PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RELATIONSHIPS FOR COUNSELOR
EDUCATORS: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ETHNIC IDENTITY,
ADVOCACY, EMPOWERMENT, AND CULTURAL EMPATHY ON FACULTY
MENTORING ALLIANCES

by

Audrey Smith Rorer

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Counseling

Charlotte

2009

Approved By:

_____
Dr. John R. Culbreth

_____
Dr. Susan Furr

_____
Dr. Lyndon Abrams

_____
Dr. Claudia Flowers

_____
Dr. Kim Buch

ABSTRACT

AUDREY SMITH RORRER. Professional development relationships for counselor educators: the relationship between ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy on faculty mentoring alliances. (Under direction of DR. JOHN CULBRETH)

Mentoring programs are viewed as effective recruiting and retention tools that orient faculty members into the professoriate and provide opportunities to integrate cultural diversity into university ideology. However, empirical research about faculty mentoring is sparse, and disparate findings exist regarding the benefits and barriers of cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships. This study describes mentoring relationships among a national sample of 226 counselor education faculty. Multiple regression and multivariate analysis of variance were employed to examine the relationships between working alliance and ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy among cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships. Strong positive relationships were found between the predictor variables of advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy and the outcome variable of working alliance, accounting for over half of the variance. Ethnic identity predicted the working alliance accounting for an additional 1% of variance. Significant differences were found between cross-cultural and homogenous mentor types. Ethnic identity was significantly higher among cross-cultural mentor relationships than for homogenous mentor relationships; however, the variance accounted for was slight. This paper describes the background for the study, methodology, and results. Implications are discussed along with future research directions.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this accomplishment to the strongest women in my life, my grandmothers, Eleanor Lowery Smith and Peggy Utley Edmonds, who inspired me as a child to confidently reach for my dreams. Their love and strength showed me the beauty of patience, faith, and self-expression.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is the sum of encouragement and direction from many people, each of whom have been uniquely supportive along my journey. Dr. John Culbreth, chair and advisor, has grounded and encouraged me throughout my doctoral experience. Dr. Susan Furr sparked my enthusiasm for research and writing. Dr. Lyndon Abrams taught me to deeply reflect upon personal and social multicultural issues, and to express these reflections in a positive way. I attribute my understanding of, and yes, even joy in, statistical analyses to Dr. Claudia Flowers' brilliant ability to teach with warmth and patience. Dr. Kim Buch not only contributed her expertise in psychology to my dissertation committee, but has mentored me as I embark upon an academic career. In addition to these incredibly supportive committee members, the mentorship from Dr. Teresa Dalhberg and Dr. Tiffany Barnes has been inspiring as role models in work for social and academic justice. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance received from Dr. Cheryl Holcomb-McCoy and Dr. Carla Adkinson-Bradley. Their insights during the developmental phase of this project were stimulating and beneficial. The additional input from Dr. Nathan Thomas and Dr. Nakia Gordon was helpful with methodology design. I certainly could not have endured the arduous academic journey without the tireless support and encouragement from my loving husband and parents. Jared has listened to and understood my personal challenges, and shared in our personal sacrifices to enable me to complete doctoral study. My parents bestowed their confidence in me and taught me the value of education early in my life, for which I am eternally grateful. It is my hope to share similar gifts with others through research and teaching.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Given the disparity of women and minorities in the professoriate overall, it is not surprising to find gender disparity and under-representation of minorities in the field of counselor education. It is imperative to understand how mentoring programs can effectively welcome and develop underrepresented faculty members into the academy. Although mentoring programs have been widely deemed as effective professional development and retention tools in education and business, faculty mentoring presents unique challenges for women and minorities. With fewer role models like themselves to mentor underrepresented faculty, it is inevitable that cross-cultural mentoring will occur. The following research proposal seeks to examine cross-cultural faculty mentoring relationships from the viewpoint of the underrepresented mentee. This study explored the working alliances of cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships and the relationships between ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. This report contains an overview of the background for the study, a review of the current literature, and the proposed methodology. Chapter one introduces the background, rationale, and scope of the proposed study.

Background of the Study

Disparity of Women and Minorities in Academe

Collective awareness of the growing diversity in the U.S. population and corresponding decreasing representation of minority faculty (U.S. Department of

Education, 2006), dictates a need for enhanced minority faculty recruiting and retention efforts (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). In the 2003 National Center for Education Statistics report, only 15% of higher education faculty consisted of minorities and 39% women. Of the female faculty, only 3% were minority women. Recent Supreme Court rulings that challenge student body Affirmative Action decisions present higher education with a pipeline deficiency (O'Neil, 2008). This impact will undoubtedly trickle into the professoriate, and without conscientious efforts to develop diversity in higher education faculty, we will be unable to reverse the effects of the disparate educational class and privilege. National efforts are underway to encourage and develop women and minorities into faculty positions, as evidenced by the formation of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE, 2006), the National Science Foundation ADVANCE project (NSF, 2008), and the Association of American Colleges and Universities diversity initiatives (AACU, 2008).

Disparities in Counselor Education

There is a disparity of gender and ethnic representation in counselor education, albeit slightly different from the professorate overall. The gender disparity in counselor education faculty is reverse from psychology and other scientific disciplines. Women represent 60% of counselor educators (ACES, 2009), therefore the gender disparity is male oriented. Minority faculty are underrepresented in the counselor education profession (Bradley, 2005; Brinson & Kottler, 1993), as they are in the professorate overall. Given these gender and ethnic disparities, the importance of diversity awareness in professional development is essential because cross-cultural mentoring is inevitable.

Less than a quarter of women and minorities reported that they receive mentoring (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). Men report desiring mentoring less often than do women (Ragins & Cotton, 1991). These findings suggest that women and minority faculty may not seek traditional mentoring relationships, may feel unprepared to engage in mentorship relationships, and may be sought as mentors less frequently than male majority members.

Mentoring Programs as Professional Development and Retention Tools

The fact that minorities continue to be underrepresented in higher education in both the student and faculty populations has been addressed by counselor education and psychology in multicultural student training (Holcolm-McCoy & Bradley, 2003), and prolifically addressed in business and teacher education (Johnson, 2002). Yet, examining the nature of cross-cultural relationships within faculty mentoring has only begun to be studied (Leong & Wagner, 1994; Magnuson, Black, & Lahman, 2006). The Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) Development Team (Luna & Cullen, 1995) called for a need to address the specialized mentoring needs of women and minorities. However, there has yet to be significant attention directed specifically toward cross-cultural mentoring for faculty development.

Most studies of mentoring for minority and female faculty indicate that approximately only 12% report having mentors (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). A need for faculty mentoring clearly exists if higher education institutions are to be able to prepare faculty for the professoriate. Being in a mentoring relationship has been associated with organizational power and prestige (Ragins, 1997). Without mentoring, institutions risk overlooking the needs of underrepresented faculty, failing to address accessibility, and thereby further marginalizing women and minorities in the academy.

Mentoring is frequently used as a tool for professional development in business (Gonzalez-Figueroa & Young, 2002) and has been demonstrated as an effective retention and recruitment tool among female minority students (Dickey, 1996). Survival in academia is often attributed to mentoring (Egan, 1993). Yet with less than a quarter of women and minorities reporting that they receive mentoring (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007), national findings of faculty work satisfaction are not surprising. Rosser (2004) found that minority faculty are retained at a lower rate than non-minority faculty, and that female faculty are less satisfied with their advising and course loads, and quality of benefits and salary than their male counterparts. Sorcinelli and Yun (2007) present a current review of the state of faculty mentoring programs and identify 15 benchmark programs underway; four of these address diversity and cross-cultural issues specifically.

Cross-cultural Mentoring Relationships

Cross-cultural mentoring relationships are inevitable, given the disparity of female and ethnic minority population in higher education (Gonzalez-Figueroa & Young, 2002; Ragins, 1997) which presents complications for mentoring relationships. The collective knowledge of establishing effective professional collaborations is in its early stages. Current research indicates mixed outcomes in cross-cultural mentoring and whether or not these relationships can be beneficial (Gelso, 1997; Royalty & Magoon, 1985). Disagreement continues about what practices and what factors impact the cross-cultural mentoring relationship (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). As research of faculty mentoring gets underway, it is important to look at current research of cross-cultural relationships, with the purpose of determining what implications may exist for developing and retaining underrepresented faculty in academe.

Examining the issues of culture within mentoring is necessary for several reasons. With the unfortunate reality that minorities and women are underrepresented in academic careers overall, understanding the dynamics involved in cross-cultural relationships is imperative for professional development and retention of incoming underrepresented faculty. Knowledge is also needed for training mentors in establishing and maintaining effective cross-cultural relationships, which will be helpful for both faculty to faculty mentoring and faculty to graduate student mentoring as a means for grooming graduate students into the academy. Investigating the nature of cross-cultural relationships in mentoring will add to multicultural awareness pedagogy.

Lessons from Mental Health Professions

The fields of counselor education and psychology are leading the way in multicultural education, as evident by both the American Counseling Association and the American Psychological Association establishment of multicultural and cross-cultural guidelines for professional practice (ACA, 2006; APA, 2006). Counselor education and psychology have long been champions of cultivating cultural awareness and empathy for the underrepresented, less privileged, factions of society. Both counselor education and psychology have addressed the reality that women and minorities continue to be underrepresented in higher education in the student and faculty populations (Holcolm-McCoy & Bradley, 2003). While women remain underrepresented in psychology at 36% of faculty positions (APA, 2009), women represent 60% of counselor educators (ACES, 2009). Minority faculty are underrepresented in the counselor education profession (Bradley, 2005; Brinson & Kottler, 1993). Given these gender and ethnic disparities, the importance of diversity awareness in professional practice is recognized. Because both

fields recognize the need for awareness of cross-cultural relationships, counselor education and psychology have pioneered examining the nature of cross-cultural relationships. Counselor education has championed cultural competencies in particular, positioning the field as a leader in understanding cross gender and cross ethnic relationships.

General mentoring and faculty development research, such as in education and business, shows great benefit to both mentor and mentee (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Bruce, 1995; Johnson, 2002; Turban, Dougherty & Lee, 2002), yet there is little research investigating cross-cultural relationships (Leong & Wagner, 1994; Magnuson, Black & Lahman, 2006). Although an operational definition of mentoring is yet to exist, the overwhelming majority of authors agree with the multiple advantages of cross-cultural mentorship (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Brown, Davis, & McClendon, 1999; Bruce, 1995; Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Fong, 2000; Gardner, 2002; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Walker, Wright & Hanley, 2001). Based on the frequency of student mentoring discussions in mental health fields, a collective agreement that new professionals require specialized induction into professional practice can be assumed.

Conversely, there is a presumption that new faculty are well prepared from graduate school (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Selby & Calhoun, 1998). The assumption of individualized career development is not conducive to cultivating mentorships (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). The absence of literature addressing identity development among new faculty supports the aforementioned statements. Yet, given that most underrepresented faculty, i.e. women and minorities, are first generation professors (Rosser, 2004), linking professional development with identity development seems

critical to the understanding of psychosocial factors that are entwined with cross-cultural mentoring relationships.

Several investigations have pointed out the need to further examine the role of ethnic identity in mentoring relationships. Gonzalez-Figueroa and Young (2002) found ethnic identity to be an important factor in mentoring relationships regarding mentee preferences for ethnic similarity and type of mentoring desired. After finding that mentoring relationships are formed on the basis of racial and gender similarity, Tuban, Dougherty and Lee (2002) point out that further investigation is needed in how gender and race impact mentoring relationships. Ensher and Murphy (1997) found that cross-cultural mentoring relationships were reported to be less supportive than same culture pairings, and that mentees did not like their mentors when from a different cultural group as well as those with same cultural pairings. Although the empirical base is sparse, it is clear that a connection exists between the ethnic identity of mentees and their experiences of mentoring relationships.

<center>Statement of the Problem</center>

Faculty mentoring programs are systematic methods of orienting and developing new members into their professions and into the academy. These formalized relationships are opportunities to integrate cultural diversity into the university ideology and to extend the campus climate beyond privilege. Without formalized programs that are informed in effective cross-cultural interactions, diversification of the academy cannot occur.

Developing an understanding of how ethnic membership impacts relationships is critical to inform practice and education. Turner, Porter, Edwards and Moore (2001) refer to the inherent problem of mentoring underrepresented faculty as the "similar-to-me-

syndrome" (p. 10). The unfortunate reality is that women and minority faculty members either find themselves without mentors, or find themselves overburdened with obligations to mentor all women or minorities within a department or organization (Bradley, 2005). Common consensus across academia indicates that diversity mentoring programs help incoming faculty, and yet these programs are disparate and have been unsuccessful in contributing significant empirical support for widespread implementation and efficacy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy on the working alliances of cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships among faculty engaged in mentoring relationships. This study is an effort to describe professional mentoring relationships and how ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy relate to the working alliances of cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships. The intent was to develop an understanding of patterns between working alliance, ethnic identity, and the variables of advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy within faculty mentoring relationships, from the vantage point of mentees.

Significance of the Study

Results generated from this investigation glean knowledge of the salience of psychosocial factors involved in forming successful working alliances among cross-cultural faculty mentoring relationships, in an effort to define cultural competency for faculty mentors. The study also captures a description of the current frequency of formalized and informalized mentoring relationships in counselor education. The study contributes to the empirical understanding of cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring

relationships with implications for developing faculty mentoring programs to address the unique needs of underrepresented members of the population. The intended larger impact of this study is that of providing perspective that facilitates advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy for underrepresented cultural groups within academia, in the continual attempt from higher education to reverse the effects of oppression and elitism in our culture.

Research Questions

Many studies have examined the efficacy of mentoring relationships on professional development and retention in the academy, but few have empirically examined cross-cultural mentoring relationships. Faculty diversity in academia is widely recognized as a critical need, resulting in the implementation of formalized mentoring programs to foster the orientation and development of new faculty. However, little empirical research exists to inform such programs of what factors facilitate strong working alliances among cross-cultural mentoring relationships. This investigation was necessary to test previous qualitative findings and to begin to discern how working alliance and ethnic identity may correlate with advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy in mentor relationships between underrepresented junior faculty and senior level faculty. The overarching research questions for this study were:

1. Can ethnic identity development, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy predict counselor education faculty working alliances with their mentors?

2. Does the type of cultural mentoring relationship, similar or dissimilar, predict counselor education faculty working alliances with their mentors?

3. Are there differences between cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships

on ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, cultural empathy, and working alliance?

Research Design

A survey instrument was utilized to obtain perceptions and attitudes of faculty in counselor education who are participating in mentoring relationships as a mentee. Multiple regression analysis was utilized in this study to measure the relationships between ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy to working alliance. Differences among cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships were compared using multivariate analysis of variance.

Delimitations

This study explored faculty mentoring from a national sample of college and university counselor education professors. The program participants were selected from the membership of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) and from counselor education list-serves, CESNET (Counselor Education and Supervision Network), and NFIN (New Faculty Interest Network). Data from this study cannot be generalized to all faculty, but presents implications for connecting theories of working alliance and ethnic identity to faculty professional development. The scope of this study examined the working alliance as it pertains to ethnic identity of underrepresented faculty mentees within counselor education.

Limitations

The population was counselor education university faculty nationwide, with a target sample of 198 participants. The results from this study are limited to counselor education faculty who are current members of ACES and/or active participants in professional list-serve groups. Outcomes obtained from this study cannot be generalized

to all mentoring relationships nor all formalized academic mentoring programs. This study was exploratory by design, to allow for the exploration of psychosocial factors within mentoring relationships. The outcomes from this research provide insights into further directions for study in cross-cultural mentoring in a broader sample of mentoring programs. Full discussion of additional limitations of the research methodology will be presented in chapter three.

Assumptions

Assumptions for this study relate to the sample and research design. One assumption regarding the sample is that the national organization for counselor education, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, provided the most current and comprehensive representation of counselor education faculty. Another sample assumption is that respondents answered the survey items honestly. The research design assumed that the survey instruments were valid and reliable measurements of the constructs being examined.

Threats to External and Internal Validity

Threats to the validity of this study include sampling, instrumentation, and measurement errors. These threats are noted here with full discussions of efforts made to reduce these threats presented in chapter three. Obtaining a representative sample of counselor education faculty was a possible threat to external validity. The respondents may not represent the general faculty population nor the total counselor education faculty population. Social desirability of self-report bias represents the greatest threat to internal validity for this study. Selection of reliable and valid instruments for survey items is another threat to the study's internal validity. As a result of these threats to validity, no

causal statements can be made from this study, nor can any implications or conclusions be generalized to all faculty mentoring relationships.

Operational Definitions

This study framed the exploration of faculty mentoring relationships in counseling and psychology terminology and constructs. The primary constructs of interest were working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. An introduction to these constructs and the rationale for use in this study follows an introduction to basic terminology.

Terminology

For the purposes of this study, the term mentor and mentee were used to indicate the position within the relationship dyad. Mentor indicates that the faculty member held a senior level position to the mentee and who served in the advisor capacity in the relationship. Mentee indicates that the faculty member held junior level status to the mentor and who served as the advisee in the relationship. The term protégé is used synonymously with the term mentee, as the former is common in business and education literature. Mentoring relationships of interest in this study were both formal and informal voluntary relationships, i.e. either paired by the institution, or paired by self-selection. Mentees may have been participating on a voluntary basis, having chosen to enroll in an institutional program or having selected their own mentor.

In terms of defining the relationship dyads, the terms cross-cultural and homogenous will be used interchangeably with dissimilar and similar relationship. Cross-cultural, or dissimilar, the focus of this study, indicates that the mentees objectively define their mentors as differing on one or both of the following characteristics of

ethnicity or gender. This definition of similar and dissimilar cultural match follows

Ragins' (1997) definition of diversified mentoring relationships which are defined as

being different on one or more group memberships that are associated with power.

Whereas researchers may vary in their specific use of cross-cultural and multicultural

terminology, for the purposes of this study, the distinction between the terms cross-

cultural and multicultural follow the definitions presented by Estrada and Williams

(2004). They assert that the term cross-cultural is a more accurate depiction of a dyad

relationship, than that of multicultural, as it describes a dyad of differing, multiple,

cultural perspectives. These cultural perspectives may stem from race, ethnicity, and

gender.

Working Alliance

The working alliance model originated from Bordin (1979) and psychoanalytic

theory as a means to assess the effectiveness of the relationship between therapist and

client. The working alliance model provides a useful framework in exploring the

subjective qualities that mentees perceive during their relationships. According to Bordin

(1979), the nature of this transformative relationship is a function of "the closeness of fit

between the demands of the particular kind of working alliance and the personal

characteristics of [the change agent] and the [change seeker]" (p.253). Because the

mentor relationship is intended to foster development and growth, the mentor role can be

described as the change agent, and the mentee role the change seeker.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity as a construct is more complex than other group identities such as

race, because it embodies multiple group identities and incorporates social,

psychological, and developmental constructs (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Ethnic identity is generally viewed as a continuum of self awareness within the context of culture, and thus is developmental in nature (Phinney, Ferguson, & Tate, 1997). Phinney's (1992) concept of ethnic identity incorporates awareness of both dominant and non-dominant cultural group attitudes. Using an ethnic identity approach toward relationships is especially appropriate in a pluralistic society (Smith, 1991). Ethnic identity, as opposed to racial identity, is used because it is viewed as representing a more complex set of socio-cultural factors rather than an objective biological factor of race (Phinney, 1992; Smith, 1991). Although race and ethnicity have been used interchangeably in literature (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1995), ethnicity was used in this study to incorporate the elements of cultural heritage beyond simple genetic factors. Similarly, the broader term of underrepresented will be used interchangeably with the more common term minority, because the context of this study focused on the cultural context of ethnicity, not the actual population number of that particular ethnicity.

Advocacy, Empowerment, Cultural Empathy

Cross-cultural mentoring relationships are generally perceived to be problematic. Research suggests that cross-cultural mentoring relationships can be successful under certain conditions. Common characteristics essential for success are advocacy (Atkinson, Casas, & Neville, 1994; Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Brown et al., 1999; Fong, 2000; Johnson, Koch, Fallow & Huwe, 2000; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005), empowerment (Bradley, 2005; Brinson and Kottler, 1993; Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Ragins, 1995; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005), and open communication about culture (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Fong, 2000; Gardner, 2002).

Advocacy, as defined by the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics, is "the promotion of the well-being of individuals and groups, and … seeks to remove barriers and obstacles that inhibit access, growth, and development." (ACA, 2005, p.20). Although Fong (2000) and Thomas (1993) are the only authors to use the word advocacy to describe mentoring relationships, several refer to sponsoring the mentee in their professional development and growth (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Brown et al., 1999; Johnson, Koch, Fallow & Huwe, 2000; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005), and the need to be proactive in doing so (Atkinson et al., 1994). Advocacy is an essential component of effective cross-cultural mentoring for the underrepresented faculty member, who would otherwise be at risk of what Stanley and Lincoln (2005) refer to as academic cloning and the inability to voice opinions freely. In the context of this study, mentors who advocate publicly support mentees.

Empowerment, as opposed to power, is widely recognized as a factor in effective mentoring relationships, with particular regard for cross-cultural relationships (Bradley, 2005; Brinson and Kottler, 1993; Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Ragins, 1995; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). A complexity appears in the definition of mentors in whether or not they are peers or individuals in positions of evaluative power compared to the mentee. Hansman (2002) states that power and organizational needs diminish the efficacy of formalized mentoring programs. In terms of faculty to faculty mentor relationships, advocacy implies seniority, an indirect form of power, within the relationship, but not necessarily an evaluative role. Empowerment is distinctly different from hierarchically based power in that it reflects "equity, reciprocity, and cooperation"

in the relationship (Richey et al., 1988, p.35). Mentors who enable mentees to perform their counselor educator roles with confidence are empowering.

Cultural empathy around cultural differences is another factor found to be critical to the success of cross-cultural mentoring relationships (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Fong, 2000; Gardner, 2002). Understanding privilege and being culturally sensitive is crucial, particularly if the necessary trust and cultural empathy are to be reached (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). The degree of cultural empathy within the mentoring relationships is connected to the satisfaction with the relationship, and therefore expected to relate to the working alliance.

Summary

Given the commitment of higher education toward creating and sustaining a pipeline of diverse faculty members, mentoring programs have been identified as one way to help achieve professional development and retention. Because of the disparity of women and minorities in the professoriate overall, and the under-representation of minorities and males in the field of counselor education, cross-cultural mentoring relationships are likely. In order to correct the propensity of homogenous, similar-to-me relationships, it is important to examine the factors related to successful cross-cultural mentoring, as role models are necessary to indoctrinate new faculty into the professoriate. Counselor educators are champions of multicultural awareness, who have pioneered the examination of cross-cultural relationships. Therefore it was fitting to survey faculty to identify the nature of faculty mentoring relationships, with particular attention to factors for cross-cultural efficacy.

This study focused on the individual perceptions and experiences of mentees who were engaged in mentoring relationships with senior faculty members. The study was expected to shed light on how these relationships are viewed, and what factors are most conducive to establishing strong working alliances. Findings from this study lead to implications for establishing effective formal faculty mentoring relationships, in anticipation of institutionalizing more effective diversity initiatives in the academy.

Organization of the Paper

A review of the literature and the conceptual framework for this study are presented in chapter two. The historical context of faculty mentoring and current related mentoring programs are outlined. Overviews of working alliance and ethnic identity are presented. Particular attention is devoted to the current research on cross-cultural relationships, the scope of the review focusing on counseling relationships, supervision relationships, and literature in the fields of counseling, psychology, and social work. The interdisciplinary scope is deemed appropriate because each of these fields address relationships and their working alliances, psychosocial constructs, and supervision within the context of professional development. The third chapter describes the research methodology and rationale of the study. Results from the study are presented in Chapter Four. A discussion of the results, implications, and recommendations for future research are presented in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

In the first chapter, the importance of faculty mentoring was described given its wide recognition as a recruiting and retention tool, particularly in the context of diversity. The following chapter presents a review of literature that focuses on higher education faculty mentoring, and more specifically, cross-cultural mentoring and counselor education. The intention is to further define the variables and terms of this study, by providing a summary of the research and practice context. The organization of the literature review will begin by introducing the theoretical framework supporting the study. Independent variables of advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy will be further defined with particular attention to their relevance to and impact on cross-cultural mentoring relationships. The context of faculty mentoring will be presented, in an effort to define mentoring and describe models and programs. A specific review of cross-cultural faculty mentoring will be presented, and due to the dearth of this literature, lessons gleaned from cross-cultural counseling supervision research will be discussed. This chapter will conclude with implications for counselor education faculty mentoring and present a summary.

Review Parameters

Given the dearth of literature in counselor education mentoring (Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003) and in cross-cultural mentoring relationships in higher education faculty (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Leong & Wagner, 1994), empirical research from

counseling supervision relationships was also reviewed. Although the role of a supervisor differs slightly from that of a mentor in the aspect of gate-keeper function (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004), similarities in the relationship dynamics are strong. The following review focuses on faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships in higher education, including seminal business literature. To review counselor education mentoring and supervision relationships, literature in graduate student and faculty mentoring was examined from counseling, psychology and social work.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework from which this study was grounded is based upon social learning theory, social identity theory, ethnic identity and the working alliance model of counseling relationships. The following section presents the theoretical overview within the context of relationships. The literature review focuses on conceptual patterns as they pertain to faculty mentoring relationships.

Social Learning Theory

The theory of social learning (Bandura, 1977) holds the central premise that human learning is accomplished through modeling what is observed in other human behavior. His 1986 work expanded this premise to incorporate a cognitive element into the theory which came to be known as self-efficacy. Bandura's (1997) concept of self-efficacy is comprised of four basic components: cognitive, motivational, mood and perceived efficacy. Each of these components construct an individual's beliefs about what she or he can accomplish in life. Self-efficacy is tested throughout the lifespan as one interacts with others and has a regulating effect on the role model behaviors which are deemed most salient by individuals. Social learning theory suggests that role models

are essential for social adaptation to occur. Bandura (1997) posits that individuals with

high self-efficacy benefit from social modeling, stating that "if you see people like

yourself succeed, you are more likely to do so" (p.5). An inherent question becomes,

How effective are mentoring relationships for underrepresented individuals in academia

when they have so few role models to emulate? A further connection between mentoring

and self-efficacy can be made by the theoretical view that individuals with low self-

efficacy do not develop satisfying social relationships (Bandura, 1997), which suggests

that faculty with low self-efficacy will have difficulty forming mentoring relationships.

Borman, Kromrey, Thomas, and Dickinson (1998) surveyed women and minority

faculty members and found surprising results regarding self-efficacy. They found that

less than half of the underrepresented faculty surveyed reported self-efficacy in

generating research ideas, reviewing journal articles, and writing journal articles. Borman

et al. (1998) also found that fewer than one-third of underrepresented respondents had

high self-efficacy on designing research studies and applying for grants. These results

indicate that the assumption that faculty feel prepared for their careers may be seriously

flawed. There is a presumption that new faculty are well prepared from graduate school

(Selby & Calhoun, 1998). However, de Janasz and Sullivan (2004) point out that the

assumption of individualized career development among faculty is not conducive to

cultivating mentorships (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004).

A high level of self-efficacy is considered to be a manifestation of empowerment

(Ozer & Bandura, 1990). When applied to mentoring relationships, this theory suggests

that the belief one has of oneself impacts the relationship dynamics in a reciprocal

fashion, and that the lack of professional role models, (i.e. mentors) is a detriment to

those individuals. The lack of mentors among underrepresented faculty members has

been well documented (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007), yet it is widely agreed across academic

disciplines that mentoring provides socialization of new faculty (Cawyer, Simonds &

Davis, 2002; Dedrick & Watson, 2002; Johnson, 2007; Kram, 1983; Luna & Cullen,

1995; Ragins, 1997; Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004; Schwiebert, 2000; Warren, 2005).

The importance of role models in career development and choices has been a central

tenant widely held among career development theories (Bolton, 1980). Although there is

some discussion in the literature of types of mentoring and how the various types impact

mentees (Gelso, 1997; Royalty & Magoon, 1985; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007), it is generally

agreed that the mentoring relationship serves as a beneficial social model for acclimating

faculty to their professions (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Bruce, 1995; Johnson, 2002;

Turban, Dougherty & Lee, 2002).

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory (Tajfel &Turner, 1985) postulates that group identities are

human tendencies that enable the formulation of discriminatory behaviors. This theory

builds from Allport's (1954) in-group and out-group descriptions of how prejudice

operates within society. The basic premise of social identity theory is that people

categorize and label into social, or ethnic, groups, and these groups serve as both a source

of self esteem and as a source of comparison between groups. Thus, one's social identity

serves as a potential mechanism for bias. Allen, Day, and Lentz (2005) point to social

identity theory as a foundation for understanding what makes cross-gender mentoring

problematic, noting that children form same gender groups early on which leads to

greater comfort within same gender relationships and discomfort with cross-gender

relationships. Cross-cultural mentoring is inherently problematic for the same reason, that individuals are more comfortable with someone of the same ethnicity as themselves.

Working Alliance

Bordin's (1979) original model of the clinical relationship states that the working alliance is a collaborative relationship comprised of three basic components: tasks, goals, and emotional bonds between therapist and client. The working alliance model fits well for mentoring relationships because it is a measure of a collaborative relationship. Because of the importance of the mentoring relationship in graduate student progression and in professional development, it seems appropriate to use the working alliance model as a framework for assessing mentoring relationships. Schlosser and Gelso (2000) suggest the same rationale for employing the working alliance model to advising relationships between faculty and graduate students. Counseling and psychology literature has presented robust support of the link between strong working alliances with therapeutic outcomes, yet little research has explored cross-cultural perceptions on working alliance and ethnic attitudes (Burkard, Juarez-Huffaker, & Ajmeer, 2003).

The working alliance, as defined in the traditional sense by Bordin (1979), is a factor of fit between the change seeker and change agent, and is "universally applicable" (p.252). Although the working alliance model as applied to mentoring relationships has yet to be published in peer reviewed journals, a recent doctoral dissertation has described mentoring relationships with the working alliance (Furcron-Turnage, 2005). The working alliance is the driving force of change in the therapeutic relationship, as it is a reflection of the relationship itself. The mentoring relationship which provides psychosocial support has been argued as a more beneficial relationship to both mentor and mentee (Cawyer &

Sanders, 2003; Gersick et al 2000; Johnson, 2007; Peluchette & Jeanquart, 2000;

Rodenhauser et al, 2000; Schrodt et al. 2003). Relationship depth, characterized by

psychosocial support, is viewed as especially important for mentoring women and

minority membership status professionals (Gilbert, 1995; Gonzáles-Figueroa & Young,

2005; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000; Thomas, 1993). Unfortunately, Thomas (1990) found

that cross-race relationships tended to provide less psychosocial support than same race

mentoring relationships.

Burkard, Ponterotto, and Reynolds (1999) pointed out the need for investigation

of cultural variables in relation to working alliance. Farsimadan, Draghi-Lorenz, and Ellis

(2007) found in their study of 100 clients that client-counselor dyads that were matched

ethnically were rated significantly better on working alliance than unmatched pairs.

Another recent study found a correlation between strong working alliances and high

racial identity development in counseling supervision dyads (Bhat & Davis, 2007).

Gatmon, Jackson, Koshkarian, Martos-Perry, Molina, Patel et al. (2001) reported findings

supporting the widely held view that discussing cultural differences within supervision

dyads leads to greater satisfaction with the relationship. It is evident that ethnic identity

and culture impact perception of the working alliance in counseling and supervision

relationships, yet how these factors operate within these relationships remains unclear. It

is less clear how ethnic identity functions within mentoring relationships.

The theoretical framework for this proposed study is based upon psychosocial and

developmental theories. Social learning theory purports that humans learn by modeling

and observation of others. Social identity theory holds that group membership, such as

gender and ethnicity, is a source of both positive and negative discrimination. The theory

of ethnic identity development suggests that individuals internalize and experience their cultural ethnicity in different ways, therefore suggesting variation in the salience of culture for people. The working alliance model of counseling relationships provides a descriptive framework for the level of depth in collaborative relationships like mentoring. These theories provide conceptual patterns suggesting how faculty mentoring relationships are experienced by mentees.

Ethnic Identity Development

The concept of ethnic identity development arose from earlier models of racial identity development. A consensus of distinctions between the two has yet to be reached within the counseling community (Fischer & Moradi, 2001). To use the distinctions of Fishcer and Moradi (2001), who adapted from Helms, the definitive researcher in racial and ethnic identity development, the terms can be distinguished as such: racial models address oppression as it is linked to genetic factors of race, while ethnic models address cultural characteristics more generally. Phinney (1990) points out that race and ethnicity are frequently considered synonymous. The process of ethnic identity development is influenced by an individual's cultural status, including the context of minority membership status (Smith, 1991). Ethnic identity is a continual process, with differing degrees and ways of internalization (Phinney, 1992; Smith, 1991). Researchers have cautioned that ethnic and racial identity be studied in terms of their salience for the individual, rather than assuming it as a primary factor for individuals (Fukuyama, 1994; Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kyung Kim, 1999; MacDonald, 1997; Smith, 1991).

In looking at mentoring relationships, the ethnic identity lens provides a psychosocial construct of forming personality as it relates to social context, cultural

background, and status within the larger context of society. This theory suggests that within a mentoring relationship, the belief one has of oneself in terms of relationship to majority social norms and expectations impacts the relationship, as well as becomes impacted by the relationship. Identity development in a cultural context has striking implications in mentoring relationships, in that trust and openness are essential components within a cross-cultural mentoring relationship (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Thomas, 1993; Williams & Schwiebert, 2000). This finding suggests that higher levels of ethnic identity development precede the development of strong cross-cultural mentoring relationships. Exploring how belonging to an individual cultural ethnicity, such as female, Native American, or both, is experienced during immersion into the additional culture of academe will provide valuable insights into the nature of mentoring and how it is perceived.

Study Variables

Advocacy

Counselor educators collectively agree that advocacy is a hallmark value of the profession. The ACA established advocacy competency domains that were endorsed by the Governing Council in 2003. These competencies call upon counselors to not only be aware of social, political, economic, and cultural factors of development, but to advocate both on an individual and systemic level to address external barriers to individual development. Advocacy is described as negotiating on behalf of vulnerable groups and individuals, increasing access to resources, and confronting environmental barriers (ACA, 2003). Based on the professional ethics of counselor education and the counseling profession overall, mentoring can be viewed as a method of sharing institutional

privilege, i.e. policies and practices for successful institutional navigation, which are often ensconced in the dominant culture (Marshall, 2000).

Advocacy for the mentee is a common component viewed as necessary in the mentoring relationship (Angelique, Kyle & Taylor, 2002; Brown et al., 1999; Bruce, 1995; Stanly & Linclon, 2005). Although Fong (2000) and Thomas (1990) are the only authors to use the word advocacy to describe mentoring relationships, several refer to sponsoring the mentee whether it is another faculty member or a graduate student (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Brown et al., 1999; Johnson, Koch, Fallow & Huwe, 2000; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Advocacy is referred to as "protection" of the protégé in business education literature (Girves, Zepeda, & Gwathmey, 2005; Kammeyer-Mueller & Judge, 2008; Ragins, 1999) and as justice (Scandura, 1997). Ward (2000) describes mentors as "networkers" for the protégé, which implies advocacy.

Atkinson (1994) goes a step beyond advocacy to note that a mentor not only advocates for the mentee, but does so proactively. The nature of advocacy for a graduate student evolves around career networking and placement (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001), and serves to ensure the mentee obtains appropriate recognition for his or her work among faculty relationships (Fong, 2000). Brown et al. (1999) said of faculty-student mentors that a "true mentoring relationship requires a faculty person to move beyond his or her space as academic expert to a space of co-discovery," which is more than "extra-advising" (p.105). This study draws from the counseling profession's definition of advocacy, best outlined by Lee and Walz's (1998) definition of counselor advocacy, which states that advocacy is systemic, collaborative, and reduces societal inequities. Angelique et al. (2002) state that the faculty mentor relationship is a collective

sharing of information and responsibility. Because advocacy is deemed as sharing organizational privilege, it is related to empowerment. However, advocacy is distinguished from empowerment in that it is an activity rather than a way of interacting with the mentee. A mentor serving as a advocate will actively engage in recommending the mentee for committee work, leadership roles, and speaking favorably about the mentee to others.

Empowerment

Power has been a centrally noted theme within the mentoring relationship (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Noe, 1988; Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991). Acting on behalf of protégé interests implies a certain amount of power within the relationship, and within an organization (Kammeyer-Mueller & Judge, 2008; Noe, 1988; Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991). Riger (1992) points out the inherent paradox of empowerment in the context of patriarchal definitions of power, in that power implies competitive individualism whereas empowerment implies cooperation and community.

In terms of mentoring relationships, power and empowerment have rarely been explicitly studied. A recent doctoral study of graduate students in counseling found empowerment to be a central theme noted in effective mentoring relationships (Farrell, 2007). Although power has been viewed as necessary for advocacy (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Noe, 1988), some have found that power prevents effective mentoring, particularly for women and minority professionals (Hansman, 2002; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005), due to a perceived evaluation component (Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991). Faculty were found to prefer mentors from outside their departments due to the lack of ability to judge performance (Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991). Empowerment as a construct has been

defined as self-efficacy (Ozer & Bandura, 1990), and as personal agency (Bandura, 1997). The definition of empowerment in this study will be power to and power from, rather than the traditional patriarchal understanding of power over (Riger, 1992). Empowerment is distinct from advocacy in that empowerment is a way of relating within the mentor relationship. An empowering mentor will enable the mentee to take action, and may encourage action, rather than act on behalf of the mentee.

Cultural Empathy

The term empathy in counseling, psychology and social work is generally attributed to Rogers (1959) and Truax and Carkhuff (1967) as ways of being with clients. The derivative term, cultural empathy, has been coined in educational research (Goodyear, 1973) and evolved in counseling, psychology, and social work from a convergence of terms and measurement constructs throughout these disciplines. Multiple terms have been used to describe cultural empathy, such as empathetic multicultural awareness (Junn, Morton, & Yee, 1995), cultural role taking (Scott & Borodovsky, 1990, ethnic perspective taking (Quintana, Ybarra, Gonzalez-Doupe, & Baessa, 2000), and ethnotherapeutic empathy (Parson, 1993). Wang et al. (2003) point out that each of these terms has been used interchangeably. Cultural empathy has been used as a general term to mean teaching students cultural understanding of tolerance and diversity for global education (Dunn & Wallace, 2004, Goodyear, 1973; Wood, 1991). Cultural empathy is generally viewed as a more specific derivative of empathy.

Early definitions of the concept are general and descriptive of attitudes and behaviors. For example, Dahl (1989) defined cultural empathy simply as the ability to accept clients' cultural self image. Hannigan (1990) identified cultural empathy as a

needed attitude in cross-cultural training. However, others have called for the construct to be clarified (Lui, 2001) and distinguished from empathy (Chung & Bemak 2002). The most comprehensive definition of cultural empathy has emerged from Ridley and Liddle (1996), who define it as both a way of relating and of understanding, extending "beyond the boundaries of traditional empathy" (p.157). Cultural empathy is learned (Ridley & Liddle, 1996), and is therefore developmental (Pedersen, Crethar, & Calson, 2008). Cultural empathy is both cognitive (Berkowitz, 1986; Pedersen et al., 2008; Ridley & Liddle, 1996) and affective (Pedersen et al., 2008; Ridley & Liddle, 1996). In their landmark book devoted to cultural empathy, Pedersen et al. (2008) note that cultural empathy is broadly applicable to relationship dynamics and not just to counseling relationships.

Cultural empathy has been primarily tested in business and counseling applications. The empirical studies consist primarily of instrument construct validation (Leong, 2007; van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000, 2001; van der Zee, Zaal, & Piekstra, 2003; Van Oudenhoven, Mol, & van der Zee, 2003). Several business training studies demonstrate cultural empathy as it relates to cross-cultural effectiveness (Chang & Tharenou, 2004; Cui & Njoku, 1992; Herfst, van Oudenhaven, & Timmerman, 2008; Van Oudenhove, & van der Zee, 2002; Van Oudenhoven & van der Zee & Van Kooten, 2001).

Cultural sensitivity is a prerequisite for cultural empathy, according to Ridley and Liddle (1996), which suggests a connection between ethnic identity development and cultural empathy. Counseling and psychological studies have supported this tenet. Valentino (2006) studied cultural empathy among music therapists, finding a significant

relationship between cross cultural training and cultural empathy. Motomura (2007) found that people with higher bi-racial identity had higher levels of cultural empathy and openmindedness. Paquette (2006) studied identity development and cultural empathy in white college students, and found a significant correlation. Because research shows a positive correlation between cultural empathy and ethnic identity, the hypothesis can be made that cultural empathy and ethnic identity will also be linked among mentoring relationships.

In summary, research has shown that advocacy and empowerment are important factors in mentoring relationships, and that cultural empathy is not only correlated with ethnic identity development, but also an important factor in multicultural relationships. Each of these variables seem to be an enhancing factor of relationships; it would appear that they would be especially important within cross-cultural relationships, or perhaps at varying degrees of importance for homogenous and cross-cultural relationships. It is necessary to examine how these factors relate to one another and to mentoring relationships overall.

<div align="center">Context of Faculty Mentoring Relationships</div>

Defining Faculty Mentoring

It is perhaps ironic that as widely as mentoring is discussed, the understanding of what constitutes a mentor and what is inherent to mentoring relationships varies in the literature. It's widely noted that definitions of mentoring are inconsistent (Black, Suarez, & Medina, 2004; Dedrick & Watson, 2002; Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991; Shweibert, 2000). Sands et al. (1991) point out that the term mentor has been widely interpreted and that how university faculty define or consider the term cannot be pinpointed. Little

attention has been given to the connection between mentoring and multiculturalism (Chung, Bemak, & Talleyrand, 2007). Although comparing research in mentoring would seem problematic due to the variance of definitions of mentoring (Sands et al., 1991), in a meta-analysis of mentoring research, effect sizes were similar regardless of the definitions of mentoring applied in the studies (Kammeyer-Mueller, & Judge, 2008). Several common themes in the definitions of mentors and the mentoring relationship emerge that relate to the role, power, and goals of the relationships.

The definition of the mentoring relationship most commonly cited is from Kram (1983), who defines mentoring as providing career support and psychosocial support. The mentor is usually a more experienced individual who provides support to a junior individual (Kram, 1988). Benefits of the mentoring relationship for mentees are frequently studied, whereas benefits to mentors remains less investigated. Luna and Cullen (1995) identify the primary benefit for both roles; mentors receive professional renewal and mentees become empowered.

The relationship itself is deemed as a close personal one that differs from other professional relationships. The term mentor implies an intense relationship (Schwiebert, 2000), more personal than that of a sponsor (Kram, 1988). Being a mentor may incorporate being a role model, but role models are not necessarily mentors (Schwiebert, 2000) due to the depth inherent in mentoring relationships. The cornerstone of mentoring relationships is trust (Moore, 1996). That the relationship has inherent depth is agreed upon in the literature (Angelique et al., 2002; Kram, 1988; Ragins, 1997; Sands et al., 1991; Schwiebert, 2000).

A dichotomy appears in the definition of a mentor in whether or not he or she is a peer, or someone in a position of power compared to the mentee. In terms of a faculty to faculty mentor relationship, advocacy implies seniority within the dyad. Brinson and Kottler (1993) suggest that the hierarchical power structure is necessary in mentoring so that the mentor is in a position to help the mentee. Several authors define the mentor as a senior faculty member who is in a position to assist the mentee (Atkinson, Casas & Neville, 1994; Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Healy, 1997; Moore, 1996). In most cases, mentoring is defined as hierarchical, with power implied (Noe, 1988; Sands et al., 1991) as a networker on behalf of the mentee (Ward, 2000) and as protective (Girves, Zepeda, & Gwathmey, 2005). Others denounce the traditional hierarchical view of mentoring in favor of a collaboration that is reciprocally beneficial (Brown et al., 1999; Bruce, 1995; Ellingson & Sotirin, 2008; Healy, 1997; Walker, 2001). McCormick (1991) calls traditional mentoring assimilation, a demonstration of mono-cultural domination, in that the dominant group defines how to succeed. Power is a contentious factor within mentoring relationships.

Another theme underlying the definitions of mentoring is what goals are implicit or explicit in the relationship. Professional development is an overarching goal for mentoring (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Gardner, 2002; Johnson et al., 2000; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Serving as a role model for new faculty members in navigating the academic arena facilitates adjustment and professional growth (Angelique et al., 2002; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Several point out that mentoring serves to assimilate new faculty members into the academic environment (Arman & McCartney, 2000; Dixon-Reeves, 2003; McCormick, 1991), which is viewed by some as

an elitism and mono-cultural dominance (Angelique et al., 2002; McCormick, 1991; Turner et al., 2001). In supervising graduate students, professional development in the form of locating post graduate employment and quality of professional service are often cited goals (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Gardner, 2002; Leong & Wagner, 1994). Others note the importance of role modeling (Angelique et al., 2002; Schwiebert, 2000; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Across all articles, mentorship in counseling excludes the supervisory role, describing either peer faculty mentoring, or senior to junior faculty relationships.

In general, mentoring is thought to be a supportive catalyst in developing new faculty and graduate students. However, the specific definitions of faculty mentors for both student and faculty dyads vary in the literature. Several common themes emerge that relate to the role, power, and goals of the relationships. "American colleges and universities today seem to be moving from reliance on the implicit, informal guidance common in mono-cultural groups to the explicit, formal mentoring typical of multicultural ones" (Gonzalez, 2006, p.190).

Given the variety of definitions of the roles of mentors and mentees, a direct investigation of how individuals themselves perceive their roles and relationships seems necessary. The disparity among faculty expectations with their students leads to the conclusion that faculty themselves are unclear of their mentoring roles, which is likely to carry over into their expectations with collegial mentoring roles and expectations. Ragins (1999) suggests providing definitions in research studies. In her study of faculty mentoring, she defines mentor as "a person who serves as a guide or sponsor, that is, a person who looks after, advises, protects, and takes a special interest in another's

development" (p.175). For the purposes of this study, the Ragins' (1999) definition will be used.

Models of Faculty Mentoring

The majority of mentoring models originate from business management and training literature (Johnson, 2002; Merriam, 1983), from which several models emerge. Speculation as to why academic interest has been disparate has ranged from the general belief that faculty are well-prepared for their roles (see de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Selby & Calhoun, 1998) to the climate and practice of collegial hiring (Exum, 1984). Models of faculty mentoring fall into two broad categories, descriptive models and process models. Descriptive models are typically formal or informal (Johnson, 2007; Schwiebert, 2000). Formal programs are institutionally sanctioned and supported and consist of a university wide, departmental, or local mentor teams (Johnson, 2007), peer or multiple mentors across an institution (Koch & Telzrow, 2002; Moss, Teshia, & Leszcz 2008; Schwiebert, 2000; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2002; Washburn, 2007), research writing groups (O'Brien, 1995; Polirstock & Digby, 2007; Ward, Johnson, & Campbell, 2004), or tiered mentoring (Clarke, 2004; Gravette & Petersen, 2007). Informal mentoring models are initiated by the mentors and protégés themselves, without institutional support, and could be single relationships, multiple relationships, or peer relationships (Schwiebert, 2000). Goodwin (2004) points out the myriad of names given to these types of informal relationships: synergistic, communities, learner-centered, and mentoring mosaics to name a few.

Process models of faculty mentoring can be categorized as developmental models, concept models, and diversity models. Key models in these categories will be described here, emphasizing only those models most relevant to faculty and cross-cultural

mentoring. Kram's (1983) seminal work on professional mentoring in corporate management environments defined mentoring as a developmental relationship across the career lifespan with two primary functions of career and psychosocial support. Empirically tested in corporate settings, the four developmental stages of mentoring follow a pattern of initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition.

Concept models of mentoring consist of a variety of types. Burlew (1991) designed a multiple mentor model based upon organizational training, which includes training, education and development components. Several propose what is termed humanistic or feministic models of mentoring that are designed to empower, rather than assimilate or parent, protégés (see Angelique, Kyle & Taylor, 2002; Richey, Gambrill & Blythe, 1988). Ellingson and Sotirin (2008) term their model "womentoring." Notable diversity models include Walters' "relational model" (2006), which calls for counselor educators to mentor women and minority members to foster empowerment and empathy. Thomas's model (1993) specifically addresses cross-race relationships in corporate mentoring, and suggests that cross-race mentoring dyads be paired based upon their preference to address or ignore race in the relationship. His findings have been supported in counseling supervision literature, which will be discussed later in this chapter. A noticeable distinction between the key business models (Burlew,1991; Kram, 1983; Thomas, 1993) and the academic models (Angelique et al., 2002; Ellingson & Sotirin, 2008; Richey et al., 1988; Walters, 2006) is the rejection of the traditional hierarchical, power-over, mentoring relationship, in favor of egalitarian mentoring that facilitates empowerment and knowledge within the institution.

In a recent review of the current state of faculty mentoring in higher education, 35 key research studies and programs were identified; only eight addressed diversity initiatives (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). Very few models exist, and of those, unfortunately sparse empirical evidence currently exists. No mentoring models for generalized multicultural applications have been empirically tested (Gonzalez-Rodriguez, 1995), despite calls for attention (Chung et al. 2007; Collins, 1994).

Faculty Mentoring Programs

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to provide an extensive review of faculty mentoring programs across disciplines, as the purpose of this study will be on the mentoring relationships of counselor educators themselves. However, a context for viewing mentoring relationships is needed, particularly for the unique qualities of the academic setting. A call for the need to mentor and connect new faculty is a major need and challenge in the future of faculty development (Gerstein, 1985; Holland, 1998; Sorcinelli, 1994). Available research providing information on the number of formal faculty mentoring programs, and describing academic mentoring models is sparse (Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004). Black et al. (2004) point out that it is unknown the extent to which counselor educators are mentored. For example, it is noteworthy that in the seminal work on mentoring counselor educators, Schwiebert (2000) discusses only a few mentoring programs, such as Big Brothers/Sisters and Alcoholics Anonymous briefly. Schwiebert (2000), like the majority of works in mentoring, focuses on individual examples and case studies. It is surprising that there is a paucity of literature presenting empirical findings on formal mentoring programs in higher education, given the popularity of the topic.

Disparate mentoring programming efforts exist in academia. The literature on formal academic mentoring programs can be generally categorized as unsupportive of formal programs, supportive, or provisionally supportive of formal mentoring. Early in the literature on mentoring programs, the success of formal programs was questioned (Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988). Formal programs have been criticized for attempting to institutionalize intimate relationships (Kram, 1985), more recently for failing to respond to minority faculty needs (Haring, 1999), for assuming hierarchical rather than collaborative relationships (Bova, 1995; Gonzalez-Rodriguez, 1995), promoting elitism and exclusivity (McCormick, 1991), and attempting to match mentoring pairs on gender and minority membership status without accounting for the lack of availability of mentors with underrepresented status (Williams & Schwiebert, 2000).

Despite criticism, the Association of American Colleges and Universities along with the Council of Graduate Schools recommended that mentoring be formalized throughout professional development, beginning in graduate school and continuing into the professoriate (Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, & Weibl, 2000). The renewed need to focus on faculty mentoring due to increasing demands on faculty for teaching, research, service, and technology is a commonly cited rationale supporting formalized faculty mentoring (Savage, Karp & Logue, 2004; Sorcinelli, 2007). Most see formal programs as problematic, yet necessary and generally effective (Johnson, 2007; Luna & Cullen, 1995; Wilson, Valentine, & Pereira, 2002). Others view formal mentoring as particularly effective recruiting and retention tools (Girves, Zepeda, & Gwathmey, 2005) and increasing research productivity (Waitzkin, Yager, & Parker, 2006).

Empirical evidence supporting efficacy of formal mentoring programs is sparse (Allen, Eby & Lentz, 2006; deJanasz & Sullivan, 2004; Egan & Song, 2008) and no distinct line of research exists in faculty mentoring (Merriam, 1983; Sands, Parson, & Duane, 1991), or the quality of mentoring relationships (Allen, et al, 2006). A national survey of faculty mentoring found mentoring more prevalent in research institutions (Johnson, 2002). In a rare experimental study of mentored faculty compared to non-mentored employees, results indicated that formal mentoring did positively impact work related attitudes (Eagan & Song, 2008).

Common ideas as to why there is a scarcity of research in the areas of faculty mentoring center around faculty rewards and assumptions about professional training. Faculty are not rewarded for service and the demand on their time is great (Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Walker et al., 2001). There is a presumption that new faculty are well prepared from graduate school (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Selby & Calhoun, 1998). There is also an assumption of individualized career development that is not conducive to cultivating mentorship, referred to as the 'sink or swim' model (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). Inconsistent definitions of mentoring have impeded research (Dedrick & Watson, 2002).

To summarize the context of faculty mentoring in post secondary education, mentoring is widely discussed, albeit disparately applied and investigated. There are various definitions of mentoring, with common themes of orienting new faculty members and facilitating career development. Common contentions in mentoring definitions surround the topics of power and hierarchy within the relationship. Models of faculty mentoring are generally descriptive, developmental, or conceptual, and there is little

empirical research investigating mentoring models or mentoring programs. The sparse

and inconsistent empirical investigation of faculty mentoring is surprising given the

attention devoted to mentoring in the literature. This paucity is especially astonishing

given the frequent calls across the literature for the need to address mentoring disparities

among women and minority faculty members.

Time in Faculty Mentoring Relationships

The type of the mentoring relationship, amount of time spent in the relationship,

and strength of the relationship are connected. Research has shown that formal,

institutionally set mentoring relationships tend to be shorter in length than informal self-

selected mentoring relationships (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Kram, 1985; Mullen,

1998; Murray, 1991; Young & Perrew, 2000). Mullen (1998) found that length of time in

the mentoring relationship positively correlated with mentoring outcomes. Frequency of

meeting was found to predict mentoring relationship levels of desired psychosocial

support among university faculty (Walters, 2004), which suggests that length of

relationship correlates with trust and communication between mentor and mentee. These

finding suggest time and length in mentoring relationships may be both a predictor and an

outcome of the strength of the relationship, i.e. mentoring working alliance.

Research Indications from Cross-Cultural Mentoring Relationships

The following section presents the academic conversations surrounding gender,

race, and ethnicity among faculty mentoring in higher education. The literature frequently

discusses barriers that women and minority faculty members face in mentoring

relationships, along with the benefits afforded by mentoring. Career and interpersonal

mentoring outcomes are also discussed. A notable shift is occurring in the conversation

from addressing whether or not cross-cultural mentoring relationships can be as effective

as homogenous relationships to how heterogenous relationships can be enhanced.

Gender

Gender issues in mentoring relationships have been widely discussed and

researched. Sexual attraction and setting boundaries in cross-gender relationships have

been a central focus (Clawson & Kram, 1984; Feist-Price, 1994; Fowler, 1982;

Schwiebert, 2000). Other research themes found in gender mentoring literature center

around barriers for women in academia (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Hall &

Sandier, 1983; Hite, 1985; Gibson, 2006; Quinlan, 1999), discomfort in the relationship

(Allen, Day, & Lentz, 2005; Bolton, 1980; Gersick et al., 2000; Noe, 1988), relationship

patterns and expectations (Bakkan, 2005; Berg & Ferber, 1983; Blackburn, Chapman, &

Cameron, 1981; Feist-Price, 1994; Gilbert, 1985; Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos, & Rouner, 1989;

Quezada et al., 1984; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000; Young, 1998),

professional identity (Young, 1998), and gender effects (Clark & Johnson, 2000; Gaskill,

1991). It has been argued that same gender mentoring pairs share experience and social

identity, making the relationship more comfortable and more communicative (Pepper &

Kulik, 2004). A key concern of gender in mentoring is that women have been absent

from these professional relationships and also from the literature on mentoring efficacy

(Blackwell, 1989; Ragins, 1989; Williams & Schwiebert, 2000).

Empirical results suggest significant gender-specific preferences in mentoring

relationships. Key findings suggest that women prefer different types of mentoring than

their male counterparts. Women are more likely to prefer a mentor who serves in the

capacity of a career and information guide (Sands et al. 1991), more likely to seek

professional confirmation from mentors (Young, 1998), more likely to prefer role models (Gilbert, 1985; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000), and more likely to prefer same-gender mentors (Clark & Johnson, 2000; Gilbert, 1985). Women rate personal attributes as important significantly more often than do men (Gilbert, 1985). Cross-gender relationships were found to be significantly less comfortable than same-gender mentoring relationships (Allen, Day, & Lentz, 2005), and in having difficulty in forming balance between intimacy and distance within the relationship (Clawson & Kram, 1984). Female mentors offer more psychosocial support than do male mentors, who prefer offering career development (Sosik & Godshalk, 2000). Males have been found to report needing a mentor less often than females (Ragins & Cotton, 1991). Given these findings, it is not surprising that cross-gender mentoring dyads tend to be male mentor, female mentee (Chang & Schwiebert, 2000).

Studies report differing statistics on the frequency and quality of mentoring based on gender. Women are more likely than men to report harmful professional relationships (Gersick et al. 2000). It is widely discussed that women have difficulty finding mentors in academia (Blackwell, 1989; Hall & Sandier, 1983), and research has found that women have fewer mentors than their male counterparts (Hill, Leinbaugh, Bradley, & Hazler, 2005). The most common type of cross-gender mentoring relationships are male mentors with female protégés (Chang & Schwiebert, 2000). However, others have reported no difference in quality and frequency of female mentoring (Clark & Johnson, 2000; Fowler, 1982; O'Neil et al., 1999). Because the lack of mentoring is viewed as a significant career barrier (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004), it is important to note current frequency and quality of cross-gender mentoring among counselor education faculty.

Female mentors face certain challenges particular to their gender. Research has demonstrated that mentors are more likely to be men (Feist-Price, 1994; Sands et al., 1991). It has been suggested that women do not serve as mentors as often as men due to males being traditionally older and at a higher level in the organization (Burke, McKeen, & McKenna, 1990; Sands et al. 1991) and their lack of a mentoring relationship referent (Ragins, 1989). Ragins and McFarlin (1990) suggested that women mentoring men have less power within cross-gender mentoring relationships, even as mentors, and may be less able to advocate for male mentees.

Race and Ethnic Identity

Ethnic minority members report having difficulty finding mentors (Dreher & Cox, 1996), undoubtedly due to the prevalent tendency of seeking similarity between race and gender among mentors and mentees (Collins, Kamya, & Tourse, 1997; Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1991; McCormick, 1991; Thomas, 1990; Tillman, 2001). Dedrick and Watson (2002) found that "the unique mentoring needs of female students, students of color, and international students" are "rarely identified" (p.285.) Thus, they cite a likely training deficit for faculty in cross-cultural mentoring, and note that due to the lack of diversity of faculty, there is an inherent problem for seeking collegial advice in managing and developing relationships with underrepresented individuals. The intent to leave faculty positions is more prevalent among minority faculty (Rosser, 2004; Smith, Smith, & Markham, 2000), and mentoring programs have been used to address this (Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Mentoring is generally thought to be professionally enhancing. However, research indicates mixed outcomes as to the benefits of cross-cultural mentoring, and whether or not these relationships can be beneficial (Gelso, 1997; Royalty & Magoon,

1985). There is a dearth of peer reviewed literature that directly addresses cross-cultural mentorship (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Leong & Wagner, 1994).

Qualitative research indicates that cross-cultural mentoring is as successful as homogenous relationships under conditional terms. Some studies indicated that students perceive relationships as positive only when cultural differences were discussed (Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Gardner, 2002). Another study reported more stress in cross-cultural mentorships among women than men (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004).

Empirical findings are disparate. Leong and Wagner (1994) concluded in their literature review on cross-cultural mentoring for faculty and students that race can have a profound impact on supervision and mentorship, however not in every circumstance. Gardner (2002) found that cross-cultural supervisory dyads are more likely to disagree on clinical diagnosis than homogenous dyads. Smith, Smith and Markham (2000) found no significant differences in psychosocial or career support in faculty mentorships. One study reported negative mentoring experiences for underrepresented graduate students and faculty (Gelso, 1997). No mentoring experiences at all were associated with low career productivity among faculty (Royalty & Magoon, 1985). In all the reviewed studies, only two defined the term "mentor" to participants, indicating that future research needs to include a common definition of mentorship.

Race is not the salient factor in mentoring relationships, rather the cultural context, i.e., one's perception of ethnicity, seems to be more relevant. Because Ellis (2004) has shown that strong ethnic identity is linked to positive attitudes towards other cultural groups, it appears important to examine the relationship between ethnic identity and the perceived strength of the mentoring relationship. Ethnic identity has been shown

to be important in mentoring relationships, although little is known about the role it plays in mentoring (Gonzalez-Figueroa & Young, 2002). Ensher and Murphy (1997) found that mentees perceptions of gender and ethnicity were related to higher satisfaction with mentors. Gonzalez-Figueroa and Young (2002) found that Latina women with lower levels of ethnic identity preferred mentors of same gender and ethnicity. Thomas' (1993) landmark study of corporate mentoring relationships found that racial identity is critical to the mentor relationship. He found that in corporate cross-race mentor dyads, matched preferences for addressing or suppressing discussions of race predicted the level of intimacy in the relationship. Nelson, Englar-Carlson, Tierney and Hau (2006) conducted a qualitative study of counseling and psychology faculty, finding that most had experienced separate cultural identity development along their socioeconomic status, culture, and academic culture; most experienced oppression in relation to these three cultural aspects. Ward's (2000) qualitative study of psychology graduate students indicates that differences in identity levels between mentor and mentee do have an impact on the relationship, but is yet to be defined. Chung et al. (2007) conducted a qualitative study of African American, Asian and Latino counseling graduate students, finding that three similar themes emerged as to what is important in the mentoring relationship (trust, respect, and guidance); cultural competency was deemed essential.

Students who report cultural mistrust are significantly more likely to prefer a same race mentor (Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997). Tillman (2000) however, found that same race match is not the strongest predictor of a successful mentoring relationship for all, and that ethnicity can be a salient factor for some. Ethnic salience was found to be an increasingly important factor in cross-cultural mentoring relationships in a recent

literature review (Darling et al. 2006). These findings indicate that ethnic identity is linked to perceptions of satisfaction within the mentoring relationship. An inference can also be made that a connection exists between the experiences of the working alliance and ethnic identity within mentoring dyads.

The barriers and benefits to mentoring female and minority member faculty has been pointed out in the much of the conceptual articles concerning mentoring. A lack of research regarding multicultural issues in mentoring is noted (Chung et al., 2007; Williams & Schwiebert, 2000). Both conceptual and empirical articles on the issues particular to mentoring women and underrepresented minority members will be discussed in the upcoming sections.

Barriers to Cross-Cultural Mentoring

Before successful cross-cultural mentoring and supervision characteristics are identified, it is important to note the problematic nature inherent in these dyads. What Turner, Porter, Edwards and Moore (2001) refer to as the "similar-to-me-syndrome," which "occurs when the faculty member desires to mentor only those students that share common theoretical orientations, hobbies, career paths, and other traits that are similar. The problem occurs when no students exist that fit the desired mold (p.10)." Strong prevalence of same race and gender mentors has been found (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Collins, Kamya & Tourse, 1997; Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1991; McCormick, 1991; Thomas, 1990). Women and minority faculty may fear being cloned and losing their identities (Gives, Zepeda, & Gwathney, 2005), or experience mentoring as academic oppression (Nelson, Englar-Carlson, Tierney & Hau, 2006). Others note that faculty seek mentees who share similar backgrounds and interests (Johnson, 2002;

Tillman, 2001; Turban, Dougherty & Lee, 2002), and, more specifically that mentors are more likely to select mentees whom they believe to be productive (Kammeyer-Mueller & Judge, 2008). Therefore, mentees with more experience and more education are likely to receive more mentoring than those with less experience and less similarity to current faculty. Indeed, in their landmark meta analysis of mentoring literature, Kammeyer-Mueller and Judge (2008) found that white mentees receive more mentoring than non white mentees.

The unfortunate result is that minority faculty members may find themselves without mentors, or find themselves overburdened with obligations to mentor all minority professionals within a department or organization (Bradley, 2005; Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Dolan, 2007). Fong (2000) discusses the cultural isolation felt by many minority faculty members. Gardner (2002) discusses the homogeneity preference in graduate student supervising and mentoring, and the resulting exclusion and isolation. Davidson and Foster-Johnson (2001) note that a reluctance to engage in open discussion about cultural differences exists in cross-cultural graduate student mentorships. Communication differences and personality differences are also indicated as areas that serve to complicate the mentoring or supervisory dyad (Bruce, 1995).

The very nature of mentoring is an Anglo-centric model, and as Angelique et al. (2002) indicate, serves to assimilate, rather than empower. Gonzalez (2006) discusses the history of university education and the Protestant model of mentoring as being hierarchical, and therefore closed, by nature. Davidson and Foster-Johnson (2001) also discuss the dominant culture model of mentoring, as it values the individual as opposed to the collective. Additional barriers to cross-cultural mentoring are frequently cited as

communication issues (Bova, 1995), stereotyping (Noe, 1988; Ragins, 1997), tokenism (Noe, 1988; Wyche & Graves, 1992; Young, 1998), difficulty finding mentors with common interests (Butner, Burley & Marbley, 2000), being able to discuss racism and sexism openly (Thomas & Hollenshead, 2002), cultural conflicts (Quezada et al. 1984), and ineffective power bases (Noe, 1988). Race and gender are generally cited as a barrier to mentoring relationships (Rodenhauser et al. 2000) and are viewed as ethical concerns in ensuring equal access for underrepresented members (Warren, 2005).

Lack of role models are a barrier to recruitment and retention of minority faculty (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Turner & Myers, 2000). Professional and social isolation are commonly cited problems with new faculty, and present a rationale for support of mentoring programs (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Gay, 2004; Sorcinelli, 1994; Tillman, 2001). Thomas (1990; 1993) found same race relationship were significantly more likely to provide psychosocial support than cross-cultural relationships; however no difference in psychosocial support was found between homogenous and cross-cultural relationships by Smith, Smith, and Markham (2000).

In outlining the problematic issues inherent in cross-cultural mentorships and supervision, several authors outlined characteristics unique to the dyads which foster successful relationships. However, these characteristics refer to the mentor, supervisor, and quality of the relationships, rather than to the mentees themselves. Understanding privilege and being culturally sensitive is crucial, particularly if the necessary trust and cultural empathy are to be reached (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Cultural empathy around cultural differences is critical to mentorships and supervision (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Fong, 2000; Fong & Lease, 1997; Gardner,

2002). Brown et al. (1999), as well as Bruce (1995), suggest that cross-cultural student mentoring needs to also include personal interaction outside the academic realm and to incorporate a sense of community. Stanley and Lincoln (2005) describe the cross-cultural mentorship model in greatest depth, adding that in addition to the aforementioned traits, the mentor should seek familiarity with the protégé's research interests to avoid academic cloning and should express the protégé's views and opinions, as protégés may not be able to do so without facing negative consequences.

Benefits of Cross-Cultural Mentoring

Despite the paucity of empirical evidence supporting formal mentoring programs, conceptual support for the overall benefits of mentoring is strong and vast. However, there is some evidence questioning the weight attributed to mentoring. Magnuson (2002) found that positive relationships with senior faculty mediated job satisfaction and stress among new counselor educators. In a meta-analysis of mentoring literature, only moderate effects for mentoring were found on career and job satisfaction, performance, race, gender, tenure, salary, promotion, and self-evaluation (Kammeyer-Mueller & Judge, 2008). Another meta analysis of mentoring relationships compared mentoring among youth program settings, academic and workplace settings, finding larger effect sizes in academic and work settings (Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & Dubois, 2008). Eby et al.'s (2008) study also found that attitudes were more impacted than career outcomes. Eby, Allen, Poteet et al. (2004) conducted a meta-analysis on career outcomes and type of mentoring (career or psychosocial) and found inconclusive results. However, they did find that faculty reporting psychosocial support reported higher levels of career satisfaction and intentions to remain in their current positions.

Faculty mentoring programs have long been used as retention and development tools (Magnuson et al., 2006; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Benefits attributed to mentoring are higher job satisfaction (Hill, Bahniuk, & Dobos, 1989; Peluchette and Jeanquart, 2000; Schordt, Cawyer & Sanders, 2003), retention (Luna & Cullen, 1995; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005) career support (Kram, 1983; Schwiebert, 2000), and social support and acclimation to environment (Cawyer, Simonds, & Davis, 2002; Dedrick & Watson, 2002; Johnson, 2007; Luna & Cullen, 1995; Schwiebert, 2000). Lack of mentoring is similarly viewed as a negative factor in career development for faculty (Bradley, 2005; Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Sands, Parsons, & Duane, 1991; Sorcinelli, 1994).

There are inherent advantages of cross-cultural mentoring, such as broadening experiences, perspectives and added scholarship production (Brinson & Kottler, 1993) and minimizing perceptions of tokenism (Ensher & Murphy, 1997). Ensher and Murphy (1997) point out that cross cultural mentoring pairings are also needed to provide an understanding of power structures and overcoming institutional barriers. In discussing the benefits of cross-cultural mentoring relationships, many authors present recommendations for successful mentoring. Stanley and Lincoln (2005) suggest informed cultural empathy (sensitivity and knowledge of privilege and underrepresented faculty), advocacy (voicing mentee concerns and sharing opportunities), and trust. Schwiebert (2000) outlines pragmatic qualities of establishing goals and making commitments, in addition to advocacy.

Empirical findings present interesting implications about the nature of cross-cultural faculty mentoring relationships. Career mentoring has not been found to be impacted by cross-cultural mentoring, but the depth of the psychosocial relationship has

(Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006). Strong interpersonal relationships in mentoring are powerful institutional strengtheners (Schrodt et al., 2003). New faculty rate collegial bonds as most instrumental in career support (Gersice et al., 2000; Rodenhauser et al., 2000). Attitudes rather than outcomes are most influenced by mentoring (Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & Duboise, 2008). Psychosocial support has been linked with higher intentions to stay (Eby, Allen, Poteet et al., 2004). Interpersonal comfort is a mediating role in mentoring relationship formation (Allen, Day, & Lentz, 2005). Bonds are central to the relationship (Cawyer, Simonds, & Davis, 2002) and the career outcomes of mentoring (Ragins, Cotton, Miller, 2000). However, some research indicates that a lower level of intimacy is more conducive to high levels of research productivity (Blackwell, 1989). These findings present clear indication that the relationship strength is central to the outcomes from the mentoring relationship.

The conversation about gender, race, and ethnicity among faculty mentoring in higher education has addressed common barriers and benefits to cross-cultural relationships. Mentoring relationships have been fewer among female and minority faculty members than their male majority faculty member counterparts. Research investigating mentee preferences and career outcomes have noteworthy implications about the salience of gender, race and ethnicity in mentoring relationships. In continuing the conversation about facilitating and enhancing cross-cultural mentoring relationships, it is important to further explore and understand the roles of gender, race and ethnicity on perceptions and experiences of mentoring.

Implications from Cross-Cultural Counseling Supervision Relationships

There is a notable distinction between counselor education supervision and mentorship, however, no consensus of the definition and role of a mentor exists (Arman & McCartney, 2000; Bruce, 1995; Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). Little empirical information is available on cross-cultural supervision and mentorship (Leong & Wagner, 1994). Yet given the similarities between the two types of relationships, comparisons and research inferences can be made. Although there is little empirical information on cross-cultural supervision (Bernard & Goodyear 2004; Bishop, Avila-Juarbe & Thumme, 2003; Chang, Hayes & Shoffner, 2003), these studies provide insight into cross-cultural mentoring relationships. Similar to the faculty mentoring research, cross-cultural supervision research has consisted primarily of qualitative studies. Relevant comparisons between supervision and mentorship are made given that both are viewed as effective minority faculty recruitment and retention strategies in higher education (Arman & McCartney, 2000; Magnuson et al., 2006).

The distinct difference between supervision and mentoring is that of an explicit evaluation component inherent in supervision (Gardner, 2002). The supervisor may serve as a mentor and also as an evaluator. Leong and Wagner (1994) suggest that supervision relationships are developmental in nature, as are mentoring relationships (Kram, 1983). Cook (1994) suggests that ethnic identity impacts attitude and relationship perceptions, much as Thomas (1993) has found in corporate mentoring relationships. Aponte (2000) asserts guidelines for cross-cultural supervision dyads, listing institutional advocacy among them. Bernard and Goodyear (2004) note in their review of racial and ethnic issues in supervision that the willingness to address multicultural issues and commitment

to attaining multicultural competence are perhaps the essential factors facilitating increased cultural competence in supervisors and supervisees. Because of the central focus toward multicultural issues in supervision, findings on gender and ethnicity in supervision relationships can be useful in examining mentoring relationships.

As in mentoring literature, gender presents implications about the nature of the supervisory relationship. Lichtenberg and Goodyear (2000) found that gender predicts the supervision structure. Granello (2003) found that supervisees are more likely to incorporate suggestions from a female supervisor, that female supervisors give more praise, and that male supervisors provide more suggestions and were asked to give opinions more often than women. Because of her findings, Granello (2003) suggested that counselors be aware of reciprocal effects of power in the supervisory relationship.

Like cross-cultural mentoring relationships, cross-cultural supervision relationships have demonstrated expectation and outcome differences. Cross-cultural supervision relationships have been found to significantly differ on clinical diagnoses than homogenous relationships (Gardner, 2002). In examining patterns of interaction within cross-cultural supervision, one study found race to be a source of tension for white supervisors (Choudhuri, 2002); another noted that race needs to be addressed early in the relationship (Estrada et al., 2004). Developmental levels of supervisors and supervisees need to be taken into account when considering how attitudes toward racial identity impact the relationship (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2003; MacDonald, 1997).

Quantitative studies have found racial differences in the willingness to explore worldviews (Estrada, 2005), that very few cultural conversations occur in cross-cultural supervision (Gatmon et al., 2001), and that ethnic minority supervisees found white

supervisors to be less empathetic, congruent, and respectful (Helms & Cook, 1999). Bhat
(2003) conducted a study of supervisor dyads and found no differences in working
alliances based upon racial or gender match. However, the study did find significant
differences on working alliances based upon perceived racial identity development levels
of counselor supervisees. Burkard (1996) found that ethnic identity predicts working
alliance formation for counselors-in-training. Bhat and Davis (2007) found that ethnic
identity pairings between supervisors and supervisees predicted the level of cultural
discourse within the relationship. Cook and Helms (1988) found that perceptions of being
liked by one's supervisor accounted for the majority of variance in the relationship,
which is linked to identity development because minority groups felt significantly less
liked by their supervisors. Bernard (1994) questions the salience of race as a cultural
force within supervision relationships, and suggests that the critical factor is perceived
support. However, Ladany et al. (1997) found that ethnic identity predicted working
alliance between supervisors and supervisees, whereas racial homogeneity did not. These
findings support the existing evidence in mentoring literature (see Thomas, 1993) that
ethnic identity development is a more salient factor than race or ethnicity itself.

Literature suggests that counselor identity development is very salient in
supervision working alliances (Cook, 1994; Fukuyama, 1994), and therefore it is also a
likely factor in professional mentoring relationships. In the earliest study of cross-cultural
supervision, Kolk (1974) found that black and white supervisees held different
expectations of the relationship, which was supported in Gardner's (2000) findings that
minority supervisees do not expect positive regard from their white supervisors.
Supervisors have been found to disparately rate supervisee competence, ranking majority

students significantly higher than minority students (Cook & Helms, 1988). Emotional bonding was found to be a central theme in successful cross-cultural supervision (Townsend, 1997).

Similar to cross-cultural mentoring relationship literature, cross-cultural supervision is seen by some as an opportunity for increased multicultural awareness (Priest, 1994; Salzman, 2000; Santiago-Rivera & Moody, 2003). A qualitative study of family therapists found that culturally different supervisors led to increased awareness and professional development (Killian, 2001). Wieling and Marshall (1999) studied cross-cultural supervision relationships among marriage and family therapists, and found that the majority (69%) reported never having had a supervisor of a different ethnic background, but that the majority believed they would have benefited from a cross-cultural relationship. However, Page (2003) points out power as a potential barrier in supervision, similar to findings in mentoring relationships. Estrada, Frame, and Williams (2004) suggest using ethnic identity measures in supervisory dyads, to enhance the relationship quality.

Because multicultural issues are a primary focus in counseling supervision, and similarities between the nature of supervision and mentoring exist, supervision research on gender and ethnicity provides insights for examining mentoring relationships. Studies have shown that ethnic identity impacts attitudes and perceptions of supervisory relationships. Ethnic identity has also been found to be a more salient factor in supervisory relationships than race itself. The desired outcomes of supervisory relationships have been shown to be impacted by gender. These findings suggest that

gender and ethnic identity will have similar impact among faculty mentoring relationships.

Implications for Counselor Education Faculty

Given that counselor education faculty have reported increased feelings of isolation during their second year of appointment (Magnuson, Shaw, Tubin, & Norem, 2004), and that positive relationships with senior faculty mediated job satisfaction and stress levels (Magnuson, 2002), a need for collegiality and mentoring is apparent. Mentoring is viewed as a crucial way to enhance the profession (Black et al., 2004; Casto, Caldwell, & Salazar, 2005; Hill, 2004; Robinson, 1994; Woodyard, 2000) and increase research in counseling (Robinson, 1994). Yet, it is also noted that the particular experiences of counselor educators are overlooked in the broad literature on faculty mentoring (Black et al., 2004; Hill, Leinbaugh, Bradley, & Hazler, 2005). Counselors themselves appear to be the least mentored profession (Schweiber, 2000), and counselor educators report the lack of mentoring as discouraging (Hill, Leinbaugh, Bradley, & Hazler, 2005) and as a barrier for career success (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004). Schwiebert (2000) postulates the lack of mentoring is due to a prevalent belief in the profession that mentoring is no longer needed once counselor or counselor educator status is reached.

Parallels are evident between mentoring relationships and counseling relationships. The skills used in both types of relationships are similar and include rapport building, goal setting, active listening, and relationship termination (Schwiebert, 2000). Empirical evidence supports the development and enhancement of counseling and

supervision skills through mentoring relationships (Peace, 1995). These parallels suggest that counselor educators will both benefit from and be astute at mentoring relationships.

Hollingsworth and Fassinger (2002) found that mentoring predicted research productivity in graduate counseling psychology students, thus providing support for the link between mentoring and career development. Graduate student mentoring assists in recruiting minority candidates into the field (Arman & McCartney, 2000). Magnuson et al. (2006) found the primary reason that faculty reported leaving counselor education was due to a lack of peer connectivity. Counseling and psychology faculty from low socioeconomic backgrounds reported having strong mentors as a major theme in their professional development (Nelson, Englar-Carlson, Tierney, & Hau, 2006). Casto, Caldwell, and Salazar (2005) caution counselor educator mentors to be aware of power within the relationship and to set appropriate boundaries; they also recommend women seek multiple mentors in order to receive increased, comprehensive guidance and support. This research demonstrates that mentoring is an essential component of faculty career development.

Although an operational definition of mentoring is yet to exist, the overwhelming majority of authors agree to the multiple advantages of cross-cultural mentorship and supervision (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Brown, Davis, & McClendon, 1999; Bruce, 1995; Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Fong, 2000; Fong & Lease, 1997; Gardner, 2002; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005; Walker, Wright & Hanley, 2001). A shared view of the characteristics of quality mentorships and supervision relationships appears to exist, however, these characteristics are distinctive, albeit without empirical support. Another

theme of note is the disagreement in the empirical research about whether cross-cultural

mentorship and supervision relationships are as effective as homogenous relationships.

Summary and Conclusions

Despite the lack of consensus for an operational definition for mentors and their

role, researchers unanimously agree that mentoring is beneficial to graduate students and

faculty alike. However, cross-cultural dyads are generally viewed as problematic due to

the nature of barriers for underrepresented populations in higher education. Initial

attempts to uncover a deeper understanding of cross-cultural mentoring relationships are

underway, albeit sparse. All agree that these relationships are central to encouraging and

fostering professional development, by recruiting and retaining underrepresented

minority professionals. Clearly, additional empirical research is warranted if academia is

to develop an in depth understanding of how cross-cultural mentoring and supervising

operate.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As shown in chapter two, there is very limited research on cross-cultural mentoring relationships, particularly in the case of faculty mentoring in academe. The intent of this study was to explore the salience of ethnic identity, and how advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy predict strength of mentoring relationships. In addition, similar and dissimilar cultural mentoring relationships were compared to determine what similarities and distinctions occur between ethnic identity development and the working alliances among cross-cultural and non-cross-cultural mentoring relationships. A non-experimental correlational study was used to test the themes derived from previous qualitative inquiries on cross-cultural mentoring relationships. The following chapter details the methodology employed for this study.

Research Questions

Based upon the review of literature, a need has been identified regarding ethnic identity and working alliances among counselor education faculty mentoring relationships. In particular, how these relationships are predicted by perceptions of mentor advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy have implications for indoctrinating new faculty as well as educating current faculty mentors. Multiple regression was used to explore the potential relationships between working alliances, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy in mentoring

relationships. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to compare cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships. The hypotheses were based upon ethnic identity and cultural empathy theories and previous research in cross-cultural relationships, which suggest that working alliances will be stronger when advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy are perceived by the mentees. The overarching research questions for this study were:

1. Can ethnic identity development, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy predict counselor education faculty working alliances with their mentors?

2. Does the type of cultural mentoring relationship, similar or dissimilar, predict counselor education faculty working alliances with their mentors?

3. Are there differences between cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships on ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, cultural empathy, and working alliance?

For research question one, the researcher hypothesized a positive relationship between working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. Research question two was hypothesized that similar cultural mentor relationships would have a positive relationship on working alliances between mentor and mentee. The third research question hypothesis was that a difference would be found between working alliances, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy among cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships.

Research Method

Participants

Inclusion criteria held that participants were currently functioning in a faculty role and were currently being mentored through a formal or informal program. Ethnicity for the purposes of this study included gender and race, as discussed in the preceding chapters. Participants were asked to self report their categories and to what degree they perceived similarities between themselves and their mentors.

The population for this study was Counselor Education faculty. All participants were members of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 433 of which identified themselves as counselor educators (ACES Membership Report, 2009). Participants were selected to participate in an electronic survey, with a target sample response of 198, as recommended to achieve a 5% sampling error (Dillman, 2007). This number exceeds the standard rule for number of cases required in multiple regression, according to Tabachnik and Fidel (2007). Because of the disparity of ethnic minorities in Counselor Education (Holcolm-McCoy & Bradley, 2003) and gender (ACES, 2009), additional participants were targeted to ensure the inclusion of underrepresented minorities and males among the sample.

Research Design

A non-experimental correlational study using survey design was used to determine the relationships between ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy and the dependent variable working alliance. This correlational design determined whether or not relationships exist among the variables, and the direction and strength of the relationships. Multivariate regression analysis was selected for the

analyses because it allowed for simultaneous analyses of several variables in determining possible relationships. However, causal relationships cannot be determined from regression analyses (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). Multiple analysis of variance was employed to determine if differences exist between culturally similar and culturally dissimilar mentoring relationships for the variables of working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy.

Survey research design was employed, as it has been demonstrated as an appropriate behavioral science research means (Dillman, 2007). The survey items followed previous research of ethnic identity (see Phinney, 2002; Phinney & Ong, 2007), working alliance (see Furcron-Turnage, 2005; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001) and cross-cultural relationships (see Lafromboise, Coleman, Hernandez, 1991; Wong & Wong, 2003). The use of email and internet based surveys has been demonstrated to provide convenience (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000), thereby increasing the response rate (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryant, 2003). Web based surveys have also been shown to include cost reduction benefits (Sax et al., 2003), response turn around time and ease of analysis (Dillman, 2007). Studies have supported no difference between online or paper surveys in response rate or bias (Porter & Umbach, 2001; Thorpe, 2002), and an increase in response rate with online delivery (Porter & Umbach, 2001).

Threats to validity emerged from the scores, instruments, and sample, rather than from the statistical procedures themselves (Kline, 2004). Threats to this study included sampling, instrumentation, and measurement errors. These threats were considered and attempts were made to reduce these threats as possible.

To reduce sampling threats, the most currently available membership list from ACES was obtained to address coverage error. Although ACES membership does not include all counselor educators, it was selected because it is the only national professional association for this profession. The preeminent national list serve for counselor educators, CESNET, was also selected, as was the New Faculty Interest Network (NFIN) list serve for counselor educators, in an attempt to reach a national sample of counselor educators.

Instrumentation threats were reduced by choosing reliable instruments with widespread, validated implementation. The reliability coefficients of the selected instruments are discussed later in the chapter. In the case of two variables without corresponding construct instruments, advocacy and empowerment, items were created by the investigator. To ensure that these items measured the intended constructs, experts in mentoring and counselor education research were solicited for item rater agreement. The rating agreements are discussed below in the instrumentation section.

Efforts to reduce measurement error included several steps of the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2007). The survey ensured trust by including the university logo, detailing confidentiality and anonymity protocols, and providing investigator contact information. The survey also provided positive reinforcement with a thank you page, offered results to participants, and also offered a reward for participation in the form of a drawing for a gift certificate to a national store chain. Social desirability, or self report error, is a recognized factor that may not be eliminated. Using an online, anonymous survey methodology decreased the likelihood of socially desirable responses (Dillman, 2007; Thorpe, 2002).

Procedures

A survey instrument was utilized to obtain perceptions and attitudes of faculty in counselor education who were engaging in either formal or informal mentoring relationships. Selected participants were invited by personalized email, as this strategy has been demonstrated to increase response rate (Dillman, 2007). An initial invitation to participate was emailed along with a link to the survey. To ensure that the survey was respondent friendly (Dillman, 2007), the time length of participation was included in the invitation and survey introduction. To provide this information and to adhere to necessary research steps (Dillman, 2007), a pilot of the survey was implemented prior to the research study. Subsequent requests to participate occurred at three intervals, with reminders of the timeframe of data collection. Up to five requests are shown effective at increasing response rate (Dillman, 2007); a total of four requests were sent for this study. The minimum sample size for multiple regression is $N \geq 50+(8)(m)$, where $m=$ number of independent variables, or $N \geq 104+m$, whichever is greater, thus the minimum size for this study is 108 (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). However, Dillman (2007) recommends a sample of 198 respondents from a population of 1000 to achieve a sampling error rate of less than 5%. With the sample size of 433 ACES members who self identified as counselor educators, a conservative number of 198 respondents was targeted.

Prior to sending invitations to participate and collecting survey data, Institutional Review Board approval was obtained from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (Appendix A). The survey was conducted online via Survey Share, a secure online surveying mechanism employed by the university. The survey was password protected, allowing only the investigator and faculty advisor to access the instrument design and

results. Participants were provided a direct link into the survey and asked to accept or

decline consent to participate (Appendix B). Refer to the appendix to view the consent

document. Declining to participate redirected respondents away from the survey to a note

of thanks. A random identification number was automatically generated by Survey Share

to ensure anonymity. Confidentiality was ensured by the investigator, who maintained the

generated list of selected participants in a separate, locked file. No association was made

from the participant list and respondents. Survey responses were contained in the

researcher's home office, within a locked cabinet.

<div align="center">Instrumentation</div>

The survey consisted of a total of 89 Likert-type and multiple choice items,

designed to measure working alliance, ethnic identity development, advocacy,

empowerment, and cultural empathy among mentors and mentees, and demographics.

Thirty-six items from the Working Alliance Inventory- Revised, Supervisee Form (WAI)

designed by Horvath and Greenberg (1989) were modified for inclusion, i.e. the term

supervisor was replaced with mentor in all items. All sixteen items from Phinney's

(1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) were contained in the survey.

Twelve survey items were designed to address perceptions of advocacy and

empowerment. Cultural empathy was measured by 18 items designed to measure cultural

empathy from the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ, van der Zee & von

Oudenhoven, 2000). Additional demographic items were included to determine the nature

of the mentoring relationship, e.g. formal or informal, degree of similarity between

mentor and mentee, gender. The instruments, rationale for instrument selection, and

descriptions of item modifications are explained in the following subsections. The

complete survey and reference to metrics and item sources are presented in Appendices C and D.

To address the concern of ethnocentric measurement that is inherent within cross-cultural research (Quintana, Troyano, & Taylor, 2001), the survey items were reviewed by counselor educators with expertise in mentoring and psychosocial measurements. Quintana et al. (2001) suggest obtaining consultation from the target audience of the study, which in this study are minority culture members. Three individuals representative of minorities in the profession agreed to serve as raters for the instrument and survey implementation to determine whether or not a consensus existed that advocacy and empowerment items were valid measurements of these constructs. Raters evaluated each item dichotomously, after which reliability of agreement was measured by Fleiss' kappa (Fleiss, 1971). Raters were asked to judge items as either positive agreement, or negative agreement, in their measurement of advocacy and empowerment. All three raters agreed that each of the items designed to measure advocacy and empowerment perceptions of mentors do address these constructs. Therefore, inter-rater agreement can be described as 100% in agreement that the advocacy items were adequate measures of perception of advocacy, and that empowerment items were adequate measures of perception of empowerment.

Working Alliance Inventory Revised-Supervisee Form

Horvath (1989) designed the WAI to measure three constructs of the working alliance within the supervisory relationship: tasks, goals and bonds. Bordin's (1979) model, upon which the WAI is based, states that the working alliance is a collaborative relationship comprised of three basic components: tasks, goals, and bonds between

therapist and client. Tasks refer to the action components between client and therapist. In counseling, these concrete tasks vary depending upon theoretical orientation, but each center around facilitating change (Bordin, 1979). In the case of mentoring relationships, the task component of the working alliance refers to the facilitation of professional development. Goals in the therapeutic working alliance refer to the establishment of mutually agreed upon client objectives, whereas goals in the mentoring relationship working alliance refer to the professional objectives that are established. In the therapeutic working alliance, bond is the level of trust and connection between counselor and client, as it is for mentoring working alliances. The working alliance model fits well for mentoring relationships because it is a measure of a collaborative relationship.

The WAI reports reliability alpha coefficients of .91 and above for each of the constructs. Convergent validity is reported as strong for two constructs (above .60 for bond and goal), and fair for one construct (.54 for task). The inventory contains 36 items.

The WAI has been the most used instrument in empirical studies to measure client-counselor relationships (Martin, Garske, & Davis, 2000), and has been demonstrated to be a reliable and valid instrument for measuring client-counselor relationships (Horvath & Symonds, 1991; Martin et al., 2000). However, while Tichenor and Hill (1989) found high internal consistency for the client and therapist versions of the WAI, the client and therapist versions of the instrument were not related to each other, an indication that client and therapist perspectives of the working alliance are not interchangeable. Because the intent of this study is to measure the perceived quality of the relationship between mentor and mentee, from the vantage point of the mentee, the WAI was selected as an applicable tool. Widely used and validated in therapeutic

relationships, it has also been applied to graduate student advisor relationships (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001), and also to mentoring relationships (Furcron-Turnage, 2005).

The survey included all WAI items to measure working alliance, however, each was modified to address the mentoring relationship rather than the therapeutic relationship. Original items with the modifications for this study are presented in Appendix D. The revised items consist of questions such as: my mentor perceives accurately what my goals are; I believe my mentor likes me; my mentor doesn't understand what I am trying to accomplish in my work.

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

The MEIM (Phinney, 1992) was used to measure individual ethnic identity development, as it is designed to assess sense of belonging to a group and involvement in ethnic practices. The intention of the MEIM is to identify both social and developmental components of individual identity, by measuring individual self-identification with: his or her own ethnicity, conceptualization of ethnicity and commitment and exploration of ethnicity. These components are identified by one overarching ethnic identity score, which is the total score, plus two subcomponents contained within the overall score, which are an affective component of commitment and belonging to ethnicity, and a developmental component of ethnic identity searching. The assessment contains 16 items.

Although psychometric studies of the MEIM have produced some dispute of the factor analysis (Lee & Yoo, 2004; Pegg & Plybon, 2005; Phinney, 1992; Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzzi, & Saya, 2003; Reese, Vera, & Paikoff, 1998; Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalano, & Oxford, 2000), it has been consistently demonstrated as a reliable and valid measure (Cokely, 2007). Reliability alphas above .80 are reported with fairly

good construct validity (Fischer & Moradi, 2001). The suggested scoring mechanism is to use the overall total mean as the ethnic identity score, rather than using the subscale scores (Phinney, 1992).

Ethnic identity as a construct is more complex than racial identity, because it incorporates social, psychological, and developmental constructs (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Ethnic identity incorporates gender, race, and social aspects of identity development, and was therefore deemed most appropriate for use in this study. This instrument has been chosen because it is not culturally specific, as are other racial identity development measures, and because the ethnicity is self identified by respondents. When measuring what is most salient for individual respondents, self-identification of ethnic group is preferable to assuming that, for example race or gender, are the salient ethnic identifiers. The MEIM measures both the social and developmental aspects of ethnic identity by examining behaviors and feelings towards ethnicity.

The complete MEIM was contained in the survey without modifications. A sample of items include questions such as I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership; I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me; I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. The complete survey, including the MEIM items, is provided in Appendix C.

Advocacy and Empowerment

Because a thorough search in ERIC, PsychInfo, Psycharticles, and Academic Search Premier yielded no instrumentation of professional advocacy or empowerment, aside from the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (Van Soest, 1996), these constructs were measured by items borrowed from two counseling instruments. The Social Justice

Advocacy Scale items were deemed inappropriate for this study as the instrument measures behaviors toward specific racial groups (e.g. each item has separate responses for African Americans, other ethnic or racial minorities, women, gay men or lesbians, persons with disabilities) rather than attitudes across cultures. Advocacy and empowerment items were measured primarily by modified items from the Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory Revised, CCCIR (Lafromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991) and the Multicultural Supervision Competencies Questionnaire (MSCQ, Wong & Wong, 2003). These items were selected because of their judged match with the terms advocacy and empowerment, and the instruments were selected due to their alignment with the intended study. The CCCIR addresses the nature of cross-cultural counseling relationships and was therefore deemed appropriate in consideration of cross-cultural mentoring relationships. The MSCQ contains a multicultural quality, not race specific focus, and was therefore judged by the investigator as appropriate for use in this study.

The CCCIR was designed to measure cultural sensitivity in counselors (Lafromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991). The instrument consists 18 items with three scales measuring cultural counseling skill, sociopolitical awareness, and cultural sensitivity. A factor analysis supported the three factor structure. The reliability coefficient alpha was reported at .92. Interrater reliability was reported at kappa .58, p<.001, with overall rater agreement at 80%. Items from the subscales socio-political awareness and cultural sensitivity subscales were modified to measure the variables of advocacy and empowerment.

The MSCQ measures multicultural competencies of counseling supervisors. The instrument contains 60 items with four subscales designed to measure attitude (i.e.

openness and respect for cultural differences), knowledge, (i.e. understands worldviews and various cultural traditions), skills (i.e. is aware and considerate of cultural biases), and relationship (i.e. able to overcome cultural barriers). Reliability coefficient alphas were reported at .90 and above (Wong & Wong, 1999). Attitude, knowledge and skill items were modified for use in measuring advocacy and empowerment variables.

Advocacy items include questions such as my mentor serves as an advocate for me; my mentor is aware of institutional barriers that affect me. Items addressing empowerment are my mentor has a tendency to abuse his/her power, e.g. impose his/her view upon me; my mentor understands that there are multiple and diverse strategies for achieving my career aspirations. The item modifications from the original instruments are detailed in Appendix D.

Cultural Empathy

As indicated in the previous chapter, cultural empathy is a distinct concept with substantially different characteristics from general empathy (see Ridley & Liddle, 1996; Wang et al., 2003). There are currently two instruments to the knowledge of the investigator that address cultural empathy specifically, the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE, Wang et al., 2003) and the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ, van der Zee & von Oudenhoven, 2000). Although the SEE bases its construct of ethnocultural empathy directly from Ridley and Liddle's (1996) definition of cultural empathy (Wang et al., 2003), the 30 item instrument focuses on internal attitudes that would not be observable by mentees, for example, "I feel annoyed when people do not speak standard English;" and "I am touched by movies or books about discrimination issues faced by racial or ethnic groups other than my own." Therefore, this instrument

was not deemed appropriate for use in surveying mentees' perceptions of their mentors. The MPQ, on the other hand, has a specific construct designed to measure cultural empathy and has been applied in business and management settings (see van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000; van Oudenhoven, Mol, & van der Zee, 2003; van Oudenhoven, van der Zee, & Van Kooten, 2001), and in a psychology dissertation (Nganga, 2006).

The MPQ is comprised of 91 total items designed to measure cultural empathy, openmindedness, social initiative, emotional stability, and flexibility, and was originally created for use with employees relocating abroad (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000). The construct of cultural empathy is deemed as "the ability to empathize with the feelings, thoughts, and behaviours of members from different cultural groups" (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, p. 294, 2000). The coefficient alpha from the confirmatory factor analysis was above .70, indicating strong reliability. Test-retest correlations for cultural empathy were modest at r=.64.

The items from the MPQ cultural empathy scale were included in the survey. An example of the items includes questions such as my mentor sympathizes with others regardless of cultural background; my mentor is attentive to facial expressions; my mentor takes people's cultural values into consideration. The only modification to these items was the inclusion of the context "my mentor" for each item. Item modifications are presented in Appendix D.

Data Analyses

Multiple regression was utilized in this study to measure the predictive relationships between the independent variables of ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy to the dependent variable of working alliance.

Multiple regression is a set of statistical analyses that enables relationships between one dependent variable and several independent variables to be determined (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). Multivariate analysis of variance was used to measure any differences between culturally similar and culturally dissimilar mentoring relationships on the variables of working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy. To address the research questions, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was employed to report demographic variables and to conduct the analyses.

A hierarchical multiple regression was employed, which requires that the independent variables be ordered into the equation. According to Tabachnick and Fidel (2007), variables with greater theoretical importance should be given early entry. Therefore ethnic identity was entered first because it is acquired through personal experiences, and is a quality of the participant. Advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy were entered in the second step, as they are considered to be generally fixed characteristics of the mentor, as perceived by the participants in the study. The type of mentor relationship, cross-cultural or homogenous, was entered as a third step.

Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine whether or not differences existed between cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships on working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. This technique enables simultaneous assessment of group differences across multiple variables while reducing the likelihood of a Type I error, i.e. rejection of the null hypothesis when it is true (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). The mean scores of the variables were compared.

Summary

The investigator hypothesized that ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy would positively predict the working alliance in mentoring relationships for mentees. The second hypothesis for this study was that type of mentor, either cross-cultural or homogenous, would predict counselor educator working alliances with their mentors. The third hypothesis was that some differences between type of mentor would exist for working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy would be obtained. The study employed survey research methodology, multiple regression analyses, and multivariate analysis of variance.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Introduction

This study examined the relationship between the variables of working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy in the mentoring relationships of counselor education faculty members. There were three overarching research questions designed to explore faculty mentoring relationships as perceived by the mentees. The first question posed was if ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy predicts counselor education faculty working alliances with their mentors. The second question posed was if the type of mentor, either similar or dissimilar, predicts counselor education faculty working alliances with their mentors. The final research question asked if there are differences between similar and dissimilar mentoring relationships on working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. The following chapter presents the demographic picture of respondents, data assumptions, and the results from the multiple regression analyses and the multivariate analysis of variance. A summary concludes this chapter.

Participant Demographics

A total of 433 ACES members who had self-reported as counselor educators were invited to participate in the study, along with members of the CESNET and NFIN list serves. An indeterminate number of additional minority faculty participants were targeted by referral. Because a purposive sampling method was employed, sampling error and

response rates cannot be calculated. There were a total of 226 respondents. The majority

of participants were female (66%) and Caucasian (78%). The majority of participants

reported their job status as Assistant Professor (37%), with 21% at Associate Professor

level. Seventy-seven percent reported their primary job function as counselor education

faculty, and 10% as counselor. Respondents who indicated "other" (11%) as their

primary job function wrote in responses falling into the following categories: academic

administration (e.g. department chair, research director), doctoral student (e.g. doctoral

candidate, PhD student), and counseling supervision (e.g. mental health director,

counselor supervisor). These participants were included in the overall analysis, as the

investigator judged these participants as counselor educators, as had they on their ACES

membership designation. Demographics are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Numbers and Percentages of Demographic Variables

Variable	Number	Percentage
Gender		
Female	148	65.50%
Male	74	32.70%
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	176	77.90%
African American	15	6.60%
Other	12	5.30%
Multiethnic	7	3.10%
Asian	6	2.70%
Hispanic/Latino	4	1.80%
Native American	1	0.40%
Position Title		
Assistant Professor	83	36.70%
Associate Professor	47	20.80%
Full Professor	36	15.90%
Other	25	11.00%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Counselor	23	10.20%
Adjunct Professor	7	3.10%
Primary Job Function		
Counselor Education		
Faculty	173	76.50%
Other	24	10.60%
Counselor	23	10.20%

Note. There were <3% missing items.

The nature of the mentoring relationships that participants based their responses

on ranged in cultural similarity, time in relationship, and type of the relationship. Of the

226 respondents, 56 indicated that they had never had a mentor and four participants did

not respond to the item. Of the 166 participants who indicated having a mentor, 62%

reported having a mentor of the same gender and 66% reported having a mentor with the

same ethnicity as themselves, however, when duplicate responses were collapsed into a

single cross-culturally or homogenous culturally matched mentor, 54% of mentoring

relationships were characterized as cross-cultural. The length of time for mentoring

relationships ranged between one year to 31 years. The mean length of time of the

mentoring relationships was just under eight years; the mode was three years. Most

respondents reported having two mentors, with the average being 2.3 mentors. More than

half of respondents indicated that their primary mentoring relationship was informal

(57%) with only 32% indicating having a formal, assigned mentor. Thirty-two percent

reported that their primary mentor was outside their department or university and 23%

reported having a primary mentor within their department or university. The majority of

participants reported meeting with their primary mentor often (35%), whereas 27%

reported meeting on a seldom basis, i.e. a few times a year, and 28% on a weekly basis.

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage descriptives of mentoring relationships.

Table 2

Descriptives of Mentoring Relationships

Variable	Number	Percentage
Type of Relationship*		
Informal (not assigned)	95	57.20%
Formal (assigned)	53	31.90%
Outside department/university	53	31.90%
Inside department/university	38	22.90%
Cultural Similarity		
Same Gender		
Yes	103	62.00%
No	161	36.70%
Same Ethnicity		
Yes	110	66.30%
No	54	32.50%
Frequency of Meetings		
Seldom (a few time a year)	45	27.10%
Often (monthly)	58	34.90%
Frequently (weekly)	46	27.70%
Other	14	8.40%
Length of Relationship in Years		
Mean	7.99	
Mode	3	
Range	1-31	
1 year	10	6.00%
2 years	22	13.30%
3 years	23	13.90%
4 - 6 years	33	20.00%
7 - 10 years	35	21.00%
> 11 years	37	22.20%

Table 2 (continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Number of Current Mentors		
Mean	2.38	
Mode	2	
Range	1 -10	
0 mentors	4	2.40%
1 mentor	39	23.50%
2 mentors	49	29.50%
3 mentors	46	27.70%
4 mentors	11	6.60%
5 mentors	8	4.80%
6 - 10 mentors	2	1.20%

Note. *Multiple selections were possible for this item, therefore percentages and numbers totals are greater than the number of respondents.

Data Assumptions

Both multiple regression and multivariate analysis of variance depend upon several assumptions about data distribution in order to avoid Type I and Type II errors. Variables were examined for outliers, missing data, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity of residuals, collinearity, equal cell size and homogeneity of group variances (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Data for the multiple regression and multiple analysis of variance included only those cases where respondents indicated having a current mentor (n = 166). The normality was determined by computing skewness and kurtosis statistics, and by generating scatterplots. Table 3 presents the skew, kurtosis, and standard error of the variables. For all tables, variables are represented as follows: working alliance (WA), ethnic identity (EI), advocacy (Adv), empowerment (Emp), and cultural empathy (CE). Kurtosis was close to zero for ethnic identity and advocacy, and can be considered normal. However, working alliance, empowerment, and cultural empathy did have scores slightly above the absolute value of zero. The researcher examined the variable standard

deviations, and because no standard deviations were above 3, it was determined that there were no excessive linear outliers. Missing data was less than 5%, which is not believed to be problematic, however, missing cases were replaced with variable means, as is a standard and conservative practice (Tabachnick and Fidel, 2007).

Table 3

Variable Skewness and Kurtosis

Variable	Skew	SE	Kurtosis	SE
WA	1.70	0.19	3.93	0.38
EI	-0.05	0.19	-0.58	0.38
Adv	1.01	0.19	0.49	0.38
Emp	0.74	0.19	1.50	0.38
CE	1.81	0.19	2.10	0.38

Correlations Between Variables

Pearson product-moment coefficients were conducted to measure the relationships among variables. The Pearson correlation matrix is displayed in Table 4. There were statistically significant correlations between working alliance and advocacy ($r = .64$, $p<.05$), empowerment ($r = .72$, $p<.05$), and cultural empathy ($r = .66$, $p<.05$). Guidelines for interpreting linear correlation strength state that a strong relationship has a value of $r = .5$, a moderate relationship has a value of $r = .3$, and a weak relationship has a value of $r = .10$ (Cohen, 1988). These relationships suggest that advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy are strongly and positively correlated with working alliance in faculty mentoring relationships. Ethnic identity was weakly and positively correlated with advocacy ($r = .20$, $p<.05$) and cultural empathy ($r = .18$, $p<.05$) and negatively correlated with mentor type ($r = -.23$, $p<.05$); mentor type was coded as one for same gender/ethnicity and two for dissimilar gender/ethnicity. Advocacy, empowerment and

cultural empathy were moderately positively correlated. Given the correlations among variables, interpretations of the multiple regression and multivariate analysis of variance should be made with caution.

Table 4

Pearson Correlation Matrix between Working Alliance and Predictor Variables

Variable	WA	EI	Adv	Emp	CE	Mentor Type
WA	1.00	.13	.64*	.72*	.66*	-.03
EI		1.00	.20*	.15	.18*	-.23*
Adv			1.00	.57*	.54*	.06
Emp				1.00	.69*	.05
CE					1.00	.03
Mentor Type						1.00

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Multiple Regression Analyses

A hierarchical multiple regression analyses was conducted to address the research questions which sought to examine how ethnic identity, perceptions of mentor advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy predict the working alliance as reported by counselor education faculty mentees, and specifically whether or not differences exist between culturally similar and culturally dissimilar relationships. The predictor variables were ordered into the regression model based upon theory and previous research. Ethnic identity was entered first, followed by advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. The third step was type of mentor, either similar or dissimilar from the mentee. This sequencing enabled the identification of the amount of variance each predictor variable had for the working alliance. The multiple regression was conducted to determine if predictive relationships existed between working alliance and the predictor variables, and whether or not type of mentor predicts working alliance.

The scales measuring each of the variables contained Likert scale ratings. The means represent the Likert scale averages. Rating scales were between one and seven for working alliance, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy, with one being a strong positive agreement and seven being a strong negative agreement. Rating scales were between one and four for ethnic identity, and with one being a strong positive agreement and four being a strong negative agreement. Mentor types were collapsed into two dummy variables, with one indicating a mentor with the same gender and/or ethnicity and two indicating a mentor with a different gender and/or ethnicity from the mentee. Of the 226 respondents, 56 indicated that they had never had a mentor and four did not respond to the item; these respondents were removed from the multiple regression. The ratio of cases to variables was marginally acceptable at a ratio of 1 to 33, with 166 cases exceeding the 108 recommended for multiple regression (Tabachnick and Fidel, 2007). A scatter plot indicated a normal linear distribution and homoscedasticity of residuals which did not indicate major problems. Variance inflation factors (VIF) values were below 2, indicating that the estimated beta values are not problematic.

The means, standard deviations, and numbers of the variables for the multiple regression are presented in Table 5. The working alliance mean indicates that counselor education faculty perceive their mentor relationships to be strong overall and there was not a great deal of variance, as indicated by the standard deviation. Ethnic identity development was also high overall for respondents. The means for advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy indicate that counselor education faculty respondents felt their mentors to be strong advocates on their behalf possessing cultural empathy and would characterize the relationships as empowering. Mentor type was coded as one for

same gender and/or ethnicity and two for different gender and/or ethnicity. The mean

(1.55) indicates the prevalence of cross-cultural mentoring relationships among the

counselor education faculty respondents. The number of responses varied among the

variables. In preparation for the multiple regression and multivariate analysis of variance,

missing data was replaced with the variable means.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Numbers of Outcome and Predictor Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	N
WA	2.30	0.67	164
EI	1.83	0.48	165
Adv	2.32	1.12	162
Emp	2.90	0.69	162
CE	2.51	0.68	163
Mentor Type	1.55	0.50	164

The results the multiple regression indicated that the variance accounted for (R^2)

with the first predictor, ethnic identity, equaled .02 (adjusted R^2=.01), which was not

significantly different from zero ($F_{(1,164)}$=.50, p=.12). Next, advocacy, empowerment

and cultural empathy were entered into the regression equation. The change in variance

accounted for (ΔR^2) was equal to .61, which was statistically significant increase in

variance accounted for over the step one model ($F_{(3,161)}$=6.35, p=.00).   In the third step,

mentor type was entered into the equation. The change in variance accounted for was

statistically significant and equal to ΔR^2 = .01, ($\Delta F_{(1,160)}$=4.25, p=.00).   The results of

the hierarchical multiple regression analyses predicting working alliance from ethnic

identity, advocacy, empowerment, cultural empathy and type of mentor are presented in

Table 6. The results indicate that ethnic identity does not predict working alliance.

However, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy did significantly predict

working alliance, with higher levels of advocacy, empowerment and working alliance

indicating higher levels of working alliance, accounting for 61% of the total variance in

working alliance. Mentor type, either similar or different, was found to negatively predict

working alliance, accounting for an additional 1% of variance after the first two steps in

the equation. The negative correlation indicates that the similar mentor type predicts a

higher working alliance whereas a dissimilar mentor type predicts lower working

alliance. However, the variance accounted for was small.

Table 6

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Evaluating Predictors of Working Alliance

Models	R	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF	df	β
Step 1	.12	.02	.02	2.50	1, 164	
ID						.12
Step 2	.79	.62	.61	86.34	3, 161	
Adv						.30*
Emp						.40*
CE						.23*
Step 3	.79	.63	.01	2.83	1, 160	
Mentor						
Type						-.08*

Note. * Indicates statistical significance at *p<.05* level. **Bolded** indicates models are statistically significant. Betas are reported according to the step in which the variable was entered into the equation.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

To address the third research question, multivariate analysis of variance

(MANOVA) was used to determine if statistical differences existed between cross-

cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships on the dependent variables of working

alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. The overall

scale means of working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy were used rather than their subscales to reduce the number of variables in the study and thus increase the power (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The overall working alliance mean score and the ethnic identity mean score are recommended for use in analysis by the instrument authors (see Horvath & Greenberg, 1989; Phinney, 1992). The Working Alliance Inventory contains several reverse score items, which were recoded in SPSS prior to analyses.

Before conducting the MANOVA, the data were screened for missing data, outliers, and normality. There were 5 cases of missing data, which is less than 5%, and was therefore deemed acceptable. Missing data was replaced with the variable mean, with two exceptions being for the missing cases of type of mentor. Two cases where type of mentor was not indicated were omitted from the analysis. The dependent variables appeared normally distributed with no excessive outliers. The means and standard deviations are reported in the Table 7. Lower variable means indicate high scores for the variables. Working alliance means were high among both types of mentors, cross-cultural and homogenous. Ethnic identity was also high among counselor education faculty. Advocacy was a characteristic identified in counselor education faculty mentors, although this variable had greater variability among scores, as indicated by the standard deviation. Empowerment and cultural empathy were also found to be high among counselor education faculty mentoring relationships.

The MANOVA was performed on the independent variables of homogenous mentor and cross-cultural mentor on the dependent variables of working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. The independent variable was

mentor type, meaning cultural similarity or cultural dissimilarity in gender and ethnicity.

A Levene's test of equality of error variances was employed to test for homogeneity of

group error variances, and was not significant for the dependent variables working

alliance (p=.199), ethnic identity (p=.792), empowerment (p=.350), and cultural empathy

(p=.546). However, advocacy did produce significance (p=.041), indicating that the error

variance is not equal across groups for this variable, therefore interpretations of results

for advocacy should be interpreted with caution. The assumption of equality of

covariance matrices was satisfied, Box's M = 24.69, p = .067. There was a significant

difference between homogenous mentor and cross-cultural mentor groups and the

combined dependent variables, Wilks' Lambda = .922, F = 2.671, p=.024. Univariate t-

tests were conducted to examine differences between mentor groups on the dependent

variables, with each test examined at the .05 level of significance. A significant

difference was found between the mentor groups on ethnic identity (p = .004), but not on

working alliance (p = .709), advocacy (p = .477), empowerment (p = .554), or cultural

empathy (p = .677). However, the effect size of ethnic identity was small, with partial eta

squared equaling .051. Although ethnic identity was significantly lower for mentees with

homogenous mentors, it accounted for just 5% of the overall variance by itself.

Table 7

MANOVA Means and Standard Deviations

Variable	Mentor Type	Mean	SD	N
WA	homogenous	2.32	0.57	74
	cross-cultural	2.28	0.74	90
	Total	2.3	0.67	164
EI	homogenous	1.94*	0.5	74
	cross-cultural	1.73	0.44	90
	Total	1.83	0.48	164

Table 7 (continued)

Variable	Mentor Type	Mean	SD	N
Adv	homogenous	2.25	1.01	74
	cross-cultural	2.38	1.2	90
	Total	2.32	1.12	164
Emp	homogenous	2.86	0.64	74
	cross-cultural	2.93	0.72	90
	Total	2.9	0.69	164
CE	homogenous	2.48	0.66	74
	cross-cultural	2.53	0.7	90
	Total	2.51	0.68	164

Note: * indicates significant difference at p<.05.

Summary

Multiple regression was conducted to determine what relationships existed between working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy on mentees perceptions of their mentors and how the variables predicted working alliance. Strong positive relationships were found between the predictor variables of advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy and the outcome variable of working alliance. Advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy accounted for over half of the variance for working alliance reported by mentees, and ethnic identity significantly predict the working alliance for an additional 1% of variance. A MANOVA was conducted to address the research question of determining if differences existed between cross-cultural and homogenous mentor types on the dependent variables. A significant difference was found between cross-cultural and homogenous culture mentor groups overall. Ethnic identity was significantly lower among homogenous mentor relationships, and the variable independently accounted for 5% of the overall variance. A discussion of these results follows in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study investigated the mentoring relationships among counselor education faculty, specifically, mentees' perceptions of working alliance as it related to ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy with their primary mentor. The study sought to determine if and how these variables relate to one another and predict working alliances, especially between cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships, in an attempt to support qualitative findings and contribute to the empirical knowledge base for counselor education professional development. The results from this study are discussed in this chapter, which includes an overview of the findings, discussion of the results, contributions, limitations and recommendations for future research.

Overview

This study was an exploration of the relationship between ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy on the working alliances of cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships among faculty engaged in mentoring relationships. Faculty mentoring programs orient new members into the professorate and provide opportunities to integrate cultural diversity into university ideology. Therefore developing an understanding of how ethnic membership impacts mentoring relationship

is critical. Counselor education has been a champion of cultural competencies and is positioned as a leader in understanding cross-gender and cross-ethnic relationships.

Cross-cultural mentoring relationships are inevitable, due to the gender and ethnic minority disparity in higher education (Gonzalez-Figueroa & Young, 2002; Ragins, 1997). Women constitute more than half of counselor educators (ACES, 2009), and minority faculty remain underrepresented in counselor education (Bradley, 2005; Brinson & Kottler, 1993). These disparities present challenges for mentoring relationships, particularly given that the empirical knowledge of establishing effective professional collaborations, particularly among counselor educators, is in its early stages. This study described professional mentoring relationships and how ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy relate to the working alliances of cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships in an effort to develop an understanding of patterns between these variables from the vantage point of mentees.

A total of 433 ACES members who had self-reported as counselor education faculty were invited to participate in the study, along with members of the CESNET and NFIN list serves. An indeterminate number of additional minority faculty participants were targeted by referral. Because a snowball sampling method was employed, sampling error and response rates could not be calculated. There were a total of 226 respondents to the online survey, which was comprised of the Working Alliance Inventory-Revised (Horvath & Greenberg,1989), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Development Measure (Phinney, 1992), and items designed to measure advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy adapted from the Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory Revised, CCCIR (Lafromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991), the Multicultural Supervision

Competencies Questionnaire (MSCQ, Wong & Wong, 2003), and the Multicultural

Personality Questionnaire (MPQ, van der Zee & von Oudenhoven, 2000).   Multiple

regression and multivariate analysis of variance were employed to address the research

questions of how the variables predicted working alliances, and whether or not

differences existed between working alliances in cross-cultural and homogenous

mentoring dyads.

<div align="center">Discussion of the Results</div>

Demographic Data

The majority of participants were female (66%) and Caucasian (78%). Seven

percent of respondents were African American, less than 3% were Asian, less than 2%

Hispanic/Latino, and less than 1% Native American. The majority reported job status as

Assistant Professor (37%), with 21% at Associate Professor level. Seventy-seven percent

reported their primary job function as counselor education faculty, and 10% as counselor.

Respondents who indicated "other" (11%) as their primary job function wrote in

responses falling into the following categories: academic administration (e.g. department

chair, research director), doctoral student (e.g. doctoral candidate, PhD student), and

counseling supervision (e.g. mental health director, counselor supervisor). These

demographic findings indicate that white females constitute the majority group among

counselor educators and that the underrepresented minorities remain disproportionate to

the general U.S. population. However, these demographics are encouraging in that

counselor education is making strides in acquiring diversity within the profession, given

that 22% of the respondents represent an underrepresented minority group.

A minority of counselor educator mentoring relationships from this sample can be characterized as cross-cultural, given that over half were same gender (62%) and over half were same ethnicity (66%). This finding supports previous mentoring research that concludes that cultural similarity is preferred within professional relationships (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Collins, Kamya & Tourse, 1997; Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1991; McCormick, 1991; Thomas, 1990). However, it should be noted that after collapsing the responses into two non-duplicate groups of either same gender and/or ethnicity mentors and different gender and/or ethnicity mentors, slightly more than half the mentoring relationships were characterized as cross-cultural (54%). This finding is encouraging, in that it suggests that counselor educators are reaching beyond similar gender and ethnicity to forge mentoring relationships, an affirmation that multicultural awareness pedagogy is taking root within professional practice.

The most frequently cited number of years in the relationship was three years, with the average length of time being eight years. This finding is not surprising given that the majority of mentoring relationships were described as informal (57%), as research has demonstrated that informal relationships tend to be lengthier than formal mentoring relationships (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Kram, 1985; Mullen, 1998; Murray, 1991; Young & Perrew, 2000). This finding also indicates that most counselor education faculty self-select their mentors. Because meeting frequency has been found to predict mentoring relationship levels of desired psychosocial support among university faculty (Walters, 2004), the results from this study suggest that counselor educator mentoring relationships are supportive, which was corroborated by the high average working alliance score of the respondents.

Most respondents reported having two mentors. Only 20% reported having a primary mentor that was within their department or university, and 56 respondents (25%) reported having never had a mentor at all, an indication that counselor education faculty are not finding mentoring relationships within their departments. This finding suggests that there is the potential for increased likelihood of feelings of isolation for some counselor educators, which is common among new faculty (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Fong, 2000; Gay, 2004; Sorcinelli, 1994; Tillman, 2001).

Multiple Regression Analysis

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to determine how the variables were related, and whether or not the outcome variable, working alliance, was predicted by ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, cultural empathy and mentor type. Steps were entered according to theory and previous research. Pearson product-moment coefficients indicated that there were significant strong positive correlations between working alliance and advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy. A significant correlation between working alliance and ethnic identity was not found. The multiple regression indicated that ethnic identity did not significantly predict working alliance, but that advocacy, empowerment, cultural empathy and mentor type did significantly predict working alliance. Advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy accounted for over half of the variance in working alliance and type of mentor accounted for an additional 1% of variance. These results indicate that mentoring working alliances can be predicted by levels of advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy within the relationship and also by type of mentor, either cross-cultural or homogenous.

Working Alliance and Ethnic Identity

The finding that ethnic identity did not predict working alliance overall was surprising. This finding does not support previous research showing that preference in mentor gender and ethnicity and strength in mentoring relationships was related to ethnic identity (Gonzalez-Figueroa & Young, 2002; Thomas, 1990). However, the overall average ethnic identity score was just below 2, on a four point scale, an indication that the overall ethnic identity development levels for counselor educators in this study was slightly above average. This finding suggests that mentees with lower than average ethnic identity may prefer similar, or homogenous mentors. Because the majority of the relationships in this study were cross-cultural, self-selected, and with high working alliances overall, these findings could be more reflective of the fact that counselor educators have been trained in relationship development, and have developed strong working alliances overall with their mentors, which may carry over into mentoring relationships. These results are a clear indication that little is known about the salience of ethnic identity in mentoring relationships.

Working Alliance, Advocacy, Empowerment, Cultural Empathy and Mentor Type

The variables of advocacy, empowerment, cultural empathy and mentor type were found to significantly positively predict working alliance in mentoring relationships among counselor educators in support of the hypothesis. These variables accounted for over half of the variance in working alliance strength, supporting the hypothesis and the findings of previous research. High advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy predicted a high working alliance. The negative correlation between mentor type and working alliance indicates that a similar mentor in gender and ethnicity predicts a higher

working alliance, whereas a mentor of different gender and ethnicity predicts lower working alliance.

These findings corroborate previous research. Advocacy has been deemed an essential characteristic of successful cross-cultural mentoring (Atkinson, Casas, & Neville, 1994; Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Brown et al., 1999; Fong, 2000; Johnson, Koch, Fallow & Huwe, 2000; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005), as has been empowerment (Bradley, 2005; Brinson and Kottler, 1993; Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Ragins, 1995; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005), and open cultural communication (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Fong, 2000; Gardner, 2002). Mentor similarity has been shown to impact the level of psychosocial support and comfort within the relationship (Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Thomas, 1990, 1993; Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006). The findings from this study suggest that the perception of mentor as advocate, as empowering the mentee, and relating to the mentee with cultural empathy are important components of a strong working alliance in both cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships, yet are particularly important for cross-cultural relationships.

In conclusion, this study supported theoretical and qualitative implications that advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy are essential components within strong mentoring relationships, and particularly for cross-cultural relationships. Having a cross-cultural mentor predicts a lower working alliance. Although these variables have been discussed in previous theoretical and qualitative works, they had not been used to predict mentoring relationships in previous empirical investigations. Determining that these variables are related to mentoring working alliances and even predict working alliance is a contribution to the literature of faculty mentoring research.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Multivariate analysis of variance was used to measure any statistical differences between cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships on working alliance, ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy. Overall mean scores of working alliance and ethnic identity were used, rather than the subscales contained in each instrument, to increase the power of the study. A significant difference was found between cross-cultural and homogenous cultural mentor groups. Ethnic identity was significantly higher among cross-cultural mentor relationships, and the variable independently accounted for 5% of the variance.

Working Alliance and Type of Mentor

The hypothesis that mentees with culturally matched, homogenous, mentors would have significantly higher working alliances than culturally mixed, cross-cultural, mentors was confirmed. This finding supports previous research that has found culturally dissimilar mentoring relationships problematic and less supportive (Gonzalez-Figueroa & Young, 2000; Thomas, 1990; Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Marchese, 2006). There are several implications associated with this finding among counselor education faculty.

Counselor educators are highly skilled at building and maintaining close interpersonal relationships, and are forming more cross-cultural mentoring relationships than homogenous relationships. Yet, establishing the same strength of working alliance still presents a challenge for cross-cultural relationships. Counselor education as a profession espouses cultural competencies and a doctrine of multiculturalism within education and practice (ACA, 2006), meaning that counselor educators may be more

likely than others to develop strong working alliances regardless of cultural similarity. The results from this study indicated high levels of working alliance across both cross-cultural and homogenous relationships.

Ethnic Identity and Type of Mentor

Ethnic identity was significantly higher for mentees with mentors of a different cultural background. Mentees with either the same gender or same ethnicity mentors had significantly lower ethnic identity than those mentees with different gender or ethnicity mentors, although the variance was minimal at 5%. Previous research suggests that lower ethnic identity within mentoring relationships indicates lower outcomes, such as psychosocial support and strength of relationship (Gonzalez-Figueroa & Young, 2000; Thomas, 1990). According to ethnic identity theory, lower identity levels are characterized by lower commitment to and/or sense of belonging to one's ethnicity and less searching of ethnic identity in context of other ethnic groups (Phinney, 1992). This theory paired with the finding of higher ethnic identity among cross-cultural mentors suggests that sense of belonging and overall comfort with cultural exploration is stronger for counselor education faculty with mentors of different gender and ethnicity. Conversely, this implies that lower ethnic identity among homogenous mentoring dyads have a lower sense of searching for ethic context. Because the respondents indicated a majority of self-selected mentoring relationships, i.e. informal, this finding may be an indication of ethnic identity as it pertains to power within the relationship. Ragins (1997) postulated that ethnic minorities attribute greater power to mentors from the majority group and argued on the basis of social identity theory that the more diverse a mentoring relationship, the less likely mentees would identify with mentors. In juxtaposition with

Phinney's (1992) ethnic identity development model, these theories indicate that a person with higher ethnic identity will not feel threatened by a mentor of a different culture, and with therefore be more likely to seek a cross-cultural mentor.

Advocacy, Empowerment, and Cultural Empathy

Although advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy were found to predict working alliances among counselor educator mentoring relationships, these variables were not found to be significantly different between cross-cultural and homogenous relationships. Previous researchers have found that these variables are important traits in cross-cultural mentoring (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Brown et al., 1999; Bruce, 1995; Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Fong, 2000; Fong & Lease, 1997; Gardner, 2002; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). These findings suggest that there is no distinction among cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships, in that both require advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy.

Contributions of the Study

A major strength of this study is that it was a national study of counselor educators, and that it is one of very few empirical studies of mentoring in counselor education. This study captured a current description of counselor education faculty mentoring relationships in terms of type of relationship, frequency of meetings, duration of relationships, and number of mentors obtained. Results from this investigation support the salience of psychosocial factors of advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy in forming successful working alliances among both cross-cultural and homogenous faculty mentoring relationships. The study contributes to the empirical investigation of ethnic identity within mentoring relationships.

Significant positive correlations between advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy and working alliance support existing qualitative findings that these factors are essential in cross-cultural mentoring relationships. This finding also suggests these factors are equally important for homogenous relationships. Ethnic identity was found to be significantly higher among cross-cultural mentor relationships, suggesting that stronger sense of cultural exploration is characteristic of same gender and same ethnic mentoring dyads. However, ethnic identity independently accounted for 5% of the variance so this interpretation is made with caution.

<div align="center">Limitations of the Study</div>

There are several limitations to this study, both in design and in statistical analyses, which reduce the robustness of findings. In research design, the population was counselor educators in the U.S., with the sample obtained from a national association of counselor educators. Results from this study cannot be generalized to all counselor education faculty, nor to faculty at large. Because the methodology was quasi-experimental survey with correlational design, self-report bias could not be eliminated, although it was minimized by employing tailored survey design protocols (Dillman, 2007). Causal statements cannot be derived from correlational studies. Another limitation to this study was the employment of newly constructed variables: advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy. Despite inter-rater agreements and foundational instruments for the design of these variable measurements, construct validity remains a threat to interpretation of results. The intercorrelations between these variables was high, as expected, and does reduce robustness of conclusions. Finally, this study has reduced

power due to the number of dependent variables. Therefore, these results should be interpreted with caution.

Conclusions

This study was an attempt to explore the relationship between ethnic identity, advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy on the working alliances among cross-cultural and homogenous counselor educator faculty mentoring relationships. This study also provided a current description of counselor educator faculty mentoring relationships which indicate that counselor educators are engaging in cross-cultural mentoring relationships in high frequency. The findings support previous qualitative research that suggests advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy are important factors for strong mentoring relationships. Differences were found in ethnic identity and cross-cultural and homogenous types of mentoring relationships, an indication that cultural context contributes to mentoring relationships.

Implications of Findings

There are several implications from the outcomes of this study. First, the characteristics of counselor education faculty mentoring relationships suggest that cultural competencies are integrated into professional development practice. Second, the relationships between advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy and working alliance were supportive of previous research. Third, differing ethnic identity findings among cross-cultural and homogenous mentoring relationships supported previous research suggesting ethnic identity as a salient factor within mentoring relationships.

Despite the gender and ethnic disparity among counselor educators (ACES, 2009), the majority of mentoring relationships in this study were characterized as cross-

cultural. This finding is supportive of the fact that counselor educators adhere to cultural competencies within professional development practice in addition to counseling and educational practice. The majority of respondents indicated having mentors, another encouraging finding, indicating that counselor educators engage in developing collegial relationships. However, the finding that some respondents reported having no mentors was disappointing. This indicates that counselor educators may need to be intentional in seeking mentees to support along their professional development.

Advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy are facets important to counselor educator mentoring relationships, regardless of whether or not they are cross-cultural or not. This finding suggests that these traits are characteristic of healthy working alliances among mentoring relationships. Guidelines for effective mentoring can outline these components and be integrated into explicit communication about developing strong mentoring relationships.

The finding that ethnic identity was significantly higher among cross-cultural mentoring relationships than homogenous relationships supports previous research. This finding indicates that sense of cultural exploration is increased among cross-cultural mentoring relationships. However, the question of salience for ethnic identity remains large, as this study cannot discern whether or not higher levels of ethnic identity were present at the formation of the mentoring relationships, or if it was a product of these cross-cultural mentoring relationships. Studies have suggested ethnic identity as a precursor for characterizing and establishing the mentoring relationship (Gonzalez,- Figueroa & Young, 2000; Thomas, 1990; Ward, 2000). No empirical studies have investigated how mentoring relationships may impact ethnic identity. Some researchers

have suggested that forging cross-cultural relationships can positively impact careers, social relationships and cultural trust (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Ensher & Murphy, 1997; Schwiebert, 2000; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005), an implication that ethnic identity development and cultural empathy can be developed through cross-cultural relationships.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study made contributions to the empirical base of faculty mentoring relationships and found support of the importance of advocacy, empowerment, and cultural empathy to working alliances. There are additional questions raised that are recommended for future research. Limitations to this study suggest methodological corrections for future research to improve the robustness of these findings.

Although this study supports qualitative findings on the importance of advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy on mentoring relationships, future studies investigating the importance of each one, independent of the other, would clarify the salience of each within the particular types of mentoring relationships, i.e. cross-cultural or homogenous. Additionally, further investigation is needed to explore ethnic identity and working alliance to confirm or refute the findings from this study that they are only marginally. Examining the relationship expectations and attraction toward a relationship between mentees and mentors will shed light onto the salience of psychosocial factors within relationship development. Clearly, no definitive evidence exists on the salience of ethnic identity within mentoring relationships, as to how it impacts and is developed by cross-cultural relationships. Controls for length and type of mentoring relationships, obtaining a larger sample of cross-cultural relationships, and studying mentors within

these dyads would also provide depth of understanding to the psychosocial factors within mentoring relationships.

Concluding Remarks

Faculty mentoring programs have been widely used as recruiting and retention tools to welcome and develop new members into the academy. These professional development relationships are opportunities to integrate cultural diversity into the university ideology and to extend the campus climate beyond privilege. Developing an understanding of how ethnic membership impacts these relationships is critical to inform current practice and education, and to thereby avoid assimilation. Common consensus across academia supports the benefits of mentoring, yet empirical support for widespread implementation and efficacy remains in the early stages.

This study broadened the literature base of faculty mentoring relationships. It also provided important implications for preparing faculty mentors. The intended larger impact of this study is that of providing perspective that facilitates advocacy, empowerment and cultural empathy for faculty in higher education, in the attempt to reverse the effects of oppression and elitism in our culture, and to facilitate beneficial cross-cultural professional relationships.

REFERENCES

Allen, T, Day, & Lentz, E. (2005). The role of interpersonal comfort in mentoring relationships. *Journal of Career Development, 31,* 155-169.

Allen, T., & Eby, L. (2004). Factors related to mentor reports of mentoring functions provided: Gender and relational characteristics. *Sex Roles*, *50,* 129-139.

Allen, T., Eby, L., & Lentz, E. (2006). Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: Closing the gap between research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 567-578.

Allen, T., Eby, L., O'Brien, K., & Lentz, E. (2008). The state of mentoring research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *73*, 343-357.

Allen, T., Eby, L., Poteet, M., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for proteges: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 127-136.

Allport, G. (1979). *The nature of prejudice* (25th ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

American Counseling Association. *Association of Counselor Education and Supervision Counselor Educator Membership Report 2009*. Unpublished raw data. Rae Ann Sites (personal communication July 28, 2009).

American Counseling Association. *Multicultural Counseling Standards and Competencies.* Retrieved November 5, 2007, from the American Counseling Association web site: http://www.aca.org/counselors.

American Psychological Association. *Demographic Characteristics of Faculty in Graduate Departments of Psychology*. Retrieved August 28, 2009 from the American Psychological Association web site: http://research.apa.org/grad00contents.html#demfac.

American Psychological Association. *Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research , Practice and Organizational Change for Psychologists*. Retrieved November 5, 2007 from the American Psychological Association web site: http://www.apa.org/monitor/nov02/ethicscode.html.

Angelique, H., Kyle, K., & Taylor, E. (2002). *Mentors and Muses: new strategies for academic success.* Innovative Higher Education, 26, 195-209.

Arman, J., & McCartney, T. (2001). *Assimilating new faculty: mentoring in counselor education*. Awareness, 1.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. *Diversity Web*. Retrieved May 20, 2008 from the Association of American Colleges and Universities website: http://www.diversityweb.org/index.cfm.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Membership Report, (2008). [Document submitted by membership chair.] Unpublished raw data.

Atkinson, D.R., Casas, A., & Neville, H. (1994). Ethnic minority psychologists: whom they mentor and benefits they derive from the process. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 22*, 37-48.

Atkinson, D., Morten, G., & Sue, D. (1995). *Counseling American minorities: A cross cultural perspective (5th ed.)*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Baker, F., Bondurant, A., Pinderhughes, C., Fuller, R., Kelley, S., Kim, S., Triffleman, & E., Spurlock, J. (1997). Survey of the Cross-Cultural Content of U.S. Psychiatry Residency Training Programs. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, *3*, 215-218.

Bakken, L. L. (2005). Who are physician-scientists' role models? Gender makes a difference. *Academic Medicine, 80*, 502-506.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Berg, H. M., & Ferber, M. A. (1983). Men and women graduate students: Who succeeds and why. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*, 629-648.

Berkowitz, D. G. (1986). Perceiving the listener as culturally empathetic: Effects upon second language phonological performance. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University). Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 47(3-A), 242.

Bernard, J. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook, Priest, and Fukuyama. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 159-171.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Bhat, C., & Davis, T. (2007). Counseling supervisors' assessment of race, racial identity, and working alliance in supervisory dyads. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 35*, 80-91.

Bishop, D. R., Avila-Juarbe, E. & Thumme, B. (2003). Recognizing spirituality as an important factor in counselor supervision. *Counseling & Values, 48*, 34-46.

Black, L., Suarez, E., & Medina, S. (2004). Helping students help themselves: Strategies for successful mentoring relationships. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*, 44-55.

Blackburn, R. T., Chapman, D. W., & Cameron, S. M. (1981). Cloning in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. *Research in Higher Education, 15*, 315-327.

Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe, 75*, 8-14.

Bolton, E. B. (1980). A conceptual analysis of the mentor relationship in the career development of women. *Adult Education, 30*, 195-207.
alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 16*, 252-260.

Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 16, 252-260.

Borman, K., Kromrey, J. D., Thomas, D., & Dickinson, W. (1998). University women and minorities: A case study of organizational supports and impediments for faculty. (ERIC Document No. 427638). Retrieved November 5, 2007 from ERIC database.

Bova, B. M. (1995). Mentoring revisited: The Hispanic woman's perspective. *Journal of Adult Education, 23*, 8-19.

Bradley, C. (2005). The career experiences of African American women faculty: Implications for counselor education programs. *College Student Journal, 39,* 518-527.

Bradley, C., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2004). African American counselor educators: their experiences, challenges, and recommendations. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *43*, 258-273.

Brinson, J., & Kottler, J. (1993). Cross-cultural mentoring in counselor education: a strategy for retaining minority faculty. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 32*, 11-35.

Brown, C. M. II, Davis, G. L., & McClendon, S. A. (1999). Mentoring graduate students of color: myths, models, and modes. *Peabody Journal of Education, 74*, 105-118.

Bruce, M. A. (1995). Mentoring women doctoral students: what counselor educators and supervisors can do. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 35*, 139-149.

Burkard, A., Johnson, A., Madson, M., Pruitt, N., Contreras-Tadych, D., Kozlowski, J., Hess, S., & Knox, S. (2006). Supervisor cultural responsiveness and unresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *53*, 288-301.

Burkard, A. W., Juarez-Huffaker, M., & Ajmere, K. (2003) White racial identity attitudes as a predictor of client perceptions of cross-cultural working alliances.

Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31, 226-244.

Burkard, A. W., Ponterotto, J. G., & Reynolds, A. L. (1999). White counselor trainees' racial identity and working alliance perceptions. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77,* 324-329.

Burke, R., McKeen, C., & McKenna, C. (1990). Sex differences and cross sex effects on mentoring: Some preliminary data. *Psychological Reports, 67*, 1111-1123.

Burlew, L. D. (1991). Multiple mentor model: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Career Development, 17,* 213-221.

Butner, B. K., Burley, H., & Marbley, A. F. (2000). Coping with the unexpected: Black faculty at predominately white institutions. *Journal of Black Studies, 30*, 453-462.

Casto, C., Caldwell, C., & Salazar, C. (2005). Creating mentoring relationships between female faculty and students in counselor education: Guidelines for potential mentees and mentors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83*, 331-336.

Cawyer, C. S., Simonds, C. & Davis, S. (2002). Mentoring to facilitate socialization: The case of the new faculty member. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 15*, 225-242.

Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G. & Shoffner, M. F. (2003). Cross-racial supervision: A developmental approach for white supervisors working with supervisees of color. *Clinical Supervisor, 22*, 121-138.

Chang, C. Y. & Schwiebert, V. (2000). In V. Schwiebert *Mentoring: Creating connected empowered relationships,* pp.25-41 Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Chang, S. & Tharenou, (2004). Competencies needed for managing a multicultural workgrou *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 42*, 57-74.

Chao, G., Walz, P., & Gardner, P. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A

comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 619–636.

Chi-Ying Chung, R. & Bemak, F. (2002). The relationship of culture and empathy in cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*, 154-160.

Choudhuri, D. (2002). Diversity issues in the clinical supervision of counseling practicum students: A thematic analysis. (ERIC Document No. ED473279).

Chung, R. & Bemak, F. (2002). The relationship of culture and empathy in cross-cultural counseling, *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*, 154-159.

Chung, R., Bemak, F., & Talleyrand, R. (2007). Mentoring within the field of counseling: A preliminary study of multicultural perspectives. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *29*, 21-32.

Clark, R., Harden, S., & Johnson, W. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training: Results of a national survey. *Teaching of Psychology*, *2*, 262-268.

Clarke, M. (2004). Reconceptualising mentoring: Reflections by an early career researcher. *Issues in Educational Research*, *14*, 121-143.

Clawson, J. G. & Kram, K. E. (1984). Managing cross-gender mentoring. *Business Horizons, 27*, 22-32.

Cohen, J. (1988). Set correlation and contingency tables. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 12*, 425-434.

Cokely, K. (2007). Critical issues in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity: A referendum on the state of the field. *Journal of Counseling Psychology. 54,* 224 –234.

Collins, P. M. (1994). Does mentorship among social workers make a difference? An empirical investigation of career outcomes. *Social Work, 39*, 413-419.

Collins, P. M., Kamya, H., & Tourse, R. (1997). Questions of racial diversity and mentorship: An empirical exploration. *Social Work*, *42*, 145-152.

Cook, D. (1983). A survey of ethnic minority clinical and counseling graduate students' perceptions of their cross-cultural supervision experiences. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(3-B), 1010.

Cook, C., Heath, F., Thompson, R. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web or internet based surveys. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 60,* p821-836.

Cook, D., & Helms, J. (1988). Visible racial/ethnic group supervisees' satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision as predicted by relationship characteristics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *35*, 268-274.

Cui, G. & Awa, N. E. (1992). Measuring intercultural effectiveness: An integrative approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16*, 311-328.

Dahl, C. I. (1989). Some problems of cross-cultural psychotherapy with refugees seeking treatment. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 49*, 19-32.

Daniels, J., D'Andrea, M., & Kyung Kim, B. S. (1999). Assessing barriers and changes of cross-cultural supervision: a case study. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38*, 191-205.

Darling, N., Bogat, G. A., Cavell, T. A., Murphy, S. E., & Sanchez, B. (2006). Gender, ethnicity, development and risk: Mentoring and the consideration of individual differences. *Journal of Community Psychology, 34*, 765–779.

Davidson, M. N., & Foster-Johnson, L. (2001). Mentoring in the preparations of graduate researchers of color. *Review of Education Research, 4*, 549-574.

Dedrick, R. F., & Watson, R. (2002). Mentoring needs of female minority and international graduate students: A content analysis of academic research guides and related print material. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 10,* 275-289.

De Janasz, S.C., & Sullivan, S.E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: developing the professional network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 263-283.

Dickey, C. (1996). The role of quality mentoring in the recruitment and retention of women students of color at the University of Minnesota. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED393345) Retrieved January 24, 2009, from ERIC database.

Dillman (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd Ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation. *Journal of Black Studies, 34*, 12-27.

Dolan, T. (2007). Is cross-race mentoring a negative? *Education Digest*, *73*, 26-30.

Dreher, G., & Cox Jr., T. H. (1996). Race, gender and opportunity: A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 297-308.

Dunn, L., & Wallace, M. (2004). Australian academics teaching in Singapore: Striving for cultural empathy. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, *41*, 291-304.

Egan, T. M. & Song, Z. (2008). Are facilitated mentoring programs beneficial? A randomized experimental field study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*, 351-362.

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T. & Dubois, D. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*, 254-267.

Efstation, J. F., Patton, M, J. Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 322-329.

Egan, K. S. (1993). Constructivists'use of mentoring for success in broadcast academe.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kansas City, MO, August 11-14. (ERIC Document NO ED361806). Retrieved from ERIC database on November 5, 2007.

Ellingson, L., & Sotirin, (2008). Academic aunting: Reimaging feminist (wo)mentoring, teaching, and relationships. *Women & Language*, *31*, 35-42.

Ellis, H. (2004). White identity development at a two-year institution. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 28, 745-761.

Ensher, E. A., & Murphy, S. E. (1997). Effects of race, gender, perceived similarity, and contact on mentor relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *50*, 460–481.

Estrada, D., Frame, M., & Williams, C. (2004). Cross-Cultural Supervision: Guiding the Conversation toward Race and Ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *32*, 307-319.

Exum, W. H. (1984). Making it at the to *American Behavioral Scientist, 27*, 301-324.

Farrell, R. (2007). Personal experiences of mentoring among doctoral students in counselor education. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68(3-A),* 885.

Farsimadan, F., Draghi-Lorenz, R., & Ellis, J. (2007). Process and outcome of therapy in ethically similar and dissimilar therapeutic dyads. *Psychotherapy Research, 17*, 567-575.

Feist-Price, S. (1994). Cross-gender mentoring relationships: Critical issues. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 60*, 13-17.

Fischer, A. R., & Moradi, B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity. In Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (2nd ed.) (pp. 341-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fleiss, J. L. (1971). Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters.

Psychological Bulletin, 76, 378-382.

Fong, B. (2000). Toto, I think we're still in Kansas. *Liberal Education, 86*, 56-61.

Fong, M., & Lease, S. (1997). Cross-cultural supervision: Issues for the white supervisor. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.) *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 387-405). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fowler, D. L. (1982). Mentoring relationships and the perceived quality of the academic work environment. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 45*, 27-33.

Fukuyama, M. A. (1994). Critical incidences in multicultural supervision: a phenomenological approach to supervision research. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 142-151.

Furcron-Turnage, C. B. (2005). Exploration of the working alliance with African American youth and mentors. (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola Univeristy, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, Vol 66(*6-B), 3442.

Gaff, J., Pruitt-Logan, A.S., & Weibl, R. (2000). *Building the faculty we need: Colleges and university working together.* Monograph of the Preparing Future Faculty Program by the Council of Graduate Schools, Association of American Colleges and Universities. (ERIC Document Reporduction Service No. ED438764).

Gardner, R. (2000). Cultural perspectives of the supervisory relationship in the training of counselor education graduate students. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (8-A),* 3050.

Gardner, R. M. (2002). Cross-cultural perspectives in supervision. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 26*, 98-106.

Gaskill, L. R. (1991). Women's career success: A factor analytic study of contributing factors. *Journal of Career Development, 17*, 167-178.

Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., & Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*, 102-114.

Gay, G. (2004). Navigating marginality en route to the professoriate: Graduate students of color learning and living in academia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *17*, 265-288.

Gelso, C. J. (1997). The making of a scientist in applied psychology: An attribute by treatment conception. The 1995 Leona Tyler Address. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *25*, 307–320.

Gersick, C., Bartunek, J., & Dutton, J. (2000). Learning from academia: The importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 1026-1044.

Gerstein, M. (1985). Mentoring: An age old practice in a knowledge-based society. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *64*, 156-158.

Gibson, S. (2006). Mentoring of women faculty: The role of organization politics and culture. *Innovative Higher Education, 31*, 63-79.

Gilbert, L. A. (1985). Dimensions of same-gender student-faculty role-model relationships. *Sex Roles, 12*, 111-123.

Girves, J., Zepeda, Y., & Gwathney, J. (2005). Mentoring in a post-affirmative action world. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*, 449-479.

Gonzalez, C. (2006). When is a mentor like a monk? *Academe, 92*, 190-214.

Gonzáles-Figueroa, E., Young, A. M. (2005). Ethnic identity and mentoring among Latinas in professional roles. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11*, 213-226.

Gonzalez-Rodriguez, Y. E. (1995). Mentoring to diversity: A multicultural approach.

New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 66, 69-77.

Goodwin, L. (2004). A synergistic approach to faculty mentoring. *Journal of Faculty Development*, *19*, 145-152.

Goodyear, F. H. (1973). A test of cultural empathy. (ERIC Document No. ED098635.)

Granello, D. H. (2003). Influence strategies in the supervisory dyad: An investigation into the effects of gender and age. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 42*, 189-202.

Grant-Thompson, S.K., & Atkinson, D.R. (1997). Cross-cultural mentor effectiveness and African American male students. *Journal of Black Psychology, 23*, 120-134.

Gravett, S., & Petersen, N. (2007). You just try to find your own way: The experience of newcomers to academia. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *26*, 193-207.

Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1983). Academic mentoring for women students and faculty. A new Look at an old way to get ahead. *Project on the Status and Education of Women of the Association of American Colleges.* (ERIC Document

Hansman, C. A. (2002). Critical perspectives on mentoring: Trends and issues. ERIC Information Series (ERIC Document No. ED465045).

Hannigan, T. (1990). Traits, attitudes, and skills that are related to intercultural effectiveness and their implications for cross-cultural training: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*, 89-111.

Haring, M. J. (1999). The case for a conceptual base for minority mentoring programs. *Peabody Journal of Education, 74*, 5-14.

Herfst, S. L., van Oudenhoven, J., & Timmerman, M. E. (2008). Intercultural effectiveness training in three western immigrant countries: A cross-cultural evaluation of critical incidents. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32(1),* 67-80.

Hill, N. (2004). The challenges experienced by pretenured faculty members in counselor education: A wellness perspective. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *44*, 135-146.

Hill, S., Bahniuk, M., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, *38*, 15- 33.

Hill, N., Leinbaugh, T., Bradley, C., & Hazler, R. (2005). Female counselor educators: Encouraging and discouraging factors in academia. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *83*, 374-380.

Hite, L. M. (1985). Female doctoral students: Their perceptions and concerns. Journal *of College Student Personnel, 26*, 18-22.

Holcomb-McCoy, C., & Bradley, C. (2003). Recruitment and retention of ethnic minority counselor educators: An exploratory study of CACREP-accredited counseling programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *42*, 231-43.

Holland, G. (1998). The mentoring of faculty and administrators in higher education. In H. T. Frierson (Ed.), *Diversity in Higher Education: Examining Protégé-Mentor Experiences*, *Vol. II* (pp. 7-40). Stamford, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Hollingsworth, M., & Fassinger, R. (2002). The role of faculty mentors in the research training of counseling psychology doctoral students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *49*, 324-330.

Horvath, A., & Greenberg, L. (1989). Development and validation of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *36*, 223-233.

Horvath, A., & Symonds, B. (1991). Relation between working alliance and outcome in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 139-149.

Johnson, W. B. (2002). Intentional mentor: strategies and guidelines. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 88-96.

Johnson, W. B. (2007). Transformational supervision: When supervisors mentor. Professional Psychology: Research & Practice, 38, p259-267.

Johnson, W. B., Koch, C., Fallow, G. O., & Huwe, J. M. (2000). Prevalence of mentoring in clinical versus experimental doctoral programs: survey findings, implications, and recommendations. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 37*, 325-334.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness:" Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *Review of Higher Education, 21*, 315-342.

Junn, E. N., Morton, K. R. & Yee, I. (1995). The 'gibberish' exercise: Facilitating empathetic multicultural awareness. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 22*, 324-329.

Kalbfleisch, P. J. & Davies, A. B. (1991). Minorities and mentoring: Managing the multicultural institution. *Communication Education, 40*, 266-271.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. & Judge, T. A. (2008). A quantitative review of mentoring research: Test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*, 269-283.

Killian, K. (2001). Differences making a difference: Cross-cultural interactions in supervisory relationships. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, *12*, 61-103.

Kline, R. B. (2004). *Beyond significance testing: Reforming data analysis methods in behavioral research.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Koch, L., & Telzrow, C. (2002). Mentoring new faculty in rehabilitation counselor education programs: Challenges, strategies, and innovative models. *Rehabilitation Education*, *16*, 49-60.

Kram, K. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 608-625.

Kram, K. (1985). Improving the mentoring process. *Training and Development Journal, 39*, p40-43.

Kram, K. (1988). Mentoring relationships at work. Lanham, MD: United Press of America.

Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C., & Pannu, R. (1997). The influence of supervisory racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *36*, 284-305.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and factor structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory--Revised. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *22*, 380-388.

Lee, C. C. & Walz, G. R. (1998). Social action: A mandate for counselors. ERIC Document No. ED417372.

Lee, R. M. & Yoo, H. C. (2004). Structure and measurement of ethnic identity for Asian American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 263-269.

Leong, C. (2007). Predictive validity of the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A longitudinal study on the socio-psychological adaptation of Asian undergraduates who took part in a study-abroad program. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31,* 545-559.

Leong, F. T., & Wagner, N. S. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: what do we know? What do we need to know? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 11-35.

Lichtenberg, J. W. & Goodyear, R. K. (2000). The structure of supervisor-supervisee interactions. *Clinical Supervisor, 19*, 1-24.

Luna, G., & Cullen, D. L. (1995). Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed. ERIC Digest. (ERIC Document NO 399888). Retrieved October 30, 2007 from ERIC database.

MacDonald, G. (1997). Issues in multicultural supervision. In Caring in the Age of Technology: Proceedings of the International Conference on Counseling in the 21st Century, Beijing, China, May 29-30, 1997. (ERIC Document NO

ED439341). Retrieved on October 30, 2007 from ERIC database.

Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *41*, 306-20.

Magnuson, S., Black, L., & Lahman, M. (2006). The 2000 cohort of new assistant professors of counselor education: Year 3. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *45*, 162-179.

Magnuson, S., Shaw, H., Tubin, B., & Norem, K. (2004). Assistant professors of counselor education: First and second year experiences. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, & Research*, *32*, 3-18.

Marshall, C. (2000). Policy discourse analysis: negotiating gender equity. *Journal of Education Policy, 15*, 125-156.

McCormick, T. (1991). An analysis of some pitfall of traditional mentoring for minorities and women in higher education. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association* (Chicago, IL, April 4, 1991. (ERIC Document No. ED334905).

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33*, 161-73.

Moore, A. (1996). Career mentoring as a career development strategy for African American women in the academy. *Thresholds in Education*, *22*, 33-36.

Moss, J., Teshima, J., & Leszcz, M. (2008). Peer group mentoring of junior faculty. *Academic Psychiatry*, *32*, 230-235.

Motomura, M. S. (2007). The diverse identities of biracial persons: Antecedent factors, well-being and multicultural effectiveness. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Windsor, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 67(7-B)*, 4160.

Mullen Mullen, E. (1998). Vocational and psychological mentoring functions: Identifying mentors who serve both. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9*, 319–331.

Murray, M. (1991). Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: how to facilitate an e•ective mentoring program. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (n.d.). *History of caretaker committee.* Retrieved May 20, 2008 from http://www.nadohe.org/history.html.

National Science Foundation (n.d.) *ADVANCE portal.* Retrieved May 20, 2008 from http://www.portal.advance.vt.edu/.

Nelson, M. L., Englar-Carlson, M., Tierney, S. C., & Hau, J. M. (2006). Class jumping into academia: Multiple identities for counseling academics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 1-14.

Nganga, R. W. (2006). Impact of cross-cultural interaction on counselor trainees' development of cultural empathy and intercultural sensitivity. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 166 pages.

Noe, R. (1988). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review, 13*, 65-78.

O'Brien, K. (1995). Enhancing research training for counseling students: Interuniversity collaborative research teams. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*, 187-199.

O'Neil, R. (2008). The supreme court, affirmative action, and higher education. *Academe, 94*, 16-20.

O'Neil, R. M., Horton, S., Crosby, F. J. (1999). Gender issues in developmental relationships. In: A. J. Murrell, F. J. Crosby, J. Faye, R. J. Ely, & N. J. Mahwah (Eds.), *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations.* (pp. 63-80). US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Ozer, E., & Bandura, A. (1990). Mechanisms governing empowerment effects: A self-efficacy analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 472-486.

Page, M. (2003). Race, culture, and the supervisory relationship: A review
of the literature and a call to action. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision, 18,*
161-174.

Paquette, T. S. (2006). Ego strength, white racial identity, racial diversity attitudes, and
cultural empathy in undergraduate students. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue
University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences
and Engineering, 66,* 4536.

Parson, E. R. (1993). Ethnotherapeutic empathy (EthE): II. Techniques in interpersonal
cognition and vicarious experiencing across cultures. *Journal of Contemporary
Psychotherapy, 23*, 171-182.

Peace, S. D. (1995). Addressing school counselor induction issues: A developmental
counselor mentor model. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 29*, 177-
191.

Pepper, M., & Kulik, C. (2004). Protégé – mentor agreement about the provision of
psychosocial support: The mentoring relationship, personality, and workload.
Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65, 519-532.

Pedersen, B., Crethar, H. C., & Carlson, J. (2008). Making relationships central in
counseling and psychotherapy. In B. Pedersen, H. C. Crethar, & J. Carlson (Eds.)
Inclusive cultural empathy (pp. 41-59). Washington, DC, US: American
Psychological Association.

Pegg, P. O. & Plybon, L. E. (2005). Toward the theoretical measurement of ethnic
identity. *Journal of Early Adolesence, 5*, 250-265.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research.
Psychological Bulletin, 108, 499-514.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure. *Journal of Adolescent
Research*, 7, 156-176.

Phinney, J. S., Ferguson, D. L., Tate, J. D. (1997). Intergroup attitudes among ethnic
minority adolescents: A causal model. *Child Development*, 68, 955-969.

Phinney, J. S., Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 271-281.

Polirstok, S., & Digby, A. (2007). Mentoring education faculty toward tenure and promotion: The work of the research & writer's group. *Journal of Faculty Development*, *21*, 109-116.

Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Stracuzzi, T. & Saya, R. (2003). The multigroup ethnic identity measure (MEIM): Psychometric review and further validity testing. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 63*, 502-515.

Porter, S. R. & Umbach, D. (2001, June). *What Works Best? Collecting Alumni Data with Multiple Technologies*. AIR 2001 Annual Forum Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Institutional Research. Long Beach, CA. (ERIC Document Service No. ED456786).

Priest, R. (1994). Minority supervisor and majority supervisee: Another perspective of clinical reality. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *34*, te152-158.

Quezada R., Loheyde, K. J., & Kacmarczyk, R. (1984). The Hispanic Woman Graduate Student: Barriers to Mentoring in Higher Education. *Texas Tech Journal of Education*, *11*, 235-241.

Quinlan, K. (1999). Enhancing mentoring and networking of junior academic women: What, why and how? *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, *21*, 31-42.

Quintana, S. M.Troyano, N. & Taylor, G. (2001) Cultural validity and inherent challenges in quantitative methods for multicultural research. In J. G. Ponterotto, M. J. Casas, L. A. Suzuki & C. M. Alexander (Eds.). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp.604-630). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Quintana, S. M., Ybarra, V. C., Gonzalez-Doupe, P., & De Baessa, Y. (2000). Cross-cultural evaluation of ethnic perspective-taking ability: An exploratory investigation with U.S. Latino and Guatemalan Ladino children. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6*, 334-351.

Ragins, B. (1989). Barrieres to mentoring: The female manager's dilemma. *Human*

Relations, 42, 1-22.

Ragins, B. R. (1995). Diversity, power, and mentorship in organizations: A cultural, structural, and behavioral perspective. In M. M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, & M. A. Costanzo (Eds.) *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace* (pp. 91-132*).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationship in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*, 482–521.

Ragins, B. R. (1999). Where do we go from here, and how do we get there? Methodological issues in conducting research on diversity and mentoring relationships. In A. J. Murrell, F. J. Crosby, & R. J. Ely, (Eds.) *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations* (pp. 227-247). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 169-174.

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

Ragins, B., & McFarlin, D. (1990). Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37*, 321-339.

Reese, L. E., Vera, E. M. & Paikoff, R. L. (1998). Ethnic identity assessment among inner-city African American children: Evaluating the applicability of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. *Journal of Black Psychology, 24*, 289-304.

Richey, C. A., Grambrill, E. D. & Blythe, B. J. (1988). Mentor relationships among women in academe. *Journal of Women & Social Work, 3*, 34-47.

Ridley, C. R., & Lingle, D. W. (1996). Article title. In B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.) *Counseling across cultures* (pp. 21-46).

Riger, S. (1993). What's wrong with empowerment? *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*, 279-293.

Robinson, E. H. III. (1994). Critical issues in counselor education: mentors, models, and money. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 11-35.

Rodenhauser, P., Rudisill, J. R. & Dvorak, R. (2000). Sills for mentors and protégés applicable to psychiatry. *Academic Psychiatry, 24*, 14-27.

Rogers, C. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.) *Psychology A study of science,* (Vol. 3, pp. 184-256). New York: McGraw Hill.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faclty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*, 285-309.

Royalty, G. M., & Magoon, T. M. (1985). Correlates of scholarly productivity among counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *32*, 458–461.

Salzman, M. (2000). Promoting multicultural competence: A cross-cultural mentorship project. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, *28*, 119-124.

Santiago-Rivera, A., & Moody, M. (2003). Engaging students in the quest for competence in multiculturalism: An expanded view of mentoring. In G. Roysircar, D. S. Sandhu, & V. E. Bibbins, Sr. (Eds.). *Multicultural competencies: A guidebook of practices* (pp. 39-50). Alexandria, VA: Association for Multicultural Counseling & Development.

Sands, R., Parson, L. & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education*, *62*, 174-193.

Savage, H., Karp, R., & Logue, R. (2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities. *College Teaching*, *52*, 21-24.

Sax, L. J., Gilmartin, S. K. & Bryant, A. N. (2003). Assessing response rates and nonresponse bias in web and paper surveys. *Research in Higher Education, 44*,

409-432.

Scandura, T. A. (1997). Mentoring and organizational justice: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*,58-69.

Schlosser, L. Z., Gelso, C. J. (2001). Measuring the working alliance in advisor-advisee relationship in graduate school. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*, 157-168.

Schrodt, P., Cawyer, C., & Sanders, R. (2003). An examination of academic mentoring behaviors and new faculty members satisfaction with socialization and tenure and promotion processes. *Communication Education*, *52*, 17-29.

Schwiebert, V. (2000). *Mentoring: Creating connected empowered relationships.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Scott, N. E. & Borodovsky, L. G. (1990). Effective use of cultural role taking. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 21*, 167-170.

Selby, J. W., & Calhoun, L. G. (1998). Mentoring programs for new faculty: unintended consequences? *Teaching of Psychology, 25*, 210-211.

Smith, E. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *70*, 181-188.

Smith, J. W., Smith, W. J. & Markham, S. E. (2000). Diversity issues in mentoring academic faculty. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 26*, 251-262.

Sorcinelli, M. (2007). Faculty Development: The Challenge Going Forward. *Peer Review*, *9*, 4-8.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72,* 474-47.

Sorcinelli, M., & Yun, J. (2007). From Mentor to Mentoring Networks: Mentoring in the New Academy. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *39*, 58-61.

Sosik, J. J., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). The role of gender in mentoring: Implications for diversified and homogenous mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*, 102-122.

Spencer, M. S., Icard, L. D., Harachi, T. W., Catalano, R. F., & Oxford, M. (2000). Ethnic identity among monoracial and multiracial early adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 20,* 365-388.

Stanley, C. A., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Cross race faculty mentoring. *Change, 37*, 44-50.

Tabachnik, L. S. & Fidel, B. G. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Tajfel H. &Turner, J. C. (1985) (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In J. T. Jost, J. Sidanius (Eds, pp. 276-293). *Political psychology: Key readings.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Thomas, D. A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 479-492.

Thomas, D. (1993). Racial dynamics in cross-race developmental relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*, 169-194.

Thomas, D. (2001). The truth about mentoring minorities: Race matters. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*, 98.

Thomas, G. D. & Hollenshead, C. (2002). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *Journal of Negro Education, 70*, p 166-175.

Thorpe, S. W. (2002, June). *Online student evaluation of instruction: An investigation of non-response bias.* Paper presented at the Annual Forum for the Association for Institutional Research. Toronto, Ontario. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service

No. ED472469.)

Tichenor, V. & Hill, C. (1989). A comparison of six measures of working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 26*, 195-199.

Tillman, L. (2001). Mentoring African American faculty in predominantly white institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, *42*, 295-325.

Towsend, I. (1997). An examination of African-American supervisees' perceptions of white supervisors' cross-cultural competence. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol 57(10-A),* p. 4276.

Trochim, W. M. (2006). The Research Methods Knowledge Base. Retrieved July 25, 2008, from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/contents.htm.

Truax, C. B. & Carkhuff, R. R. (1967) *Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine Publishing Co.

Turban, D. B., Dougherty, T. W., & Lee, F. K. (2002). Gender, race, and perceived similarity effects in developmental relationships: the moderating role of relationship duration. *Journal of Vacational Behavior, 61*, 240-262.

Turner, C. S. & Myers, S. L. (2000). Exploring underrepresentation. *Journal of Higher Education, 70,* 27-59.

Turner, T. N., Porter, D. F. Edwards, D. W. & Moore, C. L. (2001). *Passing the baton: taking strides in the mentoring process.* US Department of Education article. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED451439). Retrieved November 4, 2007 from ERIC.

U.S. Department of Education (2006). Digest of education statistics (NCES 2006 030). Retrieved May 20, 2008, from the National Center for Educational Statistics web site: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d05/tables/dt05_227.asp.

Valentino, R. E. (2006). Attitudes towards cross-cultural empathy in music therapy. *Music Thrapy Perspective, 24*, 108-114. cultural empathy among music therapists.

Van der Zee, K. I., & Van Oudenhoven, J. (2000). The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Personality*, *14*, 291-309.

Van der Zee, K. I. & Van Oudenhoven, J. (2001). The multicultural personality questionnaire: Reliability and validity of self- and other ratings of multicultural effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 278-288.

Van der Zee, K. I., Zaal, J. N.& Piekstra, J. (2003). Validation of the multicultural personality questionnaire in the context of personnel selection. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, S77-S100.

Van Eck Peluchette, J., & Jeanquart, S. (2000). Professionals' use of different mentor sources at various career stages: Implications for career success. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *140*, 549-564.

Van Oudenhoven, J., Mol, S. & Van der Zee, K. I. (2003). Study of the adjustment of Western expatriates in Taiwan ROC with the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 159-170.

Van Oudenhoven, J. & Van der Zee, K. I. (2002). Predicting multicultural effectiveness of international students: The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*, 679-694.

Van Oudenhoven, J. P, Van der Zee, K. I. & Van Kooten, M. (2001). Successful adaptation strategies according expatriates. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25,* 467-482.

Van Soest, D. (1996). Impact of social work education on student attitudes and behavior concerning oppression. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *32*, 191-202.

Waitzkin, H., Yager, J., & Parker, T. (2006). Mentoring partnerships for minority f aculty and graduate students in mental health services research. *Academic Psychiatry, 30,* 205-217.

Wang, Y. W., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The scale of ethnocultural empathy: Development, validation, and

reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 221-234.

Walker, J. (2006). A Reconceptualization of mentoring in counselor education: Using a relational model to promote mutuality and embrace differences. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development, 45*, 60-69.

Walker, K. L., Wright, G., & Hanley, J. H. (2001*). The professional preparation of African American graduate students. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 32*, 581-584.

Wanberg, C. R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. & Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and protégé predictors and outcomes of mentoring in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 410-423.

Ward, Y. (2000). A model for clinical mentoring in professional psychology graduate education. (Doctoral dissertation, George Fox University, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60(10-B),* 5236.

Ward, Y. L., Johnson, W. B., & Campbell, C. D. (2004). Practitioner research vertical teams: A model for mentoring in practitioner-focused doctoral programs. *Clinical Supervisor, 23*, 179-190.

Warren, E. (2005). Future colleague or convenient friend: The ethics of mentorship. *Counseling and Values*, *49*, 141-146.

Washburn, M. (2007). Mentoring women faculty: An instrumental case study of strategic collaboration. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 15*, 57-72.

Wieling, E., & Marshall, J. (1999). Cross-cultural supervision in marriage and family therapy. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal*, *21*, 317-329.

Williams, J. & Schwiebert, V. (2000). Multicultural aspects of the mentoring process. In V. Schwiebert (Ed.) *Mentoring: Creating connected empowered relationships,* pp.57- 70 Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Wilson, P., Valentine, D., & Pereira, A. (2002). Perceptions of new social work faculty

about mentoring experiences. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *38*, 317-333.

Wong, P. T. & Wong, L. C. (1999). Assessing multicultural competencies. In W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, D. K. Forgays, & S. A. Hayes (Eds.), Merging past, present and future in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the Fourteenth International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, (pp. 510-533). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Wong, P. T. & Wong, L. C. (2003). Multicultural Supervision Competencies Questionnaire (MSCQ). In J. M. Bernard & R K. Goodyear (Eds.), *Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision (3rd Ed.)*, (pp. 336-339). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Wood, R. J. (1991). Toward cultural empathy: A framework for global education. *Educational Record, 72*, 10-14.

Woodyard, C. (2000). The role of mentoring in the professional development of counselors. In V. Schwiebert (Ed.) *Mentoring: Creating connected empowered relationships,* pp.99-126. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Wyche, K. F. & Graves, S. B. (1992). Minority women in academia. *Psychology of Women Qarterly, 16*, 429-438.

Young, S. (1997). Mentoring of female graduate students by male faculty. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58(8-A),* 3029.

Young, A., & Perrewe, P. (2000). What did you expect. An examination of career-related support and social support among mentors and proteges. *Journal of Management, 26*, 611–632.

APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

UNC CHARLOTTE

Compliance Office / Office of Research Services

9201 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704.687.3311 f/ 704.687.2292 www.research.uncc.edu/comp/complian.cfm

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Research with Human Subjects

Approval of Exemption

Protocol #	**09-07-03**
Title:	**Professional Development Relationships for Counselor Educators: The Relationship between Ethnic Identity, Advocacy, Empowerment, and Cultural Empathy on Faculty Mentoring Alliances**
Date:	**7/7/2009**
Student Investigator	Ms. Audrey Rorrer Counseling
Responsible Faculty	Dr. John Culbreth Counseling

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) certifies that the protocol listed above is exempt under category 2 .

Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and

b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Please note that it is the investigator's responsibility to promptly inform the committee of any changes in the proposed research, as well as any unanticipated problems that may arise involving risks to subjects. Amendment and Event Reporting forms are available on our web site: http://www.research.uncc.edu/comp/human.cfm

Dr. M. Lyn Exum, IRB Chair   7-9-09
                                      Date

The UNIVERSITY *of* NORTH CAROLINA *at* CHARLOTTE

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

APPENDIX B: LETTERS OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

Dear [ACES, CESNET, NFIN] Member,
I would like to invite you to participate in a brief survey of **counselor educator professional development** relationships as part of my doctoral research. The survey will take **less than 10 minutes** to complete. *I would greatly appreciate it if you would*:
1. click on the link below to learn more about this research and to participate in the survey;
[link]
2. please forward this email to any **female and/or minority member faculty colleagues** to enable collection of a representative sample.

Participants will be entered into a random drawing for an **Amazon gift card** valued at $25. The gift card winner will be notified by email after the drawing; the winner will need to respond with contact information following completion of the survey. However, this contact information will not be linked to survey responses.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Audrey Rorrer
Doctoral Candidate, Counseling
UNC Charlotte

EMAIL INVITATION 2: ACES Membership List
Dear ACES Member,
You have previously been invited to participate in a brief survey of **counselor educator professional development** relationships as part of my doctoral research. Many have responded already, however, your additional participation is helpful. This is a reminder that if you have not yet completed the survey, please take a few minutes to participate.

The survey will **take less than 10 minutes** to complete. To learn more about this study, and to participate in the survey, click on the following link: [link].

Please forward this email to any female and minority member faculty colleagues to enable collection of a representative sample.

Participants will be entered into a random drawing for an Amazon gift card valued at $25. The gift card winner will be notified by email after the drawing; the winner will need to respond with contact information following completion of the survey. However, this contact information will not be linked to survey responses.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

If you have already taken the survey and/or do not wish to receive any additional reminders, please let me know and I will remove your email address from the list of invited participants.

Audrey Rorrer
Doctoral Candidate, Counseling
UNC Charlotte

EMAIL INVITATION 2: CESNET and NFIN List Serves
Dear [CESNET, NFIN] Member,
You have previously been invited to participate in a brief survey of **counselor educator professional development** relationships as part of my doctoral research. Many have responded already, however, your additional participation is helpful. This is a reminder that if you have not yet completed the survey, please take a few minutes to participate.

The survey will **take less than 10 minutes** to complete. To learn more about this study, and to participate in the survey, click on the following link: [link].

Please forward this email to any female and minority member faculty colleagues to enable collection of a representative sample.

Participants will be entered into a random drawing for an Amazon gift card valued at $25. The gift card winner will be notified by email after the drawing; the winner will need to respond with contact information following completion of the survey. However, this contact information will not be linked to survey responses.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Audrey Rorrer
Doctoral Candidate, Counseling
UNC Charlotte

EMAIL INVITATION 3, 4:
Dear ACES Member,
You have previously been invited to participate in a brief survey of **counselor educator professional development** relationships as part of my doctoral research. Many have responded already, however, your additional participation is helpful. This is a reminder that if you have not yet completed the survey, please take a few minutes to participate.

The survey will **take less than 10 minutes** to complete; please complete by [date]. To learn more about this study, and to participate in the survey, click on the following link: [link].

Please forward this email to any female and minority member faculty colleagues to enable collection of a representative sample.

Participants will be entered into a random drawing for an Amazon gift card valued at $25. The gift card winner will be notified by email after the drawing; the winner will need to respond with contact information following completion of the survey. However, this contact information will not be linked to survey responses.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Audrey Rorrer
Doctoral Candidate, Counseling
UNC Charlotte

APPENDIX C: COUNSELOR EDUCATION FACULTY PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

<u>Professional Relationships</u>
The term "mentor" is used to describe a person with whom you have a professional relationship with, someone who serves as a personal advisor to you in your career. For the purposes of this survey, please think of a **single** individual, whom you consider to be your **primary mentor**, as you respond to the survey items. This primary mentor may be someone you have naturally selected, or someone for whom a formal relationship was established, for example, by your department or university.

I have never had a mentor. (If this is true, please skip to section 8; if this is false, please continue on to the next item).
O True   O False

The following sentences describe some of the different ways a person might think or feel about his or her mentor.

If the statement describes the way you always feel or think, choose "always"; if it never applies to you, choose "never." Use the descriptors in between to describe the variations between these extremes.

Please work fast: your first impressions are the ones we would like to have.

	Always	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
I feel uncomfortable with my mentor.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
My mentor and I agree about the things I will need to do to improve my professional strengths.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I am worried about the outcome of our discussions.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
What I am doing in our relationship gives me new ways of looking at how I approach my work.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
My mentor and I understand each other.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
My mentor perceives accurately what my goals are.		O	O	O	O	O	O
I find what I am doing with my		O	O	O	O	O	O

134

mentor confusing.

I believe my mentor likes me. O O O O O O O

I wish my mentor and I could clarify
the purpose of our relationship. O O O O O O O

I disagree with my mentor about what
I ought to get from our relationship. O O O O O O O

I believe that the time my mentor and
I are spending together is not spent efficiently. O O O O O O O

My mentor doesn't understand what
I am trying to accomplish in my work. O O O O O O O

I am clear on what my responsibilities
are in my work- O O O O O O O

The goals of our relationship are important O O O O O O O
to me.

I find what my mentor and I are doing in O O O O O O O
our relationship is unrelated to my professional concerns.

I feel the things I do in our relationship will O O O O O O O
help me to improve my career progression.

I believe my mentor is genuinely concerned O O O O O O O
for my welfare.

I am clear as to what my mentor wants me O O O O O O O
to do in our discussions/meetings.

My mentor and I respect each other. O O O O O O O

I feel that my mentor is not totally honest O O O O O O O
about his/her feelings toward me.

I am confident in my mentor's ability O O O O O O O
to help me.

My mentor and I are working toward O O O O O O O
mutually agreed upon goals.

I feel that my mentor appreciates me.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

We agree on what is important for me to work on for my career progression.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

As a result of our relationship, I am clearer as to how I might be able to improve my work.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

My mentor and I trust one another.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

My mentor and I have different ideas on what my professional difficulties are.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

My relationship with my mentor is very important to me.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

I have the feeling that if I say or do the wrong things, my mentor will stop supporting me.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

My mentor and I collaborate on setting goals for my career progression.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

I am frustrated by the advice I am getting from my mentor.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

We have established a good understanding of the kind of changes that would be good for my career progression.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

The things that my mentor is asking me to do don't make sense to me.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

I don't know what to expect as the result of my our relationship.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

I believe the way we are working in our relationship is beneficial.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

I feel my mentor cares about me even when I do things that he/she does not approve of.   O   O   O   O   O   O   O

Please rate your mentor on the following items.

	Always	Very Often	Often	Some times	Occasion ally	Rarely	Never
My mentor has a tendency to abuse his/her	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

power, e.g. impose his/her views on me.

My mentor shares important information with me. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

My mentor is accepting that my career Aspirations may not be the same as his/hers. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

My mentor fosters open, non-threatening, discussion of my fears and anxieties. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

My mentor understands that there are multiple and diverse strategies for achieving my career aspirations. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

My mentor understands the current sociopolitical ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
○
 system of my work environment and its impact on me.

My mentor is aware of institutional barriers that affect me. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

My mentor uses her influence in the organization for my benefit. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

My mentor serves as an advocate for me. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Please respond to the following statements according to how you perceive your mentor.

	Always	Very Often	Often	Some times	Occasion ally	Rarely	Never
My mentor:							
Understands other people's feelings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tries to understand other people's behavior	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Takes other people's cultural values into consideration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Finds it hard to empathize with people not like him/herself	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sympathizes with others regardless of cultural background	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Has problems assessing relationships	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Is attentive to facial expressions	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Asks personal questions	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Enjoys other people's stories	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Remembers what other people have told said	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Is able to voice other people's concerns	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Is a good listener	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Notices when someone is in trouble	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Has an insight into human nature	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Senses when others get irritated	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Sets others at ease	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Pays attention to the emotions of others	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Enjoys getting to know people from other cultures	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Ethnicity

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or <u>ethnic groups</u> that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

1. I identify my ethnicity as: [＿＿＿＿＿＿＿]

2. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement below.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, & customs.	O	O	O	O
I am active in organizations or social groups that				

include mostly members of my own ethnic group.   o   o   o   o

I have a clear sense of my ethnic background
and what it means for me.   o   o   o   o

I think a lot about how my life will be affected
by my ethnic group membership.   o   o   o   o

I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.   o   o   o   o

I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. o   o   o   o

I understand pretty well what my ethnic group
membership means to me.   o   o   o   o

In order to learn more about my ethnic background,
I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. o   o   o   o

I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.   o   o   o   o

I participate in cultural practices of my own group,
such as special food, music, or customs.   o   o   o   o

I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.   o   o   o   o

I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.   o   o   o   o

4. My father's ethnicity is: _____.

5. My mother's ethnicity is: _____.

Demographics
1. Is the mentor relationship that you have based your responses upon:
    o Formal(Assigned)   o Informal relationship(Not assigned)
    o Within your department   o Outside your department
2. Is your mentor the same gender as you?
    o Yes   o No
3. Is your mentor the same ethnicity as you?
    o Yes   o No

4. How often do you meet or talk with your mentor about your professional
development, projects, or concerns?
    o Seldom (few times a year)
    o Often (monthly)
    o Frequently (weekly)

Other:_____

5. How long have you been in a mentoring relationship with your primary mentor (that you based your above responses)?

6. How many quality mentor relationships would you say you currently have?

7. Please indicate your Gender: O Female   O Male

 8. My ethnicity is:
   O Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
   O Black or African American
   O Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others
      O White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
   O American Indian/Native American
   O Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
   O Other (write in): _____

9. What is the title of your position?
   O Assistant Professor
   O Associate Professor
   O Full Professor
   O Adjunct Professor
   O Counselor
   O Other:
10. How long have you been in your current position? _____

11. What is your current primary job position?
   O Counselor educator faculty
   O Counselor
   O Other:_____
12. Have you completed this survey previously? O Yes   O No

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

You are now eligible to enter into a drawing for a $25 gift card to Amazon. If you would like to be eligible for the drawing, please email Audrey Rorrer, M.A. at arorrer@uncc.edu, and provide your:
1) Name,
2) Email address, and
3) Telephone number.

You may choose to provide this information in the space below to be entered into the drawing.

This information will not be associated with your survey response and will be destroyed upon dissemination of the gift card.

APPENDIX D: ORIGIN OF SURVEY ITEMS

The Survey Constructs:
- Mentor Relationship: 36 items total, adapted from the WAI
- Ethnic identity: 16 items total, all directly from the MEIM
- Cultural Empathy: 18 items, adapted from MPQ
- Empowerment: 7 items total, 1 adapted from MSCQ; 2 overlapping from WAI
- Advocacy: 5 items total, 2 adapted from CCI; 1 from MSCQ;1 overlapping from WAI
- Demographics: 8 items, plus 1 overlapping from MEIM

87 Total Items; Likert type, multiple choice, or open answer

	Modifications	**Original Item**
Working Alliance Inventory (WAI-R) (Horvath, 1982)	I feel uncomfortable with my mentor. Bond*	I feel uncomfortable with (_____).
	My mentor and I agree about the things I will need to do to improve my professional strengths. Task	(_____) and I agree about the things I will need to do to improve my abilities as a therapist.
	I am worried about the outcome of our discussions. Goals*	I am worried about the outcome of these sessions.
	What I am doing in our relationship gives me new ways of looking at how I approach my work. Task	What I am doing in supervision gives me new ways of looking at how I approach my work.
	My mentor and I understand each other. Bond	(_____) and I understand each other.
	My mentor perceives accurately what my goals are. Goals	(_____) perceives accurately what my goals are.
	I find what I am doing with my mentor confusing. Task*	I find what I am doing in supervision confusing.
	I believe my mentor likes me. Bond	I believe (_____) likes me.
	I wish my mentor and I could clarify the purpose of our relationship. Goals*	I wish (_____) and I could clarify the purpose of our sessions.
	I disagree with my mentor about what I ought to get from our relationship. Goals*	I disagree with (_____) about what I ought to get out of supervision.
	I believe that the timemy mentor and I are spending together is not spent efficiently. Task*	I believe that the time (_____) and I are spending together is not spent efficiently.
	My mentor doesn't understand what I am trying to accomplish in my work. Goals*	(_____) doesn't understand what I am trying to accomplish in supervision.
	I am clear on what my responsibilities are in our relationship. Task	I am clear on what my responsibilities are in supervision.

The goals of our relationship are important to me. Goals

I find what my mentor and I are doing in our relationship is unrelated to my professional concerns. Task*

I feel the things I do in our relationship will help me to improve my career progression. Task

I believe my mentor is genuinely concerned for my welfare. Bond

I am clear as to what my mentor wants me to do in our discussions/meetings. Task

My mentor and I respect each other. Bond

I feel that my mentor is not totally honest about his/her feelings toward me. Bond*

I am confident in my mentor's ability to help me. This will factor on advocacy Bond

My mentor and I are working toward mutually agreed upon goals. Goals

I feel that my mentor appreciates me. Bond

We agree on what is important for me to work on for my career progression. Task

As a result of our relationship, I am clearer as to how I might be able to improve my work. Goals

My mentor and I trust one another. Bond

My mentor and I have different ideas on what my professional difficulties are. Goals*

My relationship with my mentor is very important to me. Bond

I have the feeling that if I say or do the wrong things,my mentor will stop supporting me. Bond*

My mentor and I collaborate on setting goals for my career progression. This will factor in with empowerment. Goals

I am frustrated by the advice I am getting from my mentor. Task*

WAI-R

WAI-R

The goals of these sessions are important to me.

I find what (_____) and I are doing in supervision is unrelated to my concerns.

I feel the things I do in our relationship will help me to improve as a therapist.

I believe (_____) is genuinely concerned for my welfare.

I am clear as to what (_____) wants me to do in these sessions.

(_____) and I respect each other.

I feel that (_____) is not totally honest about his/her feelings toward me.

I am confident in (_____)'s ability to help me.

(_____) and I are working toward mutually agreed upon goals.

I feel that (_____) appreciates me.

We agree on what is important for me to work on.

As a result of these sessions, I am clearer as to how I might be able to improve my work as a therapist.

(_____) and I trust one another.

(_____) and I have different ideas on what my difficulties are.

My relationship with (_____) is very important to me.

I have the feeling that if I say or do the wrong things, (_____) will stop supervising me.

(_____) and I collaborate on setting goals for supervision.

I am frustrated by the things I am doing in supervision.

	We have established a good understanding of the kind of changes that would be good for my career progression. This will factor with empowerment. Goals	We have established a good understanding of the kind of changes that would be good for my work as a therapist.
	The things thatmy mentor is asking me to do don't make sense to me. Task*	The things that (_____) is asking me to do don't make sense to me.
	I don't know what to expect as the result of my relationship. Goals*	I don't know what to expect as the result of my supervision.
	I believe the way we are working in our relationship is beneficial. Task	I believe the way we are working in supervision is correct.
	I feel my mentor cares about me even when I do things that he/she does not approve of. Bond	I feel (_____) cares about me even when I do things that he/she does not approve of.
Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory Revised (Lafromboise, Coleman, Hernandez, 1991)	* are reverse scored Understands the current sociopolitical system of my work environment and its impact on the me Aware of institutional barriers that affect me	Understands the current sociopolitical system and its impact on the client Aware of institutional barriers that affect client
Multicultural Supervision Competencies Questionnaire (MSCQ) (Wong & Wong, 2003)	Has a tendency to abuse his/her power, e.g. impose his/her views on me Serves as an advocate for me	Has a tendency to abuse supervisor power (e.g., imposes view on supervisees) Is willing to advocate for minorities who experience institutional discrimination
Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) (van Oudenhoven & van der Zee 2000) Likert scale was modified from (totally not applicable,hardly applicable, moderately applicable, largely applicable, completely applicable) to (always, very often, often, sometimes, occasionally, rarely, never)	Understands other people's feelings Tries to understand other people's behavior Takes other people's cultural values into consideration Finds it hard to empathize with people not like him/herself Sympathizes with others regardless of cultural background Has problems assessing relationships Is attentive to facial expressions	Understands other people's feelings Tries to understand other people's behavior Takes other people's habits into consideration Finds it hard to empathize with others Sympathizes with others Has problems assessing relationships Is attentive to facial expressions
MPQ	Asks personal questions Enjoy other people's stories Remembers what other people have said Is able to voice other people's concerns Is a good listener	Asks personal questions Enjoy other people's stories Remembers what other people have told Is able to voice other people's thoughts Is a good listener

	Notices when someone is in trouble	Notices when someone is in trouble
	Has an insight into human nature	Has an insight into human nature
	Senses when others get irritated	Senses when others get irritated
	Sets others at ease	Sets others at ease
	Pays attention to the emotions of others	Pays attention to the emotions of others
	Enjoys getting to know people from other cultures	Enjoys getting to know others profoundly
Multi Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Phinney, 1992)	No modifications	
Survey Share online survey tool stock item	What is the title of your position?	What is the title of your position?
		Adjunct, Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor
	counselor added to choices	

Original Items

My mentor shares important information with me

My mentor is accepting that my career aspirations may not be the same as his/hers

My mentor fosters open, non-threatening, discussion of my fears and anxieties

My mentor understands that there are multiple and diverse strategies for achieving my career aspirations

My mentor uses his/her influence in the organization for my benefit

Is the mentor relationship that you have based your responses upon:

      formal, informal, assigned, not assigned, within your department, outside your department

How often do you meet or talk with your mentor about your professional development, projects, or concerns?

  seldom(few times a year), often (montly), frequently (weekly), other

Please select your gender

      male/female

How similar to you is your mentor; please check all that apply:
same race/ethnicity, same gender, different race/ethnicity, different gender

Original Items

How long have you been in your current position?

What is your current primary job position?

     counselor educator faculty, counselor, other

How many quality mentor relationships would you say you currently have?