both the mentor and protégé as they both benefit from the mutual collaboration and increases their ability to advance within their organizations.

Mentoring Relationships in Higher Education

Within the context of higher education, it was not until the late twentieth century that the concept of mentoring was noted as an important cultural element of American colleges and universities. Lyons and Scroggins (1990) noted that mentoring was first placed on the agenda of issues of importance in higher education in the late 1970's (Lyons & Scroggins, 1990). This level of credibility was established by Levinson (1978) and Roche (1979) who first created serious interest in the subject of mentoring and gave it academic legitimacy when they each published findings demonstrating a relationship between having a mentor and subsequent success in the business world (Lyons & Scroggins, p. 278**).**

It is also important to note the fundamental difference between advising and mentoring, two distinct terms that are often used synonymously. According to Knox,

Schlosser, Pruitt and Hill (2006):

> Although advising does share features with mentoring, these two constructs
>
> differ in ways quite meaningful to the current study. Mentoring connotes a
>
> positive relationship in which a protégé acquires professional skills
>
> (Cronan-Hillix, Gensheimer, Cronan-Hillix, & Davidson, 1986; Russell &
>
> Adams, 1997); advising refers to a relationship that may be positive or negative,
>
> within which guidance related to professional skill development may or may not
>
> be provided (p. 489).

Also within this time span, mentoring within higher education was seen as
characteristically different from mentoring within other contexts. Phillips (1979) was one
of the first researchers to identify the differences between career mentoring in the
workplace and academic mentoring within a university context. This is an important
finding, as it identified and validated the specific needs and purposes of mentoring
students in higher education.

In a university setting, the faculty mentor approaches the relationship with a set of
perceived needs that include: "1) altruistic desire to help students (beyond the help
afforded through assigned teaching and advising), 2) need for evidence of activities
demonstrating service to the university (for tenure and promotion decisions), and 3)
opportunity for enjoyment of the friendship and relationship with students provided by
mentoring" (Campbell & Campbell, 2000, p. 517). Simultaneously, the protégé
approaches the mentoring relationship with such needs as: "1) career guidance, 2)
assistance in coping with academic demands (generally study skills, tutoring for specific
courses), and 3) help in addressing personal problems and crises" (Campbell &

Campbell, p. 517). The kinds of social capital that students seek in this relationship also include a greater depth of content knowledge, connections to other faculty and scholars in their field, and opportunities to conduct research, presenting those findings at professional conferences and publish them. The result of this sharing off social capital is the creation of both new academic and new knowledge within a certain field: biologists training future biologists; sociologists training future sociologists, etc. In addition, the 'creator places an indelible mark placed upon the new 'creation'; the protégé is imprinted with, and generally carries on thoughts, processes and behaviors similar to those of his or her mentor.

Hollingsworth and Fassinger (2002) conducted a study on mentoring and psychology doctoral students in research training. They found that "faculty mentoring is a critical component within the research training environment as a whole (e.g. Gelso & Lent, 2000; Hill, 1997) and provides additional evidence that students' experiences with faculty research mentors are important to students' development as researchers" (p. 327). Healy and Welchert (1990) view the academic mentoring relationship as a dynamic, reciprocal relationship in a work environment between an advanced career incumbent (mentor) and a beginner (protégé) aimed at promoting the career development of both.

These various perspectives are evidence that faculty mentors serve a critical role in helping doctoral students acclimate to the world of a faculty member. But who are he various doctoral students that faculty mentors will encounter within their programs? In the next section, I examine some of the underrepresented groups that are engaged in graduate work and the specific social and cultural needs they bring to their programs.

Mentoring Marginalized Doctoral Student Groups

In the context of doctoral education, all doctoral students benefit from the knowledge and support of a faculty mentor as they navigate the academic peaks and valleys in the pursuit of an advanced degree. Yet, research has found that underrepresented and marginalized student groups within doctoral programs-primarily women, students of color and LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered-students)-receive not only mentoring in an academic content area, but also the added benefit of being mentored by people of similar underrepresented groups. These benefits take the form not only of academic role modeling, but of in interpersonal role modeling as well. When women, students of color and LGBT students are mentored by those like themselves, they are able to receive advice and encouragement on how to weather the issue-specific politics that they may face within the academy. According to the American Anthropological Association (1997):

> Surveys and interviews conducted by the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues in Anthropology have pointed to the central importance of mentoring as a factor in the experience of graduate students who identify as LGBT. The presence of a supportive mentor can help a student overcome even serious obstacles while the absence of such mentoring may severely undermine the student's academic career. (p. 1)

The importance of this like-cultural mentoring rests in the fact that given the specific and unique cultural experiences of those who are underrepresented and marginalized, these students encounter and process the world through a different set of lenses than their white male colleagues. Students from these groups, particularly those in the social sciences and

humanities, sometimes find that their perspectives or experiences do not fit into the current academic canons (University of Michigan, Rackham School of Graduate Studies 2002). Other students observe that when they select research questions focusing on race, gender or sexual orientation, professors deem their work irrelevant. Other underrepresented students have found that their experiences are missing from the current body of theory and research. These students need safe environments where their thoughts can be shared and valued, as they explore, and possibly challenge, traditional inquiry (University of Michigan, 2002, p. 19).

Studies have also been conducted specifically on the needs of students of color in doctoral programs. Dedrick and Watson (2002) examined factors that affect doctoral students of color:

1) Access and role model barriers (limited numbers of role models and decreased opportunity for interaction with same race/ethnicity faculty).

2) Lower expectations by faculty or self (students sometimes encouraged to follow easier academic path).

3) Intolerance and prejudice (either overt or covert)

4) Psychosocial effects (racial vulnerability and feelings of isolation/loneliness and low self-confidence)   (p. 278)

Although many capable, caring, and competent white male professors have successfully mentored female protégés and protégés of color academically, some underrepresented students claim to benefit from a relationship encompassing the components of same race, gender and orientation. There are students "who tend to identify with persons who are like themselves on salient identity group characteristics"

(Miller & Dredger, 1968 cited in Welch, 1996, p. 11). Specifically, women, students of color and LGBT doctoral students are able to find social and emotional support from witnessing the work of the academy being modeled by and working with others like themselves.

Padilla (1994, cited by Cullen & Luna, 1998, p. 323) describes the need for students of color to have mentors to whom they can relate: "mentoring as such an important part of the comfort level needed by ethnic students." Brown, Davis and McClendon (1999) concur that mentoring is most effective when faculty mentors spend time with protégés outside of the classroom. Within these out-of-class conversations, practical experiences are shared and discussed. This helps the student gain a better insight into his or her future profession through examples and discussion of applied knowledge.

Williamson and Fenske (1992) of Arizona State University examined the mentoring relationships of Mexican American and Native American doctoral students with faculty mentors. They compared the background characteristics of the male and female participants of both groups by creating four groups. The responses regarding mentoring were very similar when they compared the students in ethnic groups, but the differences were very apparent when they viewed the students in gender groups. Their results showed the importance of providing doctoral advisors/mentors of like gender and ethnicity (Williamson & Fenske, 1990, p. 21). The faculty mentors of these students were predominantly white males, adept within their field of study and provided constructive criticism and advice regarding the students' socialization. Yet, students preferred someone of their same gender and ethnic background to serve as faculty mentor. The researchers also found that same-sex pairings of doctoral mentor and doctoral student

were very important for academic satisfaction. The quality of interaction with the faculty mentor and faculty attitudes by students were central to the students' full incorporation into the academic system, to have a model for one's future professional role, and for the student's ultimate satisfaction during he doctoral program.

Holland (1993) described the relationship between African-American doctoral students and their advisors, focusing on the students' major advisor, which some scholars suspect has an impact on the career influences of doctoral students in higher education Holland identified five types of relationships:

1) Formal Academic Advisement Relationships: The faculty advisor provides routine educational advice relating to the student's program of study including course selection and designing a course of study. The frequency of contact between the pair is minimal.

2) Academic Guidance Relationships: These are conventional faculty advisor/student relationships, but possess a more flexible quality as the advisor provides academically related guidance and assistance. In addition, the advisor also shows concern for the student and his/her educational interest during the doctoral program. Contact between the faculty advisor and student is more frequent and communication is cooperative.

3) Quasi-Apprenticeship Relationships: The faculty advisor provides the student with research opportunities not available to all students. Interactions between student and advisor are primarily based on the work and completion of the research project.

4) Academic Mentoring Relationships: These are a developmental relationship where the faculty member functions more as a mentor by taking an interest in his/her student's career success. The faculty mentor provides the student with individualized guidance and assistance specifically aimed at helping the student prepare for academic life in higher education. This includes information regarding academic life at research universities and occurs through in-depth conversations and academic role modeling.

5) Career Mentoring Relationships: This is the most extensive relationship in terms of the mentor/protégé dynamic. Faculty mentors take a more active role in providing networking opportunities for the student as well as socializing the protégé into the academic profession.

These relationship models are not limited to African American students and their advisors and can be applied as models for faculty/student relationships that cross race, gender and orientation. To be engaged in an Academic Mentoring and/or a Career Mentoring relationship is the ideal for those in doctoral programs seeking to enter their chosen field. Unfortunately many mentoring relationships may not contain those dynamics due to lack of depth within the relationship or lack of the existence of a student/faculty mentoring relationship. In analyzing the results of this study, it raises the question of what can be done to create an environment where faculty mentors and students are able to a level of mentoring where students feel well prepared for their careers after completing their doctoral program?

Studies that examine underrepresented doctoral students being successfully mentored by same-race professors raise the question of whether having a mentor of

dissimilar gender, race or orientation is assumed has a negative effect on a doctoral student's academic training. As female doctoral students encounter different dynamics and issues than do their male counterparts, Dedrick and Watson (2002) describe factors that female doctoral students face during their time in graduate school. These four factors are:

1) Access and role model barriers (limited numbers of role models and decreased opportunity for interaction with same gender faculty).

2) Perceived gender differences (female students must do more to remain competitive with male colleagues).

3) Family pressures and commitments (feelings of guilt when focusing time on school and not with family).

4) Psychological effects (high stress and low self confidence).

(p. 278)

Still, researchers have substantiated that female doctoral students can have a fulfilling mentoring relationship especially when paired with male faculty mentors in fields that are primarily male dominated. In March, 2003, Professor Robert Gray of Stanford University was recognized by the National Science Foundation for his outstanding mentorship of female Ph.D. students in electrical engineering. According to the Stanford Report (2003), "Gray was honored…..because he 'demonstrated a successful model for attracting and accommodating women to engineering, actively mentored and encouraged women in their pursuit of electrical engineering doctorates'" (Levy, 2003, p. 1). A former protégé at the University of Washington, Dr. Eve Riskin, remarked, "He's a real standout in terms of the numbers of women [engineers] he's produced….he's working now on woman

Ph.D. number 13. We calculated he supervised about 7 percent of the women faculty in the top 23 electrical engineering departments at least as of last year." (Levy, p. 1). Another former protégé described Dr. Gray's mentoring style:

> I found him to be a model of integrity and devotion to his students. He would spend hours helping us with research ideas, with writing papers, with public speaking, with finding jobs, with everything. He always put the student's best interests first. I had two children when I was a graduate student, and I was particularly grateful for Bob's giving me flexible work hours and having confidence in my work (Levy, p. 1).

Another former protégé stated that Dr. Gray "took chances on people who did not seem cut out of the same mold as other students. These students included minority men as well as women. Their confidence may have suffered in the initial throes of the program, but they went on to do extremely well." (Levy, p. 1) This example of mentoring analysis highlights the critical aspects of a successful mentoring relationship: spending time with doctoral students to examine career possibilities, the intricacies of navigating the engineering field, and how to promote themselves within their profession. These are important aspects that are applicable to any successful mentoring relationship within higher education.

Socialization

Socialization is comprised of formal experiences (those that occur within the classroom or laboratory) and informal experiences (those that occur through conversation with peers or one's mentor). According to Tierney and Bensimon (1996), formally

structured and informal socialization both consist of a two-stage process; one occurring

before and the other after entry into an organization. This study will focus on the pre-

entry stage, also known as anticipatory socialization. This form socialization occurs

before the faculty hiring process when the student is still in doctoral studies,

"specifically, when graduate students observe participate and interact with faculty

members" (Rosser, 2003, p. 388). Merton (1957b) describes anticipatory socialization as

a stage in which those who aspire to membership in groups begin to adopt group values,

thus becoming prepared for future transitions into groups.

For Merton (1957), anticipatory socialization served two purposes: "an individual

who adopts the values of a group to which he (*sic)* aspires but does not belong: it may aid

"his rise into that group and" ease "his adjustment after he has become a part of it"

(Merton, 1957, p. 265). Goffman (1959) describes anticipatory socialization as "when we

come to be able to properly manage a real routine we are able to do this in part because of

'anticipatory socialization,' having already been schooled in the reality that is just

coming to be real for us" (p. 72). Israel (1966) adds that before the "formal training starts,

an individual has knowledge about his new role, this knowledge being acquired through

direct and indirect learning" (p. 207). Although anticipatory socialization is generally

considered functional for subsequent adjustment to acquired roles, research indicates that,

in fact, adjustment depends on how accurately experiences are perceived and conveyed

(Thornton & Nardi, 1975).

Doctoral education is the main process by which the academic community

reproduces itself (Gemme, 2005) and the socialization process for professions initially

occurs during the doctoral experience. Influenced by theoretical literature on

socialization, researchers such as Anderson and Seashore Louis (1991), Austin (2002a), Bess (1978), Golde and Dore (2001), Tierney and Rhoads (1994) and Weidman, Twale and Stein (2001) have focused on the graduate experience as the initial career stage (Austin & Wulff, 2004, p. 6). During the course of their training, Ph.D. (doctoral) students develop an academic habitus corresponding to their discipline (Bourdieu, 1998). Each academic field holds its own unique culture which defines aspects of research methodology, the intersection of research and teaching, and the level of collegiality amongst scholars within that field. Any discussion of graduate preparation and socialization for academic careers must take into account disciplinary contexts (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, 1987; Biglan, 1973, Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990). Graduate [doctoral] students learn to master language specific to their field of study, read journals germane to that area, and discover conferences that they are advised to attend either to present a paper, meet colleagues or interview for a job (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993).

From an organizational perspective, Tierney and Rhoads (1994) and Mario (1997) support that graduate and professional fields and disciplines in higher education exhibit six polar dimensions of organizational socialization described by Van Maanen and Schein (1979): 1) collective versus individual, 2) formal versus informal, 3) random versus sequential, 4) fixed versus variable pace, 5) serial versus disjunctive, and 6) investiture versus divestiture (Stein et.al., 2001, p. 6). These dimensions are important to examine as they serve as developmental steps within the professorial training process of doctoral students.

Collective socialization describes the common experiences that all graduate students encounter, such as required courses, examinations, etc. Individual socialization refers to the processes experienced students in 'an isolated and singular manner' (Rhoads & Tierney, 1994, p. 27) such as their interactions with program professors.

Formal socialization refers to programmatic experiences designed specifically for individual students to accomplish particular goals while being separated from the rest of the cohort. These activities include rites of passage including oral and comprehensive examinations as well as defense hearings. Informal socialization refers to relatively unstructured experiences that are processed in various ways, depending on the individual students and help them to survive the formal structures (Stein, Twale and Weidman, 2001, p. 6). These experiences may include the student initiated creation of study or support groups. They may also be experiences where the norms of the culture are learned through a trial and error experience.

Random socialization refers to a progression of unclear or ambiguous steps while sequential socialization refers to discrete and identifiable steps for achieving an organizational role (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Random socialization may encompass information provided during orientation before the student has gained a complete picture of their program or institution's culture. The goal of obtaining a doctorate is clear, but how to accomplish this task is very unclear. An example of sequential socialization would be the sequence of courses mapped out for the students to complete the coursework segment of the program.

Fixed pace refers to specific time frames in which certain events must occur, such as in law school where specific courses are proscribed for specific semesters. The

variable pace is applied to doctoral programs where certain students within the same cohort may finish before their colleagues based upon their self direction and motivation regarding dissertation research and analysis.

Serial socialization refers to the planned training of an individual by a senior member (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). This may include activities such as research or co-authorship of an article. In this disjunctive process of socialization, the student has no specific role model to assist with socialization. This type of socialization would apply to underrepresented groups within the academy (women, students of color, GLBT students).

Investiture socialization describes an affirming and welcoming experience into the academy which can include introductory social activities and orientation sessions. During divestiture socialization, students lose their individual characteristics identify closely with the role as a primary identity. For example, this occurs as a doctoral student becomes identified with the role of tenure-track professor and becoming engaged in all the activities that lead to tenure.

An important question to keep in mind here is how many of these stages in an ideal mentoring environment are necessary in a successful mentoring relationship, and to what degree? How, if at all, do these stages contribute to the successful preparation for one's professional life as a practitioner?

Practical and Tacit Knowledge in Applied Fields

According to Biddix (2009), current Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) come from a wide variety of experience within Higher Education Administration. Mid-career student affairs professionals who enter doctoral programs in Higher Education

Administration have taken various academic and professional paths to gain additional skills for senior level leadership positions. With such disparate experiences, how are faculty members able to help doctoral students make meaning of those experiences, connect to professional networks, and prepare for senior leadership? Hirt (2007), a faculty member in such a program, describes her experience in the academy of being both an academic within an applied field and a former practitioner. She finds marked differences in the work contexts of faculty members and student affairs practitioners:

> Colleges and universities have evolved into an academic marketplace during the past two decades….As a former student affairs administrator…it was clear to me that the academics were operating from a very different perspective than the student affairs administrators. The very language, the narratives, they used to talk about the academic enterprise illustrated this incongruity. (p. 246)

Fried (2002) also sees a marked difference between faculty members in Higher Education Administration programs and student affairs practitioners: "on many campuses the relationships between program faculty and student affairs administrators are tenuous and turf battles abound" (p. 123).

Noting that there are differences for those who work in applied fields, a key area of preparation for practitioners is to reflect upon their past experiences and gain wisdom for future professional experiences through what is known as practical intelligence. For Wagner and Sternberg (1985), practical intelligence refers to knowledge that usually is not openly expressed or stated; such knowledge is typically not directly taught or spoken about, in contrast to knowledge directly taught in classrooms (pp. 438-439). Practical knowledge "involves the ability to grasp, understand and deal with everyday tasks. This

is the contextual aspect of intelligence and reflects how the individual relates to the external world about him or her." (http://wilderdom.com/personality/L2-2Sternberg TriarchicTheory.html#Practical).

Sternberg (1984) describes practical intelligence in the context of his "triarchic theory of intelligence," (p. 5) which consists of three sub-theories. According to Sternberg (1985), he describes it as a theory of individuals and their relations to their internal worlds, their external worlds and their experiences as mediators of the individuals' internal and external worlds (p. 317). The first sub-theory examines analytical intelligence as part of a person's internal environment or inner world. This mode of intelligence is made up of three components: learning to accomplish tasks, planning what those tasks are and how to accomplish them, and actually accomplishing them. The second sub-theory considers creative or experiential intelligence: experience with tasks that involve the use of intelligence. The third sub-theory considers practical intelligence, or functioning in the everyday world.

Wagner and Sternberg (1985, 1986) find tacit knowledge to be a marker of practical intelligence. According to Sternberg (1985) the basic concept of practical intelligence relies on the concept that tacit knowledge that underlies successful performance in many real-world tasks. Sternberg uses tacit knowledge as an indicator of practical intelligence and describes it in three ways. First, it is procedural: how to do a specific task. Second, it is knowledge "that is never explicitly taught and in many instances never even verbalized" (p. 269). Third, it is knowledge about things that are deemed important by the person possessing that knowledge.

Nestor-Baker, Tschannen-Moran, Lippa, and Floyd, (2002) note that the characteristics of tacit knowledge also "include interpersonal and supervisory skills, self knowledge, insight into the actions and behaviors that lead to goal achievement, and the ability to solve practical problems and to shape environments that impede success" (Sternberg, 1985). The possession of tacit knowledge allows an individual to know when it is appropriate to enter a new environment and adapt to a new culture. Horvath and his colleagues (1999) further indicate that tacit knowledge has three broad, characteristic features: "it is 1) procedural in structure, 2) relevant to goal attainment, and 3) acquired with minimal help from others (Nestor-Baker, et. al., 2002, p. 4).

Bereiter & Scardamalia (1993, as cited in Nestor-Baker & Tschannen-Moran, 2004) maintain that tacit knowledge-the invisible knowledge behind intelligent action-is highly developed in experts. Lave and Wenger (1994, as cited in Nestor-Baker & Tschannen-Moran, 2004) discuss learning as social practice, giving rise to the consideration of tacit knowledge acquisition and application as a function of participation in communities of practice (Nestor-Baker & Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Yet, tacit knowledge is not necessarily connected to the amount of experience one has in a given area or field. That is less important than "how to do specific work-related tasks well" (Wagner, 1987, p. 1237).

This perspective on tacit knowledge and its application to the professional development of members of an applied field is important to this study. It shows the critical role an experienced professor plays in helping doctoral students process and contextualize their prior experiences to acquire tacit knowledge and prepare for their role as a senior-level practitioner.

Mentoring in Medical and Legal Applied Fields

Mentoring professional students in other applied fields, such as medicine and law, show similar dynamics and outcomes. Mentoring involves many of the same skills as teaching does; in essence it is teaching taken to a deeper level (Rose, Rukstalis & Schuckit, 2005, p. 344). In medical education, mentoring is an informal process where students seek out faculty members and practicing physicians whom they want as mentors. According to surveys of students and young physicians, enthusiasm for the specialty and the practice of medicine are critical characteristics of role models and mentors (Garmel, 2004, p. 1352).

It is important to note that faculty mentors at various stages of their own careers offer various skills and abilities to medical students. Junior faculty members are able to recall their own more recent medical school experiences and perhaps are better able to identify with students' needs. Midcareer mentors possess greater clinical experience and a more developed confidence in their own abilities. Senior faculty who serve as mentors generally have established reputations in their field and can carry considerable influence within their institutions. By and large, medical students search for faculty mentors who show dedication for their chosen specialty, as well as those who model qualities such as a strong ethic of care for patients and a sense of genuine pride, integrity, and professionalism within their work. Professionalism denotes a way of behaving in accordance with certain normative values (Cohen, 2007, p. 1029). Baernstein and Fryer-Edwards (2003, p.73) also define professionalism as the ethical and humanistic skills needed to practice medicine. These qualities are often the deciding factors used by students to choose mentors. In addition, many students select mentors based on personal

qualities rather than academic accomplishments, and many mentors started out as role

models for students only to be selected as mentors at a later time (Garmel, 2004, p. 1353).

An essential aspect of all medical school programs is reflection that transforms

experience into understanding, promoting higher levels of learning (Kolb, 1994 as cited

by Baernstein & Fryer-Edwards, 2003). This is that concept of tacit knowledge described

earlier, as medical students' goals are to gain skills that will prepare them to move on

successfully to the next steps of their careers, (which include residencies, internships and

junior faculty positions). Faculty mentors assist medical students in setting career goals,

in learning more about the professionalism of a physician and how to navigate the

political systems of medicine, including colleagues, nurses, and other medical staff.

In looking at legal education, O'Grady (1998) holds that the goal of clinical

educators is to provide information that allows students to understand the infrastructure

of their profession and to make intelligent choices and decisions. The legal academic

literature contains few if any actual studies of legal education (Apel, 1999, p. 376), but

Martin and Garth (1994), showed that law schools are very effective at "transmitting

ability in legal analysis and legal reasoning, knowledge of substantive law, sensitivity to

ethical concerns and legal research skills" (p. 449).

Still other skills used within one's practice are gained and developed through the

interaction with faculty both inside and outside of the classroom. One barrier that

prevents students from developing these skills is that, as in other disciplines, law schools

place value on scholarship over teaching, reducing the opportunities for faculty to interact

with students outside of class. But some faculty members are more student centered and

are willing to serve as mentors to law students. Apel (1999) describes this type of law

school faculty mentor as a "high interactive teacher who sees education as an interactive process between teachers and learners…these teachers welcome student participation both in and out of the classroom" (p. 372).

The legal profession also has its own body of tacit knowledge. For law students, understanding the legal culture is as important as learning any doctrine; it requires a form of learning that is less deliberate, more subtle, characterized to some extent by observation and osmosis (Apel, 1999, p. 379). Because of this, informal contact with law school faculty members is imperative for students to learn the unspoken rules of the legal profession. Law school mentors also provide the voice of experience for students who are choosing courses, clinical experiences and career paths. Law students gain practical experience through their clinical experience with a practicing attorney by learning how to represent clients and ask questions within the context of legal proceedings. Thus, in looking at the educational models of other applied fields, such as medicine and law, these training grounds provide opportunities for students to learn about the culture, hierarchical structure and day-to-day aspects of the professions into which they plan to enter.

Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs)

One specific field of practice within higher education is the area of Student Affairs. Much has been written on those interested in entering the profession of student affairs, student affairs related graduate programs and exiting the field (Brown, 1987; Komives & Kuh, 1998; Tull, 2006; Young, 1985). Another body of literature on student affairs professionals at mid-career level and their career decision to either leave the field or continue to progress within it (Johnsrud, 1996; Johnsrud, Heck & Rosser, 2000; Rosser

& Javinar, 2003). Prior to this, a number of studies in the 1980's explored the role of senior level student affairs professionals, commonly known as Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs), and their professional lifespan within the field (Kinninck and Bollheimer, 1984; Lawing, Moore and Groseth, 1982; Priest, Alphenaar and Boer, 1982; Shay, Jr., 1984). Within this particular body of literature, there is a subset regarding the graduate preparation and career paths of SSAOs that recommends further study (Arnold, 1982; Bloland, 1979; Brown, 1985; Holmes, 1982; Kuh, Evans and ,1983; Rickard,1982; Rickard, 1985). To date, however, no research has been conducted specifically on the preparation of future SSAOs taking place by faculty mentors and doctoral candidates within higher education doctoral programs.

Role of SSAOs

People rarely grow up knowing that they want to become an SSAO, as opposed to a physician, attorney or even president. Blimling (2002) describes the career paths of SSAOs as those that seemed to unfold without a specific plan:

> The talents, skills and interests of [SSAOs] presented them with
> opportunities. Others recognized qualities in them and offered them increased
> responsibilities. Some of the [SSAOs] came from nontraditional student affairs
> backgrounds and believed that the things they learned in other roles in higher
> education gave them a different perspective on student affairs work and a
> different vantage point on the field (p. 28).

The role of SSAOs has evolved over the last thirty years and has been given various titles at various institutions. Paul and Hoover (1980) conducted a comparative study of the

demographics of and change in roles of 115 SSAOs within a ten-year span; they

compared their findings to those of Brooks and Avila (1974), who had conducted a

similar study These SSAOs were located in large, public non-urban (61) and urban (54)

universities with student populations of over 10, 000 students. This type of institution

was selected because it was viewed by scholars as one in which national student affairs

trends were set. This study revealed that the title most commonly used of the SSAOs was

"Vice President of Student Affairs." This more popular title replaced the less preferred

title of "Dean of Students." In addition, 82% of the SSAOs who had earned degrees held

doctorates as compared to the 47% that Brooks and Avila found in 1974.

Paul and Hoover (1980) also found that their SSAO had an average of 8.7 years of

experience, compared to the average Brooks and Avila had found of 4.25 years. Paul and

Hoover's SSAOs averaged 46 years old, compared to the 40 to 42 years that Brooks and

Avila had found. Taken together, these findings reflect a professionalization of the role of

SSAO within large, public universities. Given that these institutions tend to be trend

setters in the field of student affairs, it provided evidence for potential change in the

demographics of SSAOs at other institutions, namely small private urban and non-urban

colleges and universities.

Most recently, Tull and Freeman (2008) conducted a study in public and private

4-year institutions, as well as 2-year institutions. This study replicated and extended

Rickard's (1985a) study of SSAO titles, looking at institutional autonomy and

professional standardization and providing a 22-year update on the uses of these titles

(Tull & Freeman, 2008, p. 265). For this study, they divided the titles into five

categories: Vice President/Chancellor, Dean, Director, SSAO and Other.

Tull & Freeman (2008) found that, currently for four year institutions, the most commonly used title was that of Vice President (37.68%) and the title that was being used less by institutions was Dean of Students (20.8%). In addition, only 27.13% of the institutions polled used the phrase "Student Affairs" within an SSAO title, yet there was in increased use of "Student Development" within the title (6.25% at the Vice Presidential Level, 1.5%at the dean level and .58% at the Director level). There was also a decrease in the use of the term "Personnel" in SSAO titles (six titles only equaling less than 1%). They also saw a greater move towards professional standardization with an increased use of the Vice President/Chancellor title, yet greater disparity was seen discovered in the use of titles (Tull & Freeman, 2008). They cite Sandeen and Barr (2006) as saying that institutions have and will continue to define their student affairs functions through labels that are best aligned with their particular values, missions, and organizational structures.

Regardless of their title, SSAOs fulfill numerous roles and are responsible for an array of functions within their institutions. Roberts (2007) describes SSAOs as those "in lead positions in student affairs in the college or university…and those who supervised numerous departmental directors or coordinators and had policy-making authority, and possessed a terminal degree in higher education, student personnel, or related field." (p. 564). Aside from overseeing student affairs in colleges and universities, SSAOs also play a pivotal role at the executive level of higher education administration; particularly in providing guidance to the college or university president. It has been shown that 'the relationship with the college president is one of the most important determinants of effectiveness of the chief student personnel officer and therefore his/her student affairs

division (Valerio, 1980 cited by Kinnick & Bollheimer, 1984, p.3). The effective SSAO must be able to step back from the operational issues (which may be the primary concern of most of his or her staff) and analyze how he or she can help the president handle some of the external, future-oriented issues (Shay, 1984).

Kinnick and Bollhimer (1984) conducted a study of college and university presidents that focused on their perceptions of SSAOs. They asked presidents to identify key areas for SSAOs and identify skills SSAOs need to function effectively in those areas. Kinnick and Bollhimer (1984) also assessed the presidents' perceptions of how SSAOs could address knowledge gaps and develop necessary skills. They found that, overall, the presidents identified areas such as student retention, financial aid, student enrollment and admissions standards as the most important issues upon which SSAOs should focus. Roberts (2002) supports this point of view, as he states that "as mid-managers progress in the profession to the [SSAO] level, they probably need greater experience in fiscal management, personnel management, and legal issues." (p.175). The presidents' perceived SSAOs as deficient and in need of professional development, similar areas were identified. The areas in which college presidents noted the SSAOs expertise were representation on student affairs within the institution, relationships with faculty, human relations skills and implementation of student development concepts and practices. Randall and Globetti (1992) found that college presidents wanted SSAOs to have, in this order, integrity, commitment to institutional mission, conflict resolution skills, decisiveness, motivation, support of academic affairs, staff supervision skills, planning skill, and flexibility (p. 171).

Sandeen (1991, cited in Schuh, 2002, p. 204) pointed out that the leadership role

has evolved to the point where the [SSAO] is also part of the institution's management

team, which includes at minimum the principal officers for academic affairs, finance and

student affairs, and the president SSAOs can also play the role of financial stewards as

they seek to further the mission of student affairs within their institutions. This occurs

through the building of new physical resources on campus, particularly residence halls

and campus student centers. Also, SSAOs often serve as part of the president's executive

team and assist with overall campus planning for academic and administration buildings.

Ackerman, DiRamio and Wilson (2005) studied the level of knowledge and involvement

of SSAOs and the campus financial decision-making processes of their institutions. In

particular, looking at the use of bonds to finance campus projects, they found the

following about the 96 SSAOs who participated in the survey:

> With respect to professional training and preparedness, On-the-Job (or tacit)
>
> knowledge was the most frequent response (f = 43, 45%)….while twelve
>
> reported no academic or professional training participants. One third (33%)
>
> of the survey participants reported being either Not Very Knowledgeable or
>
> having No Knowledge about using bonds for financing campus projects. (p. 3)

The respondents were also allowed to provide additional statements regarding their

responses. One noted that "This is an important survey because most [SSAOs] have

limited financial experience. There is a need for greater understanding of financing

higher education, not just capital financing." (Ackerman et. al, p. 5). The authors made

the following suggestion for addressing this skill deficit: "including higher education

finance as required course work in practitioner graduate programs would be one way to

emphasize the importance of role expectations of an understanding of finance and financial management" (p. 7).

Flanagan (2006) says that in recent years, new SSAOs "have been called on to provide leadership and management for areas that historically have reported to the president, provost, dean of the college, or other college officers." Flanagan (2006) provides two explanations for this shift in responsibility:

> First, these college officers are increasingly being required to devote significantly more time and energy to their institutions' curricular and fundraising initiatives which are critical for the short- and long-term success of any….college. Second, presidents are more likely to turn to their [SSAO] for managing these new areas, as well as the traditional reports, when they are confident the professional in that role understands the big picture (pp. 69-70).

Given the role of SSAOs within their institutions, we will next examine what preparation future SSAOs encounter within their doctoral programs.

Graduate School and Career Preparation

Daddona, Cooper and Dunn (2006, p. 204) cite the Peterson's Guide (2003) there are 21 institutions in the United States granting doctorates in student affairs and 93 institutions granting doctorates in higher education. The graduates of these programs go on to hold many roles within student affairs, but some progress to the role of SSAO. The possession of a doctorate is important, especially if one wishes to rise to the senior level of student affairs administration. Saunders and Cooper (1999) state that predictions of

future student affairs hiring practices indicate that a doctorate will become even more essential (p.1).

As this role can be, for some, the career goal of doctoral students in higher education programs, the question is how well are these students prepared for this role? Yet, "little research exists about the nature of doctoral study" (Coomes, Belch & Saddlemire, 1991 as cited in Saunders & Cooper, 1999, p. 2). Also non-existent is a regular systematic dialogue about the connections between skills learned in terminal degree programs and practitioners' perceptions of the importance of such values and skills in the workplace. Kinnick and Bollheimer (1984) agree on this point, as they believe that the "findings of this study should be used as a source of information for graduate programs……and should be examined by those responsible for regional and national conferences…." (p. 8).

Bloland (1979) argues that the skills and qualities needed and used by those in SSAO roles are markedly different than those of entry level student affairs professionals:

> …The [SSAO], particularly in large and complex institutions, is a manager and a supervisor, dealing with budgets, staff development, policy questions, extra-institutional publics and problem solving. (p. 58)

The role of the SSAO is a total shift from an entry level employee who deals directly with student issues to an administrator, who is ultimately removed from student contact and manages budgets, policies and colleagues. It is important for faculty in doctoral programs to be the primary educators in this transition from service provider to manager. Paul and Hoover (1980) advise that doctoral faculty be more explicit in explaining to students the shift in roles and responsibilities. In addition, students need to be aware that

once they attain a senior level position, their interaction with students will dramatically decrease.

Is it important for those who wish to become an SSAO to obtain a doctoral degree? Bloland (1979) also argues that it is it is more the skill set than academic preparation that is necessary for a SSAO. Bloland believes that

The qualities, personal and professional, which make for success in management terms are not necessarily those which typify a good counselor or student personnel worker. In fact, staff persons who are particularly empathetic and effective as counselors may have developed an orientation which is antithetic to management efficiency, organization, and a managerial perspective.

(Bloland, p. 58)

Kuh, Evans and Duke(1984) support Bloland's (1979) argument. Having studied SSAO career paths, they hold that it is not necessary for an SSAO to have had academic training in higher education or student development to attain that position. Yet, for those who do support formal preparation, those SSAOs early in their careers have some level of student affairs experience and academic training.

Daddona, Cooper and Dunn (2006) also conducted a study on those who had completed a doctorate in higher education within the last five years and on their career prospects. Based on their findings, they emphasized the role and importance of faculty in the process of socialization of doctoral students to the role of SSAO; they said "The results…provide opportunities for doctoral faculty in student affairs and higher education programs to address career expectations and career goals with students…already enrolled in doctoral programs" (p. 212).

Given this need for socialization, what are some of the key issues that need to be shared within the doctoral experience? Saunders and Cooper (1999) cite Kuh, Evans and Duke (1983) in pointing out that "The skills and content-specific knowledge about higher education and the student affairs field of most current chief student affairs officers [SSAOs] is extensively shaped by what is learned in a doctoral program" **(p.   ).** More specifically, Blimling (2002) looks at the role through a political lens and describes issues that should be discussed with doctoral students to help them understand the complexities of the role to which they aspire. These issues include the support of the president in the work of student affairs, the SSAOs relationships with the institution's other administrators and student groups, and adequate human and financial resources.

Within the curriculum of the program itself, R. D. Brown (1985) describes some components necessary to the formation of a future SSAO. Based on the structure of Bloom's taxonomy, Brown describes the various levels of knowledge that a potential SSAO should approach during graduate school:

- Level I: Basic Knowledge: This includes theoretical knowledge, principles and basic skills with an emphasis on cognitive knowledge.
- Level II: Intervention-Change Strategies: This includes principles of intervention strategies through exploration of the relationship between theory and research on one hand and practice on the other. There is also an emphasis on implications of theory.
- Level III Experiential Learning: Here the student integrates and synthesizes concepts and models through testing them in field settings with an emphasis on application.

The content areas of the program should also contain three components:

- Self: This is the most neglected area within higher education. Students must learn to understand themselves, put their total development into perspective, and establish and prioritize personal and achievable goals. This occurs through learning self-assessment strategies, establishing goals and developing a personal identity.

- Students: They need a knowledge of life span development theory and learning theory

- Systems: All parties need to understand the history and philosophy of administrative systems, management theory, budgeting, organizations, and staff development.

(R.D. Brown, 1985, p. 43)

Conclusion

Many studies have been conducted on the training and preparation for roles in the academic profession. Historians, scientists, and psychologists are trained for the research and practitioner roles to take their place as faculty within institutions of higher education. But what of those who study, train for and specialize in higher education administration itself? How are practitioners in higher education administration programs prepared for their particular roles, especially those preparing to become Senior Student Affairs Officers? What occurs during the mentoring process for those who wish to study and research the area of higher education administration? And at best, is there any type of mentoring in preparation for this role?

As is clear from the studies reviewed here, a wealth of research exists on the concept of mentoring itself, on mentoring under represented student populations enrolled in graduate degree programs, and on mentoring scientists, psychologists and others. Yet, what is clearly missing is research on those who wish to take on the role of SSAO practitioner in a U.S. college and university, specifically those enrolled in higher education administration doctoral programs.

Given the role, history, and importance of this multifaceted profession, it is necessary to further investigate how well today's doctoral students are being prepared in higher education administration programs. As twenty-first century higher education creates many expectations and much complexity for undergraduate student life, it is imperative that faculty mentors be prepared to create future senior SSAOs who are adaptive and resourceful.

Chapter 3

Design of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the mentoring relationship between faculty mentors in Higher Education doctoral programs and their former doctoral student protégées. The specific goal was to gauge the perceptions of mentoring experiences as an element of doctoral students' socialization into the role of Student Affairs senior leadership.

This interview study compared a number of faculty mentors and those mentors' former doctoral students, who are currently in senior leadership positions in Student Affairs. In the faculty mentor interviews (see Appendix I), Part One of each interview gathered demographic information and data on the professor's own experience as a teacher and protégé. Part Two addressed the experiences and interactions that led to the protégés' psychosocial and career development, especially the role that mentoring played in preparing the students for senior leadership positions within Student Affairs. In the protégé interviews (see Appendix II), Part One gathered demographic information and data on the protégé's own experience as a doctoral student. In Part Two, we discussed their experiences and interactions that led to psychosocial and career development to understand the role mentoring played in preparing them for senior leadership positions within Student Affairs.

These interviews reflected the SSAOs' and mentors' perceptions of psychosocial and career development proceeded through mentorship during their doctoral studies and how, if at all, it prepared them for their current roles. The data from the mentors and

protégés were then analyzed for their content, similarities and differences both within

across groups.

The SSAOs who were interviewed were identified as those serving in four-year

colleges and universities and varying in age, race and gender to provide as diverse a

sample as possible. They held doctorates from programs in either Student Affair or

Higher Education Administration. An additional criterion of their participation was that

they were able to identify faculty mentors from their respective doctoral programs and

provide contact information for those mentors. Interviews took place on the home

campus of each participant when possible; otherwise a phone interview was conducted.

Theoretical Framework

Much research has been conducted in the area of mentoring relationships. A

mentoring relationship is an inherently dyadic and complex process, with the mentor and

the protégé each enacting different roles and responsibilities in the relationship (Allen,

2007, p. 123). The overwhelming majority of these studies used samples of managerial

and professional employees (Dougherty & Dreher, 2007). The framework used for this

study comes from the field of organizational development, addressing issues of

mentoring and its effects upon the protégé's professional development. For this study, I

applied Kram's (1985) research, which was primarily conducted in the context of

organizational development, within the context of Higher Education Administration

doctoral programs for this study. Again, the purpose is to assess perceptions about

mentoring doctoral students and the impact that process has on their role as senior

leaders. In particular, what, if any, career and psychosocial functions within the

mentoring relationship influence the socialization of a senior leader?

Kram (1985) began her work by studying pairs of mentors and protégés; she ended by stating that individuals may, in fact, receive support from a set or "constellation" of developmental relationships including peer relationships (Chandler & Kram, 2007). Her findings can be applied to the careers of senior Student Affairs leaders; people have been engaged in many professional roles before moving their current one and who have had many supervisors and colleagues who contributed to their current skill sets. However, unlike Kram's work, in this study I isolated the role of doctoral program faculty members who served as mentors and the influence they had on these current senior Student Affairs leaders.

Research Questions

From a practitioner's perspective, mentors play a key role in organizations as they ensure the transfer and continuation of knowledge and help prepare junior colleagues for further organizational responsibility (Kram & Hall, 1996). Based on this major premise of mentoring, this study focused on faculty members as mentors and the roles they play in preparing their doctoral students to be senior leaders in Student Affairs. Given the overall purpose of this research, this study seeks to examine two central questions:

1. How do faculty mentors perceive how their mentoring relationship with their former doctoral student protégés helped to socialize them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs?

2. How do former doctoral student protégés perceive how their mentoring relationship with their faculty mentor socialized them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs?

Methods

This study used a phenomenological qualitative approach "often through a series of in-depth, exploratory, intensive interviews…The researcher seeks to understand the deep meaning of an individual's experiences and how he or she articulates those experiences" (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, p. 72). Many methods of qualitative research contain common elements that distinguish them from quantitative research. Moustakas (1994) lists three of these elements:

- Focusing on the wholeness of experience rather than solely on its objects or parts.
- Searching for meaning and essences of experiences rather than measurements and explanations.
- Formulating questions and problems that reflect the interest, involvement, and personal commitment of the researcher. (p. 21)

An empirical phenomenological model was used to carry out this study. According to Moustakas (1994), this involves a return to experience in order to obtain comprehensive descriptions that provide the basis for a reflective structural analysis that portrays the essences of the experience. I chose this method because my goal in this dissertation is to make meaning out of individuals' experiences and to describe them in a detailed way.

In addition, I chose qualitative research methods, rather than quantitative, as they best captured the subjects' experiences of mentoring and being mentored. Rossman and Rallis (1998) state that qualitative research has two unique features. First, the researcher serves as the conduit through which the research occurs and is conducted. Second, the outcome of the research should be learning something new about the social world. This second feature was the primary purpose of this study: to gain insight into perceptions about the career and psychosocial aspects of mentoring higher education administration doctoral students. This study is also an example of "research that elicits tacit knowledge and subjective understandings and interpretations" (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 53).

Ambert, Adler, Adler and Detzner (1995) describe five key goals of qualitative research:

- To seek depth rather than breadth

- To learn about how and why people behave, think, and make meaning as they do, rather than focusing on what people do or believe on a large scale

- To situate the research on several levels (micro-macro)

- To fall within the context of discovery rather than verification

- To refine the process of theory emergence through a continual 'double – fitting' where researchers generate conceptual images of their settings, then shape and reshape them according to their ongoing observations, thus enhancing the validity of their developing conceptualization (pp. 880-881)

Ambert et al. (1995) also hold that "the results of a qualitative study should contribute to our understanding of….an understudied population" (p. 884). The interviews in this dissertation aimed to capture a particular set of experiences related to the mentoring

experiences within doctoral programs in Higher Education Administration, an area that has not been highly researched. These interviews also helped to indicate how doctoral students, in particular, made meaning of these aspects of the doctoral experience: assessing their prior professional experiences and socialization into the role of senior leadership.

Evidence from phenomenological research is derived from first-person reports of life experiences (Moustakas, 1994). Creswell, Hanson, Plano Clark and Morales (2007) describe this type of research as asking "essence questions: questions about what is at the essence that all persons experience about a phenomenon" (p. 239). In doing this, it is necessary to set aside prejudgments and begin the research interview with an unbiased and receptive presence (Moustakas, 1994, p. 180). Based on what Husserl called the freedom from suppositions, otherwise known as "epoche," Moustakas describes this process as setting "aside our prejudgments, biases and preconceived ideas about things" (p. 85). For Moustakas, it also "allows things, events, and people to enter anew into consciousness, and to see them again, as if for the first time" (p. 85). This process requires the researcher to learn "to see what stands before his or her eyes, what can be distinguished and described" (p. 33).

Sample

The sampling method chosen for this study was specifically purposive, or purposeful. The primary rationale for this type of sampling is to guarantee as heterogeneous a sample as possible. As Maxwell (2005) states "The purpose here is to ensure that the conclusions adequately represent the entire *range* of variation rather than

only the typical members or some 'average' subset of this range" (p. 89). According to

Patton (1980), "purposeful sampling is used as a strategy when one wants to learn about

something and come to understand something about certain select cases without needing

to generalize to all such cases" (p. 100). This method of sampling is also useful, he says,

"to help manage the trade-off between the desire for in-depth, detailed information about

cases and the desire to be able to generalize" (p. 101).

In regard to the specific type of purposive sampling described by Patton (1980), I

chose to use snowball or chain effect sampling (p. 176), an approach that allows

participants to recommend other possible participants. The process begins by asking well-

situated people "Who should I talk to?"; As the researcher asks a number of people who

else to speak with, the "snowball" gets bigger and bigger as new information-rich cases

accumulate (p. 176). As a result, five faculty mentors and eight of their former doctoral

students were participants in the study.

First, I located SSAOs through college and university websites that described

their SSAOs. I used three criteria for SSAO participation:

- They currently serve or have served as SSAO at their institution.

- They possess an earned doctorate from a program in Higher Education
  Administration or Student Affairs.

- They were able to identify a faculty mentor from their doctoral program
  experience would be willing to participate in the study.

Once I discovered the SSAOs met the criteria, I contacted them via email explaining the

purpose of the study and asking them if they had an interest in participating. Once they

agreed, I sent an official letter requesting their participation and IRB forms from the

Boston College Institutional Review Board (IRB) for them to sign and return.

I also asked them to identify their doctoral program faculty mentors. I then contacted

these faculty mentors and asked them to participate. When they agreed, I sent them IRB

forms to complete and return to me.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

To collect the data for this study, I used semi-structured open-ended interviews.

As this is an introductory exploration of the perceptions that former mentors and their

protégés have of mentoring practices and experiences. I conducted one round of two part

interviews with each participant and each interview lasted from sixty to seventy-five

minutes. This initial research provided a baseline of data for further exploration and

research.

I am reporting the data in two formats. First, I use tables with demographic

information on the participants and other relevant information. Second, I use direct

quotes in from the subjects as they shared their responses and spoke to specific themes

and trends that surfaced from the interviews.

As stated earlier, I conducted the interviews in person whenever possible and by

phone when in person interviews were not possible, as subjects were located at various

institutions throughout the East Coast and Midwest. Each interview was 60 to 90 minutes

in length and was tape-recorded, which allowed me to have someone transcribe it. I then

analyzed each interview using the HyperTRANSCRIBE software program. This program

allowed me to play the audio taped interview and stop and start as needed in order to

transcribe it. In addition, I used pseudonyms to identify the subjects and their past and current institutions to protect the subjects' identity.

After I completed each interview, I had the data transcribed and then I coded the data using HyperRESEARCH to identify themes or trends across the interviews and to reflect similarities and differences with both the faculty mentors and the former protégés.

To analyze the transcribed data, I used the modified van Kaam method for analysis developed by Moustakas (1994). This method includes eight steps:

1.   Listing and Preliminary Grouping: I analyzed the transcribed interviews using HyperRESEARCH.

2.   Reduction and Elimination: I determined the invariant constituents by testing each expression for two requirements. First, did it contain a moment of the experience that was necessary and sufficient for understanding it? Second, was it possible to abstract and label it; if so, was it a horizon of the experience? I eliminated expressions that did not meet they did not meet those requirements. Those pieces of data that did not meet these two criteria were not included or coded. Those pieces of data that did meet these criteria were assigned a code for further analysis.

3.   Clustering and Thematizing the Invariant Constituents: I then cluster the Invariant Constituents of the experience that were related into a thematic label. These constituents became the core themes of the experience. I grouped those data grouped by appropriate label and those labels served as themes.

4.   Final Identification of the Invariant Constituents and Themes by Application: I validated the codes by checking the Invariant Constituents and their related themes

my record of each research participant. In this validation process, I used three

questions:

- Were they expressed explicitly in the complete transcription?

- Were they compatible if not explicitly expressed?

- If they were not explicit or compatible or were not relevant to the co-
  researcher's experience, then they should have been deleted.

5. Construct Individual Textual Description: Using the relevant and validated

   Invariant Constituents, I included direct quotes from the transcribed interviews. To

   support the themes I identified, I used examples and text from the transcribed

   interviews.

6. Construct Individual Structural Description: I integrated the themes and qualities of

   the interview and identified a description for each subject.

7. Construct a Textural-Structural Description: For each subject in the study, I

   checked that the particular meanings and essences of the interview experience

   incorporated the Invariant Constituents and Themes.

8. Develop a Composite Description for the meanings and essences of the experience

   representing the group as a whole. This description includes the meaning and

   essences of all subjects groups of faculty mentors, protégés, and their

   pairings/cohorts and one representative group. (pp. 121-122)

Interview Protocol

According to Dilley (2000), "Protocol questions are a guide to the journey we

want our respondents to take. They serve as a path we suggest for them to point out

landmarks and markers they think are important for us to understand and map the journey" (p. 133). The purpose of the interview protocol in this study was to gain knowledge from both the mentors and former protégés regarding their roles within the relationships as well as their perceptions about the proteges' socialization in preparation for the role of a senior Student Affairs leader. These questions also provided information on the personal relationships between each mentor and protégé and how it may have been tailored given the student's specific personal aspects (age, gender, race, orientation) and professional goals.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation was that the sample size was fairly small with a total of thirteen subjects. As the study is exploratory in nature, the research yielded results that may not be generalizeable to all Higher Education Administration doctoral students who go on to become Senior Student Affairs leaders. Still, these findings provided an in-depth view of five faculty members and their mentoring relationships with their former protégés.

An additional limitation is that the study is retrospective, as the subjects were asked to discuss their perceptions of doctoral program experiences that may have occurred several years ago. Using this method entails the risk that the subjects may have contextualized their experiences; specifically by considering how those experiences may have played a part in the protégé's socialization into the role of Senior Student Affairs Officers.

A third limitation of the study was the limited diversity of the sample population regarding race and gender. Significant attempts were made to achieve a diverse sample,

of both mentors and former student protégés based on race, age, gender and other factors.

I did not achieve the diversity I had hoped for several reasons. Some potential

participants did not meet the criteria for selection. Some identified mentors refused to

participate and one mentor had died. Other participants repeatedly cancelled scheduled

interviews. The racial diversity that was created resulted in four White mentors, one

Latina mentor, seven White SSAOs, and one African American SSAO. Regarding the

gender makeup of the participants there were three male faculty mentors, two female

faculty mentors, three male SSAOs and five female SSAOs.

Pilot Study

I conducted a pilot study to test the effectiveness of the interview protocol before

conducting the actual interviews themselves. To test this protocol, I interviewed one

professor in a Higher Education Administration program and one former protégé, who is

currently an SSAO. These semi-structured interviews lasted 1.5 hours each, and were

audio-taped and transcribed.

The former doctoral student I interviewed was an African American male SSAO.

He earned his doctorate in Higher Education at a large doctorate-granting state institution

in the Mid-Atlantic region. He has served in the role of SSAO for approximately five

years in two separate doctorate-granting Catholic institutions.

The faculty mentor was an African American female who has served as a faculty

member for over fifteen years at a large doctoral granting state institution in the Mid-

Atlantic region. She had been a professor within the protégé's program. She was not

formally paired with him as his mentor or dissertation chair, but willingly chose to take on the role of mentor.

Reviewing the results of this interview helped me to adjust the interview protocol so that it would collect the data I intended. When conducting this study pilot study, I focused solely on the senior leadership role of SSAOs. Afterwards, my dissertation chair noted that SSAOs have gone onto other positions such as college or university presidents. By including college presidents, who have also been senior leaders in student affairs, this would allow for a larger sample and an additional layer of richness in the data collected.

I also made sure that the interview questions were as open-ended as possible. I found that some of the questions asked during the pilot study yielded "yes" or "no" responses and did not provide useful answers for those particular questions. Making the questions more open-ended, provided me a greater opportunity for deeper and richer responses.

Finally, when conducting the study I felt more comfortable asking the subjects deeper questions about their perceptions of their mentoring relationships, including how differences in race, age and gender affected the mentoring relationship. In addition, I asked how the mentor and protégé were originally paired (formally or informally) and how the mentor helped prepare the protégé for senior leadership positions. These perceptions about the mentoring relationships seem to be lacking in the results of the pilot study.

Ethical Considerations

In carrying out this study, I was cognizant of issues and biases as a researcher. Moustakas (1994) describes this as "Epoche…a Greek word meaning to refrain from judgment, to abstain from or stay away from the everyday, ordinary way of perceiving things" (p. 33). Moustakas admits that "this state is seldom perfectly achieved….however we see researchers aim toward this objective when they begin a project describing their own experiences with the phenomenon and bracketing out their views before proceeding with the experiences of others (Moustakas as cited in Creswell, 2007). One ethical consideration that required my attention was not imposing any of my own ideals or biases about mentoring through the phrasing of the questions or my interpretation of the data. It was critical to pose questions that were semi-structured and open-ended; this allowed the participants to provide answers from their own experience and perspective. Interpreting this data openly allowed for the most objective findings.

I was also aware of my perceptions of the roles of those in college or university senior leadership. I have worked in Student Affairs and interacted with an SSAO for many years within a supervisor/employee context, so these experiences provided <u>one</u> perspective on the scope of their role. But I have never been in that role professionally; so I do not have knowledge of <u>their</u> perspectives regarding their socialization into this role of senior leadership. I kept an open mind regarding their perspectives and aimed to learn more about their roles through by collecting and analyzing the data for this study.

Chapter Four

Data Findings & Analysis

In this chapter, I present my analysis and findings about the perceptions of mentoring doctoral students and the way that mentoring prepares students for the role of SSAO. I also present the major themes I identified for each of the two participant groups: faculty mentors and their former doctoral students. I also examined these themes across groups and present those results later in this chapter.

Sample Demographics

Table 1 provides demographic information on the thirteen study participants. The faculty mentors are shaded and in bold with their former protégés listed below the mentor's name.

Table 1
Demographic Information on Participants

Name	Role	Length of Role	Race	Gender	Institution	Type	Location
Dr. John Christian	**Professor/ Faculty Mentor**	**33 years**	**White**	**Male**	**Red Valley University**	**Private**	**Midwest**
Dr. Grant MacAtee	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	9 years	White	Male	State College University	State	Northeast
Dr. Sarah Brown	**Associate Professor/ Program Director/ Faculty Mentor**	**14 years**	**White**	**Female**	**Christo Rey University**	**Private Religiously Affiliated**	**New England**
Dr. Sal Colavita	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	6 years	White	Male	Salvation College	Private Small Religiously Affiliated	New England
Dr. Susan James	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	6 weeks	White	Female	Triduum College	Private Religiously Affiliated	Northeast
Dr. Ellen Foster	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	6 years	White	Female	Magellan College	Private	Northeast

Dr. Mark Southern	**Retired Professor/ Former Program Director/Faculty Mentor**	**30 years**	**White**	**Male**	**Red Valley University**	**Private**	**Midwest**
Dr. Ann O'Hara	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	7 years	White	Female	Andersenville College	Private Religiously Affiliated	Midwest
Dr. Jane Sutton	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	5 years	White	Female	Middle State University	Public Large	Midwest
Dr. Daisy Ramirez	**Associate Professor/ Department Chair/ Faculty Mentor**	**12 years**	**Latina**	**Female**	**Christo Rey University**	**Private Religiously Affiliated**	**New England**
Dr. Jack Bryant	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	4 years	White	Male	Edsel University	Private	New England
Dr. Adam Mathis	**Retired Professor/Faculty Mentor**	**25 years**	**White**	**Male**	**Conowingo State University**	**Public Large**	**Midwest**
Dr. Evelyn Freeman	SSAO/Former Doctoral Student	7 years	African American	Female	The Urban University	Public Large	Mid Atlantic

The sample consisted of five faculty mentors and eight of their former doctoral student protégés who are currently SSAOs. In Table 1, each faculty mentor is noted in the role column and his or her former doctoral students are listed directly underneath. Of the mentors in the sample, three were female and two male. All three female mentors are tenured and still actively teaching; the two males are retired. Two male and two female mentors are white and one female is Latina. The mentors had been teaching at their institutions from 12 to 33 years.

Regarding the eight SSAOs, three are male and five female. All of the males are white; of the females, four are white and one African American. Their tenures as SSAOs ranged from four to nine years. Most notably, Dr. Susan James, had only been in her first SSAO position for six weeks at the time of her interview. Another participant, Dr Grant MacAtee, had only been in his current position for seven weeks at the time of his interview, but he was the longest ranking SSAO in the sample at nine years. The table provides additional information about the types and locations of institutions and other

demographics information. It is also important to note that with the exception of one, all other doctoral students were full time students at institutions that did not require participation in a practicum component.

In terms of the doctoral program and institutional demographics attended by the SSAOs, Red Valley University was a large, private institution in the Midwest with over sixteen thousand undergraduate and two thousand graduate students. The doctoral program attended was a Ph.D. program in Higher Education Administration. Students were full time and worked with their advisor to create an area of program specialization. The second doctoral program was at Christo Rey University. Christo Rey was a mid-sized, private Catholic university located in the Northeast. It has a population of nine thousand undergraduate and five thousand graduate students. In the doctoral program, students earned a Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration in areas ranging from student development & student affairs, administration and policy analysis and international & comparative higher education. The third doctoral program was at Conowingo State University. Conowingo was the flagship campus in a large state system in the Midwest. The University teaches fifteen thousand undergraduate students and four thousand graduate students. In the Ph.D. program in Higher Education, students' coursework includes studies in leadership and change in educational organizations, program development and evaluation as well as ethics and social justice.

<center>**Faculty Data Analysis and Themes**</center>

As I described in Chapter 3, After I conducted the interviews, I had them transcribed and assigned pseudonyms for all of the participants and their institutions. To conduct the analysis, I divided the data into two categories: faculty mentors and SSAOs. Within each category, I further divided the data into multiple codes and sub codes.

As I analyzed the faculty data, four major themes emerged with subthemes. These were (1) Experience of Being Mentored, (2) Characteristics of the Mentoring Relationship, (3) Career Aspects, and (4) Psychosocial Aspects. Experience of Being Mentored involves the mentors' definitions of mentoring, as well as their own experiences of being mentored as doctoral students. The Characteristics of the Mentoring Relationship include general characteristics of mentoring relationships with doctoral students, the mentors' approaches to mentoring, and the effects of age, race and gender upon those relationships. Career Aspects includes general career conversations within the doctoral experience, specific conversations about SSAO and other career choices after completing the doctoral program, and preparation of students for senior leadership in higher education. Psychosocial Aspects include the ways that mentors and students connected with one another on a personal level, the personal friendships that developed from mentoring relationships, and contact after the doctoral program.

<center>**Faculty Perceptions of Mentoring**</center>

<u>**Experiences of Being Mentored**</u>

Faculty mentors described their own experiences of being mentored in various ways. Some reflected on having one or more mentors during their own doctoral program

experiences and two said they had little to no experience of being mentored. Those who did identify faculty mentors found that their own mentors served as role models as they mentored doctoral students. For example, as Sarah Brown described her experience, "My first mentor was my academic advisor, whose most notable kind actions as a mentor were really validating me as a potential scholar. 'You're talented. You can do things.' But she also made opportunities for me." Sarah's mentor provided a sense of validation and confidence in Sarah's intellectual abilities through research opportunities that she had not experienced before.

Collegiality was the hallmark of another faculty mentor's mentoring experience. As a graduate student, Mark Southern was mentored by multiple faculty members who felt a sense of career and psychosocial responsibility for the success of their students. Southern described his experience as being treated as an equal. In particular, with one faculty mentor he published a document on student behavior and discipline during the turbulent era of student unrest and protest in the late 1960s and early 1970s:

> I was in the first graduating class of the Higher Education Administration doctoral program at Haskell University. Faculty members felt responsible to help students complete the program. I was treated as a colleague and I even had my own office. This served as my model of mentoring.

Other faculty mentors described not having faculty members they called "mentors" during most of their doctoral program experience. Daisy Ramirez did not experience much mentoring in the arena of career aspects throughout her own doctoral program. Yet, she certainly felt supported by faculty members and was mentored in more of a psychosocial way, specifically as she viewed her work through a philosophical lens:

I don't think I had very much mentoring, At the same time…I don't recall feeling that I didn't have faculty support. I think I was mentored by my dissertation committee, and it was and intellectual mentorship. I had Jenny Green on my committee, so she really shaped how I was thinking philosophically…so if I think about mentorship, it's more mentorship as a scholar.

One mentor did not describe his experience as "mentoring" at all. John Christian talked about the environment of his own doctoral program and why he strongly identified with that program:

> I don't really recognize mentoring experiences. You know that's as much about who I am as it was the University of the Midwest offered where I was. Midwest was a sink or swim kind of environment. And they very much leave it up to doctoral students to do their own thing. And I was perfectly happy with that.

Later, Christian did describe a faculty member who provided opportunities for professional development, while still allowing him the freedom and latitude he needed:

> And he was also the editor of the uh, then the Journal of College Personnel. And he used to give us manuscripts every now and then as they come in and he would say why don't you write a review of this and let me know what you think. So he would you know, give us opportunities. Try to provide resources for us to do our own thing. So I guess, that was more of a scene of people maybe recognizing my capacity to function independently. Encouraging that, trying to provide support and resources for that. And that's what made it work for me.

Later in this chapter, I will examine how all of these experiences, no matter how disparate, seemed to have influenced the way that these faculty members went on to mentor their own graduate students.

<u>Roles of Mentors</u>

Perceptions of mentoring were very much a part of the mentors' interviews. It seemed important for them to define these perceptions, as they helped to provide a context for their own experiences as mentors and mentoring relationships with doctoral students. In looking at these multiple perceptions, they described various functions that mentoring played in the lives of doctoral students.

At one end of the scale, one mentor was skeptical about the very concept of mentoring. This was because he perceived the mentoring relationship as something in which students held mentors as the key to their academic success, rather than placing confidence within their own abilities and applying those abilities. John Christian felt that too much emphasis is placed on the term mentor: "Uh, you know you come back to use the word 'mentor'. That's not something that can be independently declared." He went on to describe how doctoral students can place an inflated and unrealistic value on such a relationship: " I think in some ways that's an illusion that no one can succeed without a mentor. When it does work well, there is a real synergy there. Most of the time it's just people trying to assist other people as a matter of course to get things done."

Some expressed a more middle-of-the-road perspective. They saw mentoring in the traditional master/apprentice model where the protégé gains experience and tools for a future profession from a more experienced person. Yet within this perspective, there is

room for the faculty mentor and student to learn more about one another as individuals outside of their mentor and student roles. Daisy Ramirez described her perception of mentoring in this master/apprentice model:

> The more experienced person is there to sort of give you the landscape and tell you what they did, how they've seen other people do things and then try to ask you to try to think about those and how you fit in and don't fit in. And if you are an apprentice, you learn from them. Would that work for me? Would that not work for me?

She also described the role of a mentor as one who provides room for the protégé to wrestle with questions or issues and approach the mentor when needed:

> I also think that as a mentor, the more experienced person has to enable…to pull back...to make it possible for you [the protégé] to come to them [the mentor] as an apprentice and say "What do you think about this?" or "Who else can I go talk to about that?"

This aspect of pulling back and providing room for the student to wrestle with issues is similar to Christian's view on mentoring. Finally, Ramirez commented on the psychosocial aspects in these relationships: "I don't think of them as having the full range of qualities as friendships, but they do have some of the qualities." Later in this chapter, I will address in more detail the psychosocial issues to which Ramirez refers.

At the other end of the spectrum, some see mentoring as a holistic, almost parental, attitude toward the doctoral student. From this perspective, faculty members feel a sense of responsibility to care for and help the student develop in both professional and personal areas where friendships can often result. Sarah Brown saw the process of

mentoring in this way: "It's a kind of holistic care of someone's development, and so it's, to me it's akin to parenting because, it's about helping that person as a whole person and who you are helping them become." For Brown, this perception of mentor as parent also stems from her experience as a former Dean of Students. In this role, she would not only address the immediate disciplinary issue with students, but would also dig deeper to discover the underlying reason of why they violated the policy:

> What's going on in your life affects your dissertation and there are faculty members who just don't want to go there. As a former Dean of Students, I don't mind going there and I am fine going there. It's natural for me to do that. And this is a little bit of a digression but in some ways I love that because that is what I did all day, every day as Dean of Students was deal with students' issues and problems. So the counseling skills and empathy that I used as a Dean really are part of the mentoring. And so if somebody comes in and they are looking not so good, I don't just ignore that and do the work. I try to find out what is going on with that person. And usually something is and I'm very sensitive to back off when there is stuff going on in that person's life and to accommodate that and to make room for it.

These mentors spoke to their perceptions of the role of the mentoring experience; those perceptions seemed to echo their own experiences and models of being mentored. The mentors then went on to share their own personal approaches to mentoring doctoral students.

<center>**Relationships with Students**</center>

<u>Approaches to Mentoring</u>

The faculty mentors in this study explained that doctoral students were initially assigned to a faculty member upon their entry into the doctoral program, but were later given the opportunity to choose a faculty member as their dissertation chair. It was through this relationship as dissertation chair that they generally became a mentors to the students.

The faculty mentors also described having very positive experiences with their students and explained their varied approaches in cultivating mentoring relationships. As collegiality was the hallmark of his own experience of being mentored, Mark Southern said that he always tried to treat his students as colleagues "Each student came in with his/her own professional experience (admissions, housing, student development, etc.). I treated them as individuals with their own needs." He also tried to provide opportunities for students to interact with senior leadership at Red Valley University:

> I would host a lunch for the doctoral students with the top university administrators. Students were introduced to the president and the vice presidents and deans. The President was *very* supportive of the doctoral program, so much so that one doctoral student became his graduate assistant. The deans also appreciated the quality of program and student. As a result the program received increased funding.

Other mentors connected with students in more subtle ways. Adam Mathis described a sign in his office that served as an open-ended way of connecting with students and creating conversation:

I came from a Student Personnel background. I believed that if I was successful in

my work, then I was to help doctoral students who were in need of help. I had a

sign on my office door "I am not here to lead you, but to ask you why you want to

follow."

This sign acted as a conversation starter and allowed students to bring up topics they

wanted to discuss, rather than the mentor setting the tone for discussions. Mathis said he

had many good conversations with students about various topics ranging from

dissertations to roles within leadership.

Sarah Brown described her mentoring process as one in which both the mentor

and student protégé learn from one another, within the context of graduate research

assistants that she supervised and mentored. "The student and I work collaboratively, but

we figure out what each of us needs."

The mentors noted that the psychosocial, or interpersonal, aspects of the

relationship were important to the working relationship, particularly during the

dissertation stage. Daisy Ramirez described it in this way:

I do think the inter-relational parts of us allow us to work more effectively

together and non-effectively. And the ways in which we communicate effectively

or not. I get a little adrenaline rush when I get students' dissertations I direct.

They may be projects that don't interest me that much, but the working

relationship is a rush. I can see we are both in it, so it's the intellectual, and its

also sort of the personal, how we get along.

Here, Ramirez described the satisfaction she gains from her work with doctoral students. It comes not only from the academic project in which they are engaged, but also from the synergy that is produced.

Another approach some mentors took is to assess the students' needs and provide care and support. Here, their perception of care and support means serving only as a resource for them as students complete their academic work. John Christian describes his approach to mentoring in this way:

> Hmm, you know as I look at my entrance into faculty life it was just like my doctoral studies, there was nobody here to mentor me. You know, I've continued on in my sort of independent creation of what I did. I'm a faculty member and I am interested in every student who appears here. In trying to find out what are their goals? What do they see themselves doing? How can I help? And for some of them that means holding hands. For some of them that means giving them room to run. For some it means a lot of structure. For some it means no structure. And so I mean it varies from one type of student to the other. Students who expect a lot of hand holding and um, you know that sort of thing, I don't do that. I just don't do that very well.

These approaches to mentoring students are divergent: some mentors expressed concern about the overall well-being of their students, and others seemed to be solely focused on the students' academic success as the outcome of the relationship. But, no matter what approach they took, each had served the mentor well in helping students succeed.

Age, Race, Gender, and Orientation

The mentor identified certain demographic factors as playing a role in the mentoring relationships with doctoral students. Two mentors in particular noted generational differences between themselves and current students. John Christian described recent doctoral students and their expectations of faculty mentors in this way:

> I think doctoral students have themselves changed. I mean generationally I think. They strike me as so much more needy now than they were before. But anyway, I've had conversations fairly recently with doctoral students who said I don't inspire them. And I said "You don't need inspiration, you just need to sit down and do a little work."

Christian perceived that younger students seemed grounded in the notion that faculty mentors should be inspirational in helping students complete their program. But from his perspective, students need to find the motivation to succeed from within themselves and tap into their own tenacity to finish their doctorates.

Sarah Brown noted a cultural divide between herself and current doctoral students who are from a younger generation. She described her difficulty with those younger students who do not seem to exhibit a sense of intellectualism, a trait with which she can identify and connect:

> I don't have problems teaching people who are my senior because I really, I like to think I'm not that hierarchical a person and I have things to learn from people. I have a little bit more of a problem with some of the much younger ones. Particularly ones lately who are much more oriented to pop culture for instance,

which not only do I not care anything about and I have a sort of major reaction

against this anti-intellectualism.

Despite this intellectual divide, Brown also recognized the contributions that younger

doctoral students bring to the mentoring relationship. She described how she is open to

learning from them:

I'm aware of just as I learn about things from all my doc students that they have a

ton to offer me in terms of, in particular technology. I assume they know how to

do that and I rely on it. And then, again maybe this is just not so much

generational as cohort as age gap. And I wish them well and I will continue to

help them but it is more of a gap.

Continuing within this theme of generational difference and mentoring relationships,

Daisy Ramirez discussed age within the context of the student's place in life and how that

affects the mentoring relationship and the student experience:

And then depending on where they are in their lives, for example if students,

depending on their age or how much administrative experience they've had, they

bring all that with them. So there are ways in which we [faculty mentors] can

latch on to those and get them through this new experience. Students that are a

little younger require a little bit more massaging. Students that are married, that

are at the upper administrative ranks, have you know, had a good share of world

experiences. You [faculty mentors] would tap in on a different level and a

different set of conditions that allow you to move forward because they are more

experienced.

For Ramirez, the generational divide seemed to affect a student's professional perspective and how she, as a mentor, was able to connect with that student.

Regarding gender, sexual orientation and their roles with in the relationship, some of the mentors mentioned that these qualities in their doctoral students did not serve as any hindrance to mentoring. Sarah Brown described her experiences:

> I have mentored men, I'm trying to think if they are mostly gay? Yeah. That's a group that I just like. And gay women as well um, who I think particularly at [Cristo Rey] I wonder if they are going to be welcomed. I think they are, but that's another group I have a particular affinity towards.

Brown described specifically how she is open to many groups of people and how those issues of gender and sexual orientation play a positive role in her mentoring relationships.

Adam Mathis identified issues of race and gender were simultaneously. He focused on his positive experiences of mentoring students of opposite races and the opposite gender, specifically being a white male who mentored African American female students:

> Many students sought me out as a mentor through word of mouth, particularly African American female students. They felt that I had a welcoming attitude and would help them succeed in the program.

This was also an interesting finding, as he was the only mentor who openly discussed working with students who were both of opposite race and gender. For Mathis, he went on to describe how African American women doctoral students were very comfortable with him and felt that he was extremely supportive of their completing the program. This finding is echoed by his former student protégé later in this chapter.

Southern also described helping female doctoral students gain equal footing with their male counterparts in the marketplace: "I worked with female students on issues of negotiating contracts through role-play so that students would have equitable opportunities as their male counterparts."

These findings on race and gender and seem to align with the research reviewed in Chapter 2 on mentoring relationships, in which the mentor and student have opposite demographic characteristics. Researchers have found that mentors of opposite gender and orientation are just as effective as those with like characteristics.

Career Aspects

As coaching is described as an essential to the career aspect of mentoring in Chapter 2, many mentors described conversations with their students about post-doctoral career options. Surprisingly, very few of these conversations were specifically about the SSAO role, as faculty mentors perceived that many of their doctoral students came into the program with the knowledge and goal of SSAO as their next career step. Given this, the conversations seemed to focus more generally on work/life balance and career trajectories beyond the SSAO option.

Career Decisions and Implications

John Christian gave an example of one type of career discussion; he described a conversation advising his doctoral student about career directions after the doctoral program: "The stage was, at that point it's more what is going to be your entry level next step back into the field after you have gained some breadth of experience. You've

completed this degree, where do you go now?' Christian advised his student to think about what would be the most appropriate position and level given his professional and educational experience as a newly minted Ph.D.

Daisy Ramirez also shared an example from a conversation she had with one of her doctoral students. Her goal was to help students understand not only the career choice in question, but also how this choice would affect other dimensions of their lives:

My conversations tend to be about, what it's going to mean for them personally. So do they want families? Do they want to move around? Are they going to be the type of professional who wants to, you know, basically move up the ladder by moving to institutions across the country?

Similarly, Sarah Brown advises students on the options they need to consider and the possible impact of those options upon advancing in their career:

I push my students a lot to be geographically mobile for career advancement. Telling them that you will almost certainly not remain where you start. So you need to go for the job if you are really building your career. If you care more about lifestyle then fine, but realize you're very likely making career sacrifices.

Mentors also discussed with students the implications of limiting themselves professionally by the career choices they make. Mark Southern described how he had been very honest with students about moving forward in their careers:

I would tell students, "Don't limit yourself, you've already done that. Here are some options." I tried to advise one student to not return to her same position after the doctoral program. She did return and she regretted it.

All of the above examples were with students deciding on the positions they would take after they had completed their doctoral programs. Sarah Brown was the only faculty mentor who was very candid with students about the possible implications of applying for jobs before they have completed their dissertations:

> "Do you really want to do that? This seems like a broader path. Is there no way you can wait until you are done with your dissertation to start?" I really push students and say "Don't take that job until you're done, you will be sorry." But I don't repudiate, disown them if they make that decision and I do whatever I can to get them the job. I'm really honest though too. So I'll say "This is out of your league, you are not going to get this."

All of these conversations about careers seemed to focus on similar issues: helping students to be cautious about choosing the most appropriate position to help them progress in their careers, to considering work/life balance, to thinking about issues on which they are willing to compromise for the sake of their careers.

Preparation for Leadership

As stated earlier, the mentors did not see specific conversations about SSAO positions or the day-to-day work of SSAOs as a strong aspect of the mentoring relationship. Yet, the mentors provided interesting responses about preparing students for senior leadership positions in general. When John Christian was asked if he or the doctoral program helped to prepare their students for senior level leadership in colleges and universities, his response was the following:

You know I'm not sure that we prepare anybody. I think that if people show up

with some potential for leadership, I think we can reinforce that. We can

encourage them, we can help plant some ideas that can probably help them

develop good strategies, useful perspectives that are grounded in something other

than this is what we did at such and such a place. It gives them a broader lens on

the purposes, the aims, the general approaches to what we do at the academy. You

know, I tell people as they think about doctoral studies that this kind of doctorate

will not create a career for you. It will just enhance a career that is already

underway and you know it's that merger of experience and theory then that makes

one feel a lot clearer and more intentional about where they are going with what

they know. And I don't think you can create that kind of leadership if personal

insight and the personal characteristics and experience are not all aligned.

From Christian's perspective, leaders come to their doctoral programs with leadership

abilities already intact. The role of the doctoral program is to help students hone their

skills and provide more tools. So in essence, doctoral programs do not create leaders.

Daisy Ramirez stated that the doctoral program in which she teaches has made

improvements over the years in terms of preparing doctoral students for senior

leadership:

I think we did ok. I don't think we did great. I think that we are a better-oiled

machine now then we were back then [when her student Jack first began].

Though it wasn't that long ago but I do think that now we are at full compliment

of faculty. We have somebody whose focus is student affairs. I think that we did

ok in the sense that frankly Jack [her former protégé] didn't need much help. What

we supplied was the sort of, the intellectual tilling of the soil so to speak and then

um, and you know he had already been a successful administrator. He had some

administrative self-confidence, he had a lot of it and understood his world. And

then we added to that.

Ramirez also noted that although the program did an adequate job in preparing Jack, he

came to the program with many skills and experiences.

Mark Southern echoed similar thoughts about his work with doctoral students,

particularly in the course he taught on Leadership: "I helped a bit, but the rest was up to

them. The program was very demanding and trained them not to be administrators, but to

be leaders!"

These three mentors identified that either they individually, or their doctoral

programs, provided an environment for students to make meaning of their experiences or

create a context for what the students had already accomplished professionally.

Apparently, the most important factor was that the students entered their programs with

strong skills, abilities and experiences. The doctoral program, and the mentoring

experiences that occurred, helped to create lenses through which these students would

view their new environments and prepared the students for the next steps in their careers.

Psychosocial Aspects

Friendships

Kram (1985) holds that the psychosocial aspects of mentoring include role

modeling and friendship. Mentors described the personal relationships that they

developed within the scope of the doctoral program.

Daisy Ramirez talked about the fact that in addition to the academic work, these personal connections serve as an additional layer of the relationship:

I think this is where it has the commonalities of friendship. That you hook into things, experiences that you share or proclivities that you have or tastes. You know something as simple as a doctoral student who was just so happy when she realized that I read *People* magazine, because we could hook into pop culture. To something more like experiences as gay student or experiences as a graduate student of color or something like that or a professional of color or an immigrant or somebody who has kids.

Ramirez is able to connect with others who share her own personal aspects and interests, but she also went on talk about how she is able to connect with those who are quite different from her, such as white males who have very diverse interests as well.

Mark Southern made a concerted effort to get to know his doctoral students on both professional and personal levels. **"**I loved them and really cared about them. I wanted them to go forth and do good work. I would tell them that I was so damn proud of them." Similar to what Brown described earlier, Southern seemed to have a holistic and paternal relationship with his students, wanting them to graduate and do well in their careers, just as a proud parent would.

One interesting statement came from John Christian, who earlier downplayed the inspirational influence that a mentor could have upon a doctoral student. Toward the end of the interview, he said that he was very eager to discuss the friendship aspect of his mentoring relationships. "None of your questions really talk much about personal friendship or that kind of relationship. It's always presumed that this was purely

professional." I found this interesting: Christian highly valued the friendship element of his relationships with students. He went on to describe the friendship he developed with one former protégé whom he highly values**:**

> Oh yeah, Grant is just a person I enjoy being around. He has a good wit about him, a good sense of humor and he's bright and curious and so on. Those are just personal qualities that I'm drawn to rather than turned away by. So it doesn't hurt when that's in place as well.

All of these mentors captured interesting interpersonal characteristics of relationships with their students. This aspect of their relationships also continued after their students completed their doctoral programs.

Contact after Doctoral Program

Many mentors described how they had kept in touch with their former protégés after graduation and developed strong relationships both as professional colleagues and friends. Adam Mathis, among others, described how he stayed in contact with former students through professional conferences: "I would see my former students at NASPA and ACPA conferences when I used to attend them. I also receive letters and postcards from my students who are both in the US and all over the world." Some mentors would re-connect with their former students outside of the annual conferences. Mark Southern described his attempts to meet up with a previous doctoral cohort this past summer: "A group of my former doctoral students was having a mini-reunion in New York, and I was planning to go, but realized that I had to serve as an expert witness in a trial at that same time."

The mentors also described how much they enjoyed working with their former doctoral students as colleagues and also took a personal interest in them as individuals. As a result, they willingly continued to stayed in contact with their former students to know how they were doing both professionally and personally.

Senior Student Affairs Officer Data Analysis and Themes

During my interviews conducted with the former doctoral students who are now SSAOs, four major themes and subthemes emerged. These themes were (1) Experiences of Being Mentored, (2) General Relationship Characteristics, (3) Career Aspects of Mentoring, (4) Psychosocial Aspects of Mentoring. These themes were also similar to the themes identified by the mentors.

Experiences of Being Mentored include how the SSAOs were paired with their mentor. General Relationship Characteristics include the ways that mentors supported their students within the doctoral program, and how mentors challenged students to think differently about themselves and their self-efficacy as professionals. These protégés also described how theory and practice were blended within the context of their programs. Career Aspects outlines the SSAOs conversations and interactions with their mentors regarding coaching, identifying career options, and making decisions connected with those career options. Psychosocial Aspects include the interpersonal interactions, confidence building and personal aspects of the relationship, and the preparation that students received from their mentors and the program as a whole.

Experiences of Being Mentored

Many of the SSAOs had very positive experiences with their mentors. Many described how they were assigned an initial coursework advisor when admitted to their program, but after interactions either within or outside of class, they chose these faculty members as their dissertation chairs. These individuals eventually became mentors.

An important aspect was the process of being paired with a mentor. They had very different experiences in this process. Ann O'Hara described that Mark Southern was originally her assigned advisor, but she later realized that he would best serve as her dissertation chair:

> Mark was assigned to me, and then it was in the second year of the program where fall semester we had Law and Higher Ed. At that point in time, I thought I need to ask him to be my chair. And I think at that point in time I didn't necessarily know that I wanted to pursue a dissertation topic that would have a legal element in it. But Mark also taught the leadership course and based on his research and the curriculum he was teaching. I knew that I wanted to seek him out as my chair.

O'Hara experienced an organic process in deciding on her dissertation chair. In getting to know her assigned program advisor and learning more about his content area, she realized that he was the most appropriate person to direct her dissertation. Through this experience, Southern became someone that O'Hara began to identify as her mentor.

Although dissertation chairs were a necessary part of the dissertation experience, Grant MacAtee described his doctoral program as one in which he perceived mentoring as an important component of the doctoral program culture:

> I guess I would say first of all the Red Valley culture, it's a culture where I think mentoring is very important. [John Christian] became my mentor by really my own choosing, really. I think he and I probably both believe that you can't assign people mentors. Mentoring works better if it's something that evolves naturally. I guess that how I would describe it is it just sort of happened based on mutual interest, personality, writing style I think was a big thing. So I guess, over time I realized he's the one that I wanted to do my dissertation with.

Like O'Hara, MacAtee described a mentoring relationship that resulted from a very natural and organic process of learning more about and finding commonality with his mentor.

Some SSAOs identified more than one faculty member who served as their doctoral program mentors. Yet, they ultimately identified with the faculty member who chaired their dissertation. Sal Colavita identified having two mentors during his doctoral experience. As one faculty member retired, Sarah Brown came on as a new faculty member and ultimately his primary mentor:

> Well actually, Sarah was my dissertation director and actually really came into the role as mentor. I started there with a woman by the name of Margaret Hession, who eventually retired and she was sort of my early mentor probably about half way through the program. Probably after my classes were done and after my

comprehensive exams were done, which took about three to four years, Sarah

really became my main source of mentorship.

Another mentor pairing occurred long after a SSAO was in the program and needed guidance to help her complete the program. Evelyn Freeman spoke of the very unusual way that she was paired with Adam Mathis at Conowingo State University. This pairing eventually helped Evelyn complete her dissertation:

I took a class with Dr. Mathis. What I remember most is that I took a course from him and since I was in the doctoral program so long I lost about three chairs. So finally, and it's a funny story but I was at a conference, Dr. Mathis saw me from across the parking lot as I was leaving the conference and he hollered out "Evelyn, are you going to be ABD forever?" And I turned around and it was him so I was very smart and I said well, I um, I don't have a chair anymore and he said well, I'll be your chair. And so I said well, ok. And then he bugged me and I said finally, "I'm going to do this, I'm going to do this!"

Looking across these pairings, we see that a variety of circumstances surrounding the formation of the pairing. One was assigned as a program advisor, and later was chosen by the student as dissertation chair because of the mentor's content expertise. Another pairing occurred because of similar interests and working styles. A third pairing developed when the student's original mentor retired. The last occurred because there had been a past connection through previous coursework and the mentor wanted to make sure the student completed her program. In all these cases, genuine and organic connections had developed between student and mentor. This led to students' asking or agreeing to the faculty member serving as dissertation chair and eventually mentor.

General Characteristics of the Relationship

Many of the SSAOs described the characteristics of their mentoring relationships as generally supportive and helping them in a variety of ways. These range from finding the best fitting doctoral program to making professional connections to sharing professional expertise to completing a doctoral program from a distance.

Mentors as Support

Jane Sutton gave an example of how her future mentor Mark Southern helped to convince her that Red Valley's doctoral program would provide more options for her than her first choice program:

> Actually the truth is I was prepared to go to Arcadia University for my Ph.D. I had been there, I had interviewed there, and I had looked into the process of setting up an assistantship and had a lot of contact with faculty member Dan Black. And then, I received a phone call from Mark Southern and he talked me into going to Red Valley to get my Ph.D. So it was a quick 180 degree change.

For Sutton, Southern shared the advantages of Red Valley over other universities, especially in meeting Sutton's professional goals. At the time, Southern's role was the doctoral program director, but as time went on Southern helped her to network with national professional associations during her doctoral career:

> He always encouraged me to become involved professionally. He got me appointed to a number of national committees to look at some national documents. You know, he was always extremely encouraging not only in the classroom but just professionally as well.

Because of his initial influence in the choice of Sutton's program and his connections to national organizations, Southern connected with Sutton and she felt he had her best interests at heart. As a result, it was easy for her to identify Southern as her mentor.

Ellen Foster described her relationship with Sarah Brown as one of mutual respect and it allowed Foster to share her professional expertise in the classroom:

> Characteristics of the relationship included mutual respect. I believe she did see me as a teacher, she believed she was my mentor and teacher. And she was, appropriately so. And our relationship was such but I also think she respected the work that I had already done in the field and I appreciated that. When it came time for me to earn the student development class on my transcript instead of taking it, I helped her teach it.

This teaching experience also helped Foster better understand the faculty side of the academy and the world in which they live.

Evelyn Freeman described a positive relationship with her mentor, Adam Mathis, who supported her completion of the dissertation while Evelyn was working full time in an administrative position on the East Coast. Freeman shared how Mathis helped to make the last stages of the dissertation as meaningful and substantive as possible:

> He just kept on me. And then while he was supporting this long-distance relationship, because I was on the East Coast and he was in the Midwest. I travelled back and forth but he was always very patient. I didn't have to make any unnecessary trips for committee meetings. He was always very considerate in that regard. And also the fact that any corrections he always made in green ink or blue ink. He never wrote in red ink. The blue ink, psychologically that really did

help because I realize then it does make a person feel a lot better when you read

corrections in blue ink than red ink.

For Freeman, Mathis provided the support and encouragement she needed to finish and

defend her dissertation. From structuring her trips so that they would serve as positive

steps in the completion process to providing comments and feedback in a non-punitive

color (something other than the traditional red pen), Mathis was able to lessen her anxiety

and increase her efficacy.

Other SSAOs said their connection with their mentor was not only about

completing of their program. Some developed a genuine and supportive friendship with

their mentor and viewed their mentor as both a professional and personal role model.

Grant MacAtee described his relationship with John Christian as one of genuine

admiration and respect:

Well I think that he is somebody that people really love or they really don't. And

I think that he is one of those professors that I think on campus is probably, would

be seen as a campus personality, opinionated, really well known, very conscious

of doing good work, meticulous. I really have fun being around him and he

makes me laugh. You know, I enjoy being around him. I really respect the work

that he has done in his field and beyond that who he is as a person at his core. I

think that I really in many ways see him as a role model.

Mentors as Challenge

In the examples above, SSAOs perceived their relationships as being very

supportive, but in other cases they described relationships that were challenging at times.

These challenges primarily manifested themselves as faculty mentors who pushed their doctoral students to move beyond the students' perceptions of their own academic capabilities and career mindsets, so that students were not limited by their own sense of potential and self-efficacy. Susan James described the relationship with her mentor Sarah Brown in this way:

> I would describe my relationship with Sarah as one of challenge and support. There were times where it felt more challenging in the beginning and it felt a bit rocky. To be honest, I didn't always appreciate her advice at the time, but looking back she was right.

James went on to describe the process of deciding on her dissertation topic. She recalled, how, in a conversation with Brown, she had said she wanted to explore an aspect of student moral development. Brown replied by saying "That's fine if you are going to be a practitioner your whole life." James was a bit taken aback by this comment, but upon further reflection she realized her mentor was correct. Brown was trying to help her see that the topic of moral development had been studied frequently. If she chose a topic in that area she risked being seen solely as a practitioner, not as an administrator who could view student development from a big-picture perspective and contribute something original to the literature and to the field.

Sal Colavita talked about how Sarah Brown, as a new faculty member, challenged students to learn in a deeper way as well as pushing them to challenge themselves as professionals:

> And Sarah came in and she basically, when I look back on it now, she was really the first professional who expressed that you need to keep your nose to the

grindstone; that you really need to know this stuff. And I think it scared people. And so my first class with her, I loved her as a teacher but it was a little scary because previous to that I was doing the program part time. So I think what scared people in the program at the time was Sarah was coming in and she was really on target with stuff. That melted very quickly. I got to know her and really found out she was really looking out for the best in people and really wanted to produce really good graduates.

Colavita reflected on how Brown challenged him to go beyond his comfort zone professionally. After he recognized Brown's motivation, he better understood that she wanted him to grow and apply his academic experience to his day-to-day work as a practitioner.

In other ways, Jack Bryant described his relationship with Daisy Ramirez as one that challenged him to shift his thinking about higher education through a more intellectual lens:

I think, for me, my master's program was very practical oriented and counseling based. It wasn't really from an academic or philosophical or theoretical perspective. And so taking that first class with Daisy, I thought she was hard and she was very challenging with my writing in a good way, not with my writing but with my papers in thinking. So for me, it was such an interesting perspective I think she was able to put a practical face on the theoretical. But it was very interesting to have someone who would challenge my thinking in a very different way.

As Bryant became used to Ramirez's direct style of feedback and analysis, he came to appreciate it. He realized her feedback was focused on the quality of his work, and not about him personally. After this realization, Bryant sought her out for continued conversation:

> I got over my going back to school and my fear of writing papers and the bluntness that she could tell you about your paper. You know, I just remember that for whatever reason I would end up in her office on a variety of occasions and just chat. That was really helpful.

These SSAOs were sometimes surprised at the challenges posed by their mentors posed to them. However, even given all the ways these relationships were challenging, and perhaps difficult, each SSAO later realized that the mentors were correct in their challenges. The mentors could see the possibilities within their protégés that the protégés were not able to see within themselves at that time. These challenges within the mentoring relationships of and their impacts on the protégés would be an interesting topic for further study; this will be discussed more in Chapter 5.

Career Aspects

Many of these SSAOs interviewed commented on the various ways their mentors helped them to discover career options during the doctoral program. Their conversations about these various options helped them better understand what awaited them after graduation. Finally, mentors also acted as guides helping their former students navigate difficult and stormy career situations after their doctoral program.

Mentors Help Identify Options

Mentors played key roles in helping their former students become aware of their future career options. One SSAO, Ellen Foster, experienced a turbulent change in senior leadership and consulted her mentor, Sarah Brown, on how to weather the change. Foster described the advice she received from Brown while Foster was working full time during her doctoral program:

> And while I was there a new president came in and my area, which was new student programs orientation; the new president shifted it over to academic affairs where they were about to chop it all down to an advisement, registration period and then get rid of all the other holistic components. She [Sarah] said, "Finish this job like a well paid assistantship. Do what you need to do to do the job, don't do more. Get your PhD and be done." And she kind of laughed, it's not a bad way to think of it….and I did. I went through the rest of the year I think it was or so knowing that this job wasn't going to be my make-it-or-break-it job.

Brown was able to counsel Foster and helped her to understand that once she had completed her Ph.D., better career options awaited her.

Some SSAOs were aware that continuing their education in a doctoral program would open the door to new career options and the opportunity to explore them in a safe environment. Jane Sutton knew that she wanted to explore other career options as part of her doctoral program and described her conversation with Mark Southern about various options. Sutton described how Southern was able to help her diversify her career options while in the doctoral program:

You know, some of the things he talked about related to class sizes to mentorship to assistantships in particular. But I also wanted to have an assistantship outside of Student Affairs because that was how I had always done my work. I received an assistantship to work with the Vice President for Finance and the President of the University. All of that was very attractive so I knew that I would get a different perspective on higher education.

Southern was able to connect Sutton with professional colleagues who would introduce her to areas unfamiliar to her such as finance and university presidency.

Susan James described her conversation with Sarah Brown about career options. In particular, they discussed James' job options after she completed the degree. These conversations were eye opening to James, as Brown suggested options that James had never considered:

As a first-generation college student, being an SSAO was my greatest aspiration, but Sarah also suggested that I consider a college presidency. Sarah talked with me about not limiting myself professionally. Then I responded, "Me, a college president?!" Sarah said "Why not?!" This is something that I never would have considered before entering the doctoral program.

When James went on to apply for her first SSAO position, Brown also helped to identify and frame James' needs for her as she went through the process:

After I began to interview, I had received several job offers. Sarah helped me to keep in mind what was important to me. She reminded me that I wanted to have a personal life outside of the job and that I wanted to be back in a Catholic institution. Sarah also served as a reference for me.

Here, James was reminded of her personal and professional priorities while discerning

her job options, but she also received support from her mentor in pursuing job

opportunities beyond her own scope, such as college and university presidencies.

<u>Mentors Help Discern Options</u>

Some SSAOs said that they still consulted their faculty mentors about job

prospects long after they had completed their doctoral programs. Some mentors served

only as references, but others would engage in in-depth conversations about how to

decide on career options and how to handle difficult job situations. Ann O'Hara described

how her mentor, Mark Southern, helped her to understand what would be best for her

career:

> Toward the end of the doctoral program, the Vice President for Student Affairs at
>
> Red Valley said, "I would like you to stick around and help me raise money for
>
> the new Student Union renovation and new building project" and so there was
>
> going to be a position such as the Assistant to the Vice President for Student
>
> Affairs. He had talked to me about that and a week later the assistant to the
>
> President of Red Valley called and actually had said, "The President wants to
>
> meet with you and he wants to talk to you this afternoon." He called me after our
>
> meeting and the President had offered me a job as Chief of Staff.

O'Hara went on to share the conversation she had with Southern about these two offers:

> And I remember sharing all of that with Mark and he said, "Well you have to
>
> work for the President." I said, "I know. I just wanted to make sure you felt so
>
> too." And him saying things like "This is a one of a kind of a lifetime opportunity

because folks who work in Student Affairs are often type-cast in that area of the

academy. This is an opportunity for you to work across all divisions for the

President to advance his agenda."

This conversation helped to make her more aware that this was a rare opportunity that she

needed to take advantage to diversify her future options. She continued describing how

Southern still serves as a sounding board for her when she needs to weigh her career

options:

And since then you know, he's often given me advice and to this day he still does.

I mean he's a reference, an active reference for me, if there is an opportunity

where I think this is a natural career opportunity for me. I continue to run things

by him.

Another SSAO had the experience of deciding on a career option that was outside

of his scope of experience. Grant MacAtee described how John Christian was very

involved in helping MacAtee think about his first job after he completed the doctoral

program:

When I was looking for a job in my final year of Red Valley, there were a lot of

options that were kind of on the table. And one was the job I took was the Dean

of Students at St. Theresa's University in Denver. It was a Catholic school and I

didn't really have a much familiarity with Catholic schools. So I talked to him

[John] about that quite a bit. And I was attracted to the fact that they had a really

clear mission. He helped me think about that. I remember him saying, "You

know, don't keep looking over your shoulder, take the job and get involved in the

community and just move forward." So that's what I did. So he had a lot of

influence on my first job especially.

As in all of these situations, Christian was able to help MacAtee discern what was important to him and identify why he was attracted to this career option in a specific, but unfamiliar, area of higher education.

Psychosocial Aspects

Overall Impressions

Within the context of completing the doctoral work, many SSAOs felt that their mentoring relationships contained many psychosocial elements including support, counseling, coaching, and friendship.

Evelyn Freeman described how her mentor Adam Mathis was very supportive and ultimately helped her complete her dissertation:

> I'm pleased to have been in that program and I'm pleased with the faculty I had in that program and I do thank Dr. Mathis. If it hadn't been for him I probably would be ABD today. I guess sometimes the thing that is helpful to me is that he was a white male, very secure in himself and didn't have any hang-ups about mentoring a black female. But in terms of somebody really, I would say taking me by the shoulders and pushing me along, he really did the job.

Another SSAO described the personal trust that developed between him and his mentor. For MacAtee, trust was something that took time to develop with most people, but he described that once it was established, he was eventually able to share very personal issues with his mentor and Christian served as his confidant:

The personal issues probably took awhile for me to unveil to people, but John would have known about them much earlier. I had never really been one to talk a lot about myself or be really personal in a work environment until recently. And some of these issues I had I shared with John, knowing that he knew certain things about me that other people didn't. And also I felt comfortable talking to him about it because, you know, it was kind of a holistic relationship. He was able to kind of be a sounding board for me at different times.

MacAtee also noted that it was important for him to be explicit with Christian given the confidential matters they were discussing:

I would say to him you know, "I can't emphasize enough that I really don't want you to talk to anyone about this." You know sometimes I would have to say, "You know this is something that is about me and I don't want it to go beyond this room." He was really good with that.

Regarding the SSAOs psychosocial development, many of them felt, and continue to feel, supported and valued by their mentors, no matter infrequently they communicate. This feeling of value began during their doctoral program and has continued afterwards. Ann O'Hara described how she still remains in contact with Mark Southern and the characteristics of their relationship now:

We haven't gone more than maybe six months since I've been out without communicating in some way. And just last year at NASPA another colleague of mine and I had drinks with Mark and you know it was just like law class all over again. I am grateful to him for so much but I'm also just always so excited to reconnect with him and keep him in the loop. And he is so kind. He is like a

proud parent and he's always saying supportive things. I think in his last email to

me he said, "I am so damn proud of you!" which is just cute. But really, you

know, it makes you feel how reciprocal the relationship was.

Sal Colavita said he does not keep in regular contact with Sarah Brown, but they do keep

in contact through the students Brown refers to Colavita:

So after I graduated, we lost touch for a while. She asked me to come in and talk

to a few classes, but really didn't keep in touch. She still does what she did to

you. You know this is a good person you need to talk to. Oh, this person wants

to do this in life go talk to Sal. That is how we stay in touch.

Colavita continued to describe how much Brown believes in him and recognizes his skills

and abilities:

 And I always feel good about the fact that she still recognizes me, now I've been

out of the program how long ten, eleven years or ten years. She still recognizes

me as someone who she can still send people to. And that I like. And I saw her

in the lobby of the Sheraton and we picked up just like we had never left off. Oh,

by the way do you know this person? Or I want you to talk to this person. So

that's the kind of relationship we have.

The SSAOs said that their mentors had served in a range of roles for them in both the

career and psychosocial arenas. These areas were significant in their lives and

development.

<u>Preparation for Senior Leadership</u>

Finally SSAOs spoke about the ways that their doctoral programs, including their mentors, helped prepare them for their SSAOs positions. O'Hara described how a leadership class with her mentor during doctoral program helped her to understand the political aspects of a personal career setback she suffered after the program when an interim president hired her as an SSAO:

> So he hired me as a Vice President for Student Affairs, and he hired three women onto the cabinet that had been primarily male. I didn't think a thing about it but he was interim. I knew he was interim, I knew it was kind of a short stint but I was so stinking happy that someone wanted me to be a vice president. They ended up permanently hiring a guy who was an alum of Rickmansworth. So here is somebody with a bachelor's degree and um, he started making changes. One of those was not renewing my letter of appointment and changing the role, calling it an Associate VP and filling it with a male who had only a master's degree.

O'Hara described the lessons she learned as she reflected upon this experience:

> The phrase "at the pleasure of the president" really didn't sink in until that point in time for me; you know the higher up you are, the more vulnerable you are. I think he ultimately just sort of didn't want somebody who was starting new programs doing all kinds of the good things that we were doing. He didn't really want much in the way of change.

O'Hara commented on how she was able to connect the theory she learned from Southern's class to her own experience of senior leadership:

So, I think looking back it was the leadership class where we talked a lot about

presidential leadership, and you know that was huge. So I talked to Mark when

that was going on about what to do and thinking, "Is anybody going to hire me

again? I didn't do anything wrong. Are they going to ask what happened and all

of this?" and he was great. Mark said "You know what? It happens all the time.

And it's not fair and you kind of get over that." I remember he said "You know

most people have one big experience with the president in their career, let's hope

this is the only one you have and you've got it out of the way."

As she has continued her career, O'Hara shared what is always in the back of her mind:

You know, I'm now paying attention to when was the president inaugurated. How

long is he or she going to be there? You know, if they are going into their seventh

or eighth year, and they are talking about this is the last place I will be, then do I

want to be hired by that person? Somebody new could be coming in, in a year or

two and their best friend might become the SSAO at the institution. So, yeah, you

live and learn.

O'Hara sought the help of her mentor to navigate political turmoil and upheaval within

her institution. It was her first encounter with senior leadership that had a direct and

negative impact on her. In this case, her mentor was able to provide guidance and help

her understand that she was not the cause of political decisions. In addition, her mentor

helped her to make meaning out of the experience and apply that knowledge as she

moved forward in her career.

Susan James reflected back upon the skills and abilities her doctoral program

helped her to developed:

The doctoral program at Christo Rey provided me opportunities for assessment

and research. It also gave me the opportunity to work with faculty and I gained

valuable teaching experience. It helped me to be a faculty colleague by having the

opportunity to be a teaching assistant for a student development class. I gained a

better understanding of higher education as a whole, not just as student

development. In addition, I gained personal and professional confidence.

Just as Bryant stated earlier in this chapter, James felt that she was able to develop a new set of lenses through which to view higher education.

Surprisingly, writing also emerged as something the SSAOs learned to value during their doctoral program experience. In particular, Sal Colavita learned to hone his craft of writing during the dissertation process. Lessons that he learned during that time have carried over into his daily practice. Sal reflects upon his experiences:

I think the writing part of keeping things simple I think is really important. I

always think back on of her [Sarah's] biggest things and this is a very technical

thing but I have never forgotten it to this day. When I wrote things, I used to make

one sentence a paragraph. And she said, "No, this is how you write." When I

write reports now I make sure they are readable sentences. I know that is

technical and a little thing but you know, people look at my things and say oh

God this is really readable. It's able to be read. That was one piece of advice she

gave me, but it was a very technical piece of advice. I think the whole area of

keeping it simple; I still use it today. I still use it with people that I work with.

My Director of Housing, my Director of the Student Center. You know, keep it

simple, write it simple, that's all I'm looking for, get your point across.

Susan James also described how the dissertation process helped her to become a more skilled writer: "In writing my dissertation, I learned to be more precise with my writing. I am very aware of this every time I write a memo or a letter."

Ellen Foster described how courses in her doctoral program and the political culture of Christo Rey itself helped prepare her for her role as an SSAO:

I took a finance class, and we spent a lot of time on endowment management and finance. That class I definitely reflect on now that I am in my position. And within a month of starting my position that part of me kind of went to that. So thank God I had that class. I did not know that kind of information prior to that class, personally. And I think watching honestly the politics within the divisions at CR [Cristo Rey] was interesting for me. I had actually worked at smaller institutions prior to that so um, watching some of the politics that were at CR and how people managed them was an experience for me. I took some more deliberate classes on faculty and academic culture. Because I hadn't been one and thought it would be beneficial. So those I believe have helped me understand more about faculty cycles and faculty culture. So I speak more in their language when I speak with them.

The SSAOs in this study entered into their programs with many skill sets, but their mentors provided them time and space to explore their options, make meaning out of their prior experiences, and form meaningful relationships with role models and mentors that have had a lasting impact on their careers.

Common Themes for Mentors and SSAOs

Finally in this section, I compare the perceptions of mentoring for both the SSAOs and the faculty mentors. Both groups similarly identified that their relationships consisted of various career and psychosocial components. Both groups held that the mentor played key roles in helping the students complete their dissertations, sort through career offers, and contextualize their priorities when discerning career options and directions. Members of both groups also agreed that within the relationships, they were able to connect with and learn about one another as individuals as well as scholars.

One difference was that the faculty mentors felt that neither they, nor the program intentionally prepared the students for senior leadership. From their perspective, however, the SSAOs perceive that both their mentors and the program prepared them for senior leadership, either during the program or upon reflection after the program. One common thought about education is that teachers plant seeds for their students. They share thoughts and experiences with them, without knowing for certain whether or not they have taken root. Occasionally, students mention that a specific conversation or occurrence in class that has always stuck with them and has served as a barometer for them. It may well be the case for the mentors in this study that the psychosocial and career nurturing they provided has had more of an impact upon their students than the mentors are aware of.

In the next chapter, I examine the impact of these findings and provide recommendations for further study.

Chapter 5

Discussion of Findings and Implications

In this chapter, I review my key themes and findings on the perceptions of mentoring relationships between faculty mentors and their former doctoral students who went on to become Senior Student Affairs Officers. I will also show how these findings relate to the initial research questions and research presented on mentoring. I will also identify the limitations of the study and the implications of the findings for faculty mentors, and for doctoral programs in Higher Education Administration and Student Affairs. Finally, I will offer recommendations for improving doctoral education and for further research on this topic.

Summary of Findings

Rossman and Rallis (1998) describe open-ended qualitative studies as ones that "are open to the unexpected, and let the analytic direction of the study emerge as it progresses" (p. 174). This study yielded rich data regarding the relationships between current SSAOs and their former faculty mentors. As I stated in Chapter One, the research questions for this study were: (1) How do faculty mentors perceive how their mentoring relationship with their former doctoral student protégés helped to socialize them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs? and (2) How do former doctoral student protégés perceive how their mentoring relationship with their faculty mentor socialized them into becoming current senior leaders in Student Affairs?

In looking at the first research question, the five faculty mentors generally viewed their mentoring relationships with doctoral students as ones that supported their students in conducting research and completing their dissertations. Mentors also identified themselves as helping to provide philosophical frameworks for the ways in which students approached their dissertations, providing guidance for students' writing and revision, and also providing new frames of reference through which their students viewed higher education.

In addition, the mentors saw themselves as sounding boards and people who helped students make meaning of prior professional experiences, discern initial career options just after the doctoral program and other options many years later and consider issues of work/life balance. In these conversations, mentors helped students examine what their priorities were, both personally and professionally. Where do you want to work geographically? Where are you willing to work geographically? With what type of institution do you wish to be affiliated? Does the mission of the institution match your own? What are your family obligations and how will the position affect them? The mentors helped students think through these kinds of questions and experiences.

Finally, faculty mentors perceived that they developed collegial relationships with their former doctoral students and, to varying degrees, these relationships continued after the doctoral program ended. Many mentors spoke of talking with their former students on a regular basis via email and/or reconnecting with them at conferences or planned cohort reunions. Those who were not in regular contact did stay in touch in other ways. For example, one faculty mentor regularly referred current doctoral students to former

protégés for career discussions and insight. This referral system gave the former protégé a sense of confidence and trust that the former mentor had in him.

One interesting finding was that faculty mentors perceived themselves as not providing specific preparation for the role of SSAO. In their conversations, mentors and protégés did not discuss the day-to-day functions of the position, how to oversee multiple Student Development offices, or how to manage resources, human and fiscal. Mentors perceived that these discussions did not take place because either because the students generally demonstrated prior knowledge of this position or because the mentors referred their students to other faculty members who had much more knowledge and experience with the SSAO position. Mentors, did, however discuss senior university leadership in general, how the SSAO position would affect other areas of their students' lives such as career path, and personal and family life, and the culture and mission of the institution at which students were considering an SSAO position.

The second research question focused on the perceptions of eight former doctoral students, who are all currently SSAOs, and their preparation for their roles. The interviews revealed that some doctoral students were supported by their program directors and future mentors when applying to specific doctoral programs that met their needs and career goals. Some students were also helped by their faculty mentors to network with national Student Affairs professional organizations and to challenge their own thinking about their abilities and possible career options. The SSAOs also viewed their mentors as people in whom they could confide about both personal and professional challenges and from whom they gained personal, professional, and intellectual confidence.

In terms of their professional development, these SSAOs perceived that they were prepared for their current roles, specifically by their mentors and generally by the doctoral programs themselves. This was an interesting finding, as it contradicted the perception that their mentors generally held. In analyzing the SSAO responses, it became clear that the career preparation may not have been in the specific area of what an SSAO does day to day, but it seems that the mentors planted seeds regarding the political environment of senior leadership. In addition, some students had the opportunity to serve in various assistantships (as teaching assistants, assistants to the Senior Vice President for Finance, assistant to the President); through these experiences, they gained valuable insight into the various academic sub-cultures outside of Student Affairs. These students commented on how their experiences helped to provide a larger picture of higher education as an enterprise.

Mentoring Across Cases

In looking at the mentoring styles and practices across faculty mentors, I discovered some basic commonalities; for example, all served as dissertation chairs with a focus on various aspects of the process, including writing, research and completion. All mentors also discussed aspects of their students' careers to varying degrees. Some mentors developed more personal relationships with their doctoral students and engaged in conversation about personal issues, such as personal goals, work/life balance, and interests. Table 2 depicts the behaviors and characteristics of each mentor based on the perceptions of their former mentors and on the mentors' own descriptions of their mentoring approaches.

Table 2

Characteristics and Behaviors of Mentors

Sarah Brown	Mark Southern	Adam Mathis	John Christian	Daisy Ramirez
Advised students to not work during doctoral program Very supportive of LGBT and women students Talked students through difficult job situations Challenged students to be scholarly practitioners Connected with students about personal/life issues Provided challenging yet useful feedback	Very supportive and nurturing Talked students through difficult job situations Connected students to senior administrators and professional associations Provided opportunities for assistantships outside of student affairs Treated students as colleagues	Helped advanced doctoral students regain focus and complete program Provided good and encouraging feedback on dissertation revisions Very supportive of women of color Provided opportunities for doctoral students to socialize	Little to no handholding during doctoral process Served as resource for doctoral students Encouraged students to be self sufficient Connected with students about personal/life issues	Provided challenging but useful feedback Connected with students about personal/life issues Provided philosophical lens through which students viewed higher education and their own research Connected with students about personal/life issues Very supportive of LGBT and women students

Some mentors showed specific qualities or interests. For example, some had reputations for supporting underrepresented students (students of color, LGBT students, and female students), for strongly encouraging students to be self-sufficient, or for challenging students to view their work through a specific lens or framework. This is not to say that these characteristics were limited to certain faculty mentors, but in fact some former students, or the mentors themselves, explicitly identified them. It is also important to note that when the faculty mentors reflected on their own mentoring practices, as described in Chapter 4, they seemed to exhibit qualities hat reflected how they themselves had been mentored throughout their own careers.

There were also some interesting findings regarding mentoring within the context of the same institutions/programs themselves. Two of the faculty mentors were from Red Valley University. One former student protégé described Red Valley as a culture where mentoring was needed, as the program was rigorous academically. Given this description, mentoring did occur but in vastly different ways. As described earlier, John Christian's approach to mentoring was one of being supportive academically, but not going far beyond that. Although he described connecting on a psychosocial level with the former student protégé in this study, Christian's usual mentoring approach focused primarily on the academic tasks at hand. Within this same departmental program was faculty mentor Mark Southern. Again, Southern was more holistic and paternalistic in his approach to mentoring. By hosting annual lunches for students with senior leadership and social gatherings off campus, Southern was a strong proponent of connecting with students at the psychosocial level. This occurred in conjunction with supporting students academically by helping them to network both inside and outside of the university as well as connecting them with professional associations and opportunities.

Two other faculty mentors also taught in the same doctoral program at Christo Rey University, mid sized, private, Catholic institution and seemed to be more similar in their approaches as compared to their faculty colleagues at Red Valley. Daisy Martinez spoke of her approach as more of a master/apprentice model where she worked with students to complete the dissertation and help students think philosophically about their work, but also was able to frequently connect with a wide variety of students given her multiple interests (sports, popular culture, family issues, GLBT issues, etc.). She also described a sense of synergy when she and her doctoral students connect psychosocially,

which carries over into the career aspects of their work. Sarah Brown described her mentoring style as holistic in terms of supporting students academically, but also being very active in helping students connect with other professionals in the field from the Christo Rey program and at other institutions and organizations. She also took an approach that challenged students in their thinking about career opportunities and in how current career decisions could impact future career opportunities.

Adam Mathis taught in large state institution, yet his approach was one of getting to know students psychosocially and in terms of career goals. He developed a strong reputation as a faculty member who was very supportive of under-represented graduate students, in particular African American women. He also engaged students in conversations about various coursework concepts and career paths.

Again, mentoring approaches may be shaped by the institutional culture in which they occur. But in looking at their own histories as doctoral student protégés, mentors' approaches can be very different and are shaped by the mentors' own experiences of being mentored, personality traits and other factors.

<div align="center">**Connection to the Research**</div>

<u>**Research on Mentoring Theory**</u>

Given these results, how does this dissertation research compare to the research on mentoring? In Chapter 2, I presented several mentoring definitions. One of the more traditional definitions is that of the chronologically older, more experienced professional (the mentor) who helps the chronologically younger, less experienced, new professional

(the protégé) learn more about the social and political climates of the industry in which they are both employed.

The results of this study revealed a new variation on this context of mentoring. One difference is that the mentors were faculty members in Student Affairs/Higher Education Administration doctoral programs, many of whom had experience as practitioners, but their careers as faculty members were far longer than their careers as practitioners. Another major difference was that all of the former students interviewed entered their doctoral programs not as new professionals, but as experienced and well-seasoned professionals in Student Affairs. Also, all the students were seeking to build on their prior knowledge and experience of higher education through additional theory, education, and credentials that would enable them to progress to the senior level of their careers. Finally, as I discussed in Chapter 4, when students had specific questions about their career aspirations as SSAOs and approached faculty mentors who did not have that experience professionally or were less familiar with the role, they referred those students to other faculty members who were familiar with the role or to practicing SSAOs.

Perhaps these findings also lend themselves to a new definition of mentoring practitioners within applied fields. Mentoring in this context of doctoral education did include the presence of one (the mentor) with more knowledge and one with less knowledge (the protégé) about a certain field or discipline. Yet, the mentoring described in this study at times reflected Parks's (2000) theory of mentoring communities: where more than one mentor with special areas of expertise or experience helped them to make meaning of their past experiences and identify knowledge gaps. This occurred in the

situation described above, when students were referred to another professor who had direct knowledge of the SSAO position

Finally in this context, mentoring included the issue of tacit knowledge, which is related to meaning making. As described in Chapter 1, Sternberg (1985), views tacit knowledge as an important component of practical intelligence, or how one functions in the world. Tacit knowledge refers to knowledge not specifically taught to the individual, but seen as significant by the individual. In this study, I learned that many of the SSAOs found that through conversations and experiences with their mentor, they were able to find significance in, or make meaning of, long-term prior professional issues, conflicts, and experiences including university politics and deciding on employment based on personal and professional goals. Once they had absorbed this meaning, they were able to move forward through challenging situations and make future decisions based on the knowledge gained.

Looking at the formation of the mentoring relationships within this study, students chose faculty members based on academic interests and/or personal connections. This formation process aligned with Bennetts's (2002) definition presented in Chapter 2: mentoring relationships that form organically and are only designated as 'mentoring relationships' after the relationship has formed. As students align with faculty members, they do not consciously ask, "Will you be my mentor?" Still, as the relationship develops and deepens, the faculty member serves in the role of mentor. For the mentors and their former students within this study, the same situation held true. As each member of the mentoring pair connected and/or began work on the dissertation process, they learned more about one another and grew closer. As the relationship developed, it was focused

not just on accomplishing the work, but also included a genuine sense of care and concern for one another.

The findings from this study most strikingly correlated with the theoretical framework on mentoring proposed by Kram (1985), who viewed the mentoring relationship as encompassing two developmental dimensions: career aspects and psychosocial aspects. The relationships analyzed in this study encompassed both of these components. Kram viewed career aspects as those that prepare the protégé with the knowledge about a specific professional culture or environment and the readiness to engage within it. In terms of the career aspects within this study, students learned about, and how to engage in, the social and complex political environments within higher education.

For Kram (1985), psychosocial aspects include the coaching, guidance, and support of the protégé. Regarding the psychosocial aspects of the relationships in the study, students gained confidence in both their professional and personal abilities and learned to ask reflective questions when considering professional positions. When comparing these relationships, one or both of the components may have been deeper in some relationships than in others, but nevertheless both career and psychosocial development were present in all relationships.

In analyzing the research data, I found evidence of the four frameworks of mentoring (O'Neill, Blake-Beard and McGowan, (2007); Justice (1993); Kram (1988); Lee (2002), was also present. In the initiation phase, mentor and protégé may have preconceived ideas about the relationship, the protégé receives support from the mentor and career aspects develop. I found that the career aspects of these relationships were initially about

faculty mentors helping protégés complete the dissertation, but, again, this aspect evolved into discussions about career paths, types of institutions, and work/life balance.

The cultivation phase places an emphasis on the psychosocial aspects of the relationship where social and emotional bonds develop between faculty mentor and protégé. Career aspects are also ongoing within this stage as well. In relation to this, many mentors and protégés described the personal connections they had made and discussions about personal priorities, personal areas of interest and deeper conversations about career concerns.

In the separation phase, the protégé generally experiences less dependence upon the relationship. The participants analyzed did not explicitly discuss this phase. In some cases, this separation occurred naturally after the completion of the dissertation as less contact was maintained. For others, this stage may have occurred to some degree, yet mentors and protégés still remained in contact and had post-doctoral program career discussions but contact was less frequent.

The redefinition phase occurs when the relationship transitions from faculty mentors and student protégés to peers and colleagues. During the interviews, some mentors and former protégés discussed meeting at professional conferences, discussing of career issues and dealing with difficult professional environments. One former protégé in particular helped his former mentor become a board member at an institution and another former mentor described being invited to provide professional development work for the staff of the former protégé's student affairs division.

Campbell and Campbell (2000) posit that mentoring is an endeavor that shows specific needs and intents from both the mentor and the protégé. The mentor should show

a genuine intent to help students in their professional development, provide an activity (mentoring) that can be counted toward tenure and opportunities to get to know students as individuals and develop a personal relationship on some level. The faculty mentors in this study evidenced two out of these three aspects. Because they all were either tenured or retired faculty, they had no need to mentor for reasons of tenure. But they showed clear evidence of the other two aspects: they were altruistic in their efforts to mentor and developed personal relationships at various levels.

Campbell and Campbell (2000) also described that the protégés' intents and goals for the mentoring process included the need for career guidance, assistance from their mentors on academic issues, and receiving help regarding personal issues that arise during the doctoral program. The SSAOs in this study stated in their interviews that they received career guidance during, and in some cases after, the doctoral program. They also received help from their mentors throughout coursework and especially during the dissertation process. Finally, many received support during times of both personal and professional difficulty.

Research on Academic Career Preparation

The findings of this study on the preparation of doctoral students in the applied field of Student Affairs can be compared and contrasted with the findings on preparing doctoral students for the professoriate. Nyquist and Woodford (2000) identified doctoral students' concerns regarding knowledge gaps in being prepared for teaching, research, and service for positions in liberal arts colleges and research/comprehensive universities. Many doctoral students said they were not clear about the expectations of an academic

career. In particular, the practical experiences they received through teaching and research assistantships did not adequately prepare them for institutional politics, interdisciplinary teaching, committee work and other service assignments. Doctoral students also expressed concerns about work/life balance, professional isolation and lack of student interaction.

Nyquist and Woodford (2000) also identified students' disappointments in the lack of quality mentoring that they received during their doctoral programs regarding the career aspects of their relationships. They stressed that mentoring needs to begin earlier, to be more systemic, to be based on a multiple-mentor model and to formally include teaching and curriculum concerns and career planning (p. 13). Also, many students described a lack in the psychosocial aspects of their relationships as well. A number of students wished their mentors were more explicit in providing concrete direction, performance feedback, and emotional support.

In contrast to their professoriate-bound counterparts, the SSAO participants in this study found that they were very well prepared for their senior roles in the applied field of Student Affairs. They had multiple conversations with their mentors about institutional politics and other aspects related to the senior leadership of a higher education institution. They were also very happy with the level of their mentoring relationships, as students got to know their mentors on a professional level through course work and the dissertation process. They also connected with their mentors on a personal level and some developed friendships that still continue. Like those in the earlier studies, they were also concerned about work/life balance as well as identifying with the mission of the institution.

In the national survey on doctoral education and career preparation mentioned earlier, Golde and Dore (2001) collected data from many disciplines within the arts and sciences. They identified three areas that were critical to professional development for the professoriate: students' goals, training, and the career itself. Their results showed that there was not enough emphasis and discussion in any one specific area to successfully prepare Arts and Sciences doctoral students as college or university professors. The students in that study had the goal of becoming professors and received a great deal of knowledge and research within their content areas. But, they did not receive substantive training or knowledge about service, university structure, and other components of the professoriate, and therefore were poorly prepared for the actual career.

By applying the metric just described- students' goals, training and the actual career itself- to the findings of my study, it becomes clear that the SSAOs all had the goals of becoming senior leaders in Student Affairs. The training they received within their doctoral programs mainly consisted of theory regarding student development and higher education as a highly complex and political organization. Few students had assistantships in areas outside of Student Affairs and developed additional skills in those areas. Yet, they said they were not specifically trained for the actual career of an SSAO, but were prepared for senior leadership in general. As they entered their roles as SSAOs, they felt quite confident in their preparation, part of this being conversations with either their mentors or other faculty members who were familiar with the role itself.

Golde and Dore (2004) later compared findings about academic preparation in two vastly different academic disciplines: English Literature and Chemistry. They found that in English Literature, doctoral students spent several years in focused course work.

In addition, the culture of English Literature doctoral programs promoted the goal of training to enter the professoriate primarily in liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and community colleges. This training occurred through graduate course work and teaching assistantships in undergraduate English and literature classes, yet it was rare for students to serve as an apprentice to a particular faculty member. The students did not complete much of their dissertation work in collaboration with a faculty member as lead author; this resulted in a dissertation solely written by the doctoral student generally published as a monograph. The overall sense of the doctoral students in these programs was one of independence and isolation. In addition, despite their training for the academy, many doctoral students in this discipline found themselves underprepared to teach graduate-level courses, to use instructional technology, or to advise undergraduate students.

In comparison, chemistry doctoral students completed course work within the first one to two years. After the first year, students continued to learn in more informal settings: seminars, journal clubs, lab meetings, and during proposal writing (Golde and Dore, 2004, p. 34). The doctoral students spent most of their time in the laboratory under the supervision of their advisor and in a collaborative effort with others in their cohort, and with postdoctoral students and lab technicians. Their dissertations were a series of experiments and research papers geared toward publication and advisors provided feedback on whether or not the dissertation contained a substantive number of works. With many options open to graduates of these programs, including college and university teaching, private industry and government positions, fewer graduates considered faculty positions, which are less lucrative than positions in government or private industry. Those

who did consider faculty positions, as in English Literature programs, preferred liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and community colleges over research university settings.

In looking at the findings from this study, the doctoral students from this applied field of Student Affairs/Higher Education Administration seemed to share some qualities with each of these diverse disciplines. Similar to the chemistry programs surveyed, the doctoral students in this dissertation study worked collaboratively with their faculty advisor, in particular during the dissertation stage. Also, none of those interviewed considered faculty positions, as they all wanted to continue to work in the applied field of Student Affairs/Higher Education Administration. Similar to the English programs, all those interviewed expressed the idea that their programs were geared toward one specific goal: becoming practicing administrators within higher education in general and Student Affairs in particular.

There were also marked differences between the findings of this study and those on the two academic disciplines. Chemistry doctoral programs placed a strong focus on collaboration within the laboratory settings. None of the SSAOs described collaborative efforts with other cohort members or groups projects as a hallmark of their preparation. Chemistry programs also focused on a strong apprenticeship component within the curriculum lasting throughout their program. A small number of the SSAOs described an assistantship with an upper-level administrator in another area of Higher Education, but none described a consistent apprenticeship experience with a practitioner from whom they learned the day-to-day functions of an SSAO.

Students in English doctoral programs were primarily socialized to become faculty members through the experiential learning components of their programs. This occurred through teaching assistantships, where students taught undergraduate level courses in English literature and writing. The SSAOs in this study were primarily socialized to become upper level administrators in Higher Education, yet they did not have much direct contact with, or opportunities to participate in experiential learning with a practicing SSAO.

The preparation received in Higher Education Administration/Students Affairs programs are similar to some academic disciplines in some aspects of the socialization process, but very different in that future SSAOs are generally not provided opportunities to practice their skills during the doctoral process as others are allowed to do within academic preparation programs, such as Chemistry and English.

Research on Professional Education in Applied Fields

Golde (2008) described three areas in professional education that are essential in the formation of practitioners in various applied fields including lawyers, medical doctors, psychologists and theologians. These areas are viewed through the framework of an apprenticeship. The kind of apprenticeship they argue for- being apprenticed *with* rather than *to*- is critical for the twenty-first century because it puts ideas and learning at the center of relationships (Golde, 2008, p. 115).

The intellectual apprenticeship focuses on the content of the profession and socializes students to begin thinking like a practitioner within the given field. The skill apprenticeship provides students with opportunities to act as a professionals through

practical activities, beginning with simple tasks and working toward more complex activities and procedures. The third apprenticeship is one of identity and purpose. This introduces students to the guidelines and ethics of the profession in which they will practice.

Looking at the SSAOs' professional development, they seemed to have been engaged in the intellectual aspect of apprenticeship through coursework, learning deeply about various theories on student affairs and development and having conversations with their mentors. Many did not seem to have strong experiences in skill building and development within their programs. As mentioned earlier, some did have assistantships in other areas of Higher Education that allowed them to develop new skills, but this was not a universal experience. Finally, some seemed to have conversations with their mentors, or other faculty members, about their identity and purpose as an SSAO. Yet, this aspect of identity and purpose did not seem to be a strong aspect of preparation within their programs.

Limitations of the Study

One major limitation of the study was the identification of SSAO participants. The sources used to identify possible participants were data from NASPA's (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators) New SSAO Cohort program and the online biographies of SSAOs at various colleges and universities. Starting with those who did fit the criteria, I engaged in snowball sampling, as one participant recommended that I contact another SSAO from her cohort to participate. Unfortunately, many potential participants did not fit one of the two study criteria: having earned a Ph.D. in Higher

Education Administration/Student Affairs or being able to identify a faculty mentor. In addition, of the participants who did fit the criteria, two were later deemed ineligible to participate, one because his mentor passed away (which will be explained in regard to the next limitation) and the other because his identified mentor chose not to participate in the study. Given the low number of participants in this study, the findings may not be as sound or as generalizable when applied to the SSAO population at large.

An additional limitation of this study was the ethnic makeup of the sample. The original intent was to recruit a wide variety of faculty mentors and SSAOs, diverse in both gender and racial makeup. The gender makeup of the sample was fairly balanced with seven women and six men. Yet, given the small number who were eligible to participate, only two female participants were people of color; one faculty mentor was Latina and one SSAO was African American. In addition, the participants of color who did qualify were from large and predominantly white institutions, except for The Urban University, which predominantly serves Latino and African-American students. One potential participant was an African American male SSAO who would have added great richness to the study. After he was identified after our initial correspondence, he said in a later conversation that he could identify two faculty mentors but both had passed away. Because his mentors could not be interviewed, he was also not eligible to participate.

The final limitation was the type of doctoral program investigated in this study. None of the four programs examined required students to participate in practica components, allowing students to apply learned theory to practice. This is not necessarily typical, as many doctoral programs do require this experience.

Implications

The goal of this study was to investigate the perceptions that mentors and SSAOs have about mentoring and the professional development of SSAOs. The results revealed that this group of SSAO participants entered their doctoral programs with fairly clear ideas of what the role of SSAO encompassed. Is this experience generally the case and is this generalizable to all doctoral students in Higher Education Administration/Student Affairs doctoral programs? More importantly, the results also revealed that although Higher Education Administration is an applied field, the SSAO's had little opportunity to apply their theory, knowledge, and experience in actual student affairs situations during the course of their doctoral programs.

Walker, Golde, et al (2008) view the preparation of students in Ph.D. programs not only as providing education at the doctoral level, but preparing students to take responsibility for the trajectory of their own careers and, more importantly, to carry on the legacy of their given disciplines:

> By invoking the term *steward*, and by focusing on the formation of scholars who can indeed be good stewards, we intend to convey a sense of purpose for doctoral education that is larger than the individual and implies action. A scholar is a steward of the discipline, or the larger field, not simply the manager of her own career. (p.12)

In looking at science doctoral programs, faculty members who serve as advisors are also practicing scientists (chemist, biologists, physicians) who aim to produce the next generation of scientists. The dynamic within these programs are in line with the ideas that Walker and Golde describe, of creating stewards, those who will continue within the

footsteps of their mentors and carry on the work they began in graduate school. Yet, Paglis, Green and Bauer (2006) found in their study that even after 5.5 years with their faculty mentor practitioner in a research university environment, there was no correlation between the mentoring relationship and the students' commitment to a research career in the sciences. This lack of correlation was based on the students' direct observations of the challenges and conflicts within the mentors' academic careers and the difficulty of maintaining a satisfying work/life balance.

In comparison to the findings with science doctoral students, many of the mentors in this study were not practicing SSAOs, and, as explained earlier, students may have been referred to other faculty members with SSAO knowledge or experience when necessary. Still, though none had a practicing SSAO as a faculty mentor, all eight of these students chose to stay on their SSAO career paths. Does this mean that it is better to not have a practitioner as a mentor in an applied field? Or does it mean that not having a practicing mentor shields doctoral students from the daily realities of the role to which they aspire? If so, is this the true mission of doctoral education?

Perhaps it means that doctoral students in Higher Education Administration/ Student Affairs doctoral programs are missing an important element of their education by not having a current practitioner as a mentor or a practice component as part of the curriculum. A large body of literature addresses the Ed.D. versus Ph.D. debate (R.D. Brown, 1990; Neumann, 2005; Richardson & Walsh, 1978; Toma, 2002) which has discussed an either/or approach to doctoral education. Generally, Ph.D. programs are for those in training to be academic researchers and Ed.D. programs are for those who wish to be practitioners within the applied field of education.

Since the Ph.D. is granted to those who wish to be practitioners and senior-level administrators in Higher education Administration, why not transform the "either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D." dilemma into a "both/and" solution. A Ph.D. degree with both research and practice components makes the doctoral student a more marketable and valuable administrator for any college or university. Providing a research background allows the student to interpret the results of scientific experiments and assessments of all types of academic and student affairs programs. This degree would also help to provide credibility in the eyes of other faculty and researchers on the academic side of the institution who hold Ph.D.s. Providing the practice component within this degree would allow the doctoral student to engage in senior-level administrative issues and opportunities, while providing an environment in which students can deconstruct their perspectives and actions in addressing the issues with practitioners. This model would help to address the legendary chasm between academic affairs and student affairs and would provide more credibility for the SSAO to guide student affairs divisions in furthering the institution's academic mission for student learning.

Given this new model, three implications based on this study could improve the practical career preparation aspects of doctoral programs in Higher Education Administration/Student Development. Programs could provide mentors from the field, offer more apprenticeship opportunities, and increase faculty awareness of the need for mentoring.

Provide Mentors from the Field

One implication of the finding that not all mentors are familiar with the role of the SSAO is that doctoral programs provide more than one faculty mentor for each doctoral student. This model would build upon the research of Parks (2000), which supports the idea of having mentoring communities or multiple mentors allowing students to receive mentoring from different sources and perspectives. In addition to their faculty mentors, doctoral students would also be paired up with a "Mentor of Practice." This mentor would be an alumnus from their doctoral program who serves as an SSAO and with whom doctoral students can have direct conversations. These mentors could also be senior leaders other than SSAOs. These leaders would help provide multiple lenses through which doctoral students could view institutional issues, understand the perspectives of other constituencies and colleagues within the university, and address problems and issues from a multi-disciplinary approach. This would also allow for practical interactions with SSAOs and other senior leaders about day-to-day functions, about how the role affects family and personal lives, and discussions about future career options. Students could also speak with their Mentor of Practice about how theory and practice do (or do not) coincide when working with students and managing staff.

Increase Apprenticeship Experiences

A second implication is that given how many students had positive experiences within the doctoral program, they seemed to lack practical experiences in learning about the day-to-day life of an SSAO. This situation could be addressed by the creating a mandatory apprenticeship experience for all Higher Education Administration/Student

Affairs doctoral programs consisting of a semester apprenticeship with a practicing SSAO.

Walker et. al. (2008) view mentoring between faculty members and doctoral students through the lens of an apprenticeship:

> Apprenticeship should, in our view, be understood more broadly as a theory of learning and a set of practices that are widely relevant. Seen this way, apprenticeship can and should inform and strengthen all aspects of the doctoral program, whether during advanced classes, in the course of working in the lab, while teaching undergraduates, during seminars, while having conferences in an office, or in hallway conversations ….Apprenticeship pedagogies demand purposeful participation by both students and faculty. (p. 91)

Given this perspective, Walker et. al. believe that students should have opportunities to connect with multiple mentors during their experience:

> The traditional apprenticeship model is typically conceived as a pairing of two individuals, but the multifaceted, integrative learning expected of today's PhD's requires growth on a number of dimensions…Today's students are thus best served by having several intellectual mentors. (p. 94)

This type of experience is already a common practice in master's programs in Higher Education Administration/Student Affairs and would add an important experiential learning component to doctoral students' overall educational experience and career development. Like teaching assistantships for doctoral students preparing to enter the professoriate, this type of internship for doctoral students would, introduce students to the practical work of an SSAO and allow them to apply theory to practice before their

first official SSAO position. This experience should occur toward the end of the student's coursework phase, as it will help students put their newly learned theory and former experiences into practice. This apprenticeship experience would also help inform the dissertation process, as the topic might be based more on a practical issue that the student encountered during the apprenticeship.

Increase Faculty Awareness of Mentoring

The third issue this study raised is that faculty mentors were not fully aware of the impact they had upon their students regarding preparation for the SSAO role and leadership. In the interviews, faculty mentors also said that they mainly received feedback from their students on their role as director in helping the student finish the dissertation process and not on things learned relating to the SSAO position. Perhaps one reason for this is that students are not aware of the mentor's role in their career development until they have been in the role for some years and can reflect back upon the mentoring experience itself and share those reflections anecdotally with the mentor.

It would be helpful for faculty to hear from their former students in a formal and systemic way so they understand how they affected the students' career preparation process. One way to gather this feedback would be for the doctoral program to issue a survey to those alumni/alumnae who have been SSAOs for a certain number of years. This would create data on the role of faculty mentors in the area of career aspects of mentoring. The data would also provide more material for further research and allow institutions to document the effectiveness of their faculty and the impact of the doctoral program itself.

This finding also indicates that doctoral program faculty should be better educated on the impact of their role as faculty mentors. As each cohort is selected and oriented into its own doctoral experience, faculty would be oriented prior to the cohort's arrival about the importance and impact of faculty, in particular the psychosocial development that occurs over the course of the doctoral student mentoring experience. This would provide a more complete context regarding the role of the faculty mentor.

Increase Post-graduate Communities of Practice

As earlier noted, many of the mentoring relationships were well developed in the psychosocial area and continued after the doctoral program experience. There were SSAOs who mentioned the importance of writing as an outcome of their programs. They also mentioned that they wished to continue their scholarly work with their mentor, yet due to job responsibilities, they found this to be early impossible. One last recommendation would be for professional organizations such as NASPA and ACPA to provide funding for mentors and their former protégés to continue their scholarly work that began in the doctoral program setting. This would increase the number of senior leaders who would contribute research to the field. It would also allow a senior practitioner's voice to be heard from the field to provide additional, and perhaps contrasting, perspectives to research being conducted by faculty.

<div align="center">

Suggestions for Future Research

</div>

As described in Chapter 2, the terms "mentor" and 'mentoring' have multiple definitions. It also is a term that is very subjective. One faculty mentor who was asked to

be part of the sample, Ben Green, declined to participate in the study because he said that he had difficulty with the term "mentor." In his email response, he stated:

> I'm not sure I'm the best person for your study. I have all kinds of problems with the term "mentor." Most of my concerns are personal. I really don't like being anyone's mentor. It puts too much pressure on me. I would rather be a friend and confidante to particular students…..I hope you understand. Remember, this is very subjective in my part. In no way do I mean to challenge the significance of your work. Think of it as my own personal hang up, nothing more, nothing less.

I believe this perspective of difficulty with the term "mentor" merits more research.

In this dissertation, mentors were asked if either they or the program adequately prepared students for positions of senior leadership in Student Affairs. Their responses indicated that more research is needed in this area, as they generally felt that they did not contribute in this way. Another interesting finding was that the SSAOs believed that their faculty mentors did prepare them for both the SSAO positions and senior leadership. For future research, I recommended investigating why the mentors and SSAOs felt that way and what led to those perceptions.

The doctoral students in this study had a sense of the role of an SSAO before they moved into it. Further research could be conducted on how their perceptions of the position before they experienced it compared with their later perceptions of the actual role after they experienced it. A pre-and post- study could be conducted, as it was not within the scope of this study.

Conclusion

A group of participants consisting of five faculty mentors and eight of their former doctoral students/current Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) were interviewed to gain insights into their perceptions of the effects of faculty mentoring upon preparation for SSAO positions. Through these interviews, it was discovered that faculty mentors perceive their roles in a variety of ways. Some were mainly focused on helping students complete their doctoral programs, particularly their dissertations as these mentors also served as dissertation chairs. Yet these relationships also showed personal connections between mentor and student. Other mentors took a fully holistic approach to mentoring: they developed a strong focus on the students completing the doctoral program, but kept an equally strong focus on how the students were doing in other parts of their lives. Overall, the mentors held conversations with their former students about career paths, choosing the best position and work/life balance. The mentors generally agreed that they did not specifically discuss the day-to-day functions of an SSAO, yet they did discuss the broad topic of senior leadership in colleges and universities.

The SSAOs in the study also agreed that their mentors practiced various styles of mentoring, and additionally challenged them in very concrete ways: writing style, choices of dissertation topics, working during their doctoral programs. These challenges were sometimes difficult to discern at the time, but in retrospect, the SSAOs felt that their mentors always had their best interests at heart. The most interesting finding was that the SSAOs did feel that their mentors prepared them for their current positions. They may not have engaged in explicit discussions about the day-to-day functions of the position, but they did address larger issues of institutional vision and mission, how the role fits into

the larger governance structure, and how the role affects Student Affairs staff and the student experience.

Doctoral education plays a crucial role in the academy as its primary purpose is to provide students with an in-depth knowledge of a specific discipline and to prepare them to join the next generation of scholars and practitioners. This study has shown not only the successful completion of doctoral programs, but also more importantly the impact of faculty mentors in this process and areas of further improvement for doctoral education itself. I believe that allowing the addition of an apprenticeship within the doctoral process would make a good preparation process even better. In this way, students in Higher Education Administration/Student Affairs doctoral programs would be more fully prepared for the practical aspects of the SSAO position and would also gain the theoretical knowledge and mentorship that is currently provided.

References

Ackerman, A., DiRamio, D., & Wilson, J. (2005). Knowledge and involvement of
   student affairs officers in financial decision-making: A challenge for the
   profession. *College Student Affairs Journal,* 25(1), 64-75.

Adams, K. (2002). What colleges and universities want in a new faculty. Washington,
   DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from
   http://www.aacu.edu.org/pff/pdfs/PF_Adams.PDF.

Allen, T. (2007). Mentoring relationships from the perspective of the mentor. In Ragins,
   B. & Kram, K. (Eds.). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and
   practice* (pp. 95-121). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Allen, T., Poteet, M., & Russell, J. (2000). Protégé selection by mentors: What makes the
   difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(3), 271-282.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Doctoral education: Present realities and future trends. *College
   and University Journal*, *80(2)*, 3-10.

Ambert, A. M., Adler, P. A., Adler, P., & Detzner, D. F. (1995). Understanding and
   evaluating qualitative research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57(4)*, 879-
   893.

American Anthopological Association (1997). Mentoring and gender diversity: Issues for
   lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students. Retrieved February 13, 2006,
   from http://www.aaanet. org/reports/mentoring.htm.

American Council on Education Studies (1937). The student personnel point of view.
   Retrieved December 2, 2010, from http://www.bgsu.edu/colleges/library/cac/sahp
   /pages/resources2.html.

148

American Council on Education Studies (1949). The student personnel point of view.

    Retrieved December 2, 2010, from http://www.bgsu.edu/colleges/library/cac/sahp

    /pages/resources2.html.

American College Personnel Association/College Student Educators International (2008).

    The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs. Retrieved

    November 12, 2010 from http://www.myacpa.org/sli_delete/sli.htm.

American College Personnel Association (2010). The Student Learning Imperative:

    Implications for Student Affairs. Retrieved August 5, 2010 from

    http://www.acpa.nche.edu/sli/sli.htm.

Anderson, M. S., & Seashore Louis, K. (1991). The changing locus of control over

    faculty research: From self-regulation to dispersed influence. In J. C. Smart (Ed.),

    Higher education: Handbook of theory and research (Vol. VII). pp. 57–101. New

    York, NY: Agathon.

Apel, S. (1999). Principle 1: Good Practice Encourages Student Faculty Contact. *Journal*

    of Legal Education, 49(3), 371-385.

Arnold, K. (1982). Career development for the experienced student affairs professional.

    NASPA Journal, *20*(2), 3-8.

Association of American Universities. (2010). *Graduation in the national interest.*

    Retrieved from http://www.aau.edu/research/article.aspx?id=4668.

Association of American Universities. (2011). *Understanding doctoral education in the*

    u.s.pdf. Retrieved from http://www.aau.edu/research/article.aspx?id=4668&

    linkidentifier=id&itemid=4668.

Auster, D. (1984). Mentors and proteges: Power-dependent dyads. *Sociological Inquiry* 54(2), 142–153.

Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), Assessing academic climates and cultures. New Directions in Institutional Research, No. 68. pp. 61–74. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Austin, A. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(1), 94-122.

Austin, A., & Wulff, D. H. (2004). *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Baernsein, A & Fryer-Edwards, K. (2003). Promoting reflection on professionalism: A comparison trial of educational interventions for medical students. *Academic Medicine, 78(7),* 742-747.

Barger, R. R., & Mayo-Chamberlain, J. (1983). Advisor and advisee issues in doctoral education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *54*(4), 407-432.

Becher, T. (1984). The cultural view. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), Perspectives on higher education: Eight disciplinary and comparative views. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Becher, T. (1987). The disciplinary shaping of the profession. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional setting. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bennetts, C. (2002). Traditional mentor relationships, intimacy and emotional intelligence. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *15*(2), 155-170.

Bess, J. L. (1978). Anticipatory socialization of graduate students. *Research in Higher Education*, 8, 289–317.

Biddix, J. P. (2009). *Career paths to the SSAO for men and women at four-year institutions*. Manuscript in preparation.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 195–203.

Blake-Beard, S.D., O'Neill, R.M. & McGowan, E. (2007). Blind dates?: The importance of matching in formal mentoring programs. In B.R. Ragins & K.E. Kram (Eds), *The handbook of mentoring*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Blimling, G. S. (2002). Reflections on career development among student affairs leaders. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2002(98),* 27-37.

Bloland, P. A. (1979). Student personnel training for the chief student affairs officer: Essential or unnecessary. *NASPA Journal*, *17*(2), 57-62.

Bona, M. J., Rinehart, J., & Volbrecht, R. M. (1995). Show me how to do like you: Co-mentoring as feminist pedagogy. *Feminist Teacher*, *9(3)*, 116-124.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). The state nobility: Elite schools in the field. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings. In *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments*. 3-44. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Brooks, G. D. & Avila, J. F. (1974). A descriptive profile of junior college presidents. Research in Education, 2(2). 145-150.

Brown II, C. M., Davis, J. L., & McClendon, S. A. (1999). Mentoring graduate students

of color: Myths, models and modes. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *74*(2), 105-118.

Brown, R. D. (1985). Graduate education for the student development educator: A content and process model. *NASPA Journal*, *22*(3), 39-43.

Brown, R. D. (1987). Professional pathways and professional education. In L. V. Moore & R. B. Young (Eds.), *Expanding opportunities for professional education* (pp. 5–18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Butcher, D. (2006). Adviser, teacher, role model, friend?What is a mentor? Retrieved from http://learningsource.od.nih.gov/stride/ mentor.htm.

Campbell, D. E., & Campbell, T. A. (2000). The mentoring relationship: Differing perceptions of benefits. *College Student Journal*, *34*(1), 516-523.

Carpenter, S., & Stimpson, M. T. (2007). Professionalism, scholarly practice, and professional development in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, *44*(2), 265-284.

Chandler, D. E., & Kram, K. E. (2007). Mentoring and developmental networks in the new career context. In H.P. Gunz & M.A. Peiperl (Eds.), *Handbook of career studies.* 241-267. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chao, G.T., Waltz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, *45(3),* 619-636.

Clark, S. (1987). The academic profession and career: Perspectives and problems. *Teaching Sociology*, *14*(1), 24-34.

Cohen, J. (2007) Linking Professionalism to humanism: What it means, why it matters.

Academic Medicine, 82(11), 1029-1032.

College Student Educators International (1994). *Principles of good practice for student affairs.* Retrieved from http://www.myacpa.org/pgp/principle.htm.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Plano Clark, V. L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research designs: Selection and implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*(2), 236-264.

Dadonna, M. F., Cooper, D., & Dunn, M. S. (2006). Career paths and expectations of recent doctoral graduates in student affairs. *NASPA Journal, 43*(2), 203-215.

Dalcourt, C. J., Jr. (2002, November/December). Mentoring: Establishing a legacy, shaping the future. *Combined Arms Center Military Review, November-December English Edition,* 35-39.

Darling, N., Hamilton, S. F., & Hames, K. (2005). Relationships outside the family: Unrelated adults. In G. R. Adams & M.D. Berzonsky, (Eds.) *Blackwell encyclopedia of adolescence.* Retrieved November 12, 2007, from http://www.blackwellreference.com/public/tocnode?id=g9781405133029_chunk_g978140513302919

Dedrick, R. F., & Watson, F. (2002). Mentoring needs of female, minority and international graduate students: A content analysis if academic research guides and related print material. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 10*(3), 275-289.

Dilley, P. (2000). Conducting successful interviews: Tips for intrepid research. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 131-137.

Dougherty, T. W., & Dreher, G. F. (2007). Mentoring and career outcomes: Conceptual

    and methodological issues in an emerging literature. B. R. Ragins & K. E. Crams

    (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*. 51-

    93. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Dreher, G. F. & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and

    women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, 75(5), 539-546.

Ellinger, A. D. (2002). Mentoring in contexts: The workplace and educational

    institutions. In C.A. Hansman (Ed.). *Critical perspectives in mentoring: Trends*

    & Issues Information Series no. 388, (pp. 15-26). Retrieved December 12, 2007,

    from http://www.calpro-online.org/eric/docs/mott/mentoring4.pdf

Ender, S. C., Newton, F. B., & Caple, R. B. (2006) Contributions to learning:

    Present realities. New Directions for Student Services, 75. 5-17.

Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of

    proteges versus non-proteges. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 10(4),

    309-320.

Fagenson-Eland, E., M. A. Marks, and K. L. Amendola. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring

    relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 51(1), 29-42.

Flanagan, W. J. (2006). The future of the small college dean: Challenges and

    opportunities. *New Directions for Student Services*, *116*, 67-79.

Fried, J. (2002). The scholarship of student affairs: Integration and application. *NASPA*

    Journal, *39*(2), 120-131.

Fullerton, H. (1998). *Mentoring in higher education*. Washington: Staff and Educational

Development Association.

Gaffney, N.A. (Ed.). (1995). A conversation about mentoring: Trends and models. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.

Garmel, G. (2004) Mentoring medical students in academic emergency medicine. *Academic Emergency Medicine, 11(*12), 1351-1357.

Gemme, B. (2005). *The changing career preferences of doctoral students*. Lecture presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. In C. Calhoun, J. Gerteis, J. Moody, S. Pfaff, I. Virk (Eds.), Contemporary sociological theory, 2nd Edition, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia: A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts (www.phd-survey.org).

Golde, C. M. and Dore, T. M. (2004) The survey of doctoral education and career preparation: The importance of disciplinary contexts," In *Path to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty*, Donald H. Wulff, Ann E. Austin, & Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Golde, C.M. and Walker, G.E. (Eds.) (2006) Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Golde, C. M. (2008) Applying Lessons from Professional Education to the Preparation of the Professoriate. *New Directions for teaching & Learning, No. 113, Spring 2008. Wiley Periodicals.*

Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisers: Relationships

    with doctoral student potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel*

    Psychology, *48*(3), 537-561.

Healy, C. C., & Welchert, A. J. (1990). Mentoring relations: A definition to advance

    research and practice. *Educational Researcher, 19*(9), 17-21.

Hirt, J. B. (2007). The student affairs profession in the academic marketplace. *NASPA*

    Journal, *44*(2), 245-264.

Holland, J. W. (1993). *Relationships between African American doctoral students and*

    their major advisors. Lecture presented at annual meeting of the American

    Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Hollingsworth, M., & Fassinger, R. (2002). The role of faculty mentors in the research

    training of counseling psychology doctoral students. *Journal of Counseling*

    Psychology, *49*(3), 324-330.

Holmes, D. R. (1982). Exploring career patterns in student affairs: Problems of

    conception and methodology. *NASPA Journal*, *20*(2), 27-35.

Horvath, J. A., Forsythe, G. B., Bullis, R. C., Sweeney, P. J., Williams, W. M., McNally,

    J. A.,Wattendorf, J., & Sternberg, R. J. (1999). Experience, knowledge, and

    military leadership. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Horvath (Eds), Tacit knowledge in

    professional practice: Researcher and practitioner perspectives (pp. 39–48).

    Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Israel, J. (1966). Problems of role-learning." In Sociological theories in progress.

    J. Berger, Zelditch, and B. Anderson(Eds.). Vol. 1. 199-212, Boston: Houghton

    Mifflin.

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(4), 505-532.

Johnsrud, L. K. & Rosser, V. J. (1996). *College and university mid-level administrators: Their perceptions of their work life and morale*. Refereed paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Johnsrud, L. K., Heck, R. H., & Rosser, V. J. (2000). Morale matters: Midlevel administrators and their intent to leave. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*(1), 34-59.

Johnson, W., Koch, C., Fallow, G., & Huwe, J. (2000). Prevalence of mentoring in clinical versus experimental doctoral programs: Survey finding, implications, and recommendations. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *37*(4), 325-334.

Johnson, N.B. & Scandura, T.A. (1994). The effect of mentorship and sex-role style on male-female earnings. *Industrial Relations*, 33, 263-274.

Kelly, S., & Schweitzer, J. H. (1999). Mentoring within a graduate school setting. *College Student Journal*, *33*(1), 130-149.

Kinnick, B. C., & Bollheimer, R. L. (1984). College president's perceptions of student affairs issues and development needs of chief student affairs officers. *NASPA Journal*, *22*(2), 2-9.

Komives, S. R., & Kuh, G. (1988). "The right stuff": Some thoughts on attracting good people to student affairs work. In R. B. Young & L. V. Moore (Eds.). *The state of the art of professional education and practice.* 1–20. Washington, DC: Commission on Professional Education in Student Personnel.

Knox, S., Schlosser, L.Z., Pruitt, N. & Hill, C. E. (2006) A qualitative examination of

graduate advising relationships: The advisor perspective. *The Counseling Psychologist,* 34(4), 489-518

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentoring relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 608-625.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. London: Scott, Foresman.

Kram, K.E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Kram, K.E. and D.T. Hall (1996). Mentoring in a context of diversity and turbulence. In E. E. Kossek and S. Lobel (Eds.) *Management Diversity: Human Resource Strategies for Transforming Organizations*, 108-136. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishers.

Kuh, C. (1997). Is there a Ph.D. glut? Retrieved September 20, 2006, from http://www.cgsnet.org /vcr/kuh.htm.

Kuh, G. D., Evans, N. J., & Duke, A. (1983). Career paths and responsibilities of chief student affairs officers. *NASPA Journal*, *21*(1), 39-47.

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in american colleges and universities. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1*. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Lankau, M., & Scandura, T. A. (2007). *Mentoring as a forum for learning in organizations*.

Laslett, B., and Thorne, B. (Eds). (1997). Feminist sociology: Life histories of a movement. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lawing, M. A., Moore, L. V., & Groseth, R. (1982). Enhancement and advancement: Professional development for student affairs staff. *NASPA Journal*, *20*(2), 22-26.

Leithwood, K.A., Steinbach, R. (1995). *Expert problem solving: Evidence from school and district leaders.* Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York, NY: Ballantine

Levy, D. (2003, March 19). Presidential award honors Robert Gray for mentoring women engineers. *Stanford Report*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.

Luna, G., & Cullen, D. (1998). Do graduate students need mentoring? *College Student Journal*, *32*(3), 322-330.

Lyons, W., & Scroggins, D. (1990). The mentor in graduate education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *5*(3), 277-285.

Malaney, G. D. (2002). Scholarship in student affairs through teaching and research. *NASPA Journal*, *39*(2), 132-146.

Manning, K., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. (2006). *One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovative models of student affairs practice.* New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research,* (4th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin, J. & Garth, B. (1994). *Clinical education as a bridge between law school and practice: Mitigating the misery. Clinical Law Review, 443(1), 443-456.*

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interpretive Approach,* (2nd ed.)Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McGowan, E. (2001). *Texts and contexts of reciprocity: Five models of mentoring* Unpublished Qualifying Paper. Harvard Graduate School of Education. Cambridge, MA.

McGowan, E. (2004). *Relationship work: A descriptive theory of a faculty-to faculty formal mentoring program in higher education*. Doctoral dissertation. Harvard Graduate School of Education. Cambridge, MA.

McGuire, G., & Reger, J. (2003). Feminist co-mentoring: A model for academic professional development. *NWSA Journal*, *15*(1), 54-72.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Mincemoyer, C., & Thompson, J. S. (1998). Establishing effective mentoring relationships for individual and organizational success. *Journal of Extension*, *36*(2). Retrieved March 3, 2007, from http://www.joe.org/joe/1998april/a2 .html.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education) (1987). *A perspective on student affairs: A statement issued on the 50th anniversary of the Student Personnel Point of View.* Retrieved November 27, 2010 from the website of the Bowling Green State University Student Affairs History Project at http://www.naspa.org/pubs/ files/StudAff_1987.pdf.

Nestor-Baker, N., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). The tacit knowledge of productive scholars in education. *Teachers College Record*, *106*(7), 1484-1511.

Nestor-Baker, N., Tschannen-Moran, M., Lippa, A., & Floyd, L. (2002, April). *The tacit knowledge of highly productive professors of educational administration*. Address

presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association,

New Orleans, LA.

Nyquist, J., & Woodford, B. (2000). *Re-envisioning the Ph.D.: What Concerns Do We Have?* Seattle, WA; Center for Instructional development and Research. Retrieved October 10, 2006, from http://www.grad.washington.edu /envision/project_resources/concerns.html.

O'Grady, C.G. (1998) Preparing students for the profession: Clinical education, collaborative pedagogy, and the realities of practice for the new lawyer. *Clinical Law Review, Vol. 4, 485-530.*

O'Neil, R., Blake-Beard, S., and McGowan, E. (2007). Blind dates? The importance of matching in successful formal mentoring relationships. In B.R.Ragins and K.E. Kram (Eds.) *Handbook of Mentoring.* Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications.

Paglis, L., Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (2006). Does mentoring add value to the training and productivity of scientists? *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 451-476.

Parks, S. (2000). *Big questions, worthy dreams*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. (1980). *Qualitative research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Paul, W. L., & Hoover, R. E. (1980). Chief student personnel administrators. *NASPA Journal*, *18*(2), 34-39.

Penner, R. (2001). Mentoring in higher education. *Direction*, *30*(1), 45-52.

Peterson's Annual Guide to Graduate and Professional Programs (2003). Lawrenceville, NJ: Thomson Peterson's.

Phillips G.M. (1979). The peculiar intimacy of graduate study: A conservative view. *Communication Education*, 28 339-345.

Power, A. (2000) *Mentorship: Applying Some Methods from Musical Pedagogy and Training to the Training of Education Students as Mentors*. Address presented at Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, Australia.

Priest, D. M., Alphenaar, W. J., & Boer, W. J. (1982). Long-range planning implications and applications for the chief personnel administrator. *NASPA Journal*, *18*(1), 2-7.

Rackham Graduate School, University of Michigan. (2010). *How to get the mentoring you want: A guide for graduate students at a diverse university.* Retrieved November 11, 2006, from http://www.rackham.umich.edu/downloads/ publications/mentoring.pdf.

Ragins, B. R., & Kram, K. E. (Eds.). (2007). *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Randall, K., and Globetti, E. (1992). Desired competencies of the chief student affairs officer as perceived by college presidents. *College Student Affairs Journal, 11(3),* 54–61.

Reskin, B.F. (1979) Academic sponsorship and scientists' careers. *Sociology of Education. 52(3),* 129-146.

Rickard, S. T. (1982). Turnover at the top: A study of the chief student affairs officer. *NASPA Journal*, *20*(2), 36-41.

Rickard, S. T. (1985). Career pathways of chief student affairs officers: Making room at the top for females and minorities. *NASPA Journal*, *22*(4), 52-60.

Redman, S.I. (1990) Mentoring and cultural diversity in academic settings. *American Behavioral Scientist* **,** 34,(2) , 188-201.

Roberts, D. M. (2007). Skill development among student affairs professionals. *The

College Student Affairs Journal, *24*(2), 170-179.

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

Rose, G.L., Rukstalis, M.R., and Schuckit, M.A. (2005). Informal mentoring between faculty and medical students. *Academic Medicine*, 80, 344-348.

Rosser, V. J. (2003). Preparing and socializing new faculty members. *The Review of Higher Education*, *26*(3), 387-395.

Rosser, V.J., Javinar, J.M. (2003). Midlevel student affairs leaders' intentions to leave: Examining the quality of their professional and institutional work life. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(6), 813-830.

Rossman, G., & Rallis, S. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (1999). Doctorate in student affairs: Essential skills and competencies for mid-management. *The Journal of College Student Development*, 40(2), 1-9. Retrieved March 1, 2009, from http://findarticles. com /p/articles /mi_qa3752/is_/ai_n8850287.

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

Schlosser, L. Z., & Gelso, C. J. (2001). Measuring the working alliance in advisor/advisee relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*, 157-167.

Schuh, J. H. (2002). Lessons from leaders. *NASPA Journal*, *39*(3), 204-214.

Shay, J. E. (1984). Point of view : The chief student affairs officer and the president: Revisiting an old issue. *NASPA Journal*, *22*(2), 55-58.

Sternberg, R. J. (1984). What should intelligence tests test? Implications of a triarchic

    theory of intelligence for intelligence testing. *Educational Researcher*, *13*(1),

    5-15.

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. Cambridge:

    Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg's Triarchic Theory of Intelligence. (2004, January 24). Retrieved March 7,

    2010, from http://wilderdom.com/personality/L2-2SternbergTriarchicTheory.

    html#Practical.

Tenner, E. (2004). The pitfalls of academic mentorships. *The Chronicle of Higher

    Education, 50(49)*, pp. B7-B10.

Tierney,W. G. (1990). *Assessing academic climates and cultures*. New Directions for

    Institutional Research, No. 68. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and

    socialization in academe.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W. & Rhoads, R. (1994). *Faculty socialization as a cultural process: A mirror

    of institutionalized commitment* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.93-6,

    Rep.). Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, George

    Washington University.

Thornton, R., & Nardi, P. (1975). The dynamics of role acquisition. *The American

    Journal of Sociology*, *80*(4), 870-885.

Trevino, Y. (2010). Mentor versus advisor. Retrieved February 20, 2010, from

    http://www.indiana.edu/~grdschl/mentoring.php.

Tull, A. (2006). Synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new

professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development.* 47(4),
465-480.

Tull, A., & Freeman, J. P. (2008). Chief student affairs officer titles: Standardization of
titles and broadening of labels. *NASPA Journal*, *45*(2), 265-281.

University of Michigan (2006) *How to get the mentoring you want: A guide for graduate
students at a diverse university*. Retrieved November 11, 2006, from University of
Michigan/ The Regents of the University of Michigan website:
http://www.rackham.umich.edu/downloads/pubications/mentoring.pdf.

Van Maanen, J. and E. H. Schein (1979). Toward of theory of organizational
socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 1: 209-264.

Walker, G., Golde C., Jones, L, Bueschel, A.C. (2001). The carnegie initiative on the
doctorate. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved
October 12, 2006 from http://education.illinoi.edu/cid/Summary.pdf.

Wagner, R. K., & Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Practical intelligence in real-world pursuits:
The role of tacit knowledge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*,
436-458.

Wagner, R. K., & Sternberg, R. J. (1986). Tacit knowledge and intelligence in the
everyday world. In R. J. Sternberg & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Practical intelligence:
Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world* (pp. 51-83). Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Wagner, R.K. (1987). Tacit knowledge in everyday intelligent behavior. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 52(6),*1236-1247.

Weidman, J.C., Twale D.J., & Stein, E.L. (2001). Socialization of Graduate and

Professional Students in Higher Education: A Perilous Passage? ASHE-ERIC

Higher Education Report, 28(3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D., & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to

academic norms. *Research in Higher Education*, *44*(6), 641-656.

Welch, O. (1996). *An examination of effective mentoring models in the academy*. Address

presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research

Association, New York.

Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Promoting student success: What student affairs can do* (Occasional

Paper No. 5). Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary

Research.

Wilde, J. B., & Schau, C. G. (1991). Mentoring in graduate schools of education:

Mentees' perceptions. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 59, 165-179.

Williamson, M. J., & Fenske, R. H. (1992). *Mentoring factors in doctoral programs of

Mexican American and American Indians students*. Address presented at the

annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San

Francisco.

Young, R. B. (1985). Impressions of the development of professional identity: From

program to practice. *NASPA Journal, 23*(2), 50-59.

Zuckerman, H. (1996). Scientific elite: Nobel laureates in the united states. Brunswick,

NJ: Transaction.

Appendix I

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (Faculty Mentor)

Part I

- How long have you held your current rank at your institution?

- What was your own experience of being mentored?

- What motivated you to mentor doctoral students?

- How do you choose mentees?

- What is your goal in mentoring doctoral students?

- In what ways do you try to tailor the mentoring experience for each student?

- What keeps you sustained in the work of mentoring doctoral students?

- How have you been paired with doctoral students as their mentor (formally or informally)?

- Approximately, how many students have you mentored?

- How has your approach to mentoring changed over the course of your career?

- What have you learned about yourself as a mentor from this process?

- What are some of the challenges of mentoring doctoral students?

- How have the issues of race, gender and age affected your mentoring relationship with doctoral students?

- Have you received feedback from your former doctoral students about the mentoring you provided? If so, describe that feedback.

- Please describe the general quality/ characteristics of your relationships with your former doctoral students?

- In what ways, if at all, did you address the students' career path?

- In what ways, if at all, do you think the mentoring relationship related to students' understanding of achievement or functioning in the senior Student Affairs leadership role?

Part II
- What do you gain from your experience of mentoring doctoral students?

- What qualities do you believe make you a good mentor?

- Were there any challenges or difficulties in your mentoring relationships?

- How do you try to help students make the connection between classroom theory and application of theory as a practitioner?

- Have you received feedback from former doctoral protégés regarding your mentoring? If so, what was it?

Prompts:

- Did you engage, if at all, your former students in thinking about the role of a Senior Student Affairs leader?

- Did you give your former students specific assignments to engage them in the role of Senior Student Affairs leader?

- Did you engage them in conversations about the role or function of a Senior Student Affairs leader?

- If so, what aspects of the role did you discuss?

- How do you believe that your mentorship adequately prepared your doctoral protégés for their roles as Senior Student Affairs leaders?

Appendix II

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (Senior Student Affairs Officer)
Part 1

- What is your name and rank at your institution?

- How long have you held your current rank at your institution?

- What was the name and location of your doctoral program?

- What years were you in your doctoral program?

- Where you paired with doctoral students as their mentor (formally or informally)?

- Please describe the mentoring relationship with your mentor?

- Where there challenges or difficulties in your relationship with your mentor?

- Did the issues of race, gender, age and orientation affect your mentoring

  relationship with your mentor?

- Did you receive feedback from your mentor regarding your progress as a doctoral

  student?

- If so, how often? What was it? Was it constructive?

Part II

- Was becoming a Senior Student Affairs leader a conscious part of your career

  path?

- Did you ever express to your mentor that you were interested in becoming a

  Senior Student Affairs leader?

- If so, what conversations did you have with your mentor about that role?

- In what way(s) did your doctoral program play a role in preparing you to become

  a Senior Student Affairs leader?

- To what degree, if any, did having a faculty mentor assist you to attain the Senior Student Affairs position?

- How did your mentor help you to make meaning of your doctoral student experiences within the context of professional development for the role of Senior Student Affairs leader?

- Please describe how your mentor provided clarity or insight into your becoming a Senior Student Affairs leader?

- Please describe how your mentor helped you to make the connection between classroom theory and application of theory as a practitioner?

- Did your mentor give you advice that you currently use in your daily work?

- Do you feel that your time with your mentor adequately prepared you for you role as a Senior Student Affairs leader? And if so, how?

- Are you still connected to your doctoral program mentor?

Appendix III

Participant Information

Please complete this information so that I may contact you as needed for this study. This information will be kept separate from other data collected to maintain confidentiality.

Name _____

Title_____

Institution_____

Mailing address: _____

                          _____

                          _____

Email address:_____

Telephone:_____

□ I would like a summary of the results sent to me.
Please send to: □ work address   □email

Appendix IV

Dear Colleague,

My name is Michael Mason and I am a doctoral candidate at Boston College. I am conducting a dissertation study on the perceptions of mentoring in Higher Education doctoral programs. My hope is that this research will reveal a mentoring best practices document for both faculty and students in doctoral education.

I am writing to request your assistance as a subject in this study. You have been selected since you have identified by a former doctoral student as a faculty mentor from his/her doctoral program experience.

As a subject in this study, you will be asked to participate in a two-part interview lasting from sixty to ninety minutes in total and reflect on your mentoring experiences with doctoral students. After the interview has been completed and transcribed, I will share a copy of the transcript with you to receive feedback and ensure its accuracy.

If you choose to participate in this study, your identifying information and institution will remain anonymous in the results of this study through the use of pseudonyms and records of this study will remain private and secure. Your participation in this study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason. If you wish to withdraw, please contact me at the address, phone number, or email address listed below. Furthermore, if you have any questions about my research, please do not hesitate to contact me or my advisor, Dr. Karen Arnold, at any time.

Thank you in advance for your help in the completion of my dissertation.

Sincerely,

Michael C. Mason
107 Ocean Street
Dorchester, MA 02124
(617) 821-2595
mmason1@berklee.edu

Advisor
Dr. Karen Arnold
Higher Education Administration Department
Boston College
(617) 552-2649
arnoldkc@bc.edu

Dear Colleague,

My name is Michael Mason and I am a doctoral candidate at Boston College. I am conducting a dissertation study on the perceptions of mentoring in Higher Education doctoral programs. My hope is that this research will serve as a mentoring best practices document for both faculty and students in doctoral education.

I am writing to request your assistance as a subject in this study. You have been selected because of your role as a senior Student Affairs leader at your institution, you possess an earned doctorate from a Higher Education Administration/Student Affairs doctoral program and you are able to identify a faculty mentor from your doctoral program experience.

As a participant in this study, you will be asked to participate in a two-part interview lasting sixty to ninety minutes total and to reflect on your mentoring experiences with your former doctoral program mentor. After the interview has been completed and transcribed, I will share a copy of the transcript with you to receive feedback and ensure its accuracy.

If you choose to participate in this study, your identifying information and institution will remain anonymous in the results of this study through the use of pseudonyms and records of this study will remain private and secure. Your participation in this study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason. If you wish to withdraw, please contact me at the address, phone number or email listed below. Furthermore, if you have any questions about my research, please do not hesitate to contact me or my advisor, Dr. Karen Arnold, at any time.

Thank you in advance for your help in the completion of my dissertation.

Sincerely,

Michael C. Mason
107 Ocean Street
Dorchester, MA 02124
(617) 821-2595
mmason1@berklee.edu

<u>Advisor</u>
Dr. Karen Arnold
Higher Education Administration Department
Boston College
(617) 552-2649
arnoldkc@bc.edu