

# Basic Communication Course Annual

---

Volume 6

Article 12

---


1994

## TA Mentoring: Issues and Questions

Pamela L. Gray  
*Central Michigan University*

Martin G. Murray  
*Central Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gray, Pamela L. and Murray, Martin G. (1994) "TA Mentoring: Issues and Questions," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 6 , Article 12.

Available at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol6/iss1/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

---

## TA Mentoring: Issues and Questions

### **Cover Page Footnote**

This paper was named a 1993 Speech Communication Association Top Paper. Preliminary drafts of parts of this paper were presented at the Midwest Basic Course Director's Conference, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, February 1993, and the national convention of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, Florida, November 1993.

## **TA Mentoring: Issues and Questions\***

*Pamela L. Gray*  
*Martin G. Murray*

The extensive use of graduate teaching assistants (TAs) as instructors in higher education (Eble, 1987) has spawned concern for ways to maximize their teaching effectiveness. The speech communication discipline has shared this concern (see, for example, Buerkel-Rothfuss & Gray, 1990). One technique that currently is being explored by educators and researchers in speech communication is the use of mentoring with TAs (Avery & Gray, 1992; Bort, 1992; Buerkel-Rothfuss & Fink, 1992; Haleta, 1992; Waggenpack, 1992).

The published literature about mentoring shows that the concept has been prominent in the literature for only about 20 years (Speizer, 1981). Further, the terminology surrounding mentoring is new enough that descriptors such as "mentor" or "sponsor" are not found listed by themselves, making it difficult for educators to access available information.

The current interest in a potentially useful TA training and supervision technique coupled with a lack of published literature aimed at the needs of a TA mentoring program are the basis for this research. This paper will: (a) delineate issues to be addressed by educators interested in starting or changing a TA mentoring program, (b) share feedback from educators who have experience with TA mentoring programs,

---

\*Preliminary drafts of parts of this paper were presented at the Midwest Basic Course Director's Conference, Cedar Rapids, IA, February, 1993 and the national convention of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, FL, November, 1993.

*Mentoring*

(c) present some questions to guide educators deciding about implementing/changing mentoring programs for TAs, and (d) provide a bibliography of literature to guide those interested in integrating these ideas into a TA mentoring program. The information presented in this paper comes from several sources. First, data from a questionnaire given to the 60+ participants of the Midwest Basic Course Director's Conference (MBCDC) in Cedar Rapids, IA in February, 1993, and notes taken during an hour-long discussion at that conference form the foundation of this paper. These participants consisted of people interested in the basic course in speech communication: administrators, basic course directors (BCDs), researchers, instructors and TAs. In addition, research on and experience with mentoring by the authors (e.g., as conference participants, as basic course director or assistant basic course director) enhance the ideas presented.

## ISSUES

In order to assess mentoring as a possible technique in the arsenal of TA training and development, four issues will be highlighted: (a) choosing a guiding definition; (b) deciding on broad program goals; (c) implementing a mentoring format; and (d) choosing, training, and supervising mentors.

### *Choosing a Guiding Definition*

The first issue is the definition of mentoring to be used in the program. Educators must define the term conceptually to guide decisions made in the use of mentors. This section provides some definitions of mentoring that have been found in the literature.

Defining "mentor" is not easy. Labels such as role model, sponsor, peer counselor, advisor, etc. often are used interchangeably with the construct "mentor" (Avery & Gray, 1992).

### *Mentoring*

Further clouding the issue is that many published articles do not state the behaviors/outcomes attached to the word mentor, making it appear as though it was, indeed, one universal behavior/set of behaviors.

Kemper (1968) defined a mentor as a person who "possesses skills and displays techniques which the actor lacks...and from whom, by observation and comparison with his [her] own performance the actor can learn" (pp. 31-45). Hill, Bahniak, and Dobos (1989) described a possible view of mentors in the professional world as "informal tutors who take a parental interest in a younger, less experienced protégé" (p. 15). Another possible definition they posited was that mentoring could be a "communication relationship in which a senior person supports, tutors, guides, and facilitates a junior person's career development" (p. 15). Hill, Rouner, and Bahniak (1987) offered still another definition: Mentoring is a "process whereby individuals within a formal social system offer and receive information and support from one another in a one-way or reciprocal manner, within that system" (p. 4). Waggenspack (1992) summarized Kram's view of mentors as "providing career development/professional roles, which facilitate mentee's upward mobility, and psychosocial roles, which provide nurturance and personal support for the development of professional identity" (p. 2). Dreher and Ash (1990) viewed mentors as models who provide the mentee with information about organizational beliefs and values and set an example for what it takes to be successful in the particular environment.

These definitions contain subtle differences that could impact on decisions made in a mentoring program. For example, one definition only embraces the use of a "senior" person as a mentor. Another definition describes the mentor/mentee relationship only in terms of what the mentee does: By observation and comparison the mentee learns from the mentor. Such differences seem important as they can affect the choices made in a mentoring program, such as who

*Mentoring*

will be used as mentors, whether direct observation of the mentor at work is needed, and so on. In addition, a variety of definitions implies that candidates for mentors and mentees may have differing expectations about the relationship; failure to clarify the expectations for the relationship could undermine its success.

The participants of the MBCDC described programs that viewed mentoring from many differing perspectives. Indeed, about the only commonality was that there was some form of one-on-one contact between the mentor and mentee. Deciding on the definition that will ground a particular program seems to be an early issue for an educator to confront. The definition impacts on almost all other choices made and serves to clarify the nature of a particular program so participants share an overall concept of the mentor/mentee relationship.

### ***Deciding on Broad Program Goals***

A second issue to consider is the broad goals of the mentoring program. Each mentor/mentee pair well may develop its own particular goals; however, deciding on broad goals will help with other decisions of implementation. Five of the possible areas in which to develop goals follow: (a) orientation, (b) social, (c) teaching, (d) graduate work, and (e) expertise.

1. Orientation. Some programs use mentoring to acclimate new TAs to the community, school, department, course, etc. An experienced TA who takes the time to show the new TA around the campus, has maps of the town available, and so on can cut down on the stress of getting lost, etc. Such a mentor may be useful only for the weeks/months prior to coming to graduate school and the first few weeks after arrival on campus.
2. Social. Other programs view mentoring as a way of breaking the ice for the new TA. Starting off the pro-

## *Mentoring*

gram with a specific person designated to introduce the new TA to other TAs, invite the new person to parties, provide transportation to and introductions at department get-togethers, etc. can be a way to help socialization and acculturation during the first days of graduate school. This social mentor may serve a purpose during the first semester/term and then fade from the new TA's life as new friends and other TAs fill this social role.

3. Teaching. One important broad goal may be to increase teaching effectiveness. This could be done by having a person designated to share ideas and materials, observe the new TA teaching and allow the new TA to observe the mentor's teaching, provide feedback on observations, discuss problems and philosophies associated with teaching, etc. This mentor may be chosen after the TA has come to campus, and the pairing can be made based on common interests, teaching philosophies, teaching styles, etc. Both parties may want some choice in the establishment of this relationship, particularly if this relationship is to last throughout the new TA's tenure. On the other hand, pairing an experienced TA with a new TA just for the first semester/term of the new TA's assistantship may be a less threatening and time-intensive way of giving the new TA some formal way to discuss teaching ideas and problems.
4. Graduate Work. Another way to use a mentor is as an academic advisor. This mentor might be available to help with choice of classes, help design a program to meet the TA's long-term professional goals, keep track of the progress of the TA academically, help provide opportunities for research or other professional development endeavors, help the TA put together a professional portfolio, and so on. As with the on-going

*Mentoring*

teaching mentor, this pairing may work best with some choice on the part of the mentor and mentee based on some common interests, and so on. The comprehensive nature of this relationship may mean that it would work best if it began early in the TA's program and continued through graduation.

5. Expertise. A less-used mentoring relationship is that of TA and "expert." The expert mentors don't have an on-going relationship with any one mentee. Rather, such mentors are chosen because of their areas of expertise and so offer counseling, ideas, tutoring, etc. in that area. Mentors may be in the TA's department or may not, depending on the reason the TA is seeking a mentor (e.g., a TA in education may go to a faculty member in that department for ideas on lesson planning, but would seek a faculty mentor in speech communication for tips about speech anxiety). Mentors may be designated by an area of strength outside of their professional skills (e.g., strong interpersonal skills, good listener, knowledgeable about financial institutions in town, strong background in housing) they would be willing to share with TAs.

This list of broad program goals is not meant to be exhaustive, but it does show the diverse goals possible. However, as the ideas presented under each goal imply, it may be difficult for a single person to meet a variety of goals. More than one mentoring relationship may have to be a part of a mentoring program with diverse program goals. Carefully choosing/creating broad program goals that fit a particular program's needs for its TAs is the most effective strategy to employ and will affect many of the decisions that follow.

## ***Implementing a Mentoring Format***



### *Mentoring*

A third issue is that of choosing a program format. Speech communication seems to use mentors in a variety of formats. Three of those formats are described in the following section: (a) informal, (b) formal, and (c) integrated.

The first format, informal, has been used widely throughout this past decade (see, for example, Chism, 1991; Darling, 1987). In this format, the mentee seeks out either a peer (new or experienced) or a member of the faculty and begins a relationship that hopefully would lead to the professional and even psychosocial development of the mentee. The key factor in this form of mentoring is "choice." Mentees choose their own mentor based on what they observe and how comfortable they are around the individual. Some individuals at the MBCDC agreed that this form of mentoring occurred at virtually every institution, whether it be through a faculty member the TA related to and sought advice from or through peer associations that naturally developed. While there is much to be said for the value of these naturally-occurring relationships, it seems quite possible that some of the values of mentoring (getting feedback from a role model, having regularly scheduled times to share philosophies, having someone designated to introduce you to others, etc.) would not be met through such informal avenues. It also is important to note that it is likely that these informal relationships still will develop in addition to any formal relationships set up as part of a mentoring program.

The second format, formal, also has been used widely (see, for example, Buerkel-Rothfuss & Fink, 1992; Jensen & McKinney, 1993). In this format, a person or group of people (administrator, BCD, assistant BCD, faculty) selects a mentor for the new TA. At times, this pairing is based on information such as the mentee's stated interests and goals; at other times, it is a random pairing. Sometimes formal pairings are made prior to the new TA coming to campus; sometimes the pairings are made after information is shared and based on some commonality. The mentor could be another new peer, an

*Mentoring*

experienced peer, a faculty member, or even a supervisor. Participants at the MBCDC seemed to favor pairing the BCD with new TAs and/or the experienced TA with a new TA. Typically, these formal mentoring pairs are from the same discipline. Such formal programs are, at times, mandatory for new and experienced TAs and even for faculty members. Others are completely voluntary for all participants; still others are mandatory for new TAs and voluntary for the mentors. Choice is seen by many educators as an important aspect of the pairings. In addition, someone designated to make the pairings, train people, share information, oversee meetings, conduct evaluations, and so on also seems to be a critical part of the effectiveness of the formal mentoring programs. Incentives for mentors also can be a consideration. In one mentoring program discussed at the MBCDC, approximately six experienced TAs are chosen competitively to act as mentors; these TAs receive \$1,000 scholarships to serve as mentors for the year. Many educators at the MBCDC argued that mentors should be selected based on solid leadership skills, willingness to give time to the TA, and so on. (For a more thorough discussion of mentor characteristics, see Avery & Gray, 1992.)

The third format, integrated, has not been used as often as the others. The best example of the integrated format is described by Waggenpack (1992) in her menu-driven mentoring program. This program basically sets up a "bank" of mentors from which the mentees can make "withdrawals." The mentors are not limited to the department, but are selected from across campus by areas of expertise. For example, mentors from a counseling department might be available to a TA questioning the decision to continue seeking a graduate degree, mentors from an education department might be available to tutor beginning instructors in classroom management, and so on. Mentees can have many mentors to help with their diverse interests and concerns. It is Waggenpack's belief that the mentee has much more to gain from seeking

### *Mentoring*

the advice/support from a variety of people, thereby utilizing the expertise of each mentor. Furthermore, Waggenspack asserts that this prevents burnout because mentors would be advising only in their specific area of competence. The benefits of such a format seem plentiful. Drawbacks include the university-wide commitment required and the need to oversee the mentoring program on a large scale. In addition, an intimate relationship built on trust, multiple shared experiences, and ongoing, emotional support well may be missing.

Each of the three formats have been used at various institutions. Ideally, some combination of the formats would best serve TAs (or even adjunct and temporary instructors) as they strive for success in their roles as basic course instructors and graduate students. This ideal, however, has not been demonstrated through systematic assessment and, perhaps more pragmatically, may not be possible at a given institution. The choice of a format is an issue any educator using a mentoring program must address within the constraints of the particular institution.

### ***Choosing, Training, and Supervising Mentors***

A fourth issue educators must address is the choice, training, and supervision of mentors. The definition and broad goals that guide the program may provide direction in this area. Two of the questions and possible answers about mentoring are listed below: How should mentors be chosen, and what training and supervision of mentors will be conducted?

1. How should mentors be chosen?

Mentors from the TA's department may have the advantages of understanding department politics, knowing the content of the course or courses the TA is teaching, having access to other people who know/work with the TA to facilitate problem solving,

*Mentoring*

having credibility in the professional area of the TA, and so on. On the other hand, mentors from other departments may not be as involved in face-saving needs of the department and so may be better advocates for the TA, may allow the TA to choose people with expertise in particular concerns, etc.

Another choice centers around the use of a supervisor, faculty or peers. Peers may be less threatening to new TAs. It can be hard to disclose problems and lack of knowledge to a faculty member in the department. Other new TAs may be a good psychological support system, but they may not be able to offer much information and advice due to their own lack of experience. Experienced TAs may be able to offer some of the information and wisdom that comes with at least a semester of experience, and may still be less threatening than a faculty member. Faculty members probably provide the most comprehensive knowledge base, but they may not be as willing or able to help out with the emotional support often needed by a TA. A supervisor may be skilled in both the information, skills and emotional needs of the TAs, but may be seen as too threatening to disclose to because of the power of the supervisor over the employment of the TA.

2. What training and supervision of mentors will be conducted?

Given the many different issues posed in this paper, it would be foolish to expect mentors to all have the same definitions, ideas of format, beliefs about goals, etc. Add the TAs' attitudes and beliefs into that mix, and there is bound to be confusion unless steps are taken to clarify the goals and expectations of the program for everyone. In addition, it would be naive to believe that every potential mentor has the skills

### *Mentoring*

and understandings to mentor a new TA effectively. Even if screening is done to make sure that a decided-upon list of necessary characteristics is met before mentors are chosen, mentors likely still will need some training. A mentor may be a strong teacher but may not know steps to take to improve someone else's teaching. A mentor may be able to conduct personal research but may need help finding ways to include an unskilled partner. Training that gives needed information about expectations for the relationship and gives the mentor needed information and skills to perform effectively as a mentor was seen by the MBCDC participants as a key element in a successful program.

In addition, supervision that tries to prevent problem areas from growing into massive conflicts, that rewards the participants and keeps them feeling valued, that reminds them of the benefits of the program, that keeps them informed about meetings and paperwork, etc. also is important to the program. The discussion at the MBCDC showed a strong belief that mentoring programs can break down because problems arise that the mentor or mentee do not know how to solve and so the relationship disintegrates. Supervision was seen as a key factor in preventing this type of breakdown.

## **FEEDBACK FROM EDUCATORS WITH MENTORING PROGRAMS**

Through the MBCDC discussion and questionnaire, many educators who had experience with mentoring programs gave their insights. This next section outlines their advice to others interested in setting up a mentoring program.

*Mentoring*

1. Many obstacles to an effective mentoring program were listed. The greatest appears to be the mentor's time. The mentors must attend training sessions; at least an orientation program of expectations seems to be desirable. Mentors must make time for the mentee on a regular basis; suggestions of regularly-scheduled, weekly meetings between pairs and meetings a few times per semester/term with all mentees, mentors and the coordinator dominated the advice. Mentors also must make time to work on problems; the mentor may have to intervene with another professor, the mentor and mentee may need an outside person to help them compromise, etc. Other obstacles were a program too large to supervise or pair effectively, personality conflicts, lack of supervision throughout the program, resistance by the TAs to formalizing such relationships, and having to dismiss a TA mentor who was not doing the job well.
2. One piece of advice that a majority of the discussants agreed upon was the need for a coordinator for a mentoring program. Most of the obstacles listed above may be diminished if there is a coordinator of the program. Time problems can be tempered if mentors meet ahead of time and are informed about program expectations. Ongoing supervision also helps remind mentors and mentees that regular meetings are expected, etc. Some educators even suggested some simple paperwork could be reviewed by the coordinator (e.g., a quick form that lists the date of each meeting, the names of the mentor and mentee, what was discussed, future goals, and the next scheduled meeting time). The coordinator also would create and distribute questionnaires used for pairing mentors and mentees, make and monitor pairings, persuade TAs and mentors of the value of the program, work on

### *Mentoring*

building cohesion throughout the program, and handle general administrative tasks (assess the ongoing effectiveness of the program, intervene in problems, and so on). The least effective programs discussed seem to be those where TAs are given no choice in participation or pairing and then left to function without ongoing training, intervention, supervision, assessment, etc.

3. The discussants described several strategies a coordinator might use to enhance the program. They advised the coordinator to have an open-door policy so that problems can be dealt with immediately before, as one participant stated, "they become destructive, and the program does more harm than good." The coordinator should be organized, provide structure for the program, and be flexible enough to adapt to needed changes. It was felt that frequent praise by the coordinator was a motivating factor for all involved. In addition, the coordinator was advised to seek feedback frequently. In addition to regular meetings, feedback could consist of quick response sheets. One idea offered was to ask the TAs, "What is it that other TAs are doing that you would like to be doing?" or "What is it that you think other TAs are getting that you are not?" These questions may get more specific feedback than would a request for problems. Similar responses sought from the mentor could be useful, too.
4. Another key element posited by the MBCDC participants was choice. Mentors may be more committed to giving the time needed to meet the new TAs' needs if they choose to take on this role. There are so many details and stresses associated with graduate education for both mentors and mentees that a forced program may start a relationship off in a negative way. Choosing to participate because all parties see some

*Mentoring*

value in it seems to be the advice of the people who worked with mentoring programs. They did add that choice may be more critical if the broad program goals go beyond just orientation or social needs which do not involve the intense commitment that other goals may require.

5. One suggestion to facilitate peer mentoring was to assign shared office space to the pairs. A possible way to decide on these pairings is to use the department secretaries. Often, they see the TAs during the first few days in a more informal way than do faculty, department chairs, or BCDs. The secretaries may be the best people to pair "like personalities," if that is a desired aspect of the mentoring pairings.
6. A last comment was made concerning the benefits of mentoring. One participant felt that mentoring can enhance the overall health of the department. Without an official mentoring program, TAs may feed off each others' misery, form cliques and believe rumors more easily. Mentoring can provide an outlet to check out information and involve the TAs in a variety of relationships. This participant felt strongly that, without mentors, destructive outcomes could cause TAs to leave the program in search of a more comfortable institution.

## **QUESTIONS TO GUIDE DECISION MAKING BY EDUCATORS**

The first two sections of this paper have delineated some of the issues associated with TA mentoring programs and general feedback from educators who have had experience with mentoring programs. This next section incorporates the previous issues and advice and expands upon them to provide



### *Mentoring*

a step-by-step guide for an educator to use in creating a mentoring program with TAs. Posed are some of the questions that might be asked to lay a foundation for a program that meets specific institutional needs and realities. Following each question is a list of ideas, garnered from the discussion and questionnaire from the MBCDC, that might be useful to consider. While not every question posed here will be useful/necessary in every situation, the questions given are a starting point from which any educator can begin gathering answers to guide the development of a mentoring program.

1. What overall definition or definitions of mentoring will be utilized?

Ideas: role model, tutor, guide to career development, giver of information and support, provider of organizational beliefs and values, interpersonal support person, developer of teaching skills

2. What broad program goals and specific, individual goals will mentoring seek to accomplish?

Ideas: orient to campus and department, establish social network, facilitate effective teaching, provide additional teaching resources, advise total graduate program, counsel in areas of expertise, handle crises, spot potential crises that should be shared with BCD, provide emotional support, encourage scholarly endeavors, develop professional skills, develop professional contacts, model professional behavior, work as a team on teaching and/or research projects

3. Who will design, oversee, evaluate and revise the program?

Ideas: coordinator who could be the BCD, graduate director, department chair, experienced TA, interested faculty member

4. What resources are needed and available?  
Ideas: committed mentors, coordinator to train/supervise mentors and mentees, coordinator readily available to problem solve, incentives for mentors
5. Will design input be sought from all interested parties?  
Ideas: BCD, TA supervisors, faculty, department chair, mentors, new and experienced TAs
6. What are the TAs' needs (based on their backgrounds and experiences) that a mentor could meet?  
Ideas: is available on a regularly-scheduled basis, is available during times of crises, is knowledgeable about teaching strategies, is empathic with non-traditional students' needs, shares teaching and/or research interests, shares teaching resources, is willing to introduce the TA to other professionals, is willing to include the TA in scholarly projects, is willing to help solve problems
7. How can the TAs' needs be discerned?  
Ideas: questionnaire prior to starting program, interview, assessment by coordinator based on prior experience with TAs of similar backgrounds
8. What are characteristics of an effective mentor, given the goals of this program?  
Ideas: is willing to give time needed to the TA, is willing to let mentee observe the mentor at work, is willing to share resources, is willing to work with a partner on projects, shows patience with an unskilled partner, has the desire to facilitate the growth of a new scholar/teacher, uses a democratic or cooperative leadership style, is willing to participate in training to develop skills needed to mentor effectively, is willing to see the relationship through problematic times, has

### *Mentoring*

good listening skills, holds a specified academic degree, has taught certain classes, has published research

9. How can qualified mentors be recruited?

Ideas: assigned by the department, cooperative program within university, volunteers, everyone participates

10. What incentives and support do the mentors need/want?

Ideas: financial reward, reassigned time, additional student help with research or teaching to compensate for time given to mentoring, no other committee assignments, entry for job seeking or promotion/tenure case, recognition by department of value of program, someone who oversees the program for help

11. How can the needed incentives and support be obtained?

Ideas: commitment of department and/or university, backing of graduate school, persuasive messages of benefits to TAs by coordinator

12. What ground rules, expectations, and so forth for the mentoring program and relationship need to be established?

Ideas: mentors must attend training sessions, mentees must attend orientation sessions, pairs must have a specific meeting time set up each week, mentee can call mentor at home, pairs must meet four times per semester/term, all must attend a biweekly meeting with the coordinator and all participants

13. How can the benefits of having a mentor (see the ideas listed after Question 6) and the rules and expectations be communicated to mentees?

*Mentoring*

Ideas: written description of program prior to coming to campus, general meeting during orientation

14. What procedure will be used to assign mentees to mentors?

Ideas: random assignment, match by coordinator by research or teaching interests/areas of expertise, assignment based on teaching schedule, match by gender, choice of participants

15. When will the program begin?

Ideas: before the start of the first semester/term, during the first semester/term, whenever the mentee chooses

16. What guidelines are in place for problem intervention?

Ideas: coordinator is available to meet with pairs, designated experienced TA meets with people individually

17. What strategies for assessment of effectiveness of current pairs are in place?

Ideas: weekly meetings, monthly written evaluations by each person, suggestion box for anonymous comments

18. What avenues for changing mentors are in place?

Ideas: submit a written request to the coordinator, meet with the graduate director for assessment of the need for/desirability of the change

19. What written documents exist so that the details of the mentoring program are clearly articulated?

Ideas: a written description is given to all new TAs and mentors prior to the start of the program, a mentoring handbook is given to all participants

*Mentoring*

20. How will the effectiveness of the mentoring program be evaluated?

Ideas: written feedback throughout each semester/term, verbal assessment during general meetings helped on a regular basis, anonymous feedback turned in at the end of each year, interviews done by the coordinator at the end of each year with all participants, inclusion of both mentors and mentees in an informal evaluation meeting each year

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MENTORING LITERATURE**

The ideas provided in this paper are meant to be a starting point for an educator's personal information gathering on mentoring. However, another aspect of any educator's search for information inevitably leads to the published literature to get a more comprehensive view of a new idea. The lack of published literature in mentoring with TAs, the lack of uniformity in terminology and the diversity of fields in which mentoring literature is published make this literature review a complex task. In a further attempt to aid any educator's desire to read what has been published in a variety of disciplines, a bibliography is offered as a starting point for such a literature review. It is hoped that this will make the personal task easier for anyone undertaking the challenge! (See the Appendix for an extended bibliography of mentoring literature.)

## **CONCLUSION**

Mentoring relationships can be a useful strategy in TA training and development. The commitment to providing

*Mentoring*

quality education and challenges for graduate students causes educators to seek ways to enhance the overall graduate experience. In addition, the use of TAs in undergraduate education in our field mandates that we continue to seek ways to increase the effectiveness of TA teaching in particular. When faced with the reality and/or possibility of "certifying" TAs before allowing them to teach college classes, techniques that could increase their skill level are being sought perhaps more than ever. Mentoring is a strategy that may enhance graduate education and strengthen the TAs' teaching skills. When asked about the effectiveness of the TA mentoring programs they used, participants at the MBCDC generally were pleased. However, many felt that a lack of guidelines for developing their programs resulted in much wasted effort and time. This paper has shared the collective wisdom of some educators involved in mentoring programs that may give future program planners some needed direction. Ultimately, we hope that more people will believe, as did one educator at the MBCDC, that "mentoring is a great idea, and your questionnaire has motivated me to consider initiating such a program."

## REFERENCES

- Avery, P. B., & Gray, P. L. (1992, October-November). *Credibility and other essential characteristics/behaviors of effective mentors for graduate teaching assistants*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Bort, M. B. (1992, October-November). *Mentoring and the basic course: The roles of the assistant basic course director*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

*Mentoring*

- Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Fink, D. S. (1992, October-November). *Creating a safety net: Assistant course directors and second-year teaching assistants as mentors and role models*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Gray, P. L. (1990). Graduate teaching assistant training in speech communication and noncommunication departments: A national survey. *Communication Education, 39*(4), 292-307.
- Chism, N. (1991). Supervisors and TAs on the teaching help they give and receive. In J. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott, D. H. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach* (pp. 318-325). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Darling, A. L. (1987). TA socialization: A communication perspective. In N. Van Note Chism & S. B. Warner (Eds.), *Employment and education of teaching assistants* (pp. 91-94). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH: Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 539-556.
- Eble, K. (1987). Defending the indefensible. In N. Van Note Chism & S. B. Warner (Eds.), *Employment and education of teaching assistants* (pp. 7-13). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH: Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Gray, P. L., & Murray, M. G. (1993, February). *TA Mentoring: Background and applications*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Basic Course Director's Conference, Cedar Rapids, IA.
- Haleta, L. (1992, October-November). *Mentoring: Problems and concerns*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

*Mentoring*

- Hill, S. E. K., Bahniak, M. H., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information inadequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 38(1), 15-33.
- Hill, S. E., Rouner, D., & Bahniak, M. H. (1987, May). *Mentoring and other communication support systems in the academic setting: Development of an instrument*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Jensen, K. K., & McKinney, M. (1993, February). *Peer collaboration in the COM Studies Department at the University of Kansas*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Basic Course Director's Conference, Cedar Rapids, IA.
- Kemper, T. (1968). Reference groups, socialization and achievement. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 31-45.
- Speizer, J. J. (1981). Role models, mentors, and sponsors: The elusive concepts. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 6(4), 692-712.
- Waggenspack, B. M. (1992, October-November). *Initiating a mentoring program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.



## APPENDIX

### ***Mentoring: An Extended Bibliography***

- Adams, H. (1992). *Mentoring: An essential factor in the doctoral process for minority students*. Notre Dame, IN: National Consortium for Graduate Degrees for Minorities in Engineering and Science, Inc.
- Adams, H. (1985). *Successfully negotiating the graduate school process: A guide for minority students*. Notre Dame, IN: National Consortium for Graduate Degrees for Minorities in Engineering and Science, Inc.
- Adams, H., & Conley, M. (1986). *Minority participation in graduate education: An action plan*. The Report of the National Forum on the Status of Minority Participation in Graduate Education. Washington, DC.
- Alleman, E. (1986). Measuring mentoring — frequency quality impact. In W. A. Gray & M. M. Gray (Eds.), *Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business, and the professions* (pp. 44-51). British Columbia: Xerox Reproduction Centre.
- Auster, D. (1984). Mentor and protégés: Power-dependent dyads. *Sociological Inquiry*, 54, 142-153.
- Avery, P. B., & Gray, P. L. (1992, October-November). *Credibility and other essential characteristics/behaviors of effective mentors for graduate teaching assistants*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963). *Social learning and personality development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

*Mentoring*

- Berg, H., & Ferber, M. (1983). Men and women graduate students: Who succeeds and why? *Journal of Higher Education, 54*, 629-648.
- Blackburn, R. T., Chapman, D. W., & Cameron, S. M. (1981). "Cloning" in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. *Research in Higher Education, 15*(4), 315-327.
- Blackwell, J. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe, 75*, 8-14.
- Boehrer, J., & Chevrier, M. (1991). Professor and teaching assistant: Making the most of a working relationship. In J. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott, D. H. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach* (pp. 326-330). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Bolton, E. (1980). A conceptual analysis of the mentor relationship in the career development of women. *Adult Education, 30*, 195-207.
- Bort, M. B. (1992, October-November). *Mentoring and the basic course: The roles of the assistant basic course director*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Bova, B. (1983). The role of identification in mentoring female protégés. *Group and Organization Studies, 11*, 61-73.
- Bowen, D. D. (1985). Were men meant to mentor women? *Training and Development Journal, 39*(2), 31-34.
- Brinko, K. T. (1990). Instructional consultation with feedback in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 61*, 65-83.
- Brown, R. D., & Krager, L. (1985). Ethical issues in graduate education: Faculty and student responsibilities. *Journal of Higher Education, 56*, 403-418.
- Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Fink, D. S. (1992, October-November). *Creating a safety net: Assistant course directors and second year teaching assistants as mentors and*

*Mentoring*

- role models*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Bullough, R. (1990). Supervision, mentoring, and self-discovery: A case study of a first year teacher. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5, 338-360.
- Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1990). Mentoring in organizations: Implications for women. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 317-332.
- Burke, R. J., McKeen, C. A., & McKenna, C. S. (1990). Sex differences and cross sex effects on mentoring: Some preliminary data, *Psychological Reports*, 67, 1011 -1023.
- Bushardt, S., & Allen, B. (1988). Role ambiguity in the male/female protégé relationship. *Equal Opportunities International*, 7, 5-8.
- Cameron, S., & Blackburn, R. (1981). Sponsorship and academic career success. *Journal of Higher Education*, 52, 369-377.
- Carrnin, C. (1988). Issues in research on mentoring: Definitional and methodological. *International Journal of Mentoring*, 2, 9-13.
- Chism, N. (1991). Supervisors and TAs on the teaching help they give and receive. In J. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott, D. H. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach* (pp. 318-325). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Clarke, S., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 20-41.
- Clawson, J. G., & Kram, K. E. (1984). Managing cross-gender mentoring. *Business Horizons*, 27, 22-32.
- Colewill, N., & Pollock, M. (1988). The mentor connection update. *International Journal of Mentoring*, 2, 49-53.

Mentoring

- Cunningham, M. (1984). *Powerplay: What really happened at Bendix*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Cusanovich, M., & Gilliland, M. (May-June 1991). Mentoring: The faculty-graduate student relationship. *Communicator*, 24, 5-6.
- Darling, A. L. (1987). TA socialization: A communication perspective. In N. Van Note Chism & S. B. Warner (Eds.), *Employment and education of teaching assistants* (pp. 91-94). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH: Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Darling, L. (1985). Mentors and mentoring. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 15, 42-43.
- 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), 539-556.
- Edlind, E. P., & Haensly, P. A. (1985). Gifts of mentorship. *The Gifted Child Quarterly*, 29(2), 55-60.
- Frey, B. R., & Noller, R. B. (1986). Mentoring: A promise for the future. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 20, 49-51.
- Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37, 6-11.
- Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). *Mentoring: A review of the literature with a focus on teaching*. Austin: Research and development center for teacher education, University of Texas.
- Ganser, R. ( April, 1991). *Matching beginning teachers and mentors: Perceptions of participants in a state-mandated mentoring program*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Mentoring Association, Chicago, IL.
- Grant, C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1981). Inservice support for first year teachers: The state of the scene. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 14(2), 99-111.

*Mentoring*

- Haleta, L. (1992, October-November). *Mentoring: Problems and concerns*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Hall, H., & Sandler, B. (1983). *Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at an old way to get ahead*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, Project on the Status and Education of Women.
- Hall, G., & Loucks, S. (1978). Teaching concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. *Teacher College Record*, 80(1), 35-53.
- Hill, S. E. K., Bahniak, M. H., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information inadequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 38 (1), 15-33.
- Hill, S. E., Rouner, D., & Bahniak, M. H. (1987, May). *Mentoring and other communication support systems in the academic setting: Development of an instrument*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Hite, L. (1985). Female doctoral students: Their perception and concerns. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 18-22.
- Huffman, G., & Leak, S. (1986). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 22-25.
- Hunt, D. M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 475-485.
- Hurley, D. (1988). The mentor mystique. *Psychology Today*, 22, 38-43.
- Jensen, K. K., & McKinney, M. (1993, February). *Peer collaboration in the COM Studies Department at the University*

*Mentoring*

*of Kansas*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Basic Course Director's Conference, Cedar Rapids, IA.

- Kalbfleisch, P., & Davies, A. (1991). Minorities and mentoring: Managing the multicultural institution. *Communication Education, 40*, 266-271.
- Kemper, T. (1968). Reference groups, socialization and achievement. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 31-45.
- Klug, B. J., & Salzman, S. S. (1991). Formal induction vs. informal mentoring: Comparative effects and outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7*, 241-251.
- Knox, P., & McGovern, T. (1988). Mentoring women in academia. *Teaching of Psychology, 12*, 39-41.
- Kram, K. (1985). *Mentoring at work*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Company.
- Lawrie, J. (1987). How to establish a mentoring program. *Training and Development Journal, 3*, 25-27.
- Leitschuh, C. (1987). *A descriptive study of mentoring from the perspective of mentors in business and industry*. Unpublished thesis, University of South Dakota.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33*, 161-173.
- Moore, K. M. (1982). The role of mentors in developing leaders for academe. *Educational Record, 63* (1), 23-28.
- Myers, D., & Humphreys, N. (1985). The caveats in mentorship. *Business Horizons, 28*, 9-14.
- Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B. A. (1981). *Women and work: A psychological perspective*. New York: Praeger.
- Noe, R. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(1), 457-479.

*Mentoring*

- Noller, R. B., & Frey, B. R. (1983). *Mentoring: An annotated bibliography*. Buffalo, NY: Bearly Ltd.
- Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D. C. (1986). *Teaching mentoring*. ERIC document # ED 271 477.
- Phillips-Jones, L. (1989). Common problems in planned mentoring programs. *International Journal of Mentoring*, ;36-40.
- Ragins, B., & McFarlin, D. (1990). Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 321-339.
- Richey, C., Gambrell, E., & Blythe, B. (1988). Mentor relationships among women in academe. *AFFILIA*, 3, 34-47.
- Sacken, D. M. (1990). Taking teaching seriously: Institutional and individual dilemmas. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61, 548-564.
- Sands, R., Parson, J., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 62, 174-193.
- Shandley, T. (1989). The use of mentors for leadership development. *NASPA Journal*, 1, 59-65.
- Speizer, J. J. (1981). Role models, mentors, and sponsors: The elusive concepts. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 6(4), 692-712.
- Sprague, J., & Nyquist, J. D. (1991). A developmental perspective on the TA role. In J. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott, D. H. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), *Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach* (pp. 295-312). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Stallion, B. K., & Zimpher, N. L. (1991). Classroom management intervention: The effects of training and mentoring on the inductee teacher's behavior. *Action in Teacher Education*, 13, 42-50.

*Mentoring*

- Starnaman, S., & Miller, K. (1992). A test of a causal model of communication and burnout in the teaching profession. *Communication Education, 41*, 40-53.
- Stonewater, B., Eveslage, S., & Dingson, M. (1990). Gender differences in career helping relationships. *The Career Development Quarterly, 39*, 72-77.
- Thomas, D. (1986). *An intra-organizational analysis of differences in black and white patterns of sponsorship and the dynamics of cross-racial mentoring*. Unpublished dissertation, Yale University.
- Torrance, E. P. (1984). *Mentor relationships: How they aid creative achievement, endure, change and die*. Buffalo, NY: Bearly Ltd.
- Waggenspack, B. M. (1992, October-November). *Initiating a mentoring program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Westhoff, L. (1986). Mentor or lover. *Working Woman, 116-119*.
- Williams, R., & Blackburn, R. (1988). Mentoring and junior faculty productivity. *Journal of Nursing Education, 27*, 204-209.
- Wilson, V., & Lunneborg, P. (1982). Implications of women's changing career aspirations for college counselors. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 23*, 236-239.
- Wright, C., & Wright, S. (1987). The role of mentors in the career development of young professionals. *Family Relations: Journal of Applied Family & Child Studies, 36*, 204-208.
- York, R. O., Henley, H. C., & Gamble, D. N. (1988). The power of positive mentors: Variables associated with women's interest in social work administration. *Journal of Social Work Education, 24*(3), 242-250.



*Mentoring*

Young, C., MacKenzie, D., & Sherif, C. (1980). In search of token women in academia. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 4, 508-525.

Zey, M. C. (1984). *The mentor connection*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irvin.