Mentor Relationships in Clinical Psychology Doctoral Training: Results of a National Survey

Richard A. Clark
Sherry L. Harden
George Fox University

W. Brad Johnson
Department of Leadership, Ethics, and Law
United States Naval Academy

Mentor relationships play an important role in the development and promotion of professional identity among psychologists, yet empirical study of mentor–protégé relationships in psychology graduate education is nearly nonexistent. In this study, we provide a contemporary picture of mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral programs. We mailed a survey instrument regarding mentor relationships to 1,000 recent doctorates in clinical psychology; nearly 800 responded. Two thirds of respondents reported having a faculty mentor during graduate school. More PhDs reported having a mentor than PsyDs, as did graduates of university-based departments of psychology compared to graduates of schools of professional psychology. Men and women were equally likely to be mentored and to be satisfied with mentor relationships. Ninety-one percent of mentored graduates evaluated the mentor relationship positively, and mentored graduates were significantly more satisfied with their doctoral program. We discuss implications for graduate education.

Many educators have written about mentor relationships with students (Cameron & Blackburn, 1981; Jacobi, 1991; Redmond, 1990; Wright & Wright, 1987). Graduate school professors appear to play a particularly important role as mentors to their students (Busch, 1985; Erkut & Mokros, 1984; LeCluyse, Tollefson, & Borgers, 1985; Stafford & Robbins, 1991; Wilde & Schau, 1991). During graduate training, mentor relationships are essential to the career development of both academic psychologists (Busch, 1985; Petrie & Wohlgemuth, 1994; Wilde & Schau, 1991) and applied or professional psychologists (Ellis, 1992; Mintz, Bartels, & Rideout, 1995; O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). Nonetheless, little empirical data exist about mentoring in graduate psychology training.

Building on the work of Levinson (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978), Kram (1988) conducted in-depth interviews with pairs of young managers (protégés) and senior managers (mentors) and concluded that what defines mentoring is a specific set of functions carried out within a relational context. Kram explained that mentoring consists of two distinct function domains. Career functions, which operate at the organizational level, "are those aspects of the relationship that enhance learning the ropes and pre-paring for advancement" (p. 24). Career functions include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments. Psychosocial functions, which operate at the interpersonal level, "are those aspects of a relationship that enhance an individual's sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role" (p. 32). Psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. To the extent that a hierarchical relationship provides the full range of career and psychosocial functions, it approximates the classic form of a mentor relationship.

In an excellent review of mentoring definitions across the fields of management, education, and psychology, Jacobi (1991) identified five elements common to most conceptualizations of mentor relationships. First, mentor relationships are helping relationships designed to assist the protégé in achieving long-term, broad goals. Second, mentoring contains components related both to career and professional development and to psychological and emotional support. Third, mentor relationships are reciprocal in that the mentor as well as the protégé benefit from the interaction. Fourth, mentor relationships are personal. Fifth, within the mentoring dyad, it is the mentor who has greater professional experience, influence, and achievement.

Mentors are often considered a crucial resource for psychology graduate students (Bogat & Redner, 1985; Ellis, 1992; Mintz et al., 1995), yet little empirical evidence supports this assumption. Contemporary models of training in clinical psychology, the Boulder (scientist–practitioner) and Vail (practitioner–scholar) models, do not necessarily promote direct mentoring as an integral training component (Craig, 1992).

Mentors in psychology training programs are more than role models (Mintz et al., 1995), more than academic advisors (Cronan-Hillix, Gensheimer, Cronan-Hillix, & Davidson, 1986), and more than supervisors (Atkinson, Casas, & Neville, 1994) in that "a mentor proactively seeks to enhance the development and education of a protege while a traditional supervisor or advisor only promotes the development and education of a supervisee to the extent demanded by their position" (Atkinson et al., 1994, p. 39).

Although women now make up the majority of psychology graduate students, most faculty members, particularly senior faculty, are men (Pion et al., 1996). Although previous research suggested that women graduate students are less likely than their male counterparts to be mentored (Cohen & Gutek, 1991; Hite, 1985), it is unclear whether this difference is true in psychology graduate training. Although most female graduate students appear to have male mentors (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986), cross-gender mentoring introduces a number of relationship complexities (Kram, 1988) and ethical concerns (Johnson & Nelson, 1999) that have yet to be researched.

Modern changes in the academy may bode against the probability of frequent and intensive mentoring (Belar, 1998). These changes include university accounting systems that give faculty credit exclusively for funded research, downsizing in tenure-track positions, and increased hiring of part-time instructors. Up-to-date figures on the prevalence of mentor relationships in psychology doctoral education are absent from the literature.

What is known about the relative proportion of students mentored by faculty members during psychology graduate training comes from only four studies. In surveys of former graduate students of Pennsylvania State University (Kirchner, 1969), psychology graduate students enrolled at a large university in the Midwest during the 1983–1984 academic year (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986), psychology interns during the 1987–1988 internship year (Mintz et al., 1995), and ethnic minority psychologists (Atkinson et al., 1994), the prevalence rate of mentoring during psychology graduate training was strikingly consistent at approximately 50%. Two of the four existing studies (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Kirchner, 1969) drew respondents from single universities. One (Atkinson et al., 1994) limited participation to ethnic minorities in professional psychology. The remaining study surveyed only psychology interns (Mintz et al., 1995).

This research project sought to strengthen the knowledge base concerning mentor relationships within graduate programs in clinical psychology. Areas of investigation included (a) the prevalence of mentor relationships, (b) the initiation and duration of mentor relationships, (c) the functions of mentoring, (d) the personality characteristics of mentors, (e) protégés' evaluations of mentor relationships, (f) the negative aspects of mentor relationships, (g) beliefs about the importance of mentor relationships, (h) ethical concerns related to mentoring, (i) gender differences in protégé experience, (j) reasons for not having had a mentor during one's doctoral training, and (k) level of satisfaction with one's clinical psychology doctoral program.

Method

Participants

The sampling frame for this study consisted of all American Psychological Association (APA) members and associates residing in the United States who graduated with a PhD or PsyD in clinical psychology in 1994, 1995, or 1996. From this frame, including 3,106 individuals, a simple random sample of 1,000 individuals was drawn by the APA Research Office. Of the individuals in the sample, 787 completed and returned a survey instrument in time for inclusion in the study. Five surveys were returned as undeliverable. Thus, the response rate was 787 out of 995 (79%). Seventy percent of the respondents were women and 30% were men. Respondents ranged in age from 27 to 84 years, with a mean age of 38 years ($SD = 8.05$). Eighty-seven percent of respondents identified themselves as European American, 4% as Hispanic, 2% as African American, 2% as Asian or Asian American, less than 1% as American Indian, and 4% as other. Sixty-nine percent of respondents had earned a PhD, and 31% had earned a PsyD. Fifty-four percent of respondents had received their doctorate from a department of psychology within a university or college (DP/U), 15% from a school of professional psychology within a university or college (SOP/U), and 32% from a freestanding school of professional psychology (SOP). Demographics of the respondents were within 2% of the corresponding indicators in the sampling frame (APA, 1997).

Instrument

Due to the various meanings of the concept of mentoring, previous researchers (e.g., Bogat & Redner, 1985) have recommended providing a specific definition of mentoring to participants in mentoring research studies. The survey began with the following set of instructions:

> This survey is designed to assess your experience of having been mentored. Mentoring is a personal relationship in which a more experienced (usually older) individual acts as a guide, role model, teacher, and sponsor of a less experienced (usually younger) protégé. A mentor provides the protégé with knowledge, advice, challenge, counsel and support in the protégé's pursuit of becoming a full member of a particular profession. In light of this definition, please answer the following questions.

After these instructions, respondents indicated whether they had had a faculty mentor in their clinical psychology doctoral degree program. Respondents who had not experienced a mentor relationship with a faculty member indicated the primary reason why they had not. Respondents who had been mentored by a faculty member provided demographic data about the mentor, details about the initiation and duration of the mentor relationship, an overall evaluation of the mentor relationship, ratings of mentoring functions that might have occurred in the relationship, a list of the three most important personality characteristics of the mentor, and ratings of negative qualities that might have existed in the mentor relationship. Additionally, mentored participants responded to items concerning gender-related issues and ethical matters. Participants rated the importance of mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training and indicated their overall level of satisfaction with the clinical psychology doctoral degree program from which they graduated. Finally, all respondents provided demographic information.

Procedure

At the end of May 1997, the 1,000 individuals in the sample received a survey packet by mail. Each survey packet included a hand-signed cover letter; a double-sided, two-page Mentor Relationship Survey; a stamped, self-addressed return envelope; and a dollar bill as an inducement for participation. Anonymity of responses was guaranteed. Ten days after the initial mailing, each of the individuals in the sample received a hand-signed reminder postcard. Both the cover letter and the postcard had a humorous tone and several respondents noted on the survey that this was an important factor in their decision to participate. We accepted all survey responses received by August 1, 1997.

Results

Prevalence of Mentor Relationships

Of the 787 recent graduates who responded to the survey, 521 (66%) reported they had a faculty mentor during their doctoral training. Graduates of PhD programs were more likely to have been mentored (71%) than graduates of PsyD programs (56%), $\chi^2(1, N = 781) = 17.13, p < .0001$. Additionally, graduates who received their degree from a DP/U were more likely to have been mentored (73%) than were graduates who received their degree from either a SOP (59%) or a SOP/U (57%), $\chi^2(2, N = 783) = 18.48, p < .0001$. Although 71% of male respondents had mentor relationships compared to 65% of female respondents, the difference was not significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 783) = 3.26, p = .07$. Concerning gender matching in mentoring relationships, 79% of male respondents had male mentors and 21% had female mentors. In contrast, 54% of female respondents had male mentors, whereas 46% had female mentors. These gender pairing differences were statistically significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 518) = 30.37, p < .0001$. Protégés reported an average of 2.32 ($SD = 2.55$) faculty mentors. Forty-three percent of protégés indicated they had had one faculty mentor, 35% said they had had two faculty mentors, 11% reported three, and another 11% reported having had four or more faculty mentors.

These results suggest that student–faculty mentoring in clinical psychology doctoral training may be on the rise. In contrast to previous data (Atkinson et al., 1994; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Kirchner, 1969; Mintz et al., 1995), two thirds of respondents to our survey reported having received mentoring from a faculty member. In addition, students who were mentored often reported more than one faculty mentor.

Profile of Faculty Mentors

All mentored respondents answered questions about their most significant faculty mentor. Sixty-two percent of mentors were men and 38% were women. Eighty-six percent of mentors were older than their protégé by an average of 15.87 years ($SD = 8.22$). Nine percent of mentors were the same age as their protégé, and 5% of mentors were younger than their protégé by

an average of 8.3 years ($SD = 6.59$). PhD respondents were more likely (89%) than PsyD respondents (79%) to have had an older mentor, $\chi^2(2, N = 514) = 12.28, p < .01$.

Protégés listed the three most important personality characteristics of their most significant faculty mentor. A total of 1,675 descriptors were offered by 521 protégés. We sorted the characteristics by definition similarity and compiled them into 118 distinct categories. The 15 most frequent mentor characteristics appear in Table 1.

A portrait of the "typical" faculty mentor emerged from these data. The faculty mentor is most often male, is older than the protégé by 16 years, and is likely to be described as intelligent and knowledgeable. The mentor possesses wisdom and behaves ethically. Simultaneously, the mentor is characterized as warm, caring, and interpersonally attractive.

Nature of Mentor Relationships

Initiation and duration of mentor relationships. Forty-three percent of protégés reported that they initiated the mentor relationship, 35% indicated the relationship had been mutually initiated, and 14% reported that their mentor had been "assigned" by a third party. Only 8% of respondents reported that their mentor had initiated the relationship. Forty percent of the mentor relationships had lasted more than 4 years, 39% lasted 3 to 4 years, 20% had lasted 1 or 2 years, and only 1% of the mentor relationships had been less than 1 year in duration. Mentor relationships in PhD programs were more likely to last longer than 4 years (45%) compared to those in PsyD programs (25%), $\chi^2(3, N = 514) = 18.07, p < .001$.

Clearly, most of the mentor relationships described by our respondents had been initiated either directly by the protégé or mutually by the protégé and mentor. In other words, graduate students who successfully secure mentors appear to be proactive in seeking such relationships. Although a small minority of mentor relationships were established via formal assignment programs, the unique qualities of the mentor relationship and the long-term nature of relationship formation appear incongruent with third-party assignment.

Table 1. Most Frequently Mentioned Personality Characteristics of Mentors

Characteristic	f
Supportive	111
Intelligent	104
Knowledgeable	73
Ethical	56
Caring	54
Humorous	50
Encouraging	49
Honest	39
Empathic	39
Approachable	38
Accepting	35
Warm	33
Available	33
Genuine	33
Dedicated	30

Note. $N = 1,675$.

Table 2. Mean Ratings of Mentoring Functions

Mentoring Function	M	SD
My mentor provided direct training or instruction for me.	4.50	0.79
My mentor offered me acceptance, support, and encouragement.	4.46	0.90
My mentor served as a role model for me.	4.26	0.95
My mentor sponsored me for desirable positions such as assistantships, practica, or internship.	3.86	1.27
My mentor provided opportunities for me to engage in research.	3.76	1.35
My mentor helped me to gain greater exposure and visibility.	3.61	1.12
My mentor served to protect me.	3.46	1.17
My mentor provided personal guidance and counsel for me.	3.46	1.31
My mentor served as a friend.	3.36	1.23

Functions of mentoring. Protégés rated the degree to which they agreed—using a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*)—that the nine mentoring functions posited by Kram (1988) had been present in their primary mentor relationship. Table 2 provides mean ratings for respondents on all nine of the mentoring functions. There were no differences between male and female protégés in ratings of the mentoring functions with the exception that women agreed to a greater degree ($M = 4.53, SD = .87$) than men ($M = 4.31, SD = .97$) that their mentors offered acceptance, support, and encouragement, $t(289) = 2.48, p < .05$. Finally, there were several differences in ratings of mentoring functions based on type of degree. PhD protégés agreed more strongly ($M = 3.97, SD = 1.24$) than PsyD protégés ($M = 3.12, SD = 1.46$) that their mentor provided opportunities to engage in research, $t(197) = 6.00, p < .001$. Additionally, protégés from PhD programs agreed more strongly ($M = 3.53, SD = 1.18$) than did PsyD protégés ($M = 3.28, SD = 1.14$) that their mentor had served to protect them, $t(510) = 2.06, p < .05$. Conversely, protégés from PsyD programs agreed more strongly ($M = 4.64, SD = 0.65$) than protégés from PhD programs ($M = 4.40, SD = .97$) that their faculty mentor had offered acceptance, support, and encouragement, $t(344) = 3.21, p < .001$. Finally, PsyD protégés agreed more strongly ($M = 4.48, SD = .68$) than PhD protégés ($M = 4.18, SD = 1.01$) that their faculty mentor had served as a role model for them, $t(339) = 3.76, p < .001$.

Clinical psychologists in this sample endorsed both the career and psychosocial mentoring functions described by Kram (1988) as present in their mentor relationships. The most highly rated functions (direct training, acceptance and support, and role modeling) are highly congruent with the graduate school professor's customary role. In contrast, the lowest rated functions (protection, counseling, and friendship) may fall further from the traditional professor role and may be more indicative of mentoring within business environments.

Attraction to mentor. Respondents rated the extent of their desire to "be like" their mentor and their experience of having been attracted to their mentor emotionally, romantically, or physically or sexually on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*). Most respondents appeared neutral regarding the extent to which they wanted to be like their mentor ($M = 3.37, SD = 1.0$). Concerning the three distinct types of attraction to their mentor, the mean rating was 2.47 ($SD = 1.37$) for emotional attraction; however, 29% of respondents endorsed a 4 or 5 on this item. Female protégés were more likely to report emotional attraction ($M = 2.57, SD = 1.41$) than male protégés ($M = 2.25, SD = 1.26$), $t(509) = 2.44, p < .05$. Of those who responded to an additional item regarding whether they had discussed this emotional attraction with their mentor, 67.7% (228 of 337) said they had. Considerably fewer protégés endorsed experiencing romantic attraction to their mentor, as 88% endorsed *not at all*. Female protégés ($M = 1.29, SD = .79$) noted more romantic attraction than male protégés ($M = 1.06, SD = .79$), $t(504) = 3.49, p < .001$. Only 3.3% (9 of 270) acknowledged having discussed this attraction with their mentor. Finally, 89% of protégés endorsed *not at all* when asked about physical or sexual attraction to their mentor ($M = 1.22, SD = .67$). Female protégés endorsed slightly more attraction ($M = 1.26, SD = .74$) than males ($M = 1.12, SD = .49$), $t(504) = 2.24, p < .05$. Three percent (5 of 169) said they had not discussed this attraction with their mentor.

Negative aspects of mentoring. When questioned regarding the degree to which the mentor experience included negative qualities or outcomes, the majority of respondents denied any negative experiences. However, 25% indicated the mentor was not as available as they would have preferred, 17% experienced termination of the mentor relationship as difficult, 14% felt unable to meet the mentor's expectations, 7% indicated that maintaining the relationship required them to do things about which they felt uncomfortable, 5% agreed that their mentor took credit for their work, 5% believed their mentor engaged in unethical behavior, 4% felt their mentor's behavior was seductive, and 2% reported their mentor sexualized their relationship.

Ethical concerns. Of 519 protégés responding to an open-ended item regarding whether they had ethical concerns about their mentor relationship, 89% said they had no ethical concerns. The remaining 11% of respondents identified a total of 79 specific ethical concerns about their mentor or the mentor relationship. Both men (12%) and women (10%) noted some concerns. The most frequently mentioned ethical concerns (followed by the percentage of all respondents noting this concern) were mentor sexualized relationships with other students in the program (3%), research-related concerns (e.g. mentor published questionable findings, altered research to support hypotheses, offered protégé financial incentive to alter results; 2%), mentor had poor boundaries or was too emotionally involved with students (2%), mentor sexualized relationship with protégé (2%), and mentor claimed credit for protégé's work (1%). Unethical behavior on the part of mentors may have been underreported due to protégés' describing the mentor they perceived most favorably. This reporting bias may have excluded cases in which the protégé discontinued an earlier mentor relationship as a result of such concerns.

In response to an open-ended item regarding gender-related problems in their mentor relationships, 89% of protégés said there were no gender-related problems. The difference in the percentage of female (12.4%) and male (6.7%) protégés acknowledging gender related problems neared significance, $\chi^2(1, N = 520) = 3.79, p = .051$. The most frequently mentioned gender concerns included competitiveness between mentor and protégé, sexism by the mentor, a perception that the mentor favored male graduate students, and emotional or sexual attraction between mentor and protégé.

Based on previous research findings, we anticipated that male and female protégés might differ regarding the extent to which they socialized with their mentor; the extent to which they believed their mentor assisted them with integration of personal and professional roles (e.g., parent and professional); and the extent to which they attributed their success to themselves, their mentor, or others. Most protégés (62%) indicated that they did not socialize with their mentor outside the academic setting. Using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*), protégés rated the degree to which their mentors valued the integration of personal and professional roles. Female protégés endorsed this item to a greater degree (M = 3.61, SD = 1.22) than males (M = 3.24, SD = 1.28), $t(505) = 3.15, p < .005$.

Finally, most protégés were strongly inclined to attribute their success to themselves (M = 4.74, SD = .53). However, female protégés endorsed this item more strongly (M = 4.78, SD = .49) than male protégés (M = 4.65, SD = .60), $t(516) = 2.61, p < .01$. Protégés were more neutral concerning attribution of their success to their mentors (M = 3.45, SD = .95). Women attributed their success to mentors to a greater extent (M = 3.51, SD = .95) than men (M = 3.31, SD = .93), $t(515) = 2.26, p < .05$. A small proportion of protégés attributed their success to some extent to other teachers or supervisors (14%), a spouse (8%), parents or family members (8%), nonacademic mentors (7%), and friends (5%).

Evaluation and Importance of the Mentor Relationship

Using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*extremely negative*) to 5 (*extremely positive*), protégés provided an overall evaluation of the relationship with their faculty mentor, resulting in a mean rating of 4.41 (SD = .84). Fifty-seven percent rated the relationship as extremely positive and another 34% rated the relationship as moderately positive. Protégés from PsyD programs gave more positive ratings to the mentor relationship (M = 4.58, SD = .66) than PhD protégés (M = 4.36, SD = .89), $t(309) = 2.93, p < .01$.

All respondents rated the degree to which they believe mentor relationships are important in clinical psychology doctoral training. The mean rating was 4.46 (SD = .81) on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*extremely unimportant*) to 5 (*extremely important*). Mentor relationships were considered extremely important by 58% of respondents and moderately important by another 36%. Although both mentored and nonmentored respondents viewed such relationships as very important, mentored respondents ascribed them greater importance (M = 4.57, SD = .75) than nonmentored respondents (M = 4.25, SD = .88), $t(447) = 5.13, p < .001$. Both men (M = 4.56) and women (M = 4.58) considered mentor relationships important.

Overall Satisfaction with Doctoral Training

Respondents rated their overall level of satisfaction with the clinical psychology doctoral program from which they graduated on a scale ranging from 1 (*extremely dissatisfied*) to 5 (*extremely satisfied*). Mentored respondents indicated greater satisfaction (M = 4.03, SD = .95) than did nonmentored respondents (M = 3.65, SD = 1.07), $t(472) = 4.85, p < .001$. Satisfaction with one's program also related to respondent degree type. Graduates of PsyD programs were more satisfied with their doctoral program (M = 4.18, SD = .84) than graduates of PhD programs (M = 3.78, SD = 1.05), $t(555) = 5.59, p < .001$.

This finding is interesting when one considers that PhD respondents enjoyed a distinct advantage over PsyD respondents in terms of probability of having been mentored. The higher prevalence of mentoring in PhD programs can perhaps be explained in reference to two factors: research orientation and faculty-to-student ratio. The conduct of research with its concomitant opportunities for close interaction between faculty and students would seem to provide a context conducive to the development of mentor relationships. Similarly, mentor relationship formation would seem to be more feasible in programs with higher faculty-to-student ratios. The fact that PsyD graduates were more satisfied with their training is an interesting and unanticipated finding that certainly invites further research for the purpose of elucidating factors contributing to this outcome.

Nonmentored Respondents

Nonmentored respondents indicated the primary reason they did not have a faculty mentor during graduate school. Only 7.5% believed they did not need a faculty mentor. Thirty-two percent stated that faculty members had not had time to mentor, and another 30% asserted that mentoring had not been encouraged or provided by their doctoral program. Twenty-nine percent indicated they had been unable to find a suitable mentor among faculty, and 5% reported receiving mentoring from a psychologist outside of their doctoral program. Seventeen percent of nonmentored respondents listed additional reasons, including racism, having an advisor who did not "fit" as a mentor, difficulty assuming the protégé role, lack of understanding regarding the importance of mentoring, lack of relationship-seeking skills, lack of time to seek a mentor, inability to find a mentor with compatible values, perception that potential mentors did not take the mentor role seriously, and age concerns.

Discussion

About two thirds of recent clinical psychology doctorates reported having at least one graduate school mentor, with

PhDs reporting more mentoring than PsyDs. Although it is unclear why PsyD students were less likely to mentored, we believe at least three factors contributed to this difference. These factors include larger PsyD program student–faculty ratios, shorter time requirements for PsyD degree completion, and less student–faculty collaboration around research activities within PsyD programs. In addition, PsyD students may experience a greater degree of training diffusion (Johnson & Nelson, 1999) than PhD students. Training diffusion refers to the practice of assigning central training components (e.g., supervision and clinical practica) to professionals external to the program.

When mentoring occurs in PsyD programs, there is less emphasis placed on providing opportunities for research and greater emphasis on providing acceptance, support, and encouragement. The comparative prominence of acceptance, support, and encouragement in PsyD programs versus PhD programs may help explain why protégés from PsyD programs evaluated their doctoral programs more positively. Taken collectively, these findings appear to warrant two conclusions. First, an emphasis within the doctoral program on collaborative research between professors and students may result in a higher prevalence rate of mentoring. Second, an emphasis within the mentor relationship on the provision of acceptance, support, and encouragement may result in a more positive mentoring experience from the perspective of the protégé.

These findings revealed relatively few substantive gender differences. Although the majority of respondents were women and the majority of identified mentors were men, women reported equivalent rates of mentoring, were equally satisfied with those relationships, and were likely to evaluate the essential mentoring functions in a manner similar to male respondents. Women were more likely to select female mentors and reported receiving more support and encouragement from mentors. In contrast to previous literature suggesting that women have less access to mentoring relationships and a lower probability of reaping personal and career benefits from mentoring when it occurs (Bogat & Redner, 1985; Cohen & Gutek, 1991; Gilbert & Rossman, 1992), these findings suggest no significant differences between male and female protégés in their access to and satisfaction with mentoring in clinical psychology doctoral programs. Furthermore, male and female mentors appeared equally capable of addressing both the career and psychosocial needs of female protégés. Congruent with the findings of Stonewater, Eveslage, and Dingerson (1990), female respondents in this study endorsed both the career and psychosocial functions of mentoring as important.

There are several practical implications of this research. Our findings suggest that faculty-to-student mentoring is beneficial to graduate students and that students who initiate mentor relationships are most likely to be mentored. In addition to developing assertiveness, prospective students would be well served to evaluate the extent to which programs emphasize mentoring as an important component of the department's culture and training strategy. Clinical psychology doctoral programs may wish to evaluate the extent to which faculty mentor students and consider strategies for fostering mentor relationship formation. Additionally, programs could develop methods for rewarding active mentors and creating a culture conducive to mentoring. Finally, the APA's Committee on Accreditation might consider the implications of making evidence of effective mentoring by faculty an accreditation criterion for doctoral programs.

These findings should be evaluated in light of the limitations of our research design. Our conclusions are based on self-report data of a retrospective nature elicited by a survey instrument for which reliability and validity have not been established. In addition, the survey considered mentor relationships exclusively from the perspective of recent graduates. Obviously, a fuller understanding of mentor relationships in psychology graduate training would require assessment of perceptions of current students and faculty members. Another important limitation of our study is the fact that we surveyed only those graduate students who successfully completed doctorates. It is possible that students who exit graduate school prior to degree completion have had vastly different experiences with faculty.

Future research in this area should include data collection from the vantage point of active mentors and examination of mentor relationships that occur during doctoral training in other divisions of the profession, such as counseling psychology and experimental psychology. Also, the fact that over 10% of respondents reported four or more mentors indicates that despite our attempt to define mentoring for respondents, some heterogeneity in conceptualizing this term persisted. Future research might attempt more explicit definition of the term *mentor*.

Many additional questions regarding the formation, course, and nature of mentor relationships remain to be examined. This study yielded findings that are both hopeful and sobering. Among recent graduates of clinical psychology doctoral programs, those who had been mentored enjoyed associated benefits and reported greater satisfaction with their graduate school experience. Mentoring appears to matter. Nonetheless, one third of the recently graduated clinical psychologists in our sample had not been mentored into the profession by a faculty member. Deficits in mentor relationships for psychologists in training raise concerns about decrements in professional identity integration, professional confidence, and professional opportunity (Ellis, 1992; O'Neil & Wrightsman, 1981). We hope doctoral students, faculty, and administrators attend closely to the state of mentoring within their training programs.

References

American Psychological Association. (1997). *1997 APA directory survey*. Washington, DC: Author.

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

Belar, C. D. (1998). Graduate eduation in clinical psychology: "We're not in Kansas anymore." *American Psychologist, 53*, 456–464.

Bogat, G. A., & Redner, R. L. (1985). How mentoring affects the professional development of women. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 16*, 851–859.

Busch, J. W. (1985). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentors' perceptions. *American Educational Research Journal, 22*, 257–265.

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

Cohen, A. G., & Gutek, B. A. (1991). Sex differences in the career experiences of members of two APA divisions. *American Psychologist, 46,* 1292–1298.

Craig, R. J. (1992). On the rocks (Boulder) and under cover (Vail): Models of training and psychodiagnostic assessment. *Journal of Training and Practice in Professional Psychology, 6,* 7–13.

Cronan-Hillix, T., Gensheimer, L. K., Cronan-Hillix, W. A., & Davidson, W. S. (1986). Student's views of mentors in psychology graduate training. *Teaching of Psychology, 13,* 123–127.

Ellis, H. C. (1992). Graduate education in psychology: Past, present, and future. *American Psychologist, 47,* 570–576.

Erkut, S., & Mokros, J. R. (1984). Professors as models and mentors for college students. *American Educational Research Journal, 21,* 399–417.

Gilbert, L. A., & Rossman, K. M. (1992). Gender and the mentoring process for women: Implications for professional development. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 23,* 233–238.

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

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research, 61,* 505–532.

Johnson, W. B., & Nelson, N. (1999). Mentor–protege relationships in graduate training: Some ethical concerns. *Ethics and Behavior, 9,* 189–210.

Kirchner, E. P. (1969). Graduate education in psychology: Retrospective views of advanced degree recipients. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25,* 207–213.

Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life.* Lanham, MD: University Press.

LeCluyse, E. E., Tollefson, N., & Borgers, S. B. (1985). Differences in female graduate students in relation to mentoring. *College Student Journal, 19,* 411–415.

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.

Mintz, L. B., Bartels, K. M., & Rideout, C. A. (1995). Training in counseling ethnic minorities and race-based availability of graduate school resources. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26,* 316–321.

O'Neil, J. M., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1981). *The mentoring relationship in psychology training programs.* Unpublished manuscript.

Petrie, T. A., & Wohlgemuth, E. A. (1994). In hopes of promoting cohesion among academics: New and established. *The Counseling Psychologist, 22,* 466–473.

Pion, G. M., Mednick, M. T., Astin, H. S., Hall, C. C. I., Kenkel, M. B., Keita, G. P., Kohout, J. L., & Kelleher, J. C. (1996). The shifting gender composition of psychology: Trends and implications for the discipline. *American Psychologist, 51,* 509–528.

Redmond, S. P. (1990). Mentoring and cultural diversity in academic settings. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34,* 188–200.

Stafford, B., & Robbins, S. P. (1991). Mentorship for graduate social work students: Real and ideal. *Journal of Applied Social Sciences, 15,* 193–206.

Stonewater, B. B., Eveslage, S. A., & Dingerson, M. R. (1990). Gender differences in career helping relationships. *Career Development Quarterly, 39,* 72–85.

Wilde, J. B., & Schau, C. G. (1991). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentees' perception. *Journal of Experimental Education, 59,* 165–179.

Wright, C. A., & Wright, S. D. (1987). The role of mentors in the career development of young professionals. *Family Relations, 36,* 204–208.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this article was presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August 1998.
2. We thank Chris Koch and Clark Campbell of George Fox University for their important contributions to this research and Randolph Smith for his valuable editorial assistance.
3. Send correspondence to W. Brad Johnson, Department of Leadership, Ethics, & Law, United States Naval Academy, Luce Hall–Stop 7B, Annapolis, MD 21402; e-mail: johnsonb@usna.edu.

Call for Applications/Nominations for the Executive Director of the Office of Teaching Resources in Psychology for the Society for the Teaching of Psychology

The Society for the Teaching of Psychology announces that it is beginning the process of selecting a new Executive Director of the Society's Office of Teaching Resources in Psychology to replace Dr. Marky Lloyd, who is completing the last year of her 5-year appointment. The new Director will serve a 5-year term that will begin in August, 2001.

The Society for the Teaching of Psychology established the Office of Teaching Resources in Psychology (OTRP) in 1992 to develop and distribute peer-reviewed teaching and advising materials and to provide services for teachers of psychology at all levels. Presently, OTRP documents include 90 course syllabi and 20 documents available in hard and electronic copies (the latter via the OTRP Web site, *OTRP-Online*). In addition, OTRP oversees 3 services: the Departmental Consulting Service, the Instructional Resource Awards, and the Mentoring Service.

Some institutional support is desirable. The applicant should be able to provide institutional support such as a faculty office with sufficient storage space, a computer with access to the Internet, minor funds for telephone and copying expenses, and approximately 3 hours per week of clerical assistance (paid or volunteer).

Applicants must be members of the Society, have experience reviewing and editing manuscripts, have excellent organizational/administrative skills, be proficient in the use of e-mail and the World Wide Web, and be able to commit sufficient time to the position. The Search Committee is especially interested in candidates who are active members of the Society.

Self-nominations are welcome. Applicants should send a letter detailing their relevant experience and qualifications for the position; their vision and goals for OTRP over the next 5 years; the type of institutional support they can provide and, if relevant, the support they would need from the Society; a current copy of their curriculum vitae; and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of three individuals who can speak to their qualifications for the position. Persons making nominations of other individuals should do so in writing to the Chair of the Search committee and should ask nominees to send the information described above.

Applications, letters of nomination, and inquiries should be directed to:

Margaret A. Lloyd, PhD
Department of Psychology
Georgia Southern University
P.O. Box 8041
Statesboro, GA 30460-8041
mlloyd@gasou.edu

All materials must be received by December 10, 2000.