MENTORING EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

IN BACCALAUREATE NURSING EDUCATION

By

JANET E. BAHR

Bachelor of Science in Nursing
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas
1973

Master of Science
Texas Woman's University
Denton, Texas
1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1985

MENTORING EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

IN BACCALAUREATE NURSING EDUCATION

Thesis Approved:

_____
Thesis Advisor

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ii

PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to describe mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs with emphasis on career development and career advancement. Ten women administrators of baccalaureate nursing programs in various parts of Oklahoma were interviewed. An added benefit of conducting the research study was in being able to visit the campuses of nurse administrator colleagues. I am most appreciative of the cooperation of these colleagues in participating as subjects in this research study.

In reflecting on the accomplishment of this endeavor, many people are to be thanked for their assistance. First and foremost, I wish to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to my major advisor, Dr. Robert Kamm, for his guidance, support, encouragement and expert role modeling. I am also thankful to other committee members, Dr. Thomas Karman, Dr. Ann Austin and Dr. Dianna Newman, for their assistance.

My friends and colleagues deserve recognition for their words of encouragement, understanding and critique of rough drafts of the study. Without the support and caring of many individuals, this accomplishment would have been much more difficult.

Last, special thanks are due my family who have supported me in my educational endeavors. Although unable to see the outcome in this world, of their early years of careful instruction, my parents, the late Mr. and Mrs. Loren Bahr, deserve my most sincere thanks and

deepest appreciation for believing in me and instilling in me the importance of education and a desire to improve my life situation. To my brothers and sisters, I want to say, thank you for your love, support and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of mentoring has been around for ages. In Greek mythology, Mentor was the wise tutor, guardian, and close advisor of Telemachus, the son of Odysseus. Actually, Mentor was the Goddess Athene who disguised herself as Mentor in order to get Telemachus to cooperate in restoring balance to the kingdom during the absence of his father, Odysseus, who was away on a journey (Homer, 1967). Thus, the term mentor evolved, which has hence been defined to mean guardian, guide, teacher, and advisor. Various definitions of mentor have been developed. Whatever the formal definition, mentoring often is not clearly defined in academia and individuals tend to define the concept from their own experiences rather than from a commonly recognized standard (Reohr, 1981). Despite the uncertainty as to meaning, mentoring generally implies a positive concept. Noller (1982) commented that "like patriotism, motherhood, and apple pie, most people are 'for it'" (p. 3). Blackburn, Chapman, and Cameron (1981) commented that "if mentorship were more clearly understood and patterns of influence could be identified, this important role could be more effectively encouraged and utilized" (p. 376).

Throughout history mentor/protege pairs have formed. Some of the famous mentoring relationships were: Mentor and Telemachus; Socrates and Plato; Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung; Franz Joseph Haydn and Ludwig

1

von Beethovan; Lorenze de Medici and Michelangelo; Franz Boas and

Margaret Mead; Margaret Mead and Gail Sheehy; Jean-Paul Sartre and

Simone de Beauvoir; and Anne Sullivan and Helen Keller.

In the course of an academic career, one can generally identify at

least one person who influenced his or her career. In this situation,

mentoring is identified as a special, intense relationship in which an

older or more experienced person (or person with greater rank or exper-

tise) takes a personal interest in the professional and personal develop-

ment of another person in the organization by providing experiences that

greatly benefit the person's career (Alleman, 1982). While long acknow-

ledged to exist, it has been only recently that researchers have begun to

study these relationships and the effect of such relationships on the

career development and career advancement of individuals. The study of

how mentoring relationships influence those in academia is even more

recent.

Currently in higher education, mentoring relationships are most

commonly found in graduate school between the graduate student and the

dissertation advisor (Blackburn, Chapman & Cameron, 1981). Reohr (1981)

made the observation that "college professors don't have mentors once

they leave graduate school" (p. 4). In a study by Moore (1982) only

one-fourth to one-third of college administrators were found to have had

a mentor. However, the young, new faculty member and new administrator

could no doubt benefit from such a relationship. There are examples

from the business sector which emphasize the role of mentoring within

the working environment of the organization. Kanter (1977) has suggested

that mentors are extremely important to men in business for gaining

success, and absolutely essential for women's success. Opportunities

for women to develop mentoring relationships in academia, however, have been limited. Because of the underrepresentation of women in higher education administration, both role models of women for women and mentoring experiences have been extremely rare. Noller (1982) has indicated that "while there is considerable evidence that men for some years have profited from the mentor relationships, the pay-off for women has only recently been investigated and reported" (p. 3).

In recent years, greater interest has developed in the mentor/protege relationship and the search for the ideal mentor. Despite increasing interest in the mentoring phenomenon, systematic studies exploring this concept among women administrators in higher education has been limited. One area in particular, where only limited research is available, is in the nursing field. Spengler (1984) focused on the effective mentoring of doctoral nurses and a study by Vance (1977) investigated contemporary influentials in American nursing. Several authors (Moore & Salimbene, 1981; Queralt, 1982; Reohr, 1981; Speizer, 1981; and Wright, 1983) have emphasized the need for more research on the role of mentors and the process of mentoring within higher education. Fowler (1982) indicated that

> there is a critical lack of systematic evidence on mentoring
> relationships for women in higher education, especially in
> view of the importance of these relationships in the develop-
> ment of a professional identity and in career advancement.
> (p. 28)

From the foregoing discussion, it can be seen that there is a need to study the process of mentoring for women in higher education administration. This study will explore the mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs in higher education. The results of this study will contribute to further understanding of

one aspect of the complex phenomenon of socialization into the academic administrative profession.

## Statement of Problem

There is almost a complete lack of systematic research data on mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs within higher education.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing education programs with emphasis on career development and career advancement.

## Research Questions

Eight research questions were used to guide this study. The first four research questions in this study were adapted from research questions specifically articulated by Wright (1983) in his study of mentoring and university professors. The last four research questions were developed from the research of Moore & Sagaria (1981), Phillips (1977), and Spengler (1984). The specific research questions of this study were:

1. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs define a mentor?

2. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs describe characteristics of the mentoring experiences in terms of both having a mentor and being a mentor?

3. What do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs believe the differences are between being mentored and being a

mentor to another individual?

4. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs believe the mentoring process can be improved a) in nursing education, b) for women in higher education administration, and c) in their education settings?

5. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs perceive that mentoring contributed to their career development?

6. What are the differences in career development activities of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs who have had a mentor and those not having had a mentor?

7. What are the differences in career advancement patterns of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs who have had a mentor and those not having had a mentor?

8. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs perceive that mentoring contributed to their career advancement?

## Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following definition of terms were used:

Career advancement - ability to advance in the organization or profession or move up the career ladder. In higher education this can be partially determined by academic rank, tenure status, academic position, length of time between degrees and length of time between different career roles.

Career development - participation in various activities and endeavors contributing to the professional growth of individuals which aims at enhancing professional credibility,

productivity, and organizational leadership. In higher education this can be measured, in part, by number of research activities, publication activities, scholarly activities, and professional organization activities.

Mentor[1]- an older, wiser, more experienced individual who provides support, guidance, and creates experiences for another individual which assist that individual to become integrated into an organization.

Mentoring[1]- assistance given to a mentee by a mentor (Phillips, 1977)

Mentoring relationship[1]- a special intense relationship in which an older or more experienced person (or person with greater rank and/or expertise, i.e. mentor) takes a personal interest in the professional and personal development of another person (mentee) in the organization by providing experiences that greatly benefit the mentee's career (Alleman, 1982).

Mentee/Protege[1]- the person involved with the mentor in the mentoring relationship (Wright, 1983); an individual who has received special assistance in reaching his or her life goals from other persons (mentors) (Phillips, 1977). For purposes of this study the terms mentee and protege will be used interchangably.

Socialization - process of adopting values, norms, and social roles which constrain behavior in an organizational setting (Bess, 1978).

---

[1]These are theoretical definitions included for the purpose of clarifying the concept researched in this study.

Women administrators - women who are administrators of baccal-

    aureate nursing programs.  Titles of these women administrators

    include:  Dean, Director, Chairperson, or Department Head.

## Limitations

For the purpose of this study, the following limitations were

identified:

1.  The subjects were limited to baccalaureate nursing education

    programs in Oklahoma.

2.  There are limitations of the interview method of data collection

    such as, eagerness of the respondents to please the interviewer,

    possibility of interviewer bias, the self-report may not be

    totally correct, and the retrospective nature of the interview

    may subject the data to memory errors.

3.  The data were limited to the response of ten subjects who agreed

    to be interviewed.  Therefore, the results of this study are not

    generalizable to other women administrators.

## Delimitations

1.  Only female administrators were chosen as subjects.

2.  Only one type of female administrator (i.e. women administra-

    tors of baccalaureate nursing programs) were chosen as subjects

    for this study.

3.  Women administrators of nursing programs from a variety of

    institutional types (public, private; large, small; rural,

    urban) were included in this study.

## Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1.  Subjects were able to hear, speak, and understand the English language.

2.  Subjects responded to the interview questions in a thoughtful and honest manner.

3.  Mentoring occurs in a variety of organizational types and settings.

4.  Mentoring occurs in higher education settings

5.  Mentoring has a measurable impact on individuals.

## Summary

This chapter has included a discussion of the problem, the purpose of the research study, the research questions, definition of terms, limitations, delimitations, and assumptions for the research study. Chapter II, Review of Literature, provides the theoretical framework for the study and the review of literature related to mentoring.

Chapter III, Procedure for Collection and Treatment of Data, explains the method of data collection and the treatment of data for the purposes of the study. Chapter IV, Presentation of Findings, describes the findings of the study in relationship to the specific research questions. Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations, discusses the results of the study, the researcher's conclusions, recommendations for further research, and recommendations for practice.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This research study was conducted for the purpose of describing the mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs. This chapter, Review of Literature, provides the theoretical framework for the study and presents a discussion of literature related to mentoring.

## Theoretical Framework

It has been documented that mentorship enhances adult development (Burton, 1977; Levinson et al., 1976, 1978) and career development (Bolton, 1980; Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Phillips, 1977). More specifically a body of knowledge is developing which indicates the importance of mentoring to career development and career advancement of faculty and administrators in higher education settings (Cameron & Blackburn, 1981; Fowler, 1982; McNeer, 1983; Moore & Salimbene, 1981; Queralt, 1982).

Social learning theory (Bandura, 1969, 1973) and career socialization theory provides the framework for this research. According to social learning theory (Bandura, 1969, 1973), a primary way in which new behaviors are developed and existing behaviors are changed is through modeling and vicarious processes. As a role model, mentors demonstrate to the protege how something is to be done which allows social learning to take place. Human behavior is largely socially transmitted and

learning takes place through social interactions.

From a career socialization point of view, Holland (1959) indicated that career orientation is developed through a combination of personal orientation and career environment factors such as supports and incentives. Through the career socialization process, individuals adjust their behavior to norms acceptable to the organizational setting.

Socialization within the work setting is "the process of adopting values, norms and social roles which constrain behavior in an organizational setting" (Bess, 1978, p. 292). Within academia there are numerous unwritten norms of professional behavior. By sharing close physical proximity and similar backgrounds with members of the group to which they aspire, individuals may become part of the "inner circle" through informal socialization, sponsorship, and mentoring. Thus as Moore (1980) has indicated, mentoring can be thought of as a type of adult socialization into professional level roles, particularly leadership or administrative roles. Based on social learning theory and career socialization theory, mentoring can be viewed as a way to enhance successful integration into an academic administrative career. According to Reohr (1981) "the distinguishing characteristics of the mentor relationship is the social and intellectual status difference which allow the mentor to sponsor professional development and advancement" (p. 3).

Review of Literature

The concept of mentoring has received increased attention within the past few years. Literature on the subject can be divided into four primary categories: the role of mentoring in adult growth and development, the role of mentoring in the business world, the role of mentoring

in nursing, and the role of mentoring in academic settings. The
following review of literature will expand on each of these areas.

## Mentoring and Adult Development

The work of Daniel Levinson et al. (1978) provided one of the first
research studies on mentoring and adult development. Levinson studied
forty adult men in four professions (hourly workers in industry, busi-
ness executives, university biologists, and novelists) and concluded
that "the mentor relationship is one of the most complex, and develop-
mentally important, a man can have in early adulthood" (p. 97).
Levinson's idea of a mentor included being a teacher, sponsor, counselor,
developer of skills, stimulator of intellect, host, guide, and exemplar.
The mentor also "supports and facilitates the realization of the Dream"
(p. 98), or the vision of each young man to have the kind of life he
wants as an adult. Levinson indicated this is perhaps the most crucial
developmental function that a mentor performs.

Levinson et al. (1976) described a mentor as one who "takes a
younger man under his wing, invites him into a new occupational world,
shows him around, imparts his wisdom, cares, sponsors, criticizes, and
bestows his blessings" (p. 23). According to Levinson (1978) a mentor
is a combination of good father and good friend without being either.
In addition, the mentor relationship is described as an intense form of
"love", which may last two to three years (ten at the most), with an
8 to 15 year age difference between the mentor and protege. Levinson
found that mentor relationships are uncommon and when they do occur,
most people have only one and rarely have more than three or four in
their lifetime (1976, p. 24).

Mentoring can be considered one aspect of the mid-life development-al process in which the psycho-social task is to resolve the issue of generativity versus stagnation. This stage of development, as described by Erikson (1950), is characterized by an interest in and concern for the next generation and an awareness of one's responsibility for guiding the upcoming generation of young adults (Erikson, 1969, p. 314-321). There-fore, serving as a mentor is a contribution to society typically made by persons in middle adulthood. Merriam (1983) stated "clearly, mentoring is one manifestation of this mid-life task" (p. 163). and can be consider-ed a means of providing continuity from one generation to another.

From a specific context of adult development, Dalton, Thompson, and Price (1977) classified mentoring as part of a four stage model or career organization. From interviews with hundreds of engineers, scientists, accountants, and other professionals, four successive stages of apprentice, colleague, mentor, and sponsor were identified. The apprentice stage (Stage I) occurs early in one's career, during which the young employee works under the direction of a more experienced worker. It is a dependent relationship which includes helping, learning, and following directions. Dalton et al. (1977) indicated that having a good mentor relationship is especially important during this stage as it provides the following:

> . . .a model that the Stage I person can follow whenever he is unsure how to approach a problem. Finding a good mentor should be a key agenda item for any professional entering an organization. Providing him with the opportunity to find such a mentor is an equally important responsibility of high-ups in the organization. (p. 24-25)

Stage II is characterized by independence and colleague relation-ships. One strives to become a specialist in his or her field or profes-sion. The mentor stage (Stage III) is identified as the point in one's

career where advancement into supervisory positions occurs and ability
to provide guidance to those in Stage I or apprentice level employees
is expected. The mentor stage is characterized by a sense of personal
confidence, ability to build confidence in subordinates, and taking
responsibility for someone else. The last stage (Stage IV) is that of
sponsor in which the person helps shape the direction of the organization.
This is accomplished through participation in policy decisions and devel-
opment and advancement of key people. A sponsor is more concerned with
organizational development, while a mentor is more concerned with
individual development. A significant aspect of the four stage model
identified by Dalton et al. (1977) is the importance of a mentor type
relationship in the career development of individuals.

Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978) have identified a continuum of
helping relationships with mentors at one end of a spectrum of individ-
uals in advisory/support roles who facilitate access to positions of
leadership, authority, or power. This "patron system" (protectors,
benefactors, sponsors, champions, advocates, supporters, advisors) as
identified by the authors, consisted of mentors at one end and peer pals
at the other, with sponsors and guides in between. The authors identi-
fied "mentors" as the most intense and paternalistic of the types of
patrons. The authors also indicated that those relationships closer to
the mentor side of the continuum tend to be hierarchical, parental,
intense, exclusionary, and elitist. Relationships closer to the peer
pal side of the continuum tend to be more egalitarian, peer related, less
intense and exclusionary, and potentially more democratic. Shapiro et al.
(1977) indicated that "mentors are clearly a variable related to success
and mobility but not everyone (male or female) will choose to be or will

be chosen as a protege" (p.56).

## Women, Mentoring and the Business World

There have been few studies that addressed the issue of mentoring
relationships and career development of women and of these, most are
confined to the business world.  In writing about mentoring and adult
development, Sheehy (1976) was particularly interested in how women are
affected by mentoring relationships.  Sheehy described the advantages
of mentoring relationships in the lives of women and indicated that
those who had gained recognition in their career had at some point
encountered a mentor.

Perhaps the most extensive study in relation to mentoring and women
is that of Hennig and Jardim 91977) who studied women in business.  In
this study of 25 top-level executives, all of the women had had a mentor
who promoted their career development.   The mentor was a male boss who
provided support to the female executive until she reached mid-manage-
ment and the age of 35.  From these findings, Hennig & Jardim (1977)
advised women in management careers to "look for a coach, a godfather or
a godmother, a mentor, an advocate, someone in a more senior position
who can teach. . .support. . .advise. . .critique" (p. 162).

In a study of the career development of 331 women managers and
executives in business and industry, Phillips (1977) found that sixty-
one percent of the women indicated that they had had one or more career
mentors.  While mentoring was found to be common among these women, the
mentor was not the only factor in their success; however, it was an
important part of their overall career development.  The women in
Phillips' study ranked mentoring among the top five critical factors in

their career development.  Phillips (1977) concluded that "it is too early to say without question that all women (and men) need career mentors" (p. 123).

Bolton (1980) also reported on the mentoring relationship in the career development of women.  Bolton indicated that mentoring is part of social learning, and along with role modeling, has an influence on the career development of individuals.  She stated:

> The mentor, like the role model, demonstrates how an activity is to be performed and can enhance the learning experience. In addition the mentor personalizes the modeling influences for the individual by a direct involvement not necessarily implied by a role model.  Thus in addition to being a role model, the mentor acts as a guide, a tutor or coach, and a confidant. (p. 198)

Bolton indicated that a higher organizational position level does not necessarily imply the ability of that person to act as a mentor in the promotion and advancement of others.  What does matter, however, is the amount of expertise that has been accrued.  Bolton stated "the most important element is the willingness to share accumulated knowledge with another individual in the novice stage of development whether on the same occupational level or from a higher position" (p. 205).

The scarcity of women in high level positions who could serve as mentors to other women is pointed out by several authors (Blackburn, Chapman & Cameron, 1981; Bolton, 1980; Marshall, 1981; Moore & Salimbene, 1981; Schmidt & Wolfe, 1980; Taylor & McLaughlin, 1982).  It appears, therefore, that men provide the most likely source of mentors to women in many situations.

Mentoring in the Nursing Profession

In 1977, Vance identified the importance of mentoring to the career

development of nurses. Her exploratory descriptive study of contemporary influentials in American nursing, found that of the 71 identified leaders in nursing, 83 percent had one or more mentors. Of those individuals identified as a mentor, 70 percent were nurses, and 79 percent were female. The mentors provided specific help to the influential nurses in such areas as career advice, guidance, and promotion; professional role modeling; intellectual and scholarly stimulation; inspiration and idealism; teaching, advising, and tutoring; and emotional support.

Over 90 percent of the influential nurses identified in Vance's study served as mentors to other developing nurses. Vance (1982) stated that "these nursing leaders see their mentor role as an important part of their leadership responsibilities" (p. 11). Vance (1982) identified three major benefits of mentor relationships to the nursing profession: (1) socializing individuals to the profession's norms, values, and standards, (2) providing entry into the inner circles of the profession, and (3) promoting growth by ensuring continuity and the quality of leadership in the profession. Vance (1982) summarized that "the mentor system developed more widely in nursing will strengthen the profession by increasing its numbers of competent, successful and satisfied professionals" (p. 13).

Spengler (1984) researched the characteristics and frequency of mentoring relationships of female nurses with doctoral degrees. A self-administered questionnaire, the Mentor-Protege Survey, was sent to 725 nurses selected from the Directory of Nurses with Doctoral Degrees who had completed a doctoral degree between 1975 and 1979. A total of 501 nurses returned the questionnaire. In addition to describing the

characteristics and frequency of mentoring among this group of nurses,
she also assessed the influence of mentoring on the career planning,
career satisfaction, research productivity, and scholarly activities of
nurses with doctoral degrees.  She found that 57 percent of the respon-
dents reported having had a mentor.  In addition, sixty-four percent of
the women reporting a mentoring relationship in Spengler's study could
identify two or more mentors.

Spengler (1984) also found that there were significant differences
in career planning, career satisfaction, and sense of accomplishment
related to career goals between those having a mentor and those not
having a mentor.  However, she did not find a statistical difference
among those having mentors and those not having mentors in the areas of
research and scholarly activities.  Seventy-three percent of the nurse
doctorates identified female mentors, with sixty-three percent of the
mentors being other nurses.  A large majority (82 percent) of the
research participants said that mentoring was very important to their
career development.  Eighty-nine percent of the nurse doctorates who had
been mentored were serving or had served as a mentor to one or more
persons as compared to seventy-three percent of the non-mentored group.

Fagan and Fagan (1983) studied mentoring among nurses, police
officers, and teachers.  Eighty-four percent of the nurses surveyed had
received some mentoring, with the frequency of mentoring among police
officers and teachers not statistically different from the nurses'
mentoring experiences.  This mentoring rate exceeded that found by
Roche (1979) who reported a 64 percent mentoring rate for business
executives and Phillips (1977) who found a mentoring rate of 61 percent
for women business managers.  In addition, "beginning nurses identified

much more closely with their mentors than did novice police officers and teachers" (p. 81).

Pardue (1982) described a mentor system designed to teach graduate nursing students how to be teachers of nurses. Each graduate student selecting a teaching track was involved in a mentor relationship with an experienced nurse educator. The student was guided in preparing for and teaching a nursing practicum course by this expert. The primary purpose for this mentoring relationship was to facilitate the learning of how to teach. The evaluation from both mentors and graduate students indicated that the purpose was being achieved.

The mentor-protege relationship has been used to socialize novice nurses into the profession. Atwood (1979) described a successful mentoring program developed at Children's Hospital in San Francisco. In this system, the nurse mentor acted as a leader and provided direct client care, serving as a role model to the neophyte nurse mentee. Atwood (1978) summarized this program by saying:

> The mentor teaches, coaches, inspires, and supports the
> development and growth of the team members, including staff
> nurses and at least one neophyte: a newly graduated nurse
> who needs a docent or expert to guide her through the
> transitional period from student learner to practicing
> professional. (p. 715)

This pilot project proved to be cost effective, improved quality of care, and enhanced job satisfaction. In addition, an increased sense of camaraderie developed on the unit.

Another area in which mentoring has been used in nursing is in developing individuals for administrative positions in academia. Hawken (1980) wrote about the benefits of an administrative mentoring experience which assisted her in learning what nursing education

administration was about. The firsthand experience under the guidance of an experienced mentor was found to be very helpful. Hawken summarized her experience by saying it "gave me an overall view of the many facets of administration, under the ideal circumstances of working with a mentor who was knowledgeable, experienced, and willing to allow me to learn" (p. 171). She has since instituted a similar program to assist individuals who are interested in administration to learn through first-hand experience with her as the guide, teacher, and mentor.

Chamings (1984) described her experience of seeking out a prominent nursing administrator and designing a mentor-mentee experience to prepare her for a career in nursing education administration. Chamings' one year experience with the nurse administrator mentor helped her learn about nursing education administration. Since leaving the mentor-mentee relationship, Chamings attributes her success as a dean to her positive mentoring experience with the nurse administrator mentor. She indicated that any nurse administrator, aspiring to become a dean, should attempt to develop a mentor-mentee relationship with a successful dean across the country.

The research studies cited suggested that women do mentor other women in careers where women comprise higher-level positions within the organization. The findings that women serve as mentors to other women is contrary to what Holcomb (1980) contended in her study of successful women. Holcomb indicated that women infrequently serve as mentors to other women because of "competitive feelings among women" (p. 18). In fact, Fagan & Fagan (1983) as well as others (Kanter, 1977; Queralt, 1982; Roche, 1979; Spengler, 1984) found that women who had mentors were more likely to serve as mentors to others.

<u>Mentors</u> <u>in</u> <u>Academic</u> <u>Settings</u>

A beginning body of knowledge is being developed regarding mentoring within the academic community. Mentoring relationships in academic settings are primarily divided into two categories: those relating to student/faculty mentoring relationships and those between professional individuals.

Several institutions of higher education have developed faculty mentoring programs for undergraduate students (Brown, 1980; Gardner, 1981; Miller & Brickman, 1982; Taylor & McLaughlin, 1982). Although these programs were developed under the assumption that mentoring helps in increasing student retention, providing services, and facilitating learning of students, there are few evaluations of such programs. Taylor & McLaughlin (1982) indicated that a "conscious effort to provide mentors and role models for women should begin before entry into the professional world and should provide attitudes and skills that can subsequently be adapted to career needs" (p. 10).

Mentoring has also been used to assist students in learning about a specific career. Borman and Colson (1984) described the use of mentoring as a career guidance technique for use with high school and college students. Through mentoring experiences, students learn about career fields of interest. A student is placed in an observer role in a career field of interest (such as nursing) and experiences first hand what it is like to be a member of that career (i.e. nurse).

Lynch (1980) described a mentoring program in which 50 undergraduate junior students at Wheaton College were matched with 50 professional women in the greater Boston/Providence area. At the end of one

semester, students indicated overall evaluations of the program as being excellent. Students felt they received information and support from the mentor, gained knowledge about specific career fields, and received advice and encouragement. This study suggests that undergraduate students may benefit from a mentor in a specific kind of work or occupational field, who can provide career information, listen, and give guidance and support to the student relative to the world of work.

A mentoring program at Empire State College, assigns a faculty mentor to students in an individual education program. The faculty mentor advises, counsels, supports, and monitors the student in his or her progress toward academic goals. Cain (1981) studied the mentoring role from the faculty perspective using the critical incident technique. Faculty were asked to report or recall incidents which either facilitated or impeded mentoring. An overwhelming number of incidents were reported that were perceived as facilitating mentoring (67 incidents) as compared to 18 incidents of an impeding nature. From these incidents, the author compiled a list of critical requirements that seemed necessary for effective mentoring to occur in nontraditional educational settings. These included providing immediate feedback on student performance, knowledge of alternative teaching/learning strategies for adult learners, interpersonal relationship skills, sensitivity to student experiences, skill in assisting student to learn independently, listening ability, flexibility, resourcefulness in bridging gaps between student, mentor, and institutional expectations, knowledge of adult development, and readiness to set behavior limits (Cain, 1981, p. 124-125). The author concluded "mentoring has the potential for humanizing higher education for adults" (p. 126). He continued:

as an educational process, the success of mentoring as an
alternative approach to teaching and learning will depend
greatly upon the recognition of the adult as a unique leader
who brings a different set of experiences and expectations
to the academic environment. (p. 126)

The mentoring programs at Wheaton College and Empire State College are
used as a means of socialization into higher education and as a bridge
in the transition from higher education to the work world (Cain, 1981;
Lynch, 1980).

Canislus College has developed a mentoring system to help improve
retention of freshmen students (Miller & Brickman, 1982). The intense
personal interest in students shown by the faculty mentors has contri-
buted to the following results. Freshmen who were mentored received
fewer deficiency notices (17.7%) at midterm compared to 39.1% for the
non-mentored students. For those who did receive deficiency notices,
fewer notices were issued per student to those in the mentoring program
(1.26 notices per mentored student; 1.42 notices per non-mentored
student). Grade performance was better for those who were mentored.
Also the attrition rate was significantly less--2.7 percent for the
mentored students as compared to a rate of 10.6 percent for the non-
mentored students. This program had a positive effect on retention and
academic performance.

Watkins (1980) evaluated a structured mentor program in higher
education. In this program of post-doctorate training for women and
minorities in educational research, the mentor relationship failed to
allow for mutual teaching and learning in a new field. A more
collaborative structure replaced the mentor model. Participants in
this program found that a structure which allowed flexibility to be
a teacher at one time and a learner at another was more useful than

the mentorship model which they perceived to have hierarchical char-
acteristics of a patriarchical research university. A collegial
cooperative structure, based on feminist theory, appeared to help
promote the goals of this program—improving educational research on
issues of concern to women and minorities, and advancing women and
minorities in the system.

Schmidt and Wolfe (1980) described the use of a mentoring program
in developing student personnel professionals. They indicated that
developing mentor relationships is an important activity to promote
professionalism among potential student personnel workers and that
finding mentors to provide guidance, support, and opportunities is a
need for these new professionals. These authors identified the
following factors as being important when selecting a mentor: (1)
mentor's interest in the protege's professional development, (2)
mentor's ability to expose protege to knowledge and learning, and
(3) a similar or shared value system between mentor and protege.

On a national level, two programs of the American Council on
Education are available to assist women who aspire to leadership
positions in higher education. The ACE Fellows Program identifies
and assists 35 men and women yearly who are either contemplating a
move into administration or who are at the initial stages of an
administrative career. The Council's National Identification Program
assists 50 women yearly who are ready to move into a major administra-
tive position at the dean's level or above. Both programs feature
networking and mentoring as part of the leadership training (Green,
1982).

Another type of mentoring experience in higher education is that

between graduate student and the thesis or dissertation advisor. These close, intense, strong mentoring relationships often last years beyond the end of graduate education. In a study of women's relationships with male and female mentors, Quinn (1980) found that the majority of subjects had a need to maintain contact with the mentor even after the need for mentoring had passed. Long-lasting friendships tended to form between mentors and proteges.

Several studies have examined the relationship of mentoring and career development of faculty and administrators in higher education. Queralt (1982) has identified eleven variables in a theory of mentorship in relation to career development in the academic profession. These variables are: the origin of the mentorship, length of the mentorship, number of mentors experienced by the protege, career stage of both protege and the mentor, level of mentoring experience of the mentor, relative fit of mentor and protege, degree of identification between mentor and protege, quality or effectiveness of the mentorship, ability of the protege to perform academic tasks, and academic origin of the protege (Queralt, 1982, p. 19-20). Queralt studied 287 faculty members and academic administrators in the State University System of Florida in 1980. Her preliminary research indicated that academics with mentors had higher performance in the following areas: (1) publication, (2) grants received, (3) leadership roles assumed, (4) attainment of full professorships, (5) higher incomes from professional activities, (6) level of job satisfaction, and (7) level of career satisfaction. In addition, academics with mentors published more books, edited more reading publications, received more competitive grants of $500,000 or above, received more competitive grants between $200,000-499,999, and

had more years of national and international leadership.

Queralt (1982) also found a high degree of similarity between mentors and proteges. Similarities in personal attributes such as gender, race, ethnicity, academic field, social class background, perspective, and personality traits were theorized to help form a basis for compatibility and identification.

Queralt (1982) also indicated a relationship between being a mentor and mentoring. Most of the mentors in Queralt's study had themselves been mentored. This finding is consistent with the research of Fagan & Fagan (1983), Kanter (1977), and Roche (1979).

Another characteristic identified by Queralt (1982) was that high quality in terms of assistance, personal relationship, and timing, may be a dimension of the mentor relationship. The majority of the subjects rated their mentoring experiences high in terms of the assistance received from the mentor, the quality of the personal relationship with the mentor, and the timing of the mentoring experience.

There was slightly better performance among academics whose mentorships began early as compared to academics whose mentorships came later. Another factor identified was that academics with more than one mentor did better than those with only one mentor. Those with extended lengths of mentorships did better in terms of career development than those whose experience was brief. In summary, Queralt's research showed that "mentors appear to contribute significantly to the advancement of the academic careers of faculty members and academic administrators" (p. 15).

In looking at the academic mentoring situation, Fowler (1984) found no significant differences in the number or quality of mentoring

relationships among male and female assistant professors. In addition,
no significant differences between men and women were found in the
following areas: (1) positive outlook/attitude, (2) negative outlook/
attitude, (3) feeling of support within department, (4) feeling of
lack of support within the department, (5) sense of collegiality,
(6) awareness of the informal network, and (7) use of the informal
network. Females, however, did perceive more sex discrimination in
the work environment than male assistant professors. Fowler (1982)
indicated that the interview subjects found their mentoring relation-
ships beneficial in their professional development. At least one
mentor was identified by each of the subjects and some had as many as
six mentors. Fowler (1982) suggested that "young professionals should
be encouraged to initiate mentoring relationships with older, more
experienced persons who may provide support and assistance for them
in their career development" (p. 32).

Wright (1983) found that most university professors considered
mentoring to be important in scholarship development and professional
advancement. Wright interviewed twenty faculty members in two colleges
of education at two separate academic institutions. An equal number
of male and female faculty members were included in the study. Eighty
percent of the male professors and fifty percent of the female professors
reported having a mentor. Males defined mentors in terms of a patron,
sponsor, or career enhancer and females defined a mentor in terms of a
role model or confidence builder. In this study, a majority of the
professors said they were or had served as a mentor to another person.
Six of the male (60 percent) and seven of the female (70 percent)
professors reported serving as a mentor. Wright found that male

professors reported longer relationships with their mentor, a greater age difference between mentor and mentee, and greater contact with the previous mentor than what was reported by female professors.

In relation to career advancement, Moore and Sagaria (1981) studied a group of women administrators in Pennsylvania and found that the majority of administrators had at some time held full-time faculty positions but only 14.6 percent had been a department chairperson. The authors indicated that "these data suggest that no single career ladder predominates" (p. 27) for these women administrators. A large majority of women administrators had been in their current positions six years or less. Sixty-seven percent of the women administrators in this study had advanced to their current position from within the same institution. For women administrators not promoted from within, most came from out of state or from a position outside of higher education. Moore and Sagaria (1981) indicated that "there is little intra- or inter-state networking going on among institutions" (p. 25) for women. The number of women administrators indicating that they did or did not anticipate a move to another position within the next five years was equally divided with 40 percent indicating each option and 20 percent uncertain.

Moore and Salimbene (1981) interviewed a group of thirty-five male and female administrators in colleges and universities in Pennsylvania who indicated that they had had a mentor relationship at some time in their careers. The purposes of these interviews were to "ascertain how each individual perceived the mentoring relationship, what was learned from the mentor, and how the relationship affected the individual's career progress" (p. 53). Two major types of mentoring interactions were identified. The first is a superior/subordinate interaction in

which an older superior becomes a mentor to a younger, less experienced

employee. The mentor encourages the subordinate in his or her career

development and may provide direct career opportunities for the individ-

ual. Often the protege was being prepared to take the mentor's place

in the institution or to assume a higher administrative position at the

university or elsewhere. The second type of interaction was that between

faculty member and student. Generally, this was between doctoral student

and graduate faculty member but occasionally undergraduate relationships

were mentioned. Overall, very few graduate faculty were named as

mentors. The respondents indicated that mentors needed to have special

skills, status, and have the ability to provide special considerations

for their professional development. One protege incidated a "sense of

being chosen" and "a sense of having hands laid on you" (p. 57). These

authors found that women administrators had both male and female mentors

but male administrators had only male mentors. Generally, women were the

mentors more often to those in positions traditionally held by women

e.g. deans of nursing, deans of students, or deans of women. The

authors suggested that:

> The likelihood, then, that a male subordinate would come into
> direct contact with a female in an upper level administrative
> post was minimal. For female subordinates, too, the presence
> of female administrators was an unusual occurrence, but when
> found they were used as mentors. (p. 58)

In regard to what mentors do, a fairly common set of experiences

emerged in which the protege was expected to participate. Much of the

mentor's behavior was directed at testing and evaluating the protege.

By providing experiences in which proteges must prove themselves,

mentors are able to evaluate the administrative ability of the protege.

Another area in which the mentor provided a critical element was in

evaluation and correction of the protege's performance. The mentor provided expert feedback and discipline for the young administrator. The mentor could also defend the protege against criticisms of others which might place the protege in jeopardy in the institution.

Moore and Salimbene (1981) also discussed limitations of a mentoring relationship such as pressure to conform to the wishes of the mentor and sexual overtones in cross-gender relationships involving a male mentor and a female protege. Those proteges who do not conform to the wishes of the mentor may experience a reaction from the mentor ranging from minor disapproval to complete rejection. Problems with cross-gender relationships include others perceiving the relationship as sexual, and the woman becoming a token. Bolton (1980) and Fowler (1982) have also identified the same kinds of problems with mentoring relationships.

Although commonalities can be identified in mentoring relationships, "the quality of the mentoring process varies from relationship to relationship, sometimes as a result of the wishes of the mentor, at other times because the protege is not receptive" (Moore & Salimbene, 1981, p. 58-59). These authors concluded "that a mentor is essential for the upward mobility of academic administrators, particularly for female administrators" (p. 63). Although success is possible without a mentor, most respondents in this study believed it (success) would come more slowly without a mentor.

In a later article, Moore (1982) identified a natural evolution of the mentoring process. First, the mentee performs an important and visible task which is recognized by the mentor. Following this phase, the mentee is "tested" with additional and increasing responsibilities in which the mentor is quickly assessing the talents of the mentee.

Next, a more formal arrangement occurs when the mentor chooses the mentee to work with him or her. Last, the mentor and mentee work closely together to shape and develop the mentee. From her interviews with administrators and proteges, seven important elements emerged which contribute to an effective mentor program. These are: (1) accessibility and frequent interaction, (2) visibility by working with other high-level leaders, (3) feedback on strengths and weaknesses, (4) recognition and special acknowledgement of those who mentor others effectively, (5) allowance for failure of both mentor and protege, (6) openness to a variety of diverse pools of talented people, and (7) commitment to the mentor program (p. 28). These strategies have been found to strengthen the success of mentoring programs. These elements must be considered when attempting to initiate a mentor program for developing leaders in academia. These seven elements are an attempt to develop some formalization of the normally informal mentoring process.

McNeer (1983) studied the effects of mentors and a mentoring system on the career development of women administrators in higher education and found two critical time periods in which mentoring relationships influenced career development. This two-stage pattern consisted of an initial career socialization during graduate school before the individual actually became a college or university faculty member. This was followed by the second critical career stage when the faculty member was considering a move into administration. This is similar to the pattern discussed earlier by Moore and Salimbene (1981). Reohr (1981) and Miller et al. (1981) found that few professors in academia have mentors after they leave graduate school. McNeer (1983) indicated that "for women interested in careers in higher education

administration, this second mentoring relationship is critical" (p. 10).

In McNeer's study (1982) of 9 women administrators, the median age was 44, most had been in the present position for less than 4 years (8 of 9), all had earned doctorates, 8 of 9 had taught for 10 years or more before moving into administration, and only 2 women had been promoted from within the same institution. These administrators identified a total of 34 mentors of which 13 were women, with relationships lasting 1 to 20 years. When the mentor was identified as a graduate faculty member, the mentor tended to be older, but frequently the mentor who assisted the individual in their career change into administration was a colleague of the same age. Some of the ways mentors assisted these women administrators were encouragement/recognition, advice/counsel, inspiration/role modeling, and visibility. McNeer concluded "that mentoring appears to be a practice used to develop leaders in both faculty and administrative positions in higher education" (1983, p. 12).

In a study on sponsorship and academic career success, Cameron and Blackburn (1981) found that financial support and early collaboration with senior faculty contributed to a social selection process that significantly influenced career research success. The academic field (English, psychology, sociology) and the type of institution in which one is employed also influenced the relationship. The only area where gender influenced the outcome was in network involvement with men having significantly larger numbers of associations than females. The type of university, i.e. highly rated university, was identified as the strong-est predictor of rate of publication and grants received. These authors concluded that place of work was the critical factor, but that sponsor-ship did enter the placement process although the exact relationship

to career productivity remained unclear.

Blackburn, Chapman, and Cameron (1981) have studied the process of sponsorship from the perspective of how the mentoring role is perceived by faculty members who have been named mentors. They found that when mentor professors were asked who their most successful proteges were, they nominated those whose careers were essentially identical to their own by an overwhelming degree—in essence they favored their "clones." The majority of mentors nominated were men (90 percent), although equal numbers of women and men faculty were doing the nominating. The more productive mentors were found to have a greater number of proteges but were less informed on the proteges' personal lives. In other words, the relationship was more on a professional than personal basis. These authors concluded that "the stature and accomplishments of the mentor are important to both the academic productivity and advancement of the protege" (p. 325).

## Summary

The previous discussion has highlighted the importance of mentoring in adult development, in business and industry, in nursing, and in academic settings. The literature supports the concept of mentoring as an important part of career socialization and as such may play a part in the career development and career advancement of individuals within an organization. Although there is general agreement on the importance of mentoring in helping individuals reach their life goals, there is little systematic research related to mentoring experiences of women and especially women administrators. It was also found that the phenomenon of mentoring is just beginning to be explored in the nursing

profession. This study will contribute to the understanding of mentoring relationships by describing the mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs within higher education.

The next chapter, Procedure for Collection and Treatment of Data, explains the method of data collection and the methods used to report the results.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF DATA

This research study was an exploratory study conducted for the purpose of describing the mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs with emphasis on career development and career advancement. This chapter includes: (1) the description and selection of the population used in the research, (2) a description of the instrument used to collect the data, (3) the explanation of how the data were collected, and (4) the method used to report the results.

Population

The population consisted of all female administrators of baccalaureate nursing programs in Oklahoma. This group of nurse administrators were selected based on accessibility of subjects and feasibility when considering travel involved with personal interviews. Of the eleven administrators, ten agreed to be interviewed.

Instrument Used

The instrument used in this exploratory research study was a researcher-constructed, structured, interview schedule. The interview schedule consisted of both closed and open-ended questions. The instrument was developed in order to obtain depth and to capture the idiosyncracies of the mentoring process. The instrument was constructed

during the summer 1985 after reviewing various studies on mentoring. In particular, the research studies by Fagan & Fagan (1983), Fowler (1982), Moore & Sagaria (1981), Phillips (1977), Queralt (1982), Spengler (1984), and Wright (1983) were helpful in identifying areas for questions. Questions were developed in the areas of mentoring experiences as a mentor and mentee, opinions regarding selected aspects of the mentoring experience, mentoring and career development, and mentoring and career advancement.

After the instrument was developed, it was pilot-tested by interviewing three individuals who had experience in nursing administration or were currently in an administrative position similar to the subjects included in the study. All individuals included in the pilot test were familiar with the concept of mentoring. The pilot interviews were conducted for the purpose of identifying weaknesses in the interview schedule, assessing the sequencing of interview questions, checking the subjects understanding of the interview questions, and assisting the researcher to develop skill in administering the research instrument. The interview schedule was also reviewed by the individuals chosen for the pilot test for content validity, for clarity of wording, and for interviewer bias in question wording. Revisions were made after the first two pilot tests which included adding more specific instructions for each part of the interview schedule and making the interview schedule more structured. Minimal revisions were made after the third pilot test. The final interview schedule was developed following the third pilot test.

The Interview Schedule on Mentoring consisted of 68 questions, divided into four parts. Part I of the interview schedule included demographic data on personal background characteristics, career

characteristics and institutional characteristics. Part II of the

interview schedule focused on the mentoring experiences of the subjects.

Subsection A of Part II included questions related to having a mentor.

A set of nine questions were included for subjects not having had a

mentor. Subsection B of Part II included questions of being a mentor

to another person. Also included in Part II were questions addressing

the perceived difference between being a mentor and being mentored,

and questions asking subjects how they believed mentoring could be

improved in nursing education, for women in higher education adminis-

tration, and in the subject's specific educational setting. Part III

of the interview schedule focused on career development. A list of 25

career development activities were identified and subjects were asked

to indicate the number of times they had participated in each activity

in their career and in the last year. Another question asked subjects

to rate to what degree mentoring contributed to their career develop-

ment. Part IV consisted of questions on career advancement and

educational advancement. One question asked subjects to rate to what

degree mentoring contributed to their career advancement. The last

three questions on the interview schedule were open-ended questions for

subjects to clarify or elaborate on any aspect of having a mentor,

being a mentor, or mentoring in general. The interview schedule is

included in Appendix A.

## Data Collection

All female administrators of baccalaureate nursing education pro-

grams in Oklahoma were contacted by letter seeking participation in the

study. The contact letter is included in Appendix B. The letter

explained the purpose of the study and described how the data would be collected using personal interviews. Included in each letter was a postcard for each respondent to return if she agreed to participate in the study. A total of 10 out of 11 postcards were returned. The one non-respondent was contacted by telephone. She indicated that she had not received the original letter or that it had possibly gotten lost. A second letter was hand delivered to her at a meeting. After approximately one week, she was contacted again by telephone. At this time she declined permission for the researcher to interview her.

Following return of the postcards, each subject was contacted by telephone and an interview date and time were scheduled. Interviews were conducted on the campus of each subject except for one interview. For the convenience of one subject, the interview was conducted following a meeting away from her respective campus. The researcher conducted all interviews during the first two weeks of September 1985. Each interview was tape-recorded using 90 minute cassette tapes. Notes were also recorded on the interview schedule. All subjects were given the same directions and were asked to respond to exactly the same questions in the exact same order to ensure comparability of responses through standardization of the interview process. The taped interviews were later transcribed, organized, and summarized. The interviews ranged from 45 minutes to 106 minutes in length with a mean length of 68 minutes.

## Treatment of Data

The purpose of this research was to gather descriptive information using a structured interview approach. Responses to the interview questions were classified, categorized, and summarized. Descriptive

statistics were used to report the findings.  The results of the data are described in Chapter IV.

## Summary

This chapter has discussed the methodology of the research study. This research was exploratory in nature, using the personal interview approach.  Ten women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs in Oklahoma were selected as subjects.  During September 1985, each subject was interviewed, with the interview being tape-recorded.  The data were analyzed and results organized at a later time.  Chapter IV presents the findings of the research using both tabular and narrative forms.  Descriptive statistics are used when appropriate.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

This research study was an exploratory study conducted for the purpose of describing mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing education programs with emphasis on career development and career advancement. This chapter will present demographic characteristics and discuss the eight research questions.

Deomgraphic Characteristics

Demographic characteristics of the women who were interviewed for the study are included in Tables I to VIII. Personal background characteristics included age, race, marital status, educational level, birth order, siblings, and birth position of siblings. The women studied ranged in age from 43 to 60 years. The mean age was 50.4 years and median age was 50 years. Eight of the women in the study (80 percent) were Caucasian with one (10 percent) Black and one (10 percent) American Indian. Eighty percent (8) of the women were married and twenty percent (2) were single. Most of the women (70 percent), or seven individuals, had earned doctoral degrees as the highest educational level. Of the three with masters degrees as the highest educational leve, all are doctoral candidatees, having completed course requirements for the doctorate. See Table I for data on age, race, marital status, and highest educational level.

TABLE I

PERSONAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS: AGE, RACE,
MARITAL STATUS, HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

| Characteristics | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Age | | |
| 41 – 45 | 2 | 20 |
| 46 – 50 | 3 | 30 |
| 51 – 55 | 4 | 40 |
| 56 – 60 | 1 | 10 |
| Race | | |
| Caucasian | 8 | 80 |
| Black | 1 | 10 |
| American Indian | 1 | 10 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Married | 8 | 80 |
| Single | 2 | 20 |
| Highest Educational Level | | |
| Doctorate | 7 | 70 |
| Masters | 3 | 30 |

Birth order responses were as follows: first born or only child –
2 (twenty percent), second born – 3 (thirty percent), third born – 3
(thirty percent), fourth born – 0, and fifth born – 2 (twenty percent).
The number of siblings ranged from one to seven with a mean of 3.3.
The number of siblings totaled 33. There were an equal number of
older and younger brothers (9), an equal number of older and younger
sisters (7), and one twin sister. See Table II for these data.

TABLE II

PERSONAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS: BIRTH ORDER, NUMBER
OF SIBLINGS, BIRTH POSITION OF SIBLINGS

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Birth Order | | |
| 1st born or only child | 2 | 20 |
| 2nd born | 3 | 30 |
| 3rd born | 3 | 30 |
| 4th born | 0 | 0 |
| 5th born | 2 | 20 |
| Number of Siblings | | |
| 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 2 | 3 | 30 |
| 3 | 2 | 20 |
| 4 | 2 | 20 |
| 5 | 1 | 10 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 1 (N = 33) | 10 |
| Birth Position of Siblings | | |
| Older brothers | 9 | |
| Younger brothers | 9 | |
| Older sisters | 7 | |
| Younger sisters | 7 | |
| Twin sister | 1 (N = 33) | |

Career characteristics included current position title and years in current position, rank and years in current rank, tenure status and years tenured, total years in higher education, total years in higher education administration, and salary. Current position titles of the ten women administrators were as follows: Dean or Assistant Dean - 5 (fifty percent), Chairperson - 3 (thirty percent), Head - 1 (ten percent), and Director - 1 (ten percent). These women had been in the current

position from one month to eight years with the mean time being 3.75

years.  Table III shows these data.

TABLE III

CURRENT POSITION TITLE AND YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Current Position Title | | |
|     Dean or Assistant Dean | 5 | 50 |
|     Chairperson | 3 | 30 |
|     Head | 1 | 10 |
|     Director | 1 | 10 |
| Years in Current Position | | |
|     1 month to 2 years | 3 | 30 |
|     3 years to 4 years | 4 | 40 |
|     5 years to 6 years | 1 | 10 |
|     7 years to 8 years | 2 | 20 |

Academic rank was represented as follows:  professor - 4 (forty

percent), associate professor - 3 (thirty percent), and assistant

professor - 3 (thirty percent).  The women administrators had been in

the respective rank from three to eight years with a mean time in rank

of four and one-half years.  These data are included in Table IV.

Fifty percent (5) of the women were tenured with a range of 5 to 15

years and a mean length of time tenured as 9 years.  Table V gives

these data.  The women administrators in this study had been in higher

TABLE IV

CURRENT RANK AND YEARS IN CURRENT RANK

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rank | | |
| Professor | 4 | 40 |
| Associate Professor | 3 | 30 |
| Assistant Professor | 3 | 30 |
| Years in Current Rank | | |
| 1 year to 2 years | 0 | 0 |
| 3 years to 4 years | 7 | 70 |
| 5 years to 6 years | 1 | 10 |
| 7 years to 8 years | 2 | 20 |

TABLE V

TENURE STATUS AND YEARS TENURED

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenure Status | | |
| Tenured | 5 | 50 |
| Not Tenured | 5 | 50 |
| Years Tenured | | |
| 5 years | 2 | 40 |
| 8 years | 1 | 20 |
| 12 years | 1 | 20 |
| 15 years | 1 (N = 5) | 20 |

education between 6 and 24 years with a mean of 15.3 years. See Table

VI for these data. The number of years in administration in higher

education was 1 to 14 years with a mean of 7.7 years. Table VII

presents these data.


TABLE VI

YEARS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Years in Higher Education | | |
| 1 to 5 years | 0 | 0 |
| 6 to 10 years | 3 | 30 |
| 11 to 15 years | 1 | 10 |
| 16 to 20 years | 5 | 50 |
| 21 to 25 years | 1 | 10 |


TABLE VII

YEARS IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Years in Higher Education Administration | | |
| 1 to 5 years | 3 | 30 |
| 6 to 10 years | 4 | 40 |
| 11 to 15 years | 3 | 30 |

The mean salary earned by the women administrators in the study was $42,960 with a range of $20,000 (for nine months) to $65,000. One salary was reported for a nine month period; all others were for twelve months. For purposes of figuring mean salary for the study, the salary reported for nine months was converted to a twelve month salary. Nine of the ten subjects reported salary data.

The last section of the demographic characteristics discussion includes institutional characteristics. The universities ranged in size of student body from 1,100 to 23,000. The size of the nursing program was not reportable due to inconsistencies in determining program size. An equal number (five) of public and private institutions were included in the study. More urban than rural institutions were included in the study. Table VII shows these data.

TABLE VIII

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Size of University | | |
| Less than 4,999 | 6 | 60 |
| 5,000 to 9,999 | 2 | 20 |
| Greater than 10,000 | 2 | 20 |
| Type of University | | |
| Public | 5 | 50 |
| Private | 5 | 50 |
| Setting of University | | |
| Rural | 4 | 40 |
| Urban | 6 | 60 |

Research Questions

The eight research questions will be addressed next.  Data will be presented in narrative and tabular form.

Definition of Mentor

Question 1 asked the subjects, "How well acquainted are you with the concept of mentoring?"  All respondents indicated an acquaintance with the concept of mentoring.  Eight of the women administrators (80 percent) said they were either very well acquainted or somewhat acquainted with the concept of mentoring.  Only two respondents said they were not very well acquainted with mentoring.  Table IX presents these data.

TABLE IX

RESPONDENTS ACQUAINTANCE WITH CONCEPT OF MENTORING

| Acquaintance Level | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Very Well Acquainted | 4 | 40 |
| Somewhat Acquainted | 4 | 40 |
| Not Very Well Acquainted | 2 | 20 |
| Not Acquainted at All | 0 | 0 |

The categories with the most responses to Question 2, "Based on your understanding of the concept of 'mentor,' how would you define a mentor?" and Question 3, "Do any other words or nouns come to mind that could be used to describe a mentor?" were: Role Model (6), Experienced Person (6), Guide (5), Counselor/Advisor (4), and Confidant (3). These data are summarized in Table X.

TABLE X

TERMS USED TO DEFINE A MENTOR

| Terms | Frequency |
|---|---|
| Role Model | 6 |
| Experienced Person | 6 |
| Guide | 5 |
| Counselor/Advisor | 4 |
| Confidant | 3 |
| Encourager | 2 |
| Helper | 2 |
| Assistant | 2 |
| Teacher | 2 |
| Facilitator | 2 |
| Friend | 1 |
| Parent Surrogate | 1 |
| Leader | 1 |
| Preceptor | 1 |
| Nurturer | 1 |
| Examplar | 1 |
| Inspirer | 1 |
| Developer | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

Although role model was one of the categories mentioned most frequently by this group of women administrators, two subjects expressed explicit belief that a mentor and a role model were not the same, implying that mentoring was more than role modeling.

In addition to terms used to define a mentor, respondents also indicated personal characteristics of a mentor and what a mentor does. The categories mentioned most frequently in terms of personal characteristics of a mentor were honesty (4), expertise (3), and interest in another individual (2). Table XI summarizes these data.

TABLE XI

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF A MENTOR

| Characteristic | Frequency* |
|---|---|
| Honesty | 4 |
| Expertise | 3 |
| Interest in Another | 2 |
| Astuteness | 1 |
| Political Savvy | 1 |
| Good Interpersonal Relationship Skills | 1 |
| Candidness | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

The responses of subjects to Question 2, defining what a mentor does, will be presented in narrative form. Most respondents defined a mentor in relationship to an external purpose of helping or assisting another individual in that person's career, profession, role, position or development. Several methods of helping and/or assisting were mentioned such as providing guidance, support, direction, and encouragement.

Three subjects discussed the belief that the mentor had insight or vision into what was best or correct for the individual receiving the assistance or help. One subject defined a mentor as "someone who you feel you can trust, who has your interests at heart, who understands you, and who perceives of themselves as knowing what is best for you."

A mentor was defined as having an influence in increasing the relative position or status of another individual. This was expressed in such terms as growth, advancement, success, development, and expanding horizons. One respondent described this aspect as "asking you to be more than what you are," and to "go beyond what you are currently doing."

Two subjects defined a mentor in terms of what a mentor was not. One respondent said a mentor was not "someone to dictate your moves" and the other respondent said she would see the "mentor as not taking a position where they are in control."

In summary, the women administrators in this study defined a mentor on three dimensions: terms used for a mentor, characteristics of a mentor, and what the mentor does. From the responses, a mentor is defined as an experienced person who serves as a role model,

guide, counselor, and confidant to another individual and provides honest assistance and help in terms of advancing the individual's career, development, profession, position, or role.

## Characteristics of Relationship with Mentor

In response to Question 4, "During your formal education or during your career did you ever have a mentor?" nine of the ten subjects indicated that they had had a mentor (See Table XII).

TABLE XII

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS
REPORTING HAVING A MENTOR

| Mentor Status | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Mentor | 9 | 90 |
| No Mentor | 1 | 10 |

Question 5 asked "how many mentors have you had?" The number of mentors ranged from one to three with a mode of two and a mean of 1.77. The total number of mentors identified by the subjects are presented in Table XIII. In response to Question 6, "When in your education or career did the mentoring occur?" respondents indicated the mentor relationship typically occurred while she was a faculty member in higher education.

TABLE XIII

NUMBER OF MENTORS IDENTIFIED

| Number of Mentors* | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 33.3 |
| 2 | 5 | 55.5 |
| 3 | 1 (N = 9) | 11.1 |

*Total Mentors Identified = 16

TABLE XIV

WHEN THE MENTORING OCCURRED

| When Mentoring Occurred | Frequency |
|---|---|
| While a Faculty Member in Higher Education | 5 |
| While an Undergraduate Student | 3 |
| During Course Work Phase of Graduate School | 2 |
| During Entire Graduate School Experience | 2 |
| At Initial Entrance to Faculty Position in Higher Education | 2 |
| At Initial Entrance to Administrative Position in Higher Education | 1 |
| While an Administrator in Higher Education | 1 (N = 16) |

Subjects were asked to focus on the mentor who was most beneficial, influential or significant to them as they answered Questions 7 - 24. In response to Question 7, "What was the age, sex, and race of your most significant mentor?" subjects described the mentors as being in their 50s or 60s, primarily Caucasian females, who were 19-20 years older than the subject. Characteristics of the mentors identified by the subjects are included in Table XV.

TABLE XV

AGE, GENDER AND RACE OF MOST SIGNIFICANT MENTOR

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Age of Mentor | | |
| 20 - 29 | 1 | 11.1 |
| 30 - 39 | 1 | 11.1 |
| 40 - 49 | 1 | 11.1 |
| 50 - 59 | 4 | 44.4 |
| 60 - 69 | 2 | 22.2 |
| Gender of Mentor | | |
| Female | 8 | 88.8 |
| Male | 1 | 11.1 |
| Race of Mentor | | |
| Caucasian | 7 | 77.7 |
| Black | 2 | 22.2 |

Eight of the subjects in the study had mentors of the same gender. Six subjects had mentors of the same race. These data are shown in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI

GENDER AND RACE OF MENTOR IN RELATION
TO GENDER AND RACE OF MENTEE

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Gender | | |
| Same Gender | 8 | 88.8 |
| Not Same Gender | 1 | 11.1 |
| Race | | |
| Same Race | 6 | 66.6 |
| Not Same Race | 3 | 33.3 |

The results of Question 8, "What is/was the age of your most significant mentor in relation to your age at the time?" are presented in Table XVII. Seven of the subjects said their mentor was older, one mentor was younger than the mentee, and one mentor was the same age as the mentor.

TABLE XVII

AGE OF MENTOR IN RELATION TO AGE OF MENTEE

| Age of Mentor | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 1 - 10 years older | 0 | 0.0 |
| 11 - 20 years older | 4 | 44.4 |
| 21 - 30 years older | 3 | 33.3 |
| 1 - 5 years younger | 1 | 11.1 |
| Same age | 1 | 11.1 |

Table XVIII shows the results of Question 9, "What was the relation-ship of your most significant mentor to you?" All mentor relationships identified by the subjects, occurred in an academic setting either as the mentee being a student or a faculty member. The category with the highest response (4) was the mentor as a professor to a student, followed by mentor as dean (2), and mentor as division head (2) to a faculty member. One mentor relationship that began as professor to student continued into the first teaching position of the mentee. Thus, the relationship changed to one of division head to faculty member.

Question 10 asked, "What type of contact did you have with your most significant mentor?" The contact described was of a close nature. Frequently the mentor and mentee saw each other daily. Some subjects indicated that physical proximity, in terms of office space, was very close. Two subjects commented on the contact with the mentor extending

TABLE XVIII

RELATIONSHIP OF MENTOR TO MENTEE

| Relationship | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Professor to Student | 4* | 44.4 |
| Dean to Faculty Member | 2 | 22.2 |
| Division Head to Faculty Member | 2 | 22.2 |
| Colleague to Colleague | 1 | 11.1 |

*One relationship in this category continued into the first teaching position of the mentee.

beyond the academic setting into contact in a professional realm with other leaders in the field. Data on frequency of contact with the mentor are presented in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH MENTOR DURING
MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

| Type of Contact | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Daily | 5 | 55.5 |
| Every Other Day | 1 | 11.1 |
| Two Times Per Week | 1 | 11.1 |
| Once a Week | 2 | 22.2 |

Question 11 asked the subjects to "Describe how the mentor relation-
ship developed and progressed." Responses addressed how the relationship
was established, who initiated the relationship, and stages of the
relationship. The majority of subjects (8) indicated that contact with
the person who became their mentor in a formal role, either as a faculty
member or graduate student, was what initially prompted the relationship.
The formal structural contact in a specific role helped bring the mentor
and mentee into close proximity. Factors which influenced the further
development of the formal structural relationship into a mentoring
relationship included: mentee had a need which the mentor was able to
meet, development of mutual respect for one another, mentor and mentee
shared common goals, mentor showed interest in development of mentee,
admiration of mentor, mentor noticed ability and recognized capability
of mentee, mentor showed caring attitude, physical characteristics of
the mentor, a common mind set, and mentor's ability to anticipate the
needs of mentee.

Several of the subjects (4) mentioned the concept of "freedom" or
"individuality" as an important part of the relationship. One subject
identified this as "letting me do my own thing." Another stated what
she thought was "outstanding about this person was the way we were
individuals." The ability to express one's frustration and unhappiness
in a safe environment and have it be accepted was another factor
mentioned. Another subject stated, "It was an open relationship where
I was free to ask questions about anything. There were no limits
imposed on me and no areas I felt uncomfortable to ask." In relation-
ship to individuality, one subject stated that "I was not without my
own ideas." Another factor relating to the freedom of the relationship

was independence or autonomy.  One subject said the mentoring relation-
ship was one where the mentor allowed the mentee to feel like she was in
control of the situation, although the subject believed the mentor
probably felt like he had control.  In a subtle way, the mentor provided
the guidance but allowed the mentee to focus the direction in which the
relationship progressed.

Subjects who were able to identify stages of the mentoring relation-
ship discussed three broad stages:  (1)  establishment stage, (2) working
stage, and (3) termination stage.  Characteristics of the establishment
stage identified by the subjects in the study were mentee as passive
recipient of what mentor can offer, or receiver in the relationship,
admiration of mentor, sizing up mentor, developing trust, and beginning
to learn from mentor.  Characteristics of the working stage included
learning from each other, more collegial basis, mentee more independent
and assertive about her own ideas, mutual questioning and discussion,
very close and intense relationship between mentor and mentee, and mentee
developing confidence, knowledge, and skill.  One subject described this
stage of the relationship as "intense observation."  Another subject
indicated that as the relationship developed, the mentee knew the mentor
had the interests of the mentee at heart and was interested in helping
the mentee progress and become what the mentee wanted to be.

The working stage continued to include lasting trust in what the
mentor had to offer or progressed into the termination stage.  The
termination stage is characterized by either positive or negative ending
of the relationship.  Positive termination occurred when the mentee no
longer had a need for the mentor, either the mentee or mentor moved, or
the mentee or mentor assumed a different position.  Negative termination

was described by one subject when the mentor became threatened as the mentee advanced beyond what the mentor had achieved.

Four of the subjects could not identify specific stages of the mentor relationship. Of these, three indicated that they did not see the relationship as mentoring at the time. Table XX identifies characteristics of the three stages identified by the subjects in this study.

TABLE XX

STAGES OF THE MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Stage | Characteristics |
|---|---|
| Establishment Stage | Sizing up mentor<br>Mentee passive<br>Mentee receiving more than she gives<br>Mentee learning from mentor<br>Developing trust |
| Working Stage | One way exchange (mentor to mentee)<br>Mentee developing more independence<br>Mentee asserts self<br>Mentee developing confidence, know-<br>   ledge, skills<br>Developing collegial relationship<br>Learning from one another<br>Developing mutuality<br>Lasting trust |
| Termination Stage | Need no longer present<br>Mentor or mentee moves or assumes<br>   different position<br>Mentee advances beyond mentor<br>   a) Positive – mentor secure<br>   b) Negative – mentor threatened |

Four subjects said the mentor relationship was initiated by the mentor showing an interest in or noticing abilities of the mentee. Three subjects said it was "mutual" or "just happened." Two subjects said the mentee initiated the relationship by seeking greater contact with the mentor. Although these individuals initiated the relationship with the person who became their mentor, it did not initially develop for the purpose of mentoring. Table XXI shows these results.

TABLE XXI

PERSON INITIATING THE MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Initiator | Frequency |
|---|---|
| Mentor Initiated | 4 |
| Mentee Initiated | 2 |
| Mutual | 3 |

All of the respondents answered "Yes" to Question 12, "Has the mentoring experience ended?" Reasons given for the termination of the relationship (Question 13) were: death of mentor, either mentor or mentee moved or left position of contact with the other person, and the need for mentoring was no longer present. The data on reasons for termination are presented in Table XXII.

TABLE XXII

REASONS FOR TERMINATION OF MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Reason | Frequency |
|--------|-----------|
| Mentor moved or left position of contact with mentee | 4 |
| Mentee moved or left position of contact with mentor | 3 |
| Death of mentor | 1 |
| Need for mentor no longer present | 1 |

Eight of the nine subjects reported that the relationship ended on positive terms. One person described in detail the negative ending of her relationship with the mentor. Table XXII indicates the status of the mentoring relationship when the contact with the mentor ceased.

TABLE XXIII

WHETHER MENTORING RELATIONSHIP ENDED ON
POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE TERMS

| Contact Ended | Frequency |
|---------------|-----------|
| Contact Ceased — Positive | 8 |
| Contact Ceased — Negative | 1 |

The results of Question 14, "How long did the mentoring relation-
ship last?" are presented in Table XXIV.  Subjects said the mentor

relationship lasted between 2 and 14 years with a mean length of

relationship of 6.6 years.  The category having the most responses

was 6 - 10 years (5) followed by 1 - 5 years (3), and 11 - 15 years (1).


TABLE XXIV

LENGTH OF MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Years | Frequency |
| --- | --- |
| 1 - 5 years | 3 |
| 6 - 10 years | 5 |
| 11 - 15 years | 1 |


As mentioned earlier, the actual mentoring relationship had ended

for all subjects; however, four subjects reported having some contact

with the previous mentor.  Table XXV presents the data regarding

Question 15, "Do you have any contact with your previous mentor?  If

YES, what kind of contact do you have with your mentor?"  The formal

contact was in the job setting and informal contact included seeing the

mentor at professional meetings.  Those who reported rare contact

mentioned occasional personal visits, telephone calls, and letters.

TABLE XXV

CONTACT WITH MENTOR AFTER MENTOR RELATIONSHIP ENDED

| Contact Status | N |
|---|---|
| Contact/No Contact Status | |
|     Contact | 4 |
|     No Contact | 5 |
| Type of Contact | |
|     Formal in Job Setting | 1 |
|     Informal at Professional Meetings | 1 |
|     Rare Contact | 2 |

Question 16, "If your mentoring experience is still present, has your relationship changed, and if so, how?" was not applicable to these subjects as all mentoring relationships had ended. Question 17 asked the subjects, "How did you benefit from the mentor relationship?" Table XXVI presents the benefits of the mentor relationship identified spontaneously by the subjects.

After the subjects had spontaneously identified what they believed to be the benefits of the mentor relationship, a list of specific areas were presented. Each subject was asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "low" and 5 being "high" the degree to which the mentor helped them in the areas listed (Question 18). Results of Question 18 are presented in Table XXVII. The area with the highest rating was "Challenged you to develop your talents, skills, and capabilities" with a rating of 4.666. Two areas tied for next highest ranking with a

TABLE XXVI

BENEFITS OF THE MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Benefits | Number of Responses* |
|---|---|
| Encouraged Continued Learning via Formal Education | 2 |
| Confidence Building | 2 |
| Orientation to Academia | 2 |
| Idea Development and Testing | 2 |
| Development of Skills/Strengths | 2 |
| Career Decisions/Direction | 1 |
| Advice | 1 |
| Political Astuteness | 1 |
| Confirmation of Approach | 1 |
| Encouragement/Support | 1 |
| Acceptance of Criticism | 1 |
| Help with Decision-making and Critical Thinking | 1 |
| Socialization to Administration | 1 |
| Task Completion | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

rating of 4.555. These were "Listened to your ideas and encouraged your creativity" and "Instilled enthusiasm and excitement about your work." Four categories tied for the third highest ranking with a

rating of 4.444. These areas were "Helped you gain confidence in your own ability," "Served as a role model for you to emulate," "Encouraged you to continue learning," and "Provided positive feedback." The area with the lowest rating (3.000) was "Helped you learn the technical aspects of the job." Two areas tied for next to the lowest rating (3.333). These were "Encouraged you to take risks" and "Made you more politically astute." The third lowest ranking (3.555) was "Helped you learn the norms and values of the organization." The ranking of benefits by highest rating are presented in Table XXVII.

All but one subject (8) who had a mentor said the mentor relationship did not hinder their career in response to Question 19, "Did the mentor relationship hinder your career in any way?" The one subject not answering a categorical "No" said it was difficult to answer because she did argue with the mentor about career directions. The mentor wanted the mentee to go into teaching while the mentee wanted to remain a clinician. Ultimately, the mentee did go into teaching and indicated that in retrospect, that probably was the best decision for her career, but she always wonders what would have happened had she remained in a clinical position.

The results of Question 20, "What did you expect from the mentor relationship?" are presented next. Three subjects indicated they did not have any specific expectations. Other frequently mentioned categories were assistance in the work role and feedback. Responses to Question 20 are categorized and presented in Table XXVIII.

Question 21 asked, "What did you mentor expect of you in the mentor relationship?" Responses to this question are presented in Table XXIX. Most frequently mentioned categories were for the mentee

TABLE XXVII

RANK AND RATING OF BENEFITS OF MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Rank | Benefit | Rating* |
|------|---------|---------|
| 1 | Challenged you to develop your talents, skills, and capabilities. | 4.666 |
| 2 | Listened to your ideas and encouraged your creativity. | 4.555 |
|   | Instilled enthusiasm and excitement about your work. | 4.555 |
| 3 | Helped you gain confidence in your own ability. | 4.444 |
|   | Served as a role model for your to emulate. | 4.444 |
|   | Encouraged you to continue learning. | 4.444 |
|   | Provided positive feedback. | 4.444 |
| 4 | Encouraged you to take risks. | 4.333 |
|   | Assisted you to develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills. | 4.333 |
| 5 | Stimulated your interest in research and scholarly activities. | 4.222 |
| 6 | Introduced you to the internal workings of the organization. | 4.000 |
|   | Helped you develop high standards, ethics, and values. | 4.000 |
| 7 | Introduced you to the "right" people | 3.888 |
| 8 | Helped you better understand the administration of your organization. | 3.777 |
|   | Taught you how to work with people. | 3.777 |
| 9 | Taught you how to cut through the "red tape." | 3.666 |
|   | Provided negative feedback. | 3.666 |
| 10 | Helped you learn the norms and values of the organization. | 3.555 |
| 11 | Assisted you in making career decisions. | 3.333 |
|   | Made you more politically astute. | 3.333 |
| 12 | Helped you learn the technical aspects of the job. | 3.000 |

*Rating on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "low" and 5 being "high."

TABLE XXVIII

MENTEE EXPECTATIONS OF MENTOR

| Expectations | N* |
|---|---|
| No Specific Expectations | 3 |
| Assistance in Work Role | 3 |
| Feedback | 3 |
| Availability | 1 |
| Task Completion | 1 |
| Verification | 1 |
| Support | 1 |
| Encouragement | 1 |
| Challenge | 1 |

*Number may indicate more than one response per subject.

to advance in his or her career, to make a contribution to the profession, and to work hard.

In Question 22, subjects were asked to "Describe the most positive aspects of the mentor relationship?" Results of this question are presented in Table XXX. The categories with the most responses were support (3) and openness of the relationship (2). Some comments from the subjects regarding positive aspects of the relationship included: "she never failed me," "she was always available to me,"

TABLE XXIX

WHAT MENTEE BELIEVED MENTOR EXPECTED OF
MENTEE IN MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

| Expectations | N* |
|---|---|
| To advance in career | 3 |
| To make a contribution | 2 |
| To work hard (be prepared, accurate) | 2 |
| To do mentor's work | 1 |
| To develop high standards | 1 |
| To show enthusiasm | 1 |
| To develop professional actions | 1 |
| To have a critical, questioning mind | 1 |
| To be a capable learner | 1 |
| To exchange ideas of mutual interest and challenge | 1 |
| To take initiative | 1 |
| To seek clarification, understanding, and explanation | 1 |
| To process information from mentor in in such a way that it became useful to mentee | 1 |
| To use own strengths in becoming successful | 1 |
| No expectations | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

TABLE XXX

MOST POSITIVE ASPECTS OF MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Positive Aspect | N* |
|---|---|
| Support | 3 |
| Openness of relationship | 2 |
| Availability and dependability of mentor | 1 |
| Honesty and forthrightness | 1 |
| Positive feedback | 1 |
| Confirmation of actions and decisions | 1 |
| Career direction | 1 |
| Developing self confidence | 1 |
| No pressure from mentor for social relationship | 1 |
| Mutual respect and growth | 1 |
| Sharing of knowledge | 1 |
| Stimulation, challenge, and expansion | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

"one always knew where one stood with her," "it really was a feeling of confidence that resulted from somebody. . .thinking that I had some competence," "it was an open situation where I could learn with some freedom," and "no matter what was going on, I felt free to go in and discuss it with her openly."

Question 23 asked subjects to "Describe the most negative aspects of the mentor relationship." Results of Question 23 are presented in Table XXXI. The most frequent negative aspects mentioned were the lack of availability of the mentor to the mentee and the mentee not appreciating/understanding the expectations of the mentor at the time.

TABLE XXXI

NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

| Negative Aspect | N* |
|---|---|
| Lack of availability of mentor | 3 |
| Lack of mentee appreciating/understanding the mentor's expectations at the time | 2 |
| No negative aspects | 2 |
| Disagreements or misunderstandings | 1 |
| Periods of no communication | 1 |
| Not knowing how to deal with some feedback from mentor | 1 |
| Knowledge limitation of mentor in political area | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

The results of Question 24, "have you had any mentoring experiences that assisted you in preparing for, or working in, an administrative

role?" are presented in Table XXXII.  Three respondents answered

"yes" to this question, with six respondents saying "no."

TABLE XXXII

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING MENTORING
EXPERIENCES FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE

| Had mentoring experience for administrative role | N | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| YES | 3 | 33.3 |
| NO | 6 | 66.6 |

Two of the subjects answering "yes" to Question 24, reported that the

administrative mentoring experience was the same experience they had

just described with their most significant mentor.  The other subject

answering "yes" to Question 24 described her administrative mentoring

occurring when she was in nursing administration in which the dean

became her mentor.  She was Chairperson of the Department at the time.

Four of the six answering "no" to Question 24 said the benefits they

received from their most significant mentor relationship were applicable

and carried over into the administrative role although the mentoring

experience was not specifically for preparing for, or working in, an

administrative role.

Characteristics of Relationship with Mentee

In response to Question 34, all of the research subjects (10) indicated that they had served or were serving as a mentor to another person. Question 35 asked "How many times have you served as a mentor to another person?" The numbers of mentees identified by the subjects are presented in Table XXXIII. Most subjects (8) indicated they had one to two mentees.

TABLE XXXIII

NUMBER OF MENTEES IDENTIFIED

| Number of Mentees | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 - 2 | 8 | 80 |
| 3 - 4 | 1 | 10 |
| 5 - 6 | 1 | 10 |

Three subjects indicated that it was difficult to give a specific number answer to Question 35 because they may have been a mentor to more people than those they were able to identify. They may not have been aware that the other person perceived the relationship as mentoring. One subject said, "Sometimes I think we are mentors when we don't know it. . .and are not aware of it. . .until long afterwards."

Subjects were asked to focus on the relationship with a mentee that they considered most significant as they answered Questions 36-53. The results of Question 36, "At what career stage is/was your mentee?" are presented in Table XXXIV. The majority (6) of the mentees were faculty members in higher education at the time the mentor/mentee relationship developed.

TABLE XXXIV

CAREER STAGE OF MENTEE

| Career Stage | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Faculty in Higher Education<br>  a. New Teacher (3)<br>  b. Experienced Teacher<br>     in New Role (3) | 6 | 60 |
| Student<br>  a. Masters Level (2)<br>  b. Baccalaureate Level<br>     Senior (2)* | 4 | 40 |

*One of the relationships in this category continued into the first job of the new graduate in a hospital setting.

The results of Question 37, "What is/was the age, sex, and race of your mentee/protege?" are presented in Table XXXV. Subjects described the mentees as being primarily Caucasian females in their 30s. All of the mentees were of the same gender as the mentor. Eight of the mentees were the same race as the mentor. See Table XXXVI for these data.

TABLE XXXV

AGE, GENDER AND RACE OF MENTEES

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Age | | |
| 20 - 29 | 2 | 20 |
| 30 - 39 | 5 | 50 |
| 40 - 49 | 3 | 30 |
| Gender of Mentee | | |
| Female | 10 | 100 |
| Male | 0 | 0 |
| Race | | |
| Caucasian | 8 | 80 |
| American Indian | 2 | 20 |

TABLE XXXVI

GENDER AND RACE OF MENTEE IN RELATION
TO GENDER AND RACE OF MENTOR

| Characteristic | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Gender | | |
| Same Gender | 10 | 100 |
| Not Same Gender | 0 | 0 |
| Race | | |
| Same Race | 8 | 80 |
| Not Same Race | 2 | 20 |

The results of Question 38, "What is/was the age of your mentee/
protege in relation to your age at the time?" are presented in Table
XXXVII. All mentees were younger than the mentor by 3 to 20 years.
The average age difference was 11 years.

TABLE XXXVII

AGE OF MENTEE IN RELATION TO AGE OF MENTOR

| Age of Mentee | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 0 - 5 years younger | 2 | 20 |
| 6 - 10 years younger | 4 | 40 |
| 11 - 15 years younger | 3 | 30 |
| 16 - 20 years younger | 1 | 10 |

Results of Question 39, "What is/was your relationship to the
mentee/protege?" are presented in Table XXXVIII. All relationships
with the mentee began by virtue of contact in an academic setting
either as a faculty member or a student. The most frequently mentioned
category (50 percent) was the mentee as faculty member and mentor as
Division/Department Head.

Question 40 asked, "What type of contact do/did you have with your
mentee/protege?" Data regarding type and frequency of contact are

TABLE XXXVIII

RELATIONSHIP OF MENTEE TO MENTOR

| Relationship | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Faculty Member to Division/ Department Head | 5 | 50 |
| Student to Faculty Member | 2* | 20 |
| Faculty Member to Course Coordinator | 1 | 10 |
| Student to Assistant Dean | 1 | 10 |
| Colleague to Colleague | 1 | 10 |

*One of the relationships in this category continued into a colleague to colleague relationship in the work setting.

presented in Table XXXIX. All contact with the mentee began in the same institution. Frequency of contact ranged from seeing each other daily to monthly contact.

TABLE XXXIX

TYPE OF CONTACT BETWEEN MENTEE AND MENTOR

| Type of Contact | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Daily | 4 | 40 |
| Between Daily and Weekly | 3 | 30 |
| Weekly | 1 | 10 |
| Monthly | 2 | 20 |

Question 41 asked the subjects to, "Describe how the relationship with your mentee/protege developed and progressed." This will be presented in narrative focusing on how the relationship was established, who initiated the relationship, and stages of the relationship. All subjects reported a formal contact of some kind with the mentee prior to the development of the mentoring relationship with the mentee. As mentioned earlier, all relationships began in an academic setting with the mentee being either a faculty member or student. Factors which influenced the development of the mentoring relationship included: faculty member expressed need; common interest, shared values and standards; mentee showed interest in area of expertise of mentor; mentee performed task that gained attention of mentor; mentee was formally assigned to mentor as a graduate assistant; and mentee assumed greater responsibilities. Some subjects indicated that personal characteristics of the mentee helped establish the relationship. Characteristics of the mentee that were mentioned were serious, hard working, genuine, bright, motivated, and dependable.

Five subjects said the mentee initiated the mentoring relationship with the mentor. Three subjects indicated that they initiated the mentoring relationship with the mentee after noticing potential in the individual or anticipating a need of the mentee. Two subjects described the mentoring relationship as being mutually initiated. Table XL presents data on who initiated the mentoring relationship.

When asked about stages of the relationship, the most frequent responses were either "no stages could be identified" or the "relation-ship was new and had not progressed beyond the initial estalbishment stage." Some components of the establishment stage identified by the

TABLE XL

SUBJECTS RESPONSE TO WHO INITIATED
RELATIONSHIP WITH MENTEE

| Initiator | Frequency |
| --- | --- |
| Mentee Initiated | 5 |
| Mentor Initiated | 3 |
| Mutual | 2 |

subjects included: mentee expressed a need, mentee sought guidance,

mentor offered assistance, mentor showed personal interest in mentee,

mentee and mentor feeling each other out or testing one another, and

developing mutual trust. Very few subjects identified any stage beyond

establishment. The few responses which could be categorized as

components of the working stage included that there was no longer a

need for mentee and mentor to test each other and high intensity of the

relationship. One subject indicated her relationship with the mentee

was cyclic with periods of high intensity followed by little contact,

then greater contact and intensity.

The results of Question 42, "Has the mentoring relationship with

your mentee/protege ended" are presented in Table XLI. The majority

of respondents (70 percent) said the relationship had not ended.

The three subjects who answered "yes" to the previous question,

described the conditions leading to termination of the relationship

TABLE XLI

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
ENDING OF RELATIONSHIP WITH MENTEE

| Contact Status | Frequency |
|---|---|
| Contact Ceased - Positive | 3 |
| Contact Ceased - Negative | 0 |
| Contact Still Present | 7 |

with the mentee/protege (Question 43) as either the mentor moved away
(2) or the mentee moved away (1). The mentee who moved away did so in
order to continue her education at the doctoral level.

The results of Question 44, "How long have you or did you serve
as a mentor to your mentee/protege?" are presented in Table XLII.
Respondents indicated the relationship with the mentee had lasted
between 1 month and 20 years, with a mean length of relationship of
4.5 years. The category having the most responses was 1 to 5 years.
Two relationships were present for less than one year. One subject
said the relationship was in the category of 6 - 10 years and another
16 - 20 years.

In response to Question 45, "Do you have any contact with your
mentee/protege?", nine subjects said they did have contact with the
mentee. Only one person did not have any contact with the mentee.
The type of contact ranged from ongoing relationships that were just

TABLE XLII

LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP WITH MENTEE

| Years | Frequency |
|---|---|
| Less than 1 year | 2 |
| 1 - 5 years | 6 |
| 6 - 10 years | 1 |
| 11 - 15 years | 0 |
| 16 - 20 years | 1 |

beginning to infrequent contact two or three times a year. For the
three people who on Question 42 indicated the relationship had ended,
two subjects said they had letter correspondence with the mentee but
no personal contact and one did not have any contact with the mentee.
The type of contact included formal contact in the job setting, formal
contact outside of the job setting, informal contact via telephone,
and informal contact via letter correspondence. See Table XLIII for
presentation of these data.

One subject said that when the mentee is "making a decision about
something she usually calls me." Another subject said she is contacted
by the mentee "whenever there is a significant change in her life."
The subject went on to say that the mentee had "not made any changes
in her life that she has not called me."

TABLE XLIII

TYPE OF CONTACT WITH MENTEE

| Type of Contact | Frequency |
| --- | --- |
| Formal Contact in Job Setting | 3 |
| Formal Contact Outside of Job Setting | 1 |
| Informal Contact - Telephone | 3 |
| Informal Contact - Letter Correspondence | 2 |
| No Contact | 1 |

Question 46 asked, "If the relationship with your mentee/protege is still present, has the relationship changed, and if so, how?" Results of this question are presented in Table XLIV. Two subjects indicated the relationship had not changed since the relationship was still in the beginning stage. Other comments about changes in the relationship included less contact, more mutual support, now includes a social relationship, mentee more free to express self after student role has ended, and mentor developed great respect for accomplishments of the mentee.

Results of Question 47, "What benefit did your mentee/protege derive from the mentoring relationship?" are presented in Table XLV. The most frequent response was related to career assistance followed by learning about the organization and building confidence.

TABLE XLIV

NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
CHANGES IN RELATIONSHIP WITH MENTEE

| Changes | Frequency |
|---|---|
| Has Not Changed | 2 |
| Less Contact | 1 |
| More Mutual Support | 1 |
| Includes Social Relationship Now | 1 |
| Mentee More Free to Express Self | 1 |
| Greater Respect for Mentee's Accomplishments | 1 |

TABLE XLV

BENEFITS OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIP TO MENTEE

| Benefit | N* |
|---|---|
| Career Direction/Career Planning/ Career Enhancement/Career Goals | 5 |
| Learning About the Organization | 4 |
| Confidence Building | 4 |
| Encouragement | 3 |
| Opened Doors/Made Contacts | 1 |
| Guidance | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

In response to Question 48, "Did your association with your mentee/protege hinder his or her career in any way?", all ten subjects said they hoped not or did not think so.  The results of Question 49, "What are/were your expectations of your mentee/protege?" are presented in Table XLVI.

TABLE XLVI

EXPECTATIONS OF MENTEE BY MENTOR

| Expectation | N* |
|---|---|
| To function in work role | 4 |
| To be open, receptive and accepting of what mentor could offer | 4 |
| To be successful | 3 |
| To mutually exchange ideas | 2 |
| To continue learning | 1 |
| To grow/develop potential | 1 |
| To think on own | 1 |
| To become independent | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

Question 50 asked, "What do you think your mentee/protege expected from you?"  Responses to this question are presented in Table XLVII.

The category with the most responses was Guidance - 4, followed by

Support - 3, Assistance - 2, Leadership/Direction - 2, Honesty/

Openness - 2, and Understanding/Interpretation of Events - 2.

TABLE XLVII

WHAT MENTOR BELIEVED MENTEE EXPECTED OF
MENTOR IN MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

| Expectation | N* |
|---|---|
| Guidance | 4 |
| Support | 3 |
| Assistance | 2 |
| Leadership/Direction | 2 |
| Honesty/Openness | 2 |
| Understanding/Interpretation of Events | 2 |
| Approval | 1 |
| Political Pull | 1 |
| Feedback | 1 |
| Advice | 1 |
| Information | 1 |
| Availability/Approachable | 1 |
| Good Friend | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

The results of Question 51, "What were the most positive aspects your relationship with your mentee/protege?" are presented in Table XLVIII. The most frequently mentioned positive aspect was "seeing the mentee grow or change." Three subjects expressed positive aspects in regard to the intrinsic reward of helping another or sharing the success of another individual and in the personal relationship with the mentee. Other categories mentioned by more than one subject were: personal relationship (2) and mutual growth and satisfaction with relationship (2).

TABLE XLVIII

POSITIVE ASPECTS OF RELATIONSHIP WITH MENTEE

| Positive Aspect | N* |
|---|---|
| Seeing the mentee grow/change | 6 |
| Intrinsic reward | 3 |
| Personal relationship/friendship | 3 |
| Mutual growth/satisfaction | 2 |
| Acceptance of guidance and advice by mentor | 1 |
| Receiving positive feedback from mentee | 1 |
| Expressions of appreciation | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

One subject commented on the responsibility of the mentor that accompanies the mentee's expectations. She spoke of the responsibility for someone's professional development and that one does not want to do any-

thing that will hurt the potential development in any way. But at the same time, the mentor is human and may make mistakes. She expressed the need for the mentee to recognize and accept her human fallibility.

The results of Question 52, "What were the most negative aspects of your relationship with your mentee/protege?" are presented in Table XLIX. Two subjects could not identify any negative aspects, and two mentioned time demands involved in the relationship. Other negative aspects included: mentee feeling abandoned when relationship terminated, length of time was too short, anxiety of mentee, jealousy of others at mentee's success, mentor becoming mediator between mentee and higher authority, personal disagreements/conflicts, and guilt of mentor that she was helping one preson and not others.

TABLE XLIX

NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF RELATIONSHIP WITH MENTEE

| Negative Aspect | N* |
| --- | --- |
| No negative aspects | 2 |
| Time demands | 2 |
| Mentee feeling abandoned at termination | 1 |
| Length of time too short | 1 |
| Mentee anxiety | 1 |
| Jealousy | 1 |
| Mediator | 1 |
| Personal disagreements/conflicts | 1 |
| Guilt over relationship | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

All subjects indicated that they would consider being a mentor to another person in the future (Question 53). Two subjects qualified their answer by saying if it was on an informal basis they would consider being a mentor. One of the subjects said if someone came to her and asked her "would you mentor me?" that she would think it through and would need to know what her obligations and responsibilities to the mentee would be. One subject indicated that being a mentor was part of her developmental stage of generativity.

## No Mentor Relationship

One subject stated that she had never had a mentor in her education or career. Questions 25 - 33 were applicable to this subject. Question 25 asked, "Did you ever feel the need and consider someone as a possible mentor?" She indicated that she felt a need for a mentor but had not actually considered anyone for a mentor. In response to Question 26, "When in your career or education did this occur?", she reported that she felt the need for a mentor as a beginning teacher and as a beginning administrator. Questions 27 - 29 were not applicable as this subject had not actually considered someone to be her mentor. Her response to Question 30, "What would you have expected from a mentor relationship?" was guidance, in terms of what to do or what would be good to do.

The subject was unable to identify positive characteristics or aspects that she would have liked to learn or have enhanced by a mentor relationship (Question 31). Question 32 asked her to identify what she would "have considered to be negative aspects or problems in a mentor relationship." She indicated a negative aspect would be if the relationship became a dependent one in which the mentee would be

afraid to make his or her own decisions.

The last question addressed to this subject was Question 33, "To what do you attribute not having had a mentor?" She indicated less awareness of mentoring and unavailability of someone to be a mentor as the reasons for not having a mentor. She suggested that mentoring be included in the educational program and that educational leaders recommend that mentoring be a part of a person's development as a professional individual.

## Differences Between Being a Mentor and Being a Mentee

The third research question asked, "What do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs believe the differences are between being mentored and being a mentor to another individual?" The results of Question 54, "In your opinion, what is the difference between being mentored and being a mentor to another individual?" will be presented in Table L.

The area of greatest difference identified by the subjects was role differences. Four subjects mentioned that when one is a mentor the role is one of giving guidance, support, and direction while as a mentee the role is one of receiving, taking, and seeking what the mentor has to offer. Other factors mentioned were differences in locus of responsibility, level of expertise, focus of direction/ development, focus of learning, structural position in organization, and energy investment. Two subjects indicated there were little or no differences in the two relationships.

TABLE L

DIFFERENCES IN MENTORING AND BEING MENTORED

| Characteristics of Difference | N* |
|---|---|
| Little or No Difference Identified | 2 |
| Difference in Role<br>  Mentor gives and directs<br>  Mentee receives, takes, seeks | 4 |
| Difference in Locus of Responsibility<br>  Mentor feels responsibility to contribute<br>  Mentee feels less responsibility to give back<br>  Mentor has power to influence-responsibility<br>    for type of influence<br>  Mentee can be influenced | 2 |
| Difference in Level of Expertise<br>  Mentor has more expertise<br>  Mentee has need for expertise of mentor | 2 |
| Difference in Focus of Direction/Development<br>  Mentor outer directed<br>  Mentee inner directed | 2 |
| Difference in Focus of Learning<br>  Mentor learns from having relationship<br>    with mentee<br>  Mentee learns from mentor's expertise | 1 |
| Difference in Structural Position in Organization<br>  Mentor is older, higher position, greater<br>    authority<br>  Mentee is younger, less experienced | 1 |
| Difference in Energy Investment<br>  Mentor role requires more effort, is more<br>    difficult, harder, more responsibility<br>  Mentee role more passive, less energy<br>    required, less pressure to exert energy | 1 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

## Improvement of Mentoring Process

The next section of the narrative will address research question
four, "How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs
believe the mentoring process can be improved a) in nursing education,
b) for women in higher education administration, and c) in their
educational setting?"  Question 55 asked, "How do you believe the
mentoring process could be improved in nursing education?"  Subjects
mentioned five areas in which mentoring could be improved in nursing
education.  The most frequently mentioned categories were mentoring
for faculty (5) and mentoring for students (5).  Other categories were
mentoring for administrators (4), faculty mentoring new graduates in
transition from student to employee in a clinical setting (2), and
mentoring of nurses in clinical practice settings (2).  These data
are presented in Table LI.

TABLE LI

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING IMPROVEMENT OF
MENTORING IN NURSING EDUCATION

| Area for Improving Mentoring | N* |
|---|---|
| Mentoring for Faculty | 5 |
| Mentoring for Students | 5 |
| Mentoring for Administrators | 4 |
| Mentoring for New Graduates | 2 |
| Mentoring in Clinical Practice Settings | 2 |

*Numbers may indicate more than one response per subject.

Subjects identified difficulties encountered in mentoring relation-
ships in nursing education. The most frequently mentioned difficulties
were lack of trust and lack of information in order to better under-
stand mentoring. One subject discussed the competitiveness of nursing
and nursing education, noting that nurses need to get away from the mind
set of, "I got it, and you can get it just like I did." This subject
believed that a nonsupportive, noncooperative, competitive, distrusting
attitude must be perpetuated in nursing education since it is so
prevalent among nurses. Another subject said, "I truly believe in
order for mentorship to establish itself, there has to be a trust bond."
Several subjects mentioned the need for more knowledge about the
mentoring process and making people more aware of mentoring. One
subject reported the belief that we had not addressed mentoring in
nursing education in any planned, deliberate manner. She felt mentoring
just happened by chance and that, if it were talked about and made a
definite project, it would be helpful to students and faculty. This
subject went on to say, "It might be that if we had more workshops and
seminars on mentoring and understood what it was. . .that we could do a
better job of it." In reference to mentoring relationships with
students, several subjects mentioned aspects for improvement. One
subject believed that faculty should begin very early in helping young
students develop their professional role by being mentors to them.

One subject suggested more writing and research in this area so
nurses would begin to see themselves in the role of mentor and mentee.
Another subject indicated that content on the concept of mentoring
should be taught in the nursing curriculum along with information on
other helping relationships and leadership/management strategies.

Another subject expressed her belief that mentoring could be improved by a "commitment to the growth of the young by everyone, and within nursing we have had difficulty sensing the personal parameters of accountability to the young of the profession." One subject reported her belief that mentoring had tremendous potential in enhancing the scholarly productivity of faculty.

One subject suggested students serving as mentors to each other and perhaps "assigning" students to work together based on some dimension such as experience or technical expertise. The area of student advisement was mentioned by one subject. She suggested consistency of an advisor over the whole education time frame so that the student could get to know that person and possibly develop a mentoring relationship with the advisor. Another means of facilitating student development by mentoring identified by this subject, was in encouraging students to work with and feel comfortable with role models in the clinical practice setting. She believed this aspect of faculty practice was very critical in facilitating student learning and development.

One subject indicated that the short term relationships in nursing education and nursing practice, due to career pattern disruptions make it difficult to establish mentoring relationships. She stated, "the stability by which you can become a mentor or be mentored, simply isn't there." One subject questioned whether mentoring could be established with baccalaureate level students and that maybe it is only possible at the graduate level.

In relationship to mentoring for administrators in nursing education, the following comments were made. One subject said she wished

very much that she would have had some mentoring when she assumed an administrative position. She expressed the need for new chairpersons to associate, on a formal basis, with chairpersons who have some experience so that the opportunity for mentoring could be enhanced. Another subject said she believed more value should be placed on mentoring in academia and even suggested it be part of the faculty and administrative workload.

One subject emphasized that for her the mentoring relationship needed to be "informal." She also believed one might benefit from having more than one mentor. Another subject mentioned the need for a support system for administrators in which a formal group could serve a mentoring purpose for new administrators.

One subject cautioned administrators "to be very careful about . . .conjuring up an image of what we think a nursing professor is and trying to make people be that." Two subjects indicated the need to improve mentoring for new graduates, as they face difficulties in the first job. One subject believed that nursing could benefit from having experienced nurses in the clinical setting serve as mentors to other nurses in clinical settings. She further indicated that faculty perhaps could also serve as mentors to nurses they come in contact with in the clinical practice setting. She reported a need for more knowledge and information about the mentoring process in the clinical practice setting.

The results of Question 56, "How do you believe the mentoring process could be improved for women in higher education administration?" are presented in narrative form. Three areas will be addressed: (1) general suggestions, (2) suggestions on how other administrators can

help the woman administrator, and (3) suggestions on how the woman administrator can help herself.

Five subjects (50 percent) mentioned the need to have more women in administration to serve as mentors to less experienced women. Availability of good mentors is a problem according to this group of subjects. One subject stated, "we don't have very many experienced women in higher education who would be able to mentor those who are less experienced." Another subject suggested getting strong role models to emulate.

One subject reported the need for "some kind of mechanism whereby contact could be made with people who have had experience." Another subject jokingly suggested "maybe we could publish a list of the people who would be willing to be mentors."

One subject said, "I think that we need more women in administration because I think women feel more comfortable talking with other women about the job and about some of the ways of accomplishing things than they necessarily do talking with men." She went on to say that she did not believe that only women could mentor women and expressed that for women who relate well to men, a male mentor is a distinct possibility. But she said, "women who are uncomfortable with men, probably need to relate to women." Several other subjects (6) mentioned that men could and do serve as mentors to women in higher education administration. Another subject indicated that men could serve as mentors to women on a selective basis. It was her belief that "older" men "have not been socialized to think about women as being career oriented" therefore, she believed, it would be difficult for these men to conceive of women as administrators.

One subject related that she believed women sometimes limited
their possibilities for a mentor by seeking a "mythical ideal" and
that anything or anyone not measuring up to this ideal is not given
credit and dismissed as not useful.  She suggested a "very deliberate
seeking of whom one needs and willingness not to settle for the
'mythical ideal'."  She believed that women tend to set "mythical
ideals" of such high standards, that "what a person could offer in
one limited area, since they cannot offer in another, we tend not
to give the credit for the one limited area where we could learn."
She suggested that women need to take advantage of all opportunities
for learning from another person.  In this same line, another subject
indicated that women administrators need to seek mentoring "from a
variety of sources rather than just one mentor."

Two subjects mentioned that mentoring needed to be discussed more.
One subject suggested that mentoring be facilitated in terms of making
time for the activity.  She perceived mentoring to be very time-
consuming.  Another subject indicated the mentoring process should
be more formalized.  She believed that a more formal system would
improve accountability and a better job of mentoring would occur.

This section of the narrative will discuss how other administra-
tors can promote the development of mentoring relationships for women
in higher education administration.  One subject suggested that a
change of attitude needed to occur in higher education for women to
be seen as contributing members,  who can think and not be categorized
as "female."  She went on to say that administrators need to see
"that their responsibility includes helping the woman administrator

become part of the administrative domain." She believed administrators

needed to include women administrators in the decision-making process, to

be more supportive, and to be less selfish. In speaking about male ad-

ministrators, this subject said, "they often have their guard up to

protect their domain and maybe they don't want to see the woman get

too much power." She expressed the need to get away from the "paternal

aspect" of relationships between male and female administrators.

One subject suggested that women administrators be appointed to

important committees and that their ideas be listened to and respect

shown for the woman administrator's potential. She indicated adminis-

trators could be more consultative in helping women administrators

identify their needs.

Another subject indicated the need for friendly, non-threatening

relationships with other administrators that invite mentoring or

encourage mentoring to occur. She regarded freedom to ask questions

as an important consideration in developing mentoring relationships in

higher education.

This part of the narrative will address suggestions on how the

woman administrator can help herself in developing mentoring relation-

ships. Three subjects mentioned that women administrators need to be

assertive in making their needs known. Recognizing the need for

mentoring and identifying the areas in which mentoring would be

helpful, was identified by one subject. Along this same line,

another subject indicated that women need to make contact with

other administrators, present their ideas, and bring their concerns

to the attention of the administrator.

One subject expressed her belief that women do not make their needs for mentoring known for ear of putting their role as administrator in jeopardy. She believed that to some women administrators, seeking a mentor represented a weakness or deficit. She stated, "they wouldn't want anybody to know they have any personal deficits that would not allow them to keep that role."

Three subjects believed it was the woman administrator's responsibility to seek out people who might serve as mentors to them whether it be male or female mentors. One subject indicated that the woman administrator "should seek the type of mentor that could help them in areas that they needed help."

Another area for improvement identified by three subjects, was participating in organizations, workshops, or programs that promote the development and advancement of women. One subject mentioned participation in workshops presented by national associations such as the American Council on Education (ACE). Another subject believed that participation in an organization for the advancement of women in higher education was quite helpful to her and was a means of establishing mentoring relationships. She also mentioned workshops for women in higher education administration to help newcomers "learn the ropes" and establish networking and support systems.

Another area mentioned was making administrators aware of the treatment of women in the organization. One subject, after noticing that few women administrators had been hired, noted in her annual report to administration, "where's [sic] the women." She indicated that if women administrators are going to have female role models, we

must continually make those who are in a hiring position aware of the need for more women administrators.

This section asked respondents how mentoring could be improved for women in higher education administration. Subjects answered the question with suggestions for administration in higher education and suggestions for the woman administrator. While discussing means of improvement, many subjects identified areas of difficulty or problems encountered that limited the development of mentoring relationships for women in higher education. These have been included in the previous discussion.

The next section will address Question 57, "How do you believe the mentoring process could be utilized in your specific educational setting?" The responses to this question were categorized into areas where mentoring could be effectively utilized in the educational setting, and ways to facilitate mentoring in the educational setting.

Three primary areas for mentoring were mentioned by the subjects. These were mentoring for faculty, mentoring for administrators and mentoring for students. In relationship to faculty mentoring, six subjects specifically mentioned the need for mentoring of new faculty members. They suggested pairing new faculty with older, more experienced faculty in order to help them become socialized to higher education and to assist them in acquisition of the teaching role. Three subjects said they believed new faculty should be "assigned" a mentor. They indicated the mentoring process needed to be more formal. In addition to new faculty, the other four subjects mentioned mentoring of faculty but in a more general sense. One

subject said that faculty mentoring was important in terms of improving

the faculty member's contribution to the university and to the faculty

member's career growth. Another subject believed that mentoring for

faculty would be improved as more long-term faculty who have made a

successful adjustment are available to serve as mentors.

One subject reported that mentoring was important in helping faculty

understand the academic setting. She stated, "we haven't taught people

how to live in the university setting." She believed isolation of

nursing programs on college campuses contribute to this problem. Her

statement was:

> Many of them (nursing programs) are so isolated on university
> campuses, that not only does the faculty not operate as part
> of the total university, but students have no concept of what
> the university is about. So they come on faculty thinking
> that we are sitting here in our neat little corner and nothing
> else out there infringes on what we do, and it does; it
> dictates what we do.

Another area mentioned by the subjects was mentoring for adminis-

trators. Four subjects mentioned that grooming another for an admin-

istrative role was part of the mentoring experience of administrators.

This did not necessarily mean grooming their replacement but helping

prepare someone for an administrative position in their institution or

at another institution. One person expressed the belief that the

mentoring should definitely occur prior to taking an administrative

position. Although she identified that mentoring could be helpful

while one was an administrator, she believed the greatest benefit would

be in receiving mentoring before taking an administrative position.

Another subject indicated that as an administrator she could benefit

from mentoring provided by another administrator in the same institu-

tion as well as from other nurse administrators in similar situations.

Another subject indicated that as an administrator she provided a role model for faculty by setting an example of "what an administrator is, how an administrator functions, how things get done." She thought that some faculty might see her as a mentor in this sense.

The last general area mentioned was mentoring of students. Four subjects related that faculty and/or administrators have the opportunity to develop mentoring experiences with students. One subject indicated that because of the small size of her particular program, close relationships with students were easier to develop and thus may contribute to establishing mentoring relationships. She indicated that the advising process was a possible mechanism for establishing mentoring relationships with students. Another subject questioned whether the "average" baccalaureate student could handle a mentoring relationship at the same time they are dealing with the psychosocial stage of late adolescence and young adulthood. She did say for those students who were seeking the kind of assistance provided in a mentor relationship and were willing to make that kind of commitment that faculty members were likely mentors to this select group of students.

One subject indicated that helping students develop leadership qualities can be viewed as a mentoring relationship. She said, "I do think we do need to mentor them into the leadership position as much as we can." Another subject believed that the faculty/student relationship has "to some extent. . .has some mentoring aspects in it already." She did not feel it needed to be developed to any greater extent than what already occurs in the faculty/student relationship.

One subject reported that she "encouraged the faculty to look at

their role as models in the clinical area, not only as clinicians, but as clinical researchers." In this sense, faculty members could serve as mentors to practicing nurses as well as students in the clinical setting. Another subject stated that she believed mentoring could be used at all levels of nursing. She believed staff nurses, head nurses, administrators of nursing service, or teachers and administrators in nursing schools could all be assisted in learning their role and being guided in their personal and career development through mentor relation-ships. She said, "I don't think there is a level of nursing that couldn't use mentoring or at least the mentoring philosophy."

In addition to the areas where mentoring could be improved, subjects identified some ways of improving mentoring in each of the areas mentioned. In the area of faculty role, strategies mentioned were suggesting an advisory group on certain aspects such as tenure, talking with faculty about the role of faculty in the university, seeing that faculty serve on university committees, providing support and guidance to new faculty, seeing that new faculty are assimilated into the group either through formal or informal pairing with more experienced faculty and establishing an open-door, open communication system between all members of the organization. One subject indicated we could do a much better job helping new faculty become socialized in the teaching role. She suggested making conscious decisions about developing supportive relationships that "would probably make better teachers and maybe keep them in education and nursing better."

In relationship to mentoring for administrators, two subjects stated that more formal means of learning the administrative role is

needed. One subject had attended a seminar sponsored by a national professional organization that focused on preparing someone to be an administrator. She highly recommended that anyone considering becoming an administrator should attend a workshop or seminar of this nature. Another subject related that she believed the university needed to have somekind of training program for new department chairpersons. When she · became an administrator she asked the Academic Vice-President who he felt was the best chairperson on campus. She went to this person for assistance and guidance in certain areas. This subject recommended that some formal mechanism be established for new chairpersons in assisting them to learn their role. Another subject mentioned the use of colleagues, all of whom are directors of nursing programs in a formal established group, serving in a mentoring capacity to her.

Suggestions in relationship to students included establishing an open door policy on the part of faculty and administrators, and developing an advising process in which consistency of student/faculty pairs were maintained throughout the students' program. One subject felt it was very important for her as an administrator to know students on a first name basis. One subject indicated that faculty serve as role models to students and nurses in clinical areas. Another subject mentioned that during the leadership component of the baccalaureate nursing program was an appropriate time for faculty to serve as mentors to students.

## Mentoring and Career Development

This section will address mentoring and career development. Research Question 5 asked, "How do women administrators in baccalaureate

nursing programs perceived that mentoring contributed to their career development?" Research Question 6 asked, "What are the differences in career development activities of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs who have had a mentor and those not having had a mentor?" Question 59 of the interview schedule, asked the subjects to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "did not contribute," 2 being "contributed very little," 3 being "contributed somewhat," 4 being "contributed a great deal," and 5 being "contributed significantly" the degree to which mentoring contributed to their career development. Seventy percent of the subjects said mentoring "contributed a great deal" (5 subjects) or "contributed significantly" (2 subjects) to their career development. Two subjects (twenty percent) said mentoring "contributed somewhat" and one subject (ten percent) said mentoring "contributed very little." Results of Question 59 are presented in Table LII.

TABLE LII

DEGREE TO WHICH SUBJECTS PERCEIVED THAT MENTORING
CONTRIBUTED TO THEIR CAREER DEVELOPMENT

| Rating | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 - Did Not Contribute at All | 0 | 0 |
| 2 - Contributed Very Little | 1 | 10 |
| 3 - Contributed Somewhat | 2 | 20 |
| 4 - Contributed a Great Deal | 5 | 50 |
| 5 - Contributed Significantly | 2 | 20 |

Additional career development data were collected in Question 58. Subjects were asked the number of times they had participated in a list of 25 career development activities in the last year and in their career. Descriptive statistics will be used to present the results.

The results will be presented showing the number of subjects reporting having participated in each activity, the range of times the subjects reported engaging in the activity, the mean for the number of subjects participating in each activity, the mean for the total number of subjects having a mentor, and the data for the one person not having a mentor. For ease of presenting the data, the activities have been divided into research activities, publication activities, scholarly activities, and professional activities. Tables LIII through LVI present these data for the last year and Tables LVII through LX present the data for the career.

The data indicated that those having a mentor participated in a greater number of career development activities than the subject not having a mentor. Data were collected on 25 different activities. Subjects with a mentor reported participating in an average of 9.11 different categories of activities where the subject without a mentor participated in two different categories of activities in the last year. However, one subject with a mentor did not participate in any of the activities in the last year.

A total of 214 individual career development activities in 25 categories were engaged in by subjects having a mentor in the last year, with a mean of 23.7 activities per subject. The subject without a mentor participated in three activities in two categories during the past year.

TABLE LIII

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN LAST YEAR

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X*** | X |
| Served as principal investigator of a research project | 5 | 1-2 | 1.40 | 0.77 | 0.00 |
| Served as co-investigator of a research project | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 0.00 |
| Wrote a research grant proposal | 2 | 1-2 | 1.50 | 0.33 | 0.00 |
| Received funding for a research project | 2 | 1-2 | 1.50 | 0.33 | 0.00 |
| Presented a research paper | 4 | 1-5 | 2.25 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Published the results of a research project | 3 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.33 | 0.00 |
| Served on a peer review panel to review research proposals | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 2.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

TABLE LIV

PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN LAST YEAR

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X*** | X |
| Served on an editorial board of a profession- al journal | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 0.00 |
| Authored or co-authored a book | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Authored or co-authored a chapter in a book | 2 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 |
| Published a non-research article in a referred journal | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 0.00 |
| Published other mat- erials; pamphlets, teaching aids | 3 | 1-3 | 2.00 | 0.66 | 0.00 |
| Edited a book | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Reviewed or edited a chapter for a book | 3 | 1-4 | 2.66 | 0.88 | 0.00 |
| Reviewed manuscripts for publication in professional journals | 4 | 1-15 | 5.25 | 2.33 | 0.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

TABLE LV

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN LAST YEAR

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X*** | X |
| Presented a scholarly paper at a professional meeting | 4 | 1-11 | 3.50 | 1.55 | 0.00 |
| Presented a workshop for pay | 6 | 1-4 | 2.46 | 1.44 | 0.00 |
| Served as a professional consultant for pay | 5 | 1-4 | 2.00 | 1.11 | 0.00 |
| Wrote a non-research based grant proposal | 2 | 1-2 | 1.50 | 0.33 | 0.00 |
| Received funding for a non-research based grant proposal | 1 | 2 | 2.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

TABLE LVI

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN LAST YEAR

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X*** | X |
| Number of professional organization member- ships | 8 | 3-7 | 4.87 | 4.33 | 1.00 |
| Number of committees served on in profes- sional organizations | 6 | 2-9 | 4.00 | 2.66 | 0.00 |
| Number of offices held in professional organizations | 7 | 1-10 | 2.71 | 2.11 | 0.00 |
| Served on a board of directors or governing board of a community or civic organization | 4 | 2-3 | 2.50 | 1.11 | 0.00 |
| Served on an advisory board or as a non-paid consultant | 7 | 1-4 | 2.00 | 1.55 | 0.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

TABLE LVII

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN CAREER

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X*** | X |
| Served as principal investigator of a research project | 9 | 1-5 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 |
| Served as co-investigator of a research project | 7 | 1-5 | 2.14 | 1.77 | 0.00 |
| Wrote a research grant proposal | 7 | 1-14 | 3.85 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Received funding for a research project | 6 | 1-7 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| Presented a research paper | 7 | 1-10 | 3.42 | 2.66 | 0.00 |
| Published the results of a research project | 7 | 1-4 | 1.57 | 1.22 | 0.00 |
| Served on a peer review panel to review research proposals | 5 | 1-10 | 4.60 | 2.55 | 6.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

TABLE LVIII

PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN CAREER

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X*** | X |
| Served on an editorial board of a profession- al journal | 2 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 |
| Authored or co-author- ed a book | 2 | 1-2 | 1.50 | 0.33 | 0.00 |
| Authored or co-author- ed a chapter in a book | 4 | 1-6 | 2.25 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Published a non-research article in a referred journal | 5 | 1-5 | 2.60 | 1.44 | 0.00 |
| Published other mater- ials; pamphlets, teaching aids | 6 | 1-15 | 4.83 | 3.22 | 0.00 |
| Edited a book | 2 | 1 | 1.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 |
| Reviewed or edited a chapter for a book | 4 | 1-20 | 10.25 | 4.55 | 0.00 |
| Reviewed manuscripts for publication in professional journals | 5 | 5-30 | 15.60 | 8.66 | 0.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

TABLE LIX

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN CAREER

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X*** | X |
| Presented a scholarly paper at a profession- al meeting | 7 | 1-50 | 15.28 | 11.88 | 0.00 |
| Presented a workshop for pay | 7 | 2-10 | 7.00 | 5.44 | 0.00 |
| Served as a profession- al consultant for pay | 5 | 4-20 | 8.60 | 4.77 | 2.00 |
| Wrote a non-research based grant proposal | 5 | 1-5 | 2.60 | 1.44 | 0.00 |
| Received funding for a non-research based grant proposal | 3 | 1-5 | 2.66 | 0.88 | 0.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

TABLE LX

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF SUBJECTS IN CAREER

| Activity | Mentor (9) | | | | No Mentor (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N* | Range | X** | X**** | X |
| Number of professional organization member-ships | 9 | 2-7 | 4.77 | 4.77 | 5.00 |
| Number of committees served on in profes-sional organizations | 8 | 2-20 | 13.12 | 11.66 | 0.00 |
| Number of offices held in professional organizations | 8 | 1-20 | 7.00 | 6.22 | 0.00 |
| Served on a board of directors or governing board of a community or civic organization | 5 | 2-6 | 3.60 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| Served on an advisory board or as a non-paid consultant | 8 | 1-4 | 2.62 | 2.33 | 0.00 |

*Not all subjects reported participating in each activity.
**Mean for those having participated in the activity.
***Mean for total number of subjects (9) having a mentor.

Data regarding career development activities for the subjects

entire career showed a similar pattern. A total of 786 individual

activities in 25 categories were participated in by subjects having

a mentor. The subject without a mentor participated in 14 activities

in 4 categories. The average number of categories of activities

participated in by subjects with a mentor was 15.88. In career

data, the subject without a mentor participated in fewer total number

of activities and categories of activities than any subject who had

a mentor.

In one category, "served on a peer review panel to review research

proposals," the one subject without a mentor reported higher participa-

tion in this activity both in her career and in the last year than the

mean participation of the subjects with mentors. In another area,

"number of professional organization memberships" the subject with no

mentor showed a slightly greater number (5) in her career than the

mean (4.77) for the subjects having a mentor. In all other categories

the subject without a mentor reported less activities than did subjects

with a mentor.

The career development activities most frequently participated

in during the career by those subjects having a mentor were: (1)

presented a scholarly paper at a professional meeting, (2) served on

committees in professional organization, (3) reviewed manuscripts for

publication in professional journals and/or for book companies, (4)

held office in professional organizations, and (5) presented a workshop

for pay. During the last year, the subjects having a mentor participated

most frequently in the following activities: (1) belonged to pro-

fessional organizations, (2) served on committees in a professional

organization, (3) reviewed manuscripts for publication in professional journals and/or for book companies, (4) held offices in professional organizations, and (5) presented a scholarly paper at a professional meeting and served on an advisory board or as a non-paid consultant.

The subjects are leaders in the profession in the state. The data reflected that most career development activities are geared toward contributing to professional organizations. Most are very active in the area and have served as state or district officers and have served on numerous committees. Since the subjects are considered leaders, they are often asked to present papers at meetings, seminars, or conferences, thus the high activity in this area. Another area which related to their positions as leaders in nursing education is reviewing manuscripts for publication. Several subjects are reviewers for major book companies. In that capacity, the subjects review all proposed manuscripts prior to publication.

The subject who did not have a mentor participated in the following four activities: (1) served on a peer review panel to review research proposals, (2) belonged to professional organizations, (3) served as a consultant for pay, and (4) served as principal investigator of a research project.

Because of difficulty recalling exact numbers of activities participated in during their career, subjects may have under estimated the numbers. Some subjects who had frequently participated in an activity would say "at least so many times," indicating the exact number may have been higher. Curriculum vitaes could not be used to verify this data, as the vitae did not contain all career development activities. Recall for activities participated in during the past

year were considered more accurate. The ability of subjects to recall accurate numbers needs to be considered when interpreting the data on career development activities.

## Mentoring and Career Advancement

The last part of this chapter will address Research Question 7, "What are the differences in career advancement patterns of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs who have had a mentor and those not having had a mentor?" and Research Question 8, "How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs perceive that mentoring contributed to their career advancement?"

Results to interview schedule Question 60, "Describe your educational advancement since you graduated from nursing school," are presented in terms of basic nursing preparation, length of time between baccalaureate and masters degrees and length of time between masters and doctorate degrees. Six subjects reported the baccalaureate degree as their basic nursing preparation with four subjects reporting a diploma in nursing as the basic preparation.

The subjects having a diploma as the basic nursing preparation, had all completed baccalaureate degrees within six years of graduating from a hospital diploma program. For the subjects having a mentor the mean length of time between the baccalaureate degree and the first masters degree was 6.6 years. This is compared to the one subject not having a mentor whose length of time between baccalaureate and masters degree was 5 years. Two subjects with a mentor had completed two masters degrees with the interval between the two degrees being 5 years and 2 years respectively. Seven subjects had completed doctorate

degrees. Of these subjects, six had a mentor and one did not have a mentor. The average length of time between first masters degree and completion of the doctorate for subjects with a mentor was 12.5 years. For the subject without a mentor, the length of time between masters degree and doctorate degree was 19 years. Although this length of time was greater than the average length of time for those subjects with a mentor, two subjects in the mentor group had a length of time between the two degrees equal to or greater than the subject without a mentor.

Question 61 asked subjects to "Describe your career pathway since you graduated from nursing school with specific job titles and dates." Data provided by this question was verified with the subject's vitae. The results of this question will be organized according to the average length of time from first becoming a nurse to the beginning of the first full-time teaching position, the average length of time between the first teaching position and the first administrative position, and the average length of time from first becoming a nurse to the first administrative job. Only one subject did not have a mentor, therefore in making comparisons between those who had a mentor and those not having a mentor only descriptive statistics will be used.

The average length of time between becoming a nurse and the first full-time teaching position for subjects with a mentor was 10.3 years. For the subject without a mentor, the length of time was 11 years. A much larger difference was found in the length of time between the first teaching position and appointment to the first administrative position in academia. For those subjects having a mentor, the average length of time was 8 years. For the subject without a mentor, the time

was 20 years. This was longer than any of the subjects in the mentor group. The last part of the analysis showed that those having had a mentor began an administrative position an average of 18.3 years after becoming a nurse. The one subject without a mentor had a period of 31 years before becoming an administrator. This length of time was greater than any subject having a mentor.

The subjects interviewed reported a non-linear career pathway. Many subjects vacillated between teaching, clinical practice, and administration. After several years of teaching some subjects went into clinical practice or administration and later went back into teaching and are now currently in administration.

Question 62 asked the subjects from what position they moved into their current position. These data are presented in Table LXI.

TABLE LXI

POSITION FROM WHICH SUBJECTS MOVED INTO CURRENT POSITION

| Position | N | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Faculty position in the same institution | 4 | 40 |
| Faculty position at another institution | 2 | 20 |
| Another administrative position in the same institution | 2 | 20 |
| Another administrative position in another institution | 1 | 10 |
| From outside of higher education | 1 | 10 |

Four subjects (forty percent) said they moved into the current position from a faculty position in the same institution. Two subjects indicated they moved into the current position from a faculty position at another institution. Two subjects reported they came from another administrative position in the same institution. One subject said she moved from another administrative position in another institution and one subject was appointed to her current position from outside of higher education. The subject from outside of higher education had previously held both faculty and administrative positions in higher education.

Question 63 asked subjects, "Do you anticipate a move into another administrative position within the next 5 years?" Six subjects (sixty percent) did not anticipate a move. Two subjects said they did anticipate a move and two subjects were uncertain. The two subjects who said they anticipated a move indicated that it would be to another institution with one saying out-of-state and one not sure whether it would be out-of-state or in the same state (Question 64). One subject expressed her belief "that you should only be one place so long."

The last question (Question 65) on career development asked subjects to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being "not at all" and 5 being "contributed significantly," how they perceived that mentoring contributed to their career advancement. Two subjects (twenty percent) said mentoring "contributed significantly" to their career advancement. Three subjects (thirty percent) said mentoring "contributed a great deal" and three subjects (thirty percent) said mentor "contributed somewhat" to their career advancement. Two subjects (twenty percent) said mentoring "did not contribute at all" to their career advancement. Results of Question 65 are presented in Table LXII.

TABLE LXII

DEGREE TO WHICH SUBJECTS PERCEIVED THAT MENTORING
CONTRIBUTED TO THEIR CAREER ADVANCEMENT

| Rating | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 1 - Did Not Contribute at All | 2 | 20 |
| 2 - Contributed Very Little | 0 | 0 |
| 3 - Contributed Somewhat | 3 | 30 |
| 4 - Contributed a Great Deal | 3 | 30 |
| 5 - Contributed Significantly | 2 | 20 |

One subject indicated that her mentoring experience was very clinically oriented and not geared toward administration. So in that sense she said, "what I am today, has nothing to do with my mentoring." The other subject that stated mentoring did not contribute to her career advancement, did not have a mentor.

## Additional Information

At the end of each interview, the researcher had an opportunity to ask the subject to clarify or expand on any previously asked question. Subjects were also asked if they had anything else to say about having a mentor, being a mentor, or mentoring in general (Questions 66-68).

Additional comments regarding having a mentor centered on the importance of mentoring. In speaking of the importance of mentoring to faculty members, one subject said:

> I think that all young faculty need someone that they feel
> that they can go in and discuss problems, whether they are
> positive or negative.  I think they need someone to help
> them get started.  I think they need someone to help them
> move into the role.

This subject went on to explain the complicated university system that is often a mystery to young, new faculty.

Other subjects indicated that having a mentor would be "good," would be helpful in terms of professional development, and would be very beneficial to everyone.  One subject indicated that her experience with the mentor was a "tremendously enriching and challenging relationship."  She went on to caution against allowing the mentoring relationship to degenerate into a "sanctioned dependency."

When speaking of the mentoring relationship, one subject indicated that "obviously, it is not life and death, but I would have to think that we would be better people and better administrators, if we had that relationship."  Another subject expressed her belief that nursing would benefit by having better leaders and less burnout if the concept of mentoring was used more widely in nursing.  One subject suggested that people need to be encouraged to be mentors and to seek mentors.  She said perhaps we need to teach young women, in particular, how to find a mentor, what to look for in a mentor, and how to be a mentee.

One subject spoke of how she found herself defending her mentor.  She indicated that her mentor had a personality that most people found unusual and did not like.  The subject indicated that the mentor did not allow very many people to get to know him and so when the subjects' peers perceived his personality as "bizarre," the subject felt a need to defend or stand up for the mentor.  The subject indicated that through role modeling she learned to allow other people to be what

they wanted to be.

Additional comments regarding being a mentor centered on the reward and gratification that comes to the mentor through the mentoring relationship. Several subjects indicated that being a mentor was a rewarding, gratifying, enjoyable, and fun experience. One subject believed that to be chosen as a mentor would be flattering. When speaking of a mentor initiating a mentoring relationship, one subject stated:

> It seems to me that one has almost a natural tendency to pick out the bright, the likely to succeed, and you really do not transfer no success to success, you simply speed up the process by which the person would anyway have been highly successful. You simply make it easier, quicker, more linear.

Two subjects expanded on their belief that mentoring is a professional responsibility. In speaking of growth and development of the nursing profession, one subject indicated that nurses have a professional responsibility to assist the young, new professionals and those with less experience in developing a professional identity. Another subject stated that she feels a responsibility to assist faculty to grow and that the mentoring role can serve as a vehicle to accomplish this aspect of individual and professional development. She spoke about the need for mentoring in shaping and directing the future of the profession.

The last Question (68) asked, "Is there anything else you would like to say about mentoring in general?" Again, subjects spoke of the importance of mentoring and the need to develop mentoring relationships for the benefit of individuals and the profession. One subject talked at length about the need for younger members of the profession to become active in the affairs of nursing at the national and state

level. This subject had been in nursing for a number of years and as she stated, "had paid her dues." She was now content to let others carry on and lead the profession. She indicated that serving as a mentor was one way to "plant my seed" and assure continuation of her professional ideals.

Another subject believed that mentoring needed to be more on a conscious level and not just happen by chance. She felt that if mentoring relationships were initiated purposely it would not only help the individual and women but also the profession would benefit. She indicated that if she had experienced more mentoring, and particularly in leadership roles, her career might have developed faster than what it did.

One subject indicated that she wished she knew more about mentoring. At the end of the interview she stated, "this will stimulate me to do some reading about it."

## Summary

This chapter, Presentation of Findings, presented the results of the demographic characteristics and discussed the eight research questions. Descriptive statistics were used to present the data. The data collected from the interview sessions were categorized, summarized, and interpreted through tables and narrative discussion.

Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations will summarize the results of the research study, draw conclusions from the data, and make recommendations for further study and for practice.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary and discussion of the findings of this study. Results from Chapter IV are summarized, conclusions are presented, and recommendations for further study and for practice are identified.

## Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs with emphasis on career development and career advancement. Eight research questions were developed to guide the research study. The research questions were:

1. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs define a mentor?

2. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs describe characteristics of the mentoring experience in terms of both having a mentor and being a mentor?

3. What do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs believe the differences are between being mentored and being a mentor to another individual?

4. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs believe the mentoring process can be improved a) in nursing

education, b) for women in higher education administration, and c) in their education setting?

5. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs perceive that mentoring contributed to their career development?

6. What are the differences in career development activities of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs who have had a mentor and those not having had a mentor?

7. What are the differences in career advancement patterns of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs who have had a mentor and those not having had a mentor?

8. How do women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs perceive that mentoring contributed to their career advancement?

## Summary of Findings

Ten women administrators of baccalaureate nursing programs were interviewed for the purpose of describing their mentoring experiences with emphasis on career development and career advancement. Because of the nature of this exploratory/descriptive study, the subject had a mentor if they viewed it as such. No attempt was made to test a specific definition of mentor and mentoring. The purpose was to describe the mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs as perceived by the subjects.

The majority of subjects (80 percent) were Caucasian and married with 70 percent having doctoral degrees. The mean age was 50.4 years. Sixty percent were either second or third born children which was consistent with what Phillips (1977) found but was contradictory to the findings of Melillo (1982) who found most academic women to be first

born or only children.  Most (7 out of 10) had been in the current

position for less than 4 years.  Seventy percent were either full

professors or associate professors with fifty percent being tenured.

The subjects had been in higher education from 6 to 24 years with a

mean of 15.3 years and in administration in higher education from

1 to 14 years with a mean of 7.7 years.  The current position titles

of the women administrators were primarily Dean or Associate Dean (5)

or Chairperson (3).  The mean salary was $42,960.

An equal number of public and private institutions, ranging in

size from 1,100 to 23,000 student population, were included in the

study.  Slightly more urban (6) than rural (4) institutions were

represented.

A summary of the eight research questions follows.  All subjects

indicated an acquaintance with the concept of mentoring and defined a

mentor in terms of a role model, experienced person, guide, counselor/

advisor, and confidant.  In addition, the following characteristics

were felt to be important:  honesty, experience, and interest in

another.  Subjects also defined a mentor in terms of what a mentor does.

Frequently mentioned functions of a mentor were helping or assisting

another individual in their career, profession, role, position, or

development.  Based on the responses from subjects in this study, a

mentor can be defined as "an experienced person who serves as a role

model, guide, counselor, or confidant to another individual and provides

honest assistance and help in terms of advancing the individual's

career, development, profession, position, or role.

Nine subjects (90 percent) identified one or more persons (16

total) who had served as a mentor to them with most of the mentor

relationships occurring while the subject was a faculty member in higher education. Subjects were asked to focus on the mentoring experience they considered most significant, beneficial, or influential in describing the actual mentoring experience. Mentors described by the subjects were primarily white females in their 50s or 60s who were 11 to 30 years older than the subject at the time the mentoring occurred. All mentor relationships identified by the subjects, occurred in an academic setting. Most mentor relationships developed as a result of contact with the mentor in a formal role either as faculty member or graduate student. The mentoring relationship lasted from 2 to 14 years. All subjects reported that the mentoring experience had ended and four subjects indicated still having some contact with the mentor. Most mentoring experiences ended in a positive way.

Subjects reported gaining the greatest benefit from the mentoring relationship in the areas of confidence building, orientation to academia, idea development and testing, development of skills/strengths, and encouragement for continued learning. Subjects indicated that they expected assistance in the work role and feedback from the mentor. Subjects believed the mentor expected them to advance in their career, make a contribution to the profession, and to work hard. The most positive aspects of the mentor relationship identified were support and openness of the relationship. The most negative aspects of the mentor relationship were lack of availability of the mentor and what appeared at the time to be a lack of appreciation or understanding of the mentor's expectations of the mentee.

In describing their experiences as a mentor, all ten subjects indicated that they had served or were serving as a mentor to another

person. Most (60 percent) of the mentees were faculty members in higher education at the time the mentor/mentee relationship developed. Subjects described the mentees as being primarily white females in their 30s. All relationships with the mentee began through contact in an academic setting either as a faculty member or a student.

Factors which influenced the development of the relationship with the mentee included: faculty member expressed a need; common interest, shared values, and standards; mentee showed interest in area of expertise of mentor; mentee performed task that gained attention of mentor; mentee was formally assigned to mentor as a graduate assistant; and mentee assumed greater responsibilities. Most (8) of the relationships with the mentee had been present for less than five years. Seven subjects indicated the relationship with the mentee was still present, with two other subjects reporting that contact with the mentee was maintained even though the mentoring had ceased. Subjects believed the mentee benefited from the mentoring relationship in the following ways: career direction/planning/enhancement/goals; learning about the organization; building confidence; and encouragement. Subjects expected the mentee to function in the work role; to be open, receptive, and accepting of what the mentor could offer; to be successful; and to participate in mutual exchange of ideas. Subjects believed the mentee expected guidance, support, assistance, leadership/direction, honesty/openness, and understanding/interpretation of events from the mentor.

Subjects described the most positive aspects of the relationship with the mentee as seeing the mentee grow/change, the intrinsic reward involved in helping another person, the mutual growth and satisfaction, and the personal relationship/friendship. The most frequently

mentioned negative aspect of the relationship with the mentee was the time demands on the mentor.

Subjects identified the greatest difference in being mentored and being a mentor as role differences of the mentor and mentee. Other differences mentioned were in relation to locus of responsibility, level of expertise, focus of direction/development, focus of learning, structural position in the organization, and energy investment of mentor and mentee.

Fifty percent of the subjects believed the mentoring process could be improved in nursing education for faculty and students. Four subjects (forty percent) mentioned improving mentoring for administrators, two subjects (twenty percent) each mentioned mentoring for new graduates and mentoring in clinical practice settings.

Five subjects (fifty percent) believed there needed to be more women in administration who could then serve as mentors to less experienced women. Other strategies identified by the subjects for improving mentoring for women in higher education administration included changing attitudes regarding women administrators, appointment of women to important committees, and development of friendly, non-threatening environments in which mentoring can develop. Three subjects believed that women administrators needed to be more assertive in making their needs for mentoring known. Other strategies identified were seeking out male and female mentors, participating in organizations, workshops, or programs that promote the development and advancement of women, and making administrators aware of hiring practices or conditions that limit the advancement of women administrators. Three

areas for mentoring within their own educational settings were identi-
fied by the subjects. These areas were mentoring for faculty (partic-
ularly new faculty), mentoring for administrators and mentoring for
students.

Seventy percent of the subjects believed that mentoring either
contributed a great deal or contributed significantly to their career
development. Subjects with a mentor participated in a greater number
of career development activities in the last year and in their career
than did the subject without a mentor. Because only one subject
reported not having a mentor as compared to nine subjects with a
mentor, this data must be evaluated carefully in terms of representa-
tiveness of characteristics relating to career development activities.

In relationship to career advancement, the interval between the
baccalaureate degree and the masters degree was similar for subjects
having a mentor (6.6 years) and the one subject not having a mentor
(5 years). Subjects with a mentor had an average length of time between
completing a masters degree and completing a doctorate of 12.5 years
compared to 19 years for the one subject without a mentor.

Subjects with a mentor and without a mentor showed a similar
pattern in relationship to length of time between first becoming a
nurse and first full-time teaching position, with 10.3 years and 11
years respectfully. A much larger difference was noted in length of
time between the first teaching position and the first administrative
position in academia. Subjects with a mentor had an average length
of 8 years compared to 20 years for the subject without a mentor.

The majority (60 percent) of the subjects reported moving into

the current administrative position from a faculty position. The same

percentage (60) said they did not anticipate a move into another

administrative position in the next five years.

Last, fifty percent of the subjects indicated that mentoring either

contributed a great deal or contributed significantly to their career

advancement. Two subjects, however, said mentoring did not contribute

to their career advancement.

The findings of this study should be interpreted cautiously in

light of the small sample size, the reliance on self-reported informa-

tion, and due to the fact that only one subject reported not having

had a mentor. Any comparisons between those with and without a mentor

must be viewed tentatively. In addition, the findings of the study in

relationship to mentoring and career development activities must be

interpreted cautiously because of possible inaccurate recall of exact

numbers of career development activities.

## Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions

were made:

1. Women administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs in this

study had mentors who were perceived as having contributed to the

subjects' career development and career advancement. The high incidence

of mentoring in this group of subjects may relate to the fact that most

nurse leaders and nurse administrators are female thus resulting in

the availability of female role models and mentors for this group of

women. In this case, the data suggests that women do serve as mentors

to other women.

2. Mentoring primarily occurs in academic settings for faculty members and for students. Although most of the administrators in the study could identify one or more mentors at some point in their life, mentoring specifically for an administrative role was limited. Once an individual accepts an administrative position, it appears that mentoring becomes less available and less prevalent. This may be related to the limited number of women administrators in higher education in general, who could serve as mentors for women administrators in baccalaureate nursing education or the willingness of male administrators in higher education to serve as mentors to women. Another factor may be the woman administrator taking the initiative to seek mentoring from either male or female administrators outside of the nursing profession. Another factor may be related to the perceived notion that once these women become administrators, there is no longer a need for mentoring. Limited mentoring at this career stage may perhaps impede the further advancement of baccalaureate nursing administrators in to higher administrative roles in higher education such as Academic Dean, Vice-President, or President. If women are going to be represented in greater numbers at these levels, they are going to need the help and assistance of those in higher administrative positions in promoting them and preparing them for this kind of career goal. Although it is recognized that mentoring cannot be mandated, educational institutions should be encouraged to develop formal programs to assist those seeking a mentor or those wanting to be a mentor. These programs could be utilized in assisting individuals in the transition to an administrative role and in ascending the career ladder.

3.  A formal structural relationship either in the role of faculty member or graduate student is perhaps an important condition for bringing mentor and mentee in contact with each other.  The academic setting is a natural environment in which mentoring can be initiated and fostered.  Potential mentors need to be aware of the conditions which invite mentoring relationships to develop and to encourage the relationship for the mutual growth and benefit of both mentor and mentee. Therefore, attempts should be made in higher education settings to facilitate the development of mentoring relationships (i.e. valuing the concept, making oneself available as a mentor or mentee, making mentoring a part of the formal reward structure in higher education).  Having a mentor early in one's academic career appeared to speed up the process of preparing for (getting the academic qualifications) and moving in to an administrative role in baccalaureate nursing education.  Individuals in nursing who aspire to administrative positions should be encouraged to develop mentoring relationships early in their career to help them define career goals and plan strategies for reaching career goals.

4.  The mentoring process often is an unplanned, chance happening according to the mentee.  Because of the unplanned nature of the experience, the mentee may not gain the optimal benefit from the relationship at the time.  If relationships of this kind could be identified as mentoring in the beginning, perhaps even greater satisfaction and benefits for both parties could be accrued.  In this sense, young, new professionals beginning a career should be encouraged to actively seek a mentor who can help them become established and socialized into the work role, professional role, or career role.

Even when not formally planned, mentoring experiences were perceived as valuable and positive. Intentional seeking of a mentor on the part of the mentee may result in an even more productive and beneficial relationship.

5. Women administrators in baccalaureate nursing education believed that mentoring was important to the profession of nursing. A personal and professional commitment to mentoring as a means of socialization into work roles, career roles and goals, and as a means of developing professional identity would seem to improve the quality of leadership in the profession. The profession of nursing needs strong leaders who are willing to invest the time and energy necessary for promoting the goals and ideals of the profession. Part of this development of the profession involves nurturing and mentoring the young of the profession. Much like parents, the leaders in a profession need to guide and assist the young newcomers as they grow and develop and become part of the profession. Nurse administrators and nurse faculty members should make a commitment to the development of the young in the profession through developing supportive relationships, one of which may be mentoring. Schools of nursing have a responsibility of introducing the up-coming newcomers to the profession to mentoring through formal content on mentoring in the curriculum as well as through experiential situations in which faculty can serve as mentors to students in selected situations. Mentoring would not only benefit the individual nurse, but the profession as well as the educational institution would benefit by having better prepared leaders.

6. Data from this study suggests that mentoring is an important factor in the career development and career advancement of baccalaureate

nursing administrators. This special relationship does not occur in all cases, but when it does occur, it is perceived as beneficial. However, mentoring experiences cannot be considered the only factor contributing to the career success of these women administrators. Other factors may interact with mentoring to produce the positive benefits identified in this study.

## Recommendations for Research

As additional research data on mentoring is obtained, a theory of mentoring may emerge. This exploratory study contributes to the empirical evidence necessary for theory development by studying one aspect of the mentoring phenomena. Hypotheses related to various aspects of the mentoring experience could be generated from the data gathered and empirically tested in order to further understand the relationship among different variables. Data gathered in this study could be used as the basis for a much larger and broader study of mentoring using more rigorous scientific control. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further research are identified:

1. Another study be conducted looking at mentoring relationships of women administrators in other professions. In order to fully understand the impact of mentoring on women administrators, other groups of women administrators need to be studied. Empirical data gathered from a variety of mentoring situations will contribute to theory generation by identifying basic or universal elements of the mentoring condition.

2. Another study be conducted concerning mentoring relationships of men and women administrators in nursing programs. A study of this nature would assist in addressing the similarities and differences in the mentoring experiences between men and women.

3. Another study be conducted concerning mentoring experiences of nurses in clinical practice settings. The data from this study indicated that mentoring occurred primarily in academic settings. Since the majority of nurses are employed in clinical practice settings, it would be necessary to study the mentoring experiences of these nurses in order to develop a greater understanding of mentoring in the nursing profession.

4. Another study be conducted concerning mentoring experiences of nurses from a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds. This study and most previous studies on mentoring reported that subjects were primarily Caucasian. A study of this nature might assist in answering the question regarding mentoring experiences of racial and ethnic minorities.

5. A study be conducted to determine which factors interact with mentoring and are deemed crucial to the career success of women administrators. A study of this nature would help determine the power of mentoring in regard to career success. By knowing what factors interact with mentoring to produce beneficial effects, greater effort to maximize the process could occur.

6. Further study of mentor/mentee pairs be conducted to assess the congruence between perceptions of the mentoring experience from the perspective of both mentor and mentee. A study of both mentor and

mentee, concurrently, would help clarify the mutual aspect of the relationship and the characteristics that enable the relationship to develop.

## Recommendations for Practice

Data from this study would seem to indicate that when mentoring does occur, it is perceived as beneficial to the individual. Given this evidence, some implications for practice have been identified.

1. Attempts be made within higher education to facilitate the development of mentoring relationships. Administrators in higher education could perhaps enhance the mentoring experience by assisting faculty to identify appropriate mentors; facilitating the introduction of individuals who have similar interests, values, and goals; supporting and rewarding the efforts of those who mentor others; valuing the concept of mentoring as an appropriate means of career and professional socialization; and by serving as a mentor to others who desire a mentoring relationship.

2. Young, new professionals beginning a career should be encouraged to seek a mentor who can help them become established and socialized into the work role, professional role, or career role. Faculty and administrators can assist new professionals not only by serving as mentors to them, but also by helping new professionals to define their career goals in order to seek the appropriate kind of mentor. By consciously identifying and discussing career goals early in one's professional life, perhaps one can be assisted to channel their efforts in order to gain the greatest benefit from a mentor in helping them reach the defined career goals.

3. Nurse administrators and nurse faculty members are encouraged to make a commitment to the development of the young in the profession through developing supportive relationships such as mentoring. Mentoring is one means of assuring continuity of leadership and growth of the profession by assisting individuals to assume positions of leadership and authority sponsored by the mentor.

4. Educational institutions are encouraged to develop mechanisms to assist individuals in the transition into an administrative role. One mechanism may be mentoring. Although formal assignment may not be appropriate, programs which foster mentoring need to be more widely available and utilized to facilitate the development of an administrative role.

REFERENCES

Alleman, E. (1982). Summary of results of research on mentoring. (Available from Leadership Development Consultants, Inc.)

Atwood, A. H. (1979). The mentor in clinical practice. Nursing Outlook, 27, 714-717.

Bandura, A. L. (1969). Social-learning theory of identificatory processes. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Bandura, A. L. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Bess, J. (1978). Anticipatory socialization of graduate students. Research in Higher Education, 8, 284-317.

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

Bolton, E. B. (1980). A conceptual analysis of the mentor relationship in the career development of women. Adult Education, 30, 195-207.

Borman, C. & Colson, S. (1984). Mentoring - an effective career guidance technique. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 32, (3), 192-197.

Brown, R. D. (1980). Developmental transcript mentoring: A total approach to integrating student development in the academy. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education. Cincinnati: American College Personnel Association.

Burton, A. (1977). The mentoring dynamic in the therapeutic transformation. The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 37, 115-122.

Cain, R. A. (1981). Critical incidents and critical requirements in mentoring. Alternative Higher Education: The Journal of Nontraditional Studies, 6, 111-127.

Cameron, S. W. & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). Sponsorship and academic career success. Journal of Higher Education, 52, 369-377.

Chamings, P. A. & Brown, B. J. (1984). The dean as mentor. Nursing and Health Care, 5, (2), 88-91.

Dalton, G. W.; Thompson, P. H.; & Price, R. L. (1977). The four stages of professional careers. _Organizational Dynamics_, _6_, 19-42.

Erikson, E. (1950). _Childhood and society_. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. (1969). _Gandi's truth_. New York: Norton.

Fagan, M. M. & Fagan, P. D. (1983). Mentoring among nurses. _Nursing and Health Care_, _4_, (2), 77-82.

Fowler, D. L. (1982). Mentoring relationships and the perceived quality of the academic work environment. _Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors_, _45_, 27-33.

Gardner, J. N. (1981). Developing faculty as facilitators and mentors. In V. A. Harrer et al. (Eds.), _New directions for student services: Facilitating students' career development_. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Green, M. F. (1982). A Washington perspective on women and networking: The power and the pitfalls. _Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors_, _46_, 17-21.

Hawken, P. L. (1980). Growing our own: A way to prepare deans. _Nursing Outlook_, _28_, 170-172.

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. (1977). _The managerial woman_. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Holcomb, R. (1980). Mentors and the successful woman. _Across the Board_, _17_, 13-18.

Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. _Journal of Counseling Psychology_, _6_, 35-45.

Homer. (1967). _The Odyssey_. New York: Norton.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). _Men and women of the corporation_. New York: Basic Books.

Levinson, D. J.: Darrow, C. N.; Klein, E. B.; Levinson, M. H.; & McKee, B. (1976). Periods in the adult development of men: Ages eighteen to forty-five. _Counseling Psychologist_, _6_, 21-25.

Levinson, D. J.; Darrow, C. N.; Klein, E. B.; Levinson, M. H.; & McKee, B. (1978). _The seasons of a man's life_. New York: Ballantine Books.

Lynch, S. M. (1980). The mentor link: Bridging education and employment. _Journal of College Placement_, _41_, 44-47.

McNeer, E. J. (1982). The role of mentoring in the career development of women administrators in higher education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2954A. (University Microfilms No. 8129060)

McNeer, E. J. (1983). Two opportunities for mentoring: A study of women's career development in higher education administration. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 47, 8-14.

Marshall, C. (1981). Organizational policy and women's socialization in administration. Urban Education, 16, 205-231.

Melillo, D. (1982). Role model and mentor influences on the career development of academic women. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3401B-3402B. (University Microfilms No. 8202191)

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. Adult Education Quarterly, 33, 161-173.

Miller, C.; Layne, L; O'Conner, J.; & Poe, R. (1981). Characteristics of mentor relationships in male and female university professors. Paper presented at the Association for Women in Psychology, Boston.

Miller, T. E. & Brickman, S. B. (1982). Faculty and staff mentoring: A model for improving student retention and service. Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 19, 23-27.

Moore, K. M. (1980). What to do until the mentor arrives. Washington, D. C.: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors.

Moore, K. M. (1982). The role of mentors in developing leaders for academe. Educational Record, 63, 23-28.

Moore, K. M. & Sagaria, M. A. D. (1981). Women administrators and mobility: The second struggle. Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 44, 21-28.

Moore, K. M. & Salimbene, A. M. (1981). The dynamics of the mentor-protege relationship in developing women as academic leaders. Journal of Educational Equity & Leadership, 2, 51-64.

Noller, R. B. (1982). Mentoring: A renaissance of apprenticeship. The Journal of Creative Behavior, 16, 1-4.

Pardue, S. F. (1983). The who-what-why of mentor teacher/graduate student relationships. Journal of Nursing Education, 22, (1), 32-37.

Phillips, L. L. (1977). Mentors and proteges: A study of the career development of women managers and executives in business and industry. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 6414A. (University Microfilms No. 7806517)

Queralt, M. (1982). The role of the mentor in the career development of university faculty members and academic administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 693A.

Queralt, M. (1982). The role of the mentor in the career development of university faculty members and academic administrators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors. Indianapolis, IN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 614)

Quinn, B. J. (1980). The influence of same-sex and cross-sex mentors on the professional development and personality characteristics of women in human services. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1498A-1499A. (University Microfilms No. 8023454)

Reohr, J. R. (1981). Mentor and colleague relationships in academia. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 640)

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentoring. Harvard Business Review, 57, 14-28.

Schmidt, J. A. & Wolfe, J. S. (1980). The mentor partnership: Discovery of professionalism. NASPA Journal, 17, 45-51.

Shapiro, E. C.; Haseltine, F. P.; & Rowe, M. P. (1978). Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the "patron system". Sloan Management Review, 19, 51-58.

Sheehy, G. (1976). Passages: Predictable crises of adult life. New York: E. P. Dutton.

Speizer, J. J. (1981). Role models, mentors and sponsors: The elusive concepts. Signs, 6, 692-712.

Spengler, C. D. (1984). Mentor-protege relationships. A study of career development among female nurse doctorates. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2113B-2114B.

Taylor, I. C. & McLaughlin, M. B. (1982). Mentoring freshmen women. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 45, 10-15.

Vance, C. N.   (1977).   A group profile of contemporary influentials
     in American nursing.   Dissertation Abstracts International, 38,
     4734B.   (University Microfilms No. 7806517)

Vance, C. N.   (1982).   The mentor connection.   The Journal of Nursing
     Administration, 12, (4), 7-13.

Watkins, B.   (1980).   Training educational opportunity researchers:
     Some sobered thoughts on mentoring, some optimistic thoughts on
     community.   (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 193 322)

Wright, S. Q.   (1983).   University professors and their mentor/mentees:
     Characteristics of the mentor process in higher education.
     (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1983).

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ON MENTORING

## INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ON MENTORING

BEGINNING TIME: _____          DATE: _____

Directions: I want to tell you a little bit about my research before we get started with the actual interview. I have been interested in mentoring for a long time. As a faculty member and as an administrator in the profession of nursing, I saw the need for newcomers to have some orientation or means of socialization to the new role. When I was deciding on a dissertation topic, I wondered if nursing administrators had any experiences with mentoring as a means of professional socialization. The purpose of this study is to describe mentoring experiences of women administrators in baccalaureate nursing education programs with emphasis on career development and career advancement.

I want to remind you that I am tape recording the interview so that I can be accurate in reporting the results of the data. No names of individuals or institutions will be used in the final copy of the dissertation. If I seem direct and focused in sticking with the topic, it is because I will be following an interview format so that I can develop consistency between interviews and some standardization of the interview process. For the most part, I would like for you to provide short answers of one to three sentences for each question. If you think of anything you would like to add to your responses as we go through the interview, you will have an opportunity to do that at the end. If there are any questions that you would rather not answer, please feel free to indicate that to me.

The first part of the interview was developed so that I can get to know you better and to collect demographic data. Some of this information I may already know, but I am going to ask it anyway so that I can have accurate and current information. Do you have any questions about the interview before we start?

PART I. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:

Name: _____          Gross Annual Salary: _____

Institution: _____          Birthdate: _____

Title/Current Position: _____          Birth Order:
                                          ____1st born or only child
_____          ____2nd born
Years in Current Position: _____          ____3rd born
Rank: _____          ____4th or later born

Years in Rank: _____          Siblings:
                                          ____older brothers
Tenured: Yes _____ No _____          ____younger brothers
                                          ____older sisters
Years Tenured: _____          ____younger sisters
Total Years in Higher Ed: _____

Total Years in Administration: _____          Race: _____

Size of University: _____          Marital Status: _____

Size of Nursing Program: _____          Highest Educational Level: _____

Directions: The next part of the interview deals with the actual mentoring experiences. The first set of questions focus on your understanding of the mentor relationship and having a mentor.

PART II. MENTORING EXPERIENCES

PART A. QUESTIONS ON HAVING A MENTOR

1. How well acquainted are you with the concept of mentoring? Would you say you are . . .
   ____very well acquainted
   ____somewhat acquainted        .
   ____not very well acquainted
   ____not acquainted at all

2. Based on your understanding of the concept of "mentor," how would you define a mentor?

3. Do any other words or nouns come to mind that could be used to describe a mentor?

4. During your formal education or during your career, did you ever have a mentor? YES ___ NO ___ If NO, ask additional question: Based on how you described a mentor in questions 2 and 3, have you ever had anyone help you in your career in those ways? YES ___ NO ___ If NO, ask additional question: Did you ever have a special intense relationship with an older or more experienced person (or person with greater rank or expertise) who took a personal interest in your professional and personal development and provided experiences which greatly benefited your career? YES ___ NO ___

Directions: If answer to question 4 is YES, continue with question 5. If answer to question 4 is NO, go to question 25.

5. How many mentors have you had? ____

6. When in your education or career did the mentoring occur?
   ____during your course work phase of graduate school
   ____during your dissertation research phase of graduate school
   ____at the initial entrance to a faculty position in higher education
   ____at the initial entrance to an administrative position in higher education
   ____while a faculty member in higher education
   ____while an administrator in higher education
   ____in a professional position outside of higher education
   ____Other: _____

Directions: If you have had more than one mentor, focus on the mentor that was MOST beneficial, influential or significant to you as you answer the following questions.

7. What was the age, sex and race of your most significant mentor?
   AGE _____ SEX _____ RACE _____

8.  What is/was the age of your most significant mentor in relation to your age at the time?

    _____ years older    _____ years younger    _____ same age

9.  What was the relationship of your most significant mentor to you?

    Academic Setting                    Non-Academic Setting
    ____Peer/Colleague                  ____Peer/Colleague
    ____President/Provost               ____Boss/Superior
    ____Dean                            ____Friend
    ____Division Head                   ____Relative
    ____Teacher/Professor               ____Other: _____
    ____Other Administrator
    ____Other: _____

10. What type of contact did you have with your most significant mentor?  Same institutions_____ Frequency of contact _____

11. Describe how the mentor relationship developed and progressed. (Other questions may be necessary to clarify:  How was the relationship established?  Who initiated the relationship? Did the relationship go through stages?)

12. Has the mentoring experience ended?  YES _____ NO _____

13. If YES, describe the conditions leading to termination of the relationship.  (Did the relationship end on positive or negative terms?)

14. How long did the mentoring relationship last?  _____ years

15. Do you have any contact with your previous mentor?  YES _____ NO _____  If YES, what kind of contact do you have with your mentor?

16. If your mentoring experience is still present, has your relationship changed, and if so, how?

17. How did you benefit from the mentor relationship?  (Specific ways the mentor helped or assisted you.)

18. I am going to list some specific areas and I want you to tell me on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "low" and 5 being "high," the degree which your mentor helped you in each of the following areas.

____helped you gain confidence in your own ability
____helped you better understand the administration of your organization
____taught you how to cut through the "red tape"
____helped you learn the technical aspects of the job
____taught you how to work with people
____listened to your ideas and encouraged your creativity
____introduced you to the "right" people
____served as a role model for you to emulate
____assisted you in making career decisions
____helped you learn the norms and values of the organization
____introduced you to the internal workings of the organization
____encouraged you to take risks
____stimulated your interest in research and scholarly activities
____made you more politically astute
____assisted you to develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills
____encouraged you to continue learning
____challenged you to develop your talents, skills, and capabilities
____instilled enthusiasm and excitement about your work
____helped you develop high standards, ethics and values
____provided positive feedback
____provided negative feedback

19. Did the mentor relationship hinder your career in any way?

20. What did you expect from the mentor relationship?

21. What did your mentor expect of you in the mentor relationship?

22. Describe the most positive aspects of the mentor relationship.

23. Describe the most negative aspects of the mentor relationship.

24. Have you had any mentoring experiences that assisted you in preparing for, or working in, an administrative role?
YES _____ NO _____ If YES, describe this mentor relationship.

Directions: The next 9 questions are for those answering NO to question 4.

25. Did you ever feel the need and consider someone as a possible mentor? YES _____ NO _____

Directions: If YES, continue. If NO, go to question 30.

26. When in your career or education did this occur?


27. What was the age, sex and race of the person you considered as a mentor? AGE _____ SEX _____ RACE _____

28. What was the age of the person you considered as a possible mentor in relation to your age at the time? ____years older ____years younger ____ same age

29. What was the relationship of the person you considered as a possible mentor to you?

Academic Setting
____Peer/Colleague
____President/Provost
____Dean
____Division Head
____Teacher/Professor
____Other Administrator
____Other: _____

Non-Academic Setting
____Peer/Colleague
____Boss/Superior
____Friend
____Relative
____Other: _____

30. What would you have expected from a mentor relationship?




31. What positive characteristics or aspects would you have liked to learn or have enhanced by a mentor relationship?




32. What would you have considered to be negative aspects or problems in a mentor relationship?




33. To what do you attribute not having had a mentor?

Directions: The next set of questions are in relationship to you being a mentor to another person.

PART B. QUESTIONS ON BEING A MENTOR

34. To what degree are you, or have you, served as a mentor to another person?
   a. _____to a substantial degree
   b. _____to a limited degree
   c. _____not at all

If a or b above, continue. If c, go to question 53.

35. How many times have you served as a mentor to another person? _____

Directions: If you have served as a mentor to another person more than one time, focus on the MOST significant relationship as you answer the next questions.

36. At what career stage is/was you mentee/protege?

37. What is/was the age, sex and race of your mentee/protege?
   AGE _____ SEX _____ RACE _____

38. What is/was the age of your mentee/protege in relation to your age at the time? ____ years older ____ years younger ____ same age

39. What is/was your relationship to the mentee/protege?

| Academic Setting | Non-Academic Setting |
|---|---|
| ____Peer/Colleague | ____Peer/Colleague |
| ____President/Provost | ____Boss/Superior |
| ____Dean | ____Friend |
| ____Division Head | ____Relative |
| ____Teacher/Professor | ____Other: _____ |
| ____Other Administrator | |
| ____Other: _____ | |

40. What type of contact do/did you have with your mentee/protege?
   Same institution _____ Frequency of contact _____

41. Describe how the relationship with your mentee/protege developed and progressed. (Other questions may be necessary to clarify: How was the relationship established? Who initiated the relationship? Did the relationship go through stages?)

42. Has the mentoring relationship with your mentee/protege ended? YES _____ NO _____

43. If YES, describe the conditions leading to termination of the relationship with your mentee/protege. (Did the relationship end on positive or negative terms?)


44. How long have you or did you serve as a mentor to your mentee/protege? _____ years

45. Do you have any contact with your mentee/protege? YES ____ NO ____ If YES, what kind of contact do you have with your mentee/protege?


46. If the relationship with your mentee/protege is still present, has the relationship changed, and if so, how?


47. What benefit did your mentee/protege derive from the mentoring relationship?


48. Did your association with your mentee/protege hinder his or her career in any way?


49. What are/were your expectations of your mentee/protege?


50. What do you think your mentee/protege expected from you?


51. What were the most positive aspects of your relationship with your mentee/protege?


52. What were the most negative aspects of your relationship with your mentee/protege?


53. In the future, would you consider being a mentor to another person? YES _____ NO _____

54. In your opinion, what is the difference between being mentored and being a mentor to another individual? (In terms of characteristics of the relationship and responsibilities of each person)

55. How do you believe the mentoring process could be improved in nursing education?

56. How do you believe the mentoring process could be improved for women in higher education administration?

57. How do you believe the mentoring process could be effectively utilized in your specific educational setting?

Directions:  The next part of the interview focuses on career development.  I have a list of activities that can be considered career development activities.  It is a comprehensive list and not everyone would be expected to have participated in each activity.  I would like for you to give me the number of times you have participated in each of the activities in your career and then in the last year.  I am asking for two responses to each question.

PART III.  QUESTIONS ON CAREER DEVELOPMENT

| 58. How many times have you participated in the following activities? | In your career | In last year |
|---|---|---|
| Served as principal investigator of a research project. | _____ | _____ |
| Served as co-investigator of a research project. | _____ | _____ |
| Wrote a research grant proposal. | _____ | _____ |
| Received funding for a research project. | _____ | _____ |
| Presented a research paper. | _____ | _____ |
| Published the results of a research project. | _____ | _____ |
| Served on a peer review panel to review research proposals. | _____ | _____ |
| Served on an editorial board of a professional journal. | _____ | _____ |
| Authored or co-authored a book. | _____ | _____ |
| Authored or co-authored a chapter in a book. | _____ | _____ |
| Published a non-research article in a referred journal. | _____ | _____ |
| Published other materials; pamphlets, teaching aids. | _____ | _____ |
| Edited a book. | _____ | _____ |
| Reviewed or edited a chapter for a book. | _____ | _____ |
| Reviewed manuscripts for publication in professional journals or books. | _____ | _____ |
| Presented a scholarly paper at a professional meeting. | _____ | _____ |
| Presented a workshop for pay. | _____ | _____ |
| Served as a professional consultant for pay. | _____ | _____ |
| Wrote a non-research based grant proposal. | _____ | _____ |
| Received funding for a non-research based grant proposal. | _____ | _____ |

Number of professional organization memberships. _____ _____

Number of committees served on in professional organizations. _____ _____

Number of offices held in professional organizations. _____ _____

Served on board of directors or governing board of a community or civic organization. _____ _____

Served on an advisory board or as a non-paid consultant. _____ _____

59. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "did not contribute at all" and 5 being "contributed significantly," how do you perceive that mentoring contributed to your career development?

_____ 1 did not contribute at all
_____ 2 contributed very little
_____ 3 contributed somewhat
_____ 4 contributed a great deal
_____ 5 contributed significantly

Directions: The last part is on career advancement.

PART IV. QUESTIONS ON CAREER ADVANCEMENT

60. Describe your educational advancement since you graduated from nursing school. _____ Graduate from nursing school

_____ B.S. Area: _____

_____ M.S. Area: _____

_____ Doctorate. Area: _____

61. Describe your career pathway since you graduated from nursing school with specific job titles and dates.

62. Did you move into your current position from:
_____ a faculty position in the same institution
_____ a faculty position at another institution
_____ another administrative position in the same institution
_____ another administrative position in another institution
_____ from outside higher education

63. Do you anticipate a move into another administrative position within the next 5 years? YES _____ NO _____ UNCERTAIN _____

64. If question 63 above is YES, will your move be:
     _____ within the same institution
     _____ to another institution within the same state
     _____ to another institution in another state
     _____ outside of higher education
     _____ uncertain
     _____ other (specify):_____

65. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "did not contribute at all" and
    5 being "contributed significantly," how do you perceive that
    mentoring contributed to you career advancement?
     _____ 1 did not contribute at all
     _____ 2 contributed very little
     _____ 3 contributed somewhat
     _____ 4 contributed a great deal
     _____ 5 contributed significantly

<u>Directions</u>:  This is the end of the formal part of the interview.

66. Is there anything else you would like to say about having a mentor?

67. Is there anything else you would like to say about being a mentor?

68. Is there anything else you would like to say about mentoring in
    general?

Thank you very much for your participation in this research study.
I will be glad to share the results of my study with you when they
are available.

ENDING TIME:  _____

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUBJECTS

July 31, 1985


Subject's Name
Subject's Address


Dear (Subject):

As you know, the concept of mentoring has long been recognized by those in business as a means of professional socialization but only recently has systematic inquiry into the benefits of mentoring within higher education been undertaken. As part of my doctoral studies at Oklahoma State University, I am interested in finding out how nurse administrators in higher education describe their mentoring experiences and how they perceive that mentoring has contributed to their own career development and career advancement.

I would like very much to interview you as part of my dissertation research study being conducted the summer and fall of 1985. In order to accurately report the findings, each interview will be tape recorded. No individuals or institutions, however, will be identified in the analysis of the data. Knowing of your interest in this area as a woman administrator in higher education, I will be happy to send you a copy of the results of this study as soon as it is completed.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the enclosed postcard and return it to me as soon as possible. I will contact you by telephone to set up an interview date and time.

I appreciate your assistance and cooperation in this study. If you have questions about the study, I can be contacted at the numbers listed below. Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

Cordially,


Janet E. Bahr, M.S.
Doctoral Candidate
Oklahoma State University
515 Kim
Tahlequah, OK  74464
(918)-456-6967 (home)
(918)-456-5511 Ext. 3030 (work)

ㇷ゙

VITA

Janet E. Bahr

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis:  MENTORING EXPERIENCES OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS IN BACCALAUREATE
        NURSING EDUCATION

Major Field:  Higher Education Administration

Biographical:

   Personal Data:  Born in Eureka, Kansas, November 15, 1951, the
        Youngest daughter of Loren W. and L. Leota Bahr.  Siblings
        include three sisters and three brothers.

   Education:  Graduated from Severy High School, Severy, Kansas in
        May 1969; received Bachelor of Science in Nursing Degree
        from Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas in May, 1973;
        received Master of Science with a major in Nursing from
        Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas in May, 1978; com-
        pleted requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at
        Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December,
        1985.

   Professional Experience:  Assistant Instructor, Department of
        Nursing Butler County Community College, ElDorado, Kansas,
        September, 1973 to May, 1975; Instructor and Assistant
        Professor, Department of Nursing, Wichita State University,
        Wichita, Kansas, August, 1975 to July, 1980.  Director,
        Undergraduate Nursing Program, Wichita State University,
        Wichita, Kansas, July, 1980 to July, 1982; Assistant Pro-
        fessor and Assistant Director, Division of Nursing, North-
        western Oklahoma State University, Alva, Oklahoma, July,
        1982 to July, 1984; Associate Professor, Division of Nursing,
        Northeastern State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, August,
        1984 to January, 1985.  Interim Director, Division of
        Nursing, Northeastern State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma,
        January, 1985 to June, 1985; Chairperson, Division of
        Nursing, Northeastern State University, Tahlequah, Oklahoma,
        June, 1985 to present.

Professional Organizations:  American Nurses Association;
     Oklahoma Nurses Association; Sigma Theta Tau; Phi Delta
     Kappa; Phi Kappa Phi.