DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 257 UD 026 802

AUTHOR Flaxman, Erwin; And Others
TITLE Youth Mentoring: Programs and Practices. Urban Diversity Series No. 97.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 88
CONTRACT OERI-RI88062013
NOTE 76p.; For related document, see UD 026 900.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Box 40, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Counseling; *Disadvantaged Youth; Guidance; *High Risk Persons; Interpersonal Relationship; Intervention; *Mentors; Modeling (Psychology); *Persistence; *Role Models; Significant Others; Social Development; Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Protege Mentor Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the literature on mentoring for adult and youth populations for the following purposes: (1) to apply issues and concerns found in the literature to mentoring programs for disadvantaged and tenacious youth; and (2) to establish assumptions and program principles beyond the considerations of the existing literature. Chapter I, "The Basis and Functions of Planned Mentoring," distinguishes between natural (non-parental, unstructured) and planned (formal, programmatic) mentoring and examines the psychological bases of the mentoring process as well as the social values inherent in mentoring programs. Chapter II, "Mentoring in Organizations," describes natural and planned mentoring in the forum where they first became popular, and explores the shortcomings and benefits of their application to youth mentoring. Chapter III, "Planned Mentoring for Tenacious and Other Youth," discusses formal mentoring programs for disadvantaged youth and explores such issues as program organization and mentor-mentee match. Chapter IV, "The Power of Mentoring," focuses on the salience of the mentoring relationship and examines its place within larger multi-intervention programs. Chapter V, "Summary and Conclusions," contains general observations on youth mentoring programs and policy recommendations for their conduct. A list of 81 references, and the names of 64 organizations and programs consulted, are appended. (AF)

Youth Mentoring: Programs and Practices

Erwin Flaxman
Carol Ascher
Charles Harrington

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Urban Education

YOUTH MENTORING: PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES

Erwin Flaxman
Carol Ascher
Charles Harrington

YOUTH MENTORING: PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES

Erwin Flaxman
Carol Ascher
Charles Harrington

Urban Diversity Series No. 97

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education

December 1988

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Box 40, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
212/678-3433

Director: Erwin Flaxman
Assistant Director: Robin Johnson Utsey
Managing Editor: Wendy Schwartz

This publication was produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education, under contract number R18806213, and from Teachers College, Columbia University. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

Acknowledgements

This paper was developed with the partial support of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation for the project *Mentoring Programs and Practices: An Analysis of the Literature and Recommendations for Policy.* The authors thank the Foundation and Mr. Peter Gerber for the invitation to develop the paper. We wish also to thank several staff members of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education who provided bibliographic and editorial assistance: Cheryl Norton, Wendy Schwartz, Anne Storelli, and Michael Webb.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Adolescents are an increasingly isolated population. Because of changes in the structure of the family, in community and neighborhood relationships, and in workplace arrangements, these youth are being deprived of the adult contacts that historically have been a primary source of socialization and a support for development. As a result, there are fewer natural opportunities for youth to sustain durable relationships with adults. For disadvantaged and at-risk youth who are victim to the deleterious influences of street life, this isolation is particularly devastating; many of them avoid or drop out of society. Further, the schools which may have once had the power help, have failed to be an adequate substitute for the home and community for this population.

For many social planners mentoring programs are an alternative: they believe these programs can be designed and developed to provide the adult relationships absent in the lives of these youth. Our task in this paper is to consider ways that these mentoring programs are being structured to do so, and how they may or may not be fulfilling their goals.

At the invitation of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation we have developed a literature review to answer several superficially simple questions about mentoring programs:

1. What kind of mentoring is being practiced in them?
2. What roles should mentors play in them?
3. What particular characteristics should mentors have, if any?
4. What can mentoring in these programs be expected to accomplish?

As we set out to answer these questions we learned very quickly that they raised others. First, there is the question of what happens when a mentoring program tries to artificially create what has been at heart a natural psychological and social occurrence—can we turn an arranged marriage into a love match? Second, because mentoring activities for social growth are often an add-on to other interventions, for developing academic or work-related skills, for example, we have explored the power of mentoring alone and its place in relationships to other interventions. Finally, as we looked at the mentoring in many studies and program descriptions, we have considered, when mentoring is "mentoring" and when it is just "help."

For our purposes, we use the working definition of mentoring as: **a supportive relationship between a youth or young adult and someone more senior in age and experience, who offers support, guidance, and concrete assistance as the younger partner goes through a difficult period, enters a new area of experience, takes on an important task, or corrects an earlier problem. In general during mentoring, mentees identify with, or form a strong interpersonal attachment to, their mentors; as a result, they become able to do for themselves what their mentors have done for them.**

A word should also be said about the term *mentee*, which we use to identify those who are mentored. We found it difficult to find a term that seemed both literate and always to the point. This is because the mentoring relationship itself is so varied that calling someone a learner, novice, disciple, or protege appears limiting or distorting. *Protege* is used widely in the literature; but a protege is frequently associated with a talented follower of some artist, scientist, teacher, or leader. It also still faintly carries the meaning of its etymology, from the French *to protect.* Because no term alone seemed to convey the position of someone being mentored, we have decided to use *mentee*; it is the newest of the terms available and so carries the least baggage. It thus allows us to develop its connotation and richness as we use it.

As we analyzed the literature, we found that there is a push toward developing prototypes or models of mentoring which, when looked at closely, are very simplistic. They may appear tidy on paper, but they lack a higher level of synthesis, as yet not possible, and so are not useful. As we explain in the paper, we feel that this effort to develop models is premature. Because we do not have the trappings of mentoring programs reported in the literature, we need more case studies and better program descriptions and evaluations before we can create effective prototypes of either the forces affecting the mentoring relationship at a particular moment or of the changes that the relationship can be expected to move through over time.

From the outset we recognized that mentoring is carried out by people (and program planners) with particular assumptions about society and the individual's capabilities to function within it, and that these social assumptions often govern who mentors, who gets mentored, and what the mentoring is for. Whether we view society as open and unrestricted, blocked, or organic affects the kinds of programs we develop (see Chapter I for a discussion of these views of society). We intended

to test these assumptions in reviewing the programs; unfortunately the current literature on mentoring allows us only to conjecture about the social view informing the design and outcomes of various programs. We do, however, discuss different views of society and suggest ways that they predict particular activities and prompt particular goals. Needless to say, we feel that establishing and articulating these assumptions is a critical factor in conducting and evaluating mentoring programs for tenacious and other disadvantaged youth. Such assumptions, even if inadvertently, lead to different expectations for success and failure in the society, as well as to different types of programs.

We have been guided in our review by the desire to MacArthur Foundation to better understand activities or programs for mentoring tenacious youth. So now a word about these youth. Supporters of programs for this population identify them with a few simple demographic features. These youth are not school dropouts, but neither are they on clear educational or career paths, and they could drop out. They are not school failures, but they have average or lower grade point averages. They come from homes with parents who did not attend or graduate from college, but they are not plagued by the vicissitudes of family poverty or disruption. They are not the students at highest risk for educational or social failure, but they do not have the many—and redundant—social resources of middle-class youth. And, finally, because they have not been identified as potentially high achievers or gifted youth, they are not on a protected educational path to make sure that they use all their gifts.

Organization of the Paper

We had two purposes in developing this review, which are reflected in the paper itself. First, we wanted to analyze the existing mentoring literature for adult and youth populations in order to record its concerns and to draw from it issues that may affect program evaluations and planning for mentoring interventions for disadvantaged and tenacious youth. Second, we wanted to establish some assumptions about mentoring and principles for conducting the programs beyond what the current state of the literature considers.

In developing the paper we followed several steps. First, we searched several social science data bases to identify the current and salient literature on the mentoring of adults and youth; e.g., ERIC, Psychological Abstracts, Social Science Citation Index, and Sociological Abstracts. Second, we reviewed theoretical works, research reports, program evaluations, and more popular documents, including news

articles and promotional brochures, to develop some essential issues to be considered in establishing and evaluating formalized mentoring programs. Third, we turned back to the most substantive works in the literature to prod these issues more fully. Throughout we sought ways to better conceptualize the dynamics of the mentoring relationship and the structure of mentoring programs.

The paper is organized into five chapters. Chapter I contains a theoretical discussion of the psychological bases of mentoring, particularly of disadvantaged and tenacious youth. Here we also present a typology of mentoring behaviors and a conceptualization of the distinction between natural and planned mentoring, as well as a brief discussion of social values embedded in mentoring programs.

Chapter II describes natural and formal mentoring in organizations, where mentoring first became popular. The literature on mentoring in organizations has defined the common terms for understanding youth mentoring programs. This literature also presents the fullest critique of the shortcomings and benefits of the formal mentoring now being used in organizational and youth programs.

Chapter III is a discussion of planned mentoring programs for disadvantaged and tenacious youth. It examines such issues as program organization, and mentor/mentee match. It also contains a discussion of tenacious youth aimed at informing just how mentoring programs for this population need to be developed.

Chapter IV focuses on the important issue of the power of mentoring. In doing so, it also examines the mentoring relationship within the structure of larger multi-intervention programs.

Chapter V contains our general observations about mentoring programs and policy recommendations for conducting them.

Finally, in an appendix, we list the names of the organizations and programs that we consulted in developing this paper.

CHAPTER I: THE BASIS AND FUNCTIONS OF PLANNED MENTORING

Mentoring occurs naturally when adolescents and young adults use the guidance of someone other than a parent to help them pass through a stage of development or move through a new body of learning. Traditionally, the relationship has come about idiosyncratically and fortuitously through the identification, desire, and need of both parties. But because of its perceived power for individual, organizational, and community growth, planned mentoring programs have recently been developed, particularly for those who might otherwise lack the opportunity for the sustained relationship with an adult that mentoring makes possible.

Natural mentoring is fundamentally open and varied; it can take the form of friendship, collegiality, instruction, advocacy, coaching, pseudo-parenting, and so forth. Mentor and mentee often find each other somewhat accidentally, usually when the mentee has done something to show promise and has a need that the mentor wants to satisfy. Natural mentoring relationships generally last for several years, during which time the relationship is both intense and shifting. When the mentee has learned what is needed, and no longer wants to remain passive, a natural mentoring relationship breaks up, and, in the best case, becomes a friendship of equals.

By contrast, planned mentoring is more structured and programmatic. The participants do not find each other, but are chosen or choose each other in a formal selection process. The character of the relationship and the nature of the interaction is bounded by a previously determined objective for both mentor and mentee. Inherently, then, the planned mentoring relationship is less intense, the encounters less frequent and less sustained over time, and the results more limited. In models for planned mentoring (if not always in the relationships themselves), the conflicts and power struggles of natural mentoring are rationalized into a benign series of stages in the relationship.

Because we are most interested here in planned mentoring, it is useful to consider how the transmission and reception of the mentoring messages differ in natural and planned mentoring relationships. In natural mentoring, the exchange is more casual and random, and the mentee can be somewhat passive, picking up on behavioral as well as verbal cues as they are communicated directly or as the mentor is observed in action. In planned mentoring, the message becomes more formal and structured; it is delivered under preset and scheduled conditions in

designated settings, and is at times more verbal than behavioral—a lesson to be learned rather than cues to follow. In natural mentoring the messages are more varied, concerned with a wider range of personal and social life than simply with receiving a piece of information or learning a specific task; this makes for greater receptivity, although inevitably also greater ambivalence and conflict on the part of the mentee. In planned mentoring, the content of the message is more homogeneous and neutral, and thus can sometimes be accepted or rejected more easily without conflict or confusion, but it is possibly also less compelling.

What we know about natural mentoring has been used to justify planned mentoring. Throughout the argument of this paper we will consider whether it is logical and appropriate to do so, or whether planned mentoring for tenacious and disadvantaged youth must have a different character.

Mentoring Functions

A mentor has been likened to a coach, sponsor, guide, advocate, and role model; a mentee to a novice, apprentice, student, disciple, or learner. However we view mentoring, it is clearly defined more by the functions it serves and the character of the relationship than by the personality of the mentor or mentee. At its simplest, mentors support, guide, and shape young adults as they go through difficult periods, enter new arenas, or undertake important tasks. In any mentoring relationship, young mentees initially experience themselves as novices to more expert and more authoritative adults. The outcome for mentees is a greater capacity for autonomy and individual action. For mentors, there is a sense of generativity, of creating anew what has come before, and of validating what they represent.

According to popular belief, a mentor plays many roles which are overlapping and apparently indistinguishable as they blend into each other. Yet, for our purposes, these roles can be analytically distinguished in a useful manner into *instrumental mentoring* and *psychosocial mentoring*.[1]

Instrumental mentoring has a direct and observable consequence for the mentee's educational progress, career, or social life. In this role, mentors are sponsors, patrons, hosts, or advocates who provide opportunities to a person lacking them. Mentors first open doors to new worlds (schools and jobs, for example) that

[1] The following discussion of mentoring roles draws on the analysis of Kram (1985), who makes a distinction between psychosocial and career mentoring.

might otherwise be closed to the mentee because of youth, inexperience, prejudice, or low social status; then, as sponsors, mentors monitor the progress of the young person and try to remove any barriers to progress, advancement, or success. This kind of mentor has social resources or know-how at his or her disposal and particular influence and access to social or organizational networks.

Such sponsorship or advocacy helps mentees negotiate a particular life path or overcome personal, social, or institutional barriers. Mentors create public support, either through garnering it openly from others, or, less directly, by simply allowing the mentee to associate with someone powerful or knowledgeable. Instrumental mentoring also exposes the young person to new relationships and opportunities, and thus has a socializing dimension. It also can be protective; it can shield the mentee from damaging experiences. Acting as an advocate, such mentors intervene in situations that a mentee cannot handle; they reduce unnecessary risks, and they generally stand in for the mentee when necessary.

Mentors also act instrumentally in their roles of teacher, advisor, or coach. Here, mentors provide skills, relationships, or settings in which their mentees can become more competent. This is neither education nor schooling in its proper sense, but something closer to the utilitarian aspects of training, although it can be central to the development or well-being of the learner. As coaches, mentors enhance the mentees' knowledge and understanding of how to navigate or negotiate particular situations, problems, or settings. Acting as advisors, they offer suggestions for problem-solving, for accomplishing objectives, for making decisions, and for achieving aspirations. This advice can be based on the mentors' direct experience, on concrete and specific information, or on contact with others who can explain the formal and informal ways things work.

Just as the goal of instrumental mentoring is to change the social circumstances of the mentee, the conscious and unconscious purpose of *psychosocial mentoring* is to change the mentee personally. In instrumental mentoring mentors help the mentees negotiate the environment (and sometimes intervenes as well), and thus the rewards and outcomes of the mentoring are extrinsic; in psychosocial mentoring there is a dynamic change in the mentees' sense of self—which ultimately also affects how they will act socially. Here mentors act as role models or examples, confirmors, counselors, and sources of support. As a role model, who is perceived as worthy of identification or imitation, mentors give mentees an opportunity to evaluate their attitudes, values, behavior, or beliefs. Mentees imagine doing the

same things as their mentors do. Role modeling succeeds because of the conscious and unconscious emotional attachment of the younger to the older person and the quality of the interpersonal relationship.

In addition to the potential for role modeling, mentors support, accept, and confirm the younger person's acts, thoughts, and feelings. Thus, the younger person derives a stronger sense of self, which allows experimentation with new behaviors. Such mentoring also allows for conflict, tolerates differences, and most important, results in the younger person's eventual differentiation from the mentor. Because friendship, rather than familial ties, connect the older and younger person, the older person does not seem either as close or distant, or as judgmental, as a parent might be.

Psychosocial mentoring also includes counseling. Often a mentor must explain to the mentee how personal concerns interfere with education, work, or a sense of the self. But, because of the mentee's trust and emotional attachment, these anxieties, fears, and ambivalences can be legitimately discussed with the mentor, and, optimally, overcome with his or her guidance.

In its most inclusive and exhaustive function, mentoring fosters "the realization of the dream." Through the relationship with adult companions who are the masters of the words, symbols, and images of a creative and socially useful life, mentees come to believe in their own potential for such a life. Mentors come to represent the larger realms of life: education to the young person who wants to become educated, work to the young person who wants to work (Winstone, 1986). Such mentoring gives meaning to the young person's life; it "fosters the young adult's development by believing in him, sharing the youthful dream and giving it his blessing, helping him to define the newly emerging self in the newly discovered world, and creating a space in which the young man can work out a reasonably satisfactory life structure that contains the Dream" (Levinson, 1976, pp. 88-89).

It is important to realize that, although mentors perform many of the functions of a parent or friend, they are likely to be neither of them. If we are to understand its role, mentoring should be distinguished from both child rearing and friendship. Mentors perform parent-like functions for the youth but are not parents; mentees need to feel that the relationship is somewhat temporary and that it will soon result in independence and autonomy—that they will be able to do alone what their mentors have been doing. If mentors provide an example or role model, mentees

can accept it with less conflict than would be the case with a parent; mentees are thus freer to identify with mentors and to fantasize about emulating them. Most mentors also have more social resources than friends or peers are likely to possess. Moreover, their greater age and status reduces the envy and competition that might exist between peers and friends with very different resources.

Psychosocial Identification in the Mentoring Process

Mentoring, as most people knew it, can be explained as a process of social and psychological identification: mentees pattern their thoughts, feelings, or actions after another person who serves as a model. Mentoring may also foster identification with a group by providing opportunities for the mentee to learn socially relevant competencies, beliefs, and values of that group, to which the mentor belongs.

Whenever mentees are able to attach themselves to mentors, identification with such a role model becomes an important aspect of both instrumental and psychosocial mentoring.[2] In identification, young learners adopt the mentors' or models' patterns of behavior; the matched behavior is then maintained by internal reward or intrinsic reinforcement. The role model is internalized as part of the self, and the person is altered. This is different from imitation, in which a learner reproduces a role model's responses to a particular situation for instrumental reasons, which are supported by external rewards, but, internally, they remain the same.

In a mentoring relationship, a variety of motivating conditions determine which features of the role model will be emulated. First, the frequency and intimacy of the social interaction can affect how much the learner will identify with the mentor. The image of the model, however, can be retained and symbolized even without direct interaction if the desired behavior is highly utilitarian and the model is considered an expert or someone to emulate. This is especially so when the learner thinks that the model's situation applies to him or her as well. The model's way of dealing with the outcome of behavior also has a considerable influence on the regulating behavior of the learner. In addition, the status and prestige of the model influences whether the learner will emulate or match the behavior, although there is a point beyond which a mentor's status and prestige may seem too high to be salient to a mentee's goals, and so less modeling, if any, will take place. Identification with the role model is also often transferrable to others who share characteristics with the model in similar areas of behavior.

---

[2] This discussion of the psychosocial process of identification is based on Bandura (1969).

Finally, role models can be not only adults with whom the person has direct contact, but also peers, public figures, and even media celebrities. As a matter of fact, one can have multiple identifications through direct and vicarious experiences with a variety of actual or symbolic role models.

Not all learning situations need to be explained exclusively as occurring through identification or role modeling. As with most learning, we can account for the learning in mentoring situations by other models as well; for example, accumulation, personality, and cognitive development theories of social learning may help to account for many learning situations (Hess & Torney, 1967).

An *accumulation* model of learning predicates that the learner lacks information, and that all that is required is that he or she receive it. Here, the information is considered neutral. The learner's cognitive equipment, emotional orientation, and attitudes and beliefs are not considered relevant in such learning, and so do not interfere with the teaching. A *personality* model accounts for the role that an individual's previous interpersonal experiences and gratifications play in the learning process. These continuities in how individuals behave over time are independent of a specific setting or the events in which a learner is embedded at the moment. The learner comes to each new experience with presuppositions, identifications, and personality orientations. In a *cognitive developmental* model, the individual characteristic affecting learning is not personality, but the place of the learner is his or her life span. This is usually operationalized as age or developmental stage—child, adolescent, young adult, and so forth. If an individual is cognitively and psychosocially prepared for a particular kind of learning, he or she will be able to master the tasks and conflicts specific to that particular stage of development.

While theoretically distinct, these three types of learning are not unrelated in practice. Content cannot be well-learned and may not accumulate if the learning is not stage-appropriate and/or the learner is not well-motivated. Take, for example, information about the qualifications for entering jobs in the communication industry presented to minority adolescent girls who already have shown an interest in this work and an aptitude for doing it. By contrast, this knowledge will not be absorbed if the girls do not view themselves as potential workers, if the possibility of achievement on-the-job threatens their peer affiliations, or if they are skeptical that a minority female can succeed in the worlds of computers and the media. In any of

these cases, knowledge of how to enter the communications industry would have little value, no matter how clearly presented.

Mentoring programs that assume one learning theory to the exclusion of others may have difficulties. The basis for effective instrumental mentoring cannot be only the accumulation of knowledge; the context of the information and the mentor's activities must be salient to the personality and development of the learner. Similarly, although psychosocial mentoring seems to depend on the mentee's personality or developmental stage, it is not content free. As the mentee is being helped to develop, he or she also accumulates knowledge about the adult world.

According to Erik Erikson (1963, 1980), the transition to young adulthood requires that adolescents convert their childhood knowledge of the "world of skills and tools" into a social prototype by which to view themselves and to determine how they appear to others and fit into the world. To do so they need to individuate, to become more autonomous, and to commit themselves to work and study that is distinctly their own but fits into the social world they inherit. They must form an ego identity continuous with their past but rooted in the present and holding the promise for a "life career" in the future. One danger of this formative stage is role confusion, if the adolescent is unable to establish an individual identity and overidentifies with others (peers, cliques, social stereotypes, and so forth). Another danger is that, out of self-protection and to ward off apparently threatening, unknown, or undesirable influences, adolescents will distance or isolate themselves, and refuse to develop and adult ego identity. To make a successful transition to adulthood, young adults need to commit themselves to a "life career" in the form of concrete affiliations and partnerships with others—personally, on the job, in school, and in other social settings.

Because Erikson's model shows how the identifications and personality of adolescents powerfully combine with their cognitive states, it can explain their development at particular stages. Within mentoring programs it can be used to frame particular goals based on a dynamic combination of different models for learning. Mentoring under these conditions can be an agent for the formation of the youth's ego identity.

Mentoring as a Social Intervention

One of three prevailing views of society and its institutions are implicit in all mentoring, whether natural or planned, and whether the mentoring is for adults or youth.

In one view, society is *open*, and access to institutions is unrestricted at all levels and in all spheres. Open societies are viewed as benign and assumed to be fertile arenas for individual development; barriers to individual growth reside in individuals, or, in some instances, the institutions, but not in the society. If individuals do not succeed, they are seen as lacking a particular know-how, as deficient constitutionally, or as coming from homes and communities not able to socialize them to the particular community or institution they are entering. The obvious locus of intervention for those who view society as open is the individual. Mentoring programs for youth, with interventions to "enrich" their development or remedy their deficiencies, implicitly accept this view of the open society. Such programs provide psychosocial mentoring along with direct content teaching as a way of resocializing the youth.

A second view postulates society as *blocked* or stratified by divisions that are difficult or impossible to cross. Here society is characterized by inequities and an uneven distribution of resources in every institution. This view most often prompts laws prohibiting discrimination, and affirmative action programs. Such efforts either deal with the problems of equity directly, by unblocking the institutions of society—opening up opportunity structures by networking, changing stratified systems, and so forth—or indirectly, by making resources available to individuals and providing them with better skills for dealing with stratified systems. Instrumental mentoring can be an effort to open access to resources to individuals who have been denied them in a blocked society, and some planned mentoring programs for both adults and youth have had an affirmative action goal.

A third view is that society is *organic*, growing, or evolving. Within the constraints embedded in any setting, individuals, as long as they have certain skills and meet particular prerequisites, can get as far ahead as their capabilities allow. In an organic view of society, an individual's failure to develop would result from a bad fit between the individual and the social placement, not from a failure of the individual, as in open societies, or from society, as in blocked societies. While there are haves and have-nots in such a system, resources can be distributed on the basis of the individual's performance, rather than on the basis of irrelevant status

characteristics (gender or race, for example). In fact, societal growth is linked to, and dependent upon, individual growth and development. Society cannot block this development without suffering, and it cannot afford to be indifferent to personal development or act benignly toward discrimination.

This view of society as organic prevails in programs that provide for individual mentoring with an eye to institutional change or growth. It also produces a concern for the fit of the individual mentee's resources to the social environment; a common effort is to find the best (most fertile) arena for that individual's unique combination of skills and resources. In this apparently benign view there is still the possibility of conflict as different individuals compete for placement, but the conflict is inevitable and can be fair. Mentoring in this view provides content learning and a concern for skills, behaviors, and values *in combination with* social and networking interventions: a combination of instrumental and psychosocial interventions.

CHAPTER II: MENTORING IN ORGANIZATIONS

In the previous chapter we provided some theoretical constructs for understanding the social and psychological dynamics of mentoring. Before examining particular programs targeted for tenacious and other youth, we pause here to discuss issues raised by more general programs for mentoring in business organizations and for professional development. We do this because the literature on such mentoring has defined the terms of the discussion about planned mentoring in youth programs, and because both strengths and weaknesses of organizational mentoring have been carried into programs for youth.

Traditionally mentoring in organizations has occurred naturally, but in recent years, because of its perceived value, it is also being arranged and institutionalized. With few exceptions, the studies of mentoring in both businesses and the professions are strongly biased in favor of it, at times recommending it beyond what the data about its success would seem to warrant. The early, much mentioned article in the *Harvard Business Review*, "Everyone Who Makes It Has a Mentor" (Collins & Scott, 1978), was a clarion call for mentoring in organizations that has also been heard in many other institutions—schools, colleges, prisons, and community organizations. In fact, the popularity of arranged mentoring over the last decade has created a bandwagon effect, making it more difficult for those who are looking for ways to plan developmental or social interventions to understand what mentoring really is and might provide. Yet, despite weaknesses, the organizational literature raises questions that are important in conceptualizing mentoring, even when the populations served are different from those in organizations and the professions.

First, another caveat based on some problems with the research. Most studies of mentoring in organizations, even those which contain evaluations, leave important questions uninvestigated and suffer from methodological problems (Bowen, 1986; Merriam, 1983). Mentoring is usually not defined in these studies, so one cannot be sure what is being measured or offered as an ingredient for personal success. It is also likely that some, or all, of the qualities imputed to arranged mentoring relationships also take place naturally with supervisors, counselors, or others, although no research has been carried out comparing these different kinds of relationships with mentoring.

Also, most published research reports are based on surveys of "successful" business people and professionals about their earlier experiences as mentees. That

is, the accounts are retrospective, and generally do not control for the risk of reshaping by time. For example, people are told to recall mentors and evaluate their importance, which in itself tends to prompt helpful subjects to have memories of what they hope might be called mentoring, and to emphasize the positive aspects of these relationships. Merriam (1983) notes that no research has included in its survey questions about drawbacks and dangers of the mentoring relationship. Very significantly, only a small body of research compares the mentees' views of the relationship with those of the mentors'. In fact, few studies focus at all on the mentor's perspective. Finally, because the populations studied are mostly white middle-class men, some of the findings may be questionable when translated to other populations. We will deal with this last issue in more detail both in the section on diversity below and in the next chapter on the mentoring of tenacious and other disadvantaged youth, including those from minority adolescent populations.

Natural Mentoring

Natural mentoring is currently the ideal mode of assistance and support for the novice in the professions or in organizations. Most studies of mentoring in a business or an academic context imply an open view of society; they are based on individual recollections by one or both individuals about a mentoring relationship that arose spontaneously between them (Kaufman, 1985). The argument of the studies is simple: those who advance most in their careers have been improved by their mentors (see, for example, Levinson, 1976; Roche, 1979). Having a mentor is also associated with greater job satisfaction, better performance, higher levels of education, faster promotion, stricter adherence to career plans, and even the likelihood of becoming a mentor (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Watkins, Giles, & Endsleg, 1987). One study suggests that women who have mentors can equalize their salaries with those of men (Kaufmann, Harrel, Milan, Woolverton & Miller, 1986). The open society reasons given for the greater career success of mentored individuals are that mentoring relationships helped them to increase self-confidence and to learn both the technical and normative aspects of the job. Other more closed views of society credit success to gaining better access to networks, power, and influence (Krupp, 1987).

Not only mentees gain from the relationship: the mentors themselves are said to grow emotionally, and to find new satisfaction when their own careers may have reached a plateau (Krupp, 1987). Thus, instrumental mentoring can result in the psychosocial development of mentors.

From the corporate side, mentoring is supposed to improve morale, ensure a sense of shared values, improve the humaneness of the organization, and bring about a new generation of executives and other personnel who both are committed to the goals and style of the organization and bring it their independent creativity (Krupp, 1987; Gray, 1988). The mentoring here which has brought about growth for the mentor, mentee, and the organizations can be said to arise out of an organic view of society.

We should also note, however, that while the negative consequences of mentoring to an individual are explored briefly in the literature (Merriam, 1983; Watkins, et al., 1987), the role of mentoring in organizational crime and sabotage is never acknowledged, let alone studied. Further, "natural" mentoring never seems to include behavior that is not good for the organization, such as a mentor telling an employee how to selfishly get ahead or a mentor warning a mentee about the organization, or a behavior that is not good for individuals, such as a mentor leading a mentee into a career path where he or she is not entirely happy.

Mentor/Mentee Characteristics. Two questions are commonly addressed in the organizational literature: (1) to be successful in their roles, do mentors and mentees have to have particular definable characteristics?; and, (2) do such characteristics have to be matched? A common answer to the first question is that mentors need a secure position within the organization; inside knowledge; good coaching skills (which include skills in observation, analysis, interviewing, and feedback); and such personal qualities as trust, empathy, suspension of judgment, and generosity. Mentees have been said to need ambition, trust, ability, and the desire for help (Frey & Woller, 1983; Orth, Wilkinson, & Benfari, 1987; Willie, 1987).

Yet the evidence is mixed about whether personality is a factor in a successful mentoring relationship, and therefore whether mentors and mentees must be matched for personality or other traits. Although natural mentees are said to see themselves as similar to their mentors (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike, & Newman, 1984), this is probably a case of people thinking they are like those whom they admire. There is no evidence that natural mentors and mentees are more alike in personality characteristics than non-mentoring pairs (Alleman et al., 1984). Mentors apparently say that they look for mentees with a great potential for success, rather than for one who resembles them (Alleman et al., 1984). However, since mentors see themselves as successful, they are apt to perceive their "high potential" mentee as more like themselves than different. In addition, mentors' perceptions that mentees accept

their values, at the same time as they are neither too conforming or too deviant, may be more important to them than any interpersonal dynamic (Clawson & Blank, 1987). Finally, whatever the factors that make two people believe they can work together, they may be important only in the beginning stages of a relationship, and decrease in significance over time (Bowen, 1986).

Nevertheless, perceived personal differences appear to negatively affect the mentoring of women and minorities—as will be discussed in greater detail below. Most mentors, both in academic and corporate settings, are white males, and they seek out white male mentees more readily than minorities or females (Cooper, 1985; Papa-Lewis, 1987). One reason for this may be that corporate mentors tend to choose mentees who physically fit the image of the present holders of high level positions. Corporate mentors are also said to prefer mentees whom they see as predictable (people whose actions they feel sure will fall within a certain range). People different from them—women and minorities—tend to get lower scores on both fit and predictability (Cooper, 1985; Mertz, Welch, & Henderson, 1988). In public school settings, where both mentors and mentees are more likely to be female, same-sex mentoring is still the most common type (Krupp, 1987). An exception, largely based on necessity, is that when college men major in female-dominated subjects, they do appear to use female professors as mentors (cited in Farylo, Bohdan, & Paludi, 1985).

Age is another personal characteristic that may influence the mentoring relationship. In corporate and professional settings natural mentor-mentee relationships happen most frequently when mentors are over age 40 and mentees are in their 20s and 30s (Levinson, 1976; Papa-Lewis, 1987). Levinson (1976) also suggests that a mentor is usually older than his or her mentee by half a generation, roughly 8-15 years. In these circumstances, women who take time out from their careers may find it particularly difficult to be mentored by an appropriately older male of higher rank. More important than age, though, may be the developmental stage of both mentor and mentee. Young adults launching a career and people changing careers in midlife require different kinds of mentors and stimulate different kinds of relationships (Kram, 1985).

Stages of the Relationship. Organizational research on natural mentoring suggests that the relationship begins when the mentor recognizes a talented mentee, because he or she has performed some important and visible task. Moore (1982) describes three mentoring stages in the grooming of faculty for administrative

positions in the university. She suggests that an initial moment of "recognition" is followed by additional "tests" that may either be constructed by the mentor, or may arise naturally, and finally by the actual "mentor-mentee relationship," in which the two work closely together. More formally, the stages in both corporate and academic environments have been described as: 1) introduction; 2) initiation or mutual trust building; 3) cultivation, which includes the teaching of risk taking, the communication of professional skills, and the transfer of professional standards; 4) dissolution or separation; and 5) redefinition or lasting friendship (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Kram, 1985; Hunt & Michael, 1983; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1986).

Organizational studies of natural mentoring often also maintain that bitterness and disappointment is a common part of the last stage. Here, mentees may feel stifled by their mentors, or may discover differences between them which they had not previously taken seriously. In the best circumstances, however, this bitterness is overcome, and the relationship is redefined (Kram, 1985).

Critiques of Natural Mentoring. Although the literature on natural mentoring supports its value in organizations, there may be a dark side as well. Most important, because mentors are always a scarce resource, many individuals end up without mentors and so are cut off from an obvious route to success (Watkins, Giles & Endsleg, 1987). This scarcity of mentors also intensifies competition, and leads to envy and other bad feelings among those who are not mentored. In addition, because mentors tend to choose individuals who promise to uphold the company image, mentoring has been criticized as elitist, tending to leave out men of different social class and education, white and minority women, and minority men.

Among those who do become mentees, some may feel (or, in fact, be) held back by mentors, and mentors can be threatened by gifted mentees (Watkins, et al., 1987). Roskin (1988, p. 29) suggests that mentoring can choke out creativity by leading to inbreeding and nepotism and that it can produce a "cloning" in "correct beliefs and values." He also notes that those who teach mentoring in graduate business schools promote or "address themes thought, only a few years ago, to be blatantly manipulative and of questionable ethical standards." As an antidote, he suggests that mentors use as their operating manual St. Augustine's precept, "Love God and do what you like"—that is, that they help get the organization in the mentees' blood, but leave them the freedom for responsibility and self-determination.

Finally, mentoring can undermine the efforts of junior workers to form their own supportive networks and find resources other than their mentors (Kaufman, 1985).

Natural Mentoring and Diversity

Contrary to the recent rhetoric that mentoring opens up closed social structures, historically mentoring has been a relationship between two white men. In fact, the organizational literature on mentoring minorities is extremely scarce; it is currently limited to a few articles on blacks, with nothing on Hispanics or Asians. How mentoring would differ psychologically and socially for different groups has thus never really been considered. A newly-emerging body of literature on mentoring and gender, however, throws some light on how mentoring might need to be transformed if programs recognized the different requirements of their clients.

Men tend to mentor men even when they say that the gender of a potential mentor or mentee is unimportant (Farylo & Paludi, 1985). A number of reasons have been suggested for why this is so in corporate and professional environments: the general preference for same-sex relations in the workplace; women's tendency to have relations with people of the same status, rather than with people in power; the visibility of token women in an organization so that failure would make for more publicity, and place a mentor at greater risk; and the tendency of men in power to see women as lacking the traits of leadership, aggressiveness, competition and ambition believed to be obvious mentee characteristics (Noe, 1988).

When men do mentor women, some suggest that their behavior is the same as with men (Alleman, et al., 1984). (Two of these same authors, in one of the few studies of cross-race mentoring in organizations, also found no reported differences in behavior between whites mentoring blacks and whites mentoring whites [Alleman, Newman, Huggins, & Carr, 1987].) However, an opposing view, as well as common sense, suggests that differences do occur when white men mentor either white women or black men or women. Papa-Lewis (1987), for example, found that white male mentors restrict mentoring behaviors toward female mentees. Noe (1988) reports that they are afraid of sexual involvement, or of being seen as having a sexual involvement, even if there isn't one. Brooks and Haring-Hidore (1987) also suggest that more women than men experience problems in mentoring relationships. Possibly this is because women may be more sensitive to interpersonal problems than men, or more likely to acknowledge and express them (Brooks & Haring-Hidore, 1987). Harrington (1987) found blacks were almost always mentored only by blacks, and that whites never reported a significant

mentoring relationship with a black superior. This means that successful black males rarely mentioned their bosses (inevitably white) as influential to their careers.

Given the unlikelihood of both cross-gender and cross-race mentoring, an obvious solution might be to have blacks mentor blacks and women mentor women. However, research suggests that when women are tokens, they resist being identified as "women" through taking on other women as mentees. (Informal information on blacks, Hispanics, and Asians when they are tokens in organizations corroborates this phenomenon.) In fact, we know that women in leadership positions are more likely to mentor women as the percentage of women in the organization increases. Thus, one needs a significant number of women in an organization before one can successfully ask women to mentor each other (Noe, 1988).

There is also the question of whether women, or blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, gain more when they are mentored by someone of the same gender or race. Research on role models suggests that women are apparently more likely than men to use a woman as a role model, although they are as likely as men to choose a man (Basoe & Glasser Howe, 1980). Yet, as Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1987) point out, women today may also resist using older women as role models. They suggest that this is so because women who "made it" a generation earlier may have done so under circumstances "significantly different from those facing women now entering the professions," and their strategies and compromises are no longer relevant (p. 53). Instead, Shapiro et al. suggest that women should think in terms of partial, multiple, role models, including models who are men. In a similar vein, Kram and Isabella (1985) point out that having a number of peer relationships may be a less complicated, and more useful, solution than mentoring for women today.

What do women, blacks, Hispanics, or Asians actually want, or need, from mentors? We have no information for blacks, Hispanics, or Asians, and for women the literature is contradictory. Some suggest that women want encouragement and praise—that is, psychosocial mentoring—in contrast to men, who want career, business, and professional expertise from their mentors—that is, instrumental mentoring (Torrance, 1983). On the other hand, women can be more affected by mentors in career choices than men (Burke, 1984). When women enter previously all-male technical jobs, they worry about doing the job well; by contrast, men focus on securing the ties they know will help them advance. If this is so, a mentor might provide protection and networking in the workplace for women preoccupied with their performance (Nieva & Gutek, 1981). Paven (1987) suggests that women

may need different types of mentoring at different points in their career: more instrumental mentoring in the early stages, and more psychosocial mentoring later on.

Mentoring within and across race and gender boundaries raises problems usually ignored in natural and planned mentoring. Although both race and gender may be too static as categories to convey the range of personalities and needs of the individuals in any group, it is clear that insofar as racism and sexism exist, they affect all relationships, including those of mentoring. Moreover, as will become clearer in Chapter III, there are differences in culture, personal backgrounds, learning styles, expectations, ways of expressing ambition, and so on, that determine whether mentoring is salient and fits the needs of particular individuals and groups.

Planned Mentoring

Planned, or formal, mentor programs were initially begun in a wide range of organizations in response to the perceived success of natural mentoring, and out of widely differing social views. Some, viewing society as blocked, saw such planned programs as helping corporations meet social agendas, such as affirmative action mandates (Zey, 1985); others, viewing society as open, simply wished to enhance the skills of rising professionals or compensate for any deficiencies; still others, from an organic view of society saw mentoring as a mechanism for bettering the fit of new employees to the style and methods of the organization.

While in natural informal mentoring the relationship between mentor and mentee arises spontaneously, largely by a mentor spotting a talented mentee, the coupling of mentor and mentee in a planned mentoring program is done through a selection process. No studies exist to pinpoint successful and unsuccessful pairing in planned mentoring. However, Gray (1988) draws on studies of natural mentoring to suggest selection criteria for formal mentoring programs: the mentors should be people-oriented, confident, secure, flexible, trusting, and sensitive to mentees' needs; the mentees should be receptive to the program and take responsibility for learning what the mentor has to offer; as a pair, the two should have already worked in close proximity so that they can readily get along together. Zey (1985) also suggests that, despite the cumbersomeness of a long protracted process, it may be advantageous to give participants as much control as possible in selecting each other.

Not surprisingly, to deal with the uncertainty about mentor and mentee characteristics, training looms very large in efforts to institutionalize mentoring: the

argument goes that mentoring is a behavior and behavior can be taught to both parties. In an international study of formal mentoring in 67 companies, Gray (1988) ranks training as the most important component in planned mentoring. This training enables *both* mentors and mentees to understand their roles and to communicate their expectations to each other, theoretically narrowing the gap between them and improving the salience of the connection. Training is also said to help both parties act in ways appropriate to the stage of the relationship, and thus prevent the power struggles, misunderstandings, and bitterness that can be part of natural mentoring. Training for mentoring can also include helping the mentor in peer observation and coaching, in group process skills, and in offering support (Far West Laboratory, 1986).

Most formal mentoring programs have explicit program goals, criteria for participation, and methods for mentee and mentor interaction (Phillips-Jones, 1983; Zey, 1985). A minimum frequency of interaction and the length of the program is also generally stipulated. It us argued that contacts should be "fairly frequent," at least twice a month, and that the intervention should occur in six-month cycles, to be reviewed after each cycle or phase has been completed, and renewed if successful (Zey, 1985). The advocates of formal mentoring are also optimistic that it can be formalized and structured into stages that eliminate the waywardness and complex psychodynamics of natural mentoring. Ironically, under these conditions, the idiosyncratic character and the natural closeness of a pair working together in natural mentoring, some of its strengths, are thus eliminated. Equally important, we have no data about whether the stages described in the literature bear any relationship even to the path of formalized mentoring relationships.

Monitoring and evaluation are central to all planned mentoring models, partly "to convince decision makers to keep, expand, or drop the mentoring program." (Phillips-Jones, 1983, p.42). Monitoring is accomplished through brief meetings with mentors and/or mentees, through telephone calls, and through short written testimonials by the participants. Finally, evaluations (which can be based partly on the information gathered during the monitoring) are used to debrief participants and to provide suggestions for changes and improvements for the next group.

Phillips-Jones (1983) reports that a review of several mentoring programs revealed ten features critical for success:

1) support by top management,
2) integration into a larger career development or management training effort,

3) voluntary participation,
4) short program,
5) careful selection of mentors and mentees,
6) orientation for mentors and mentees,
7) "structured flexibility" to allow mentors to use their own style,
8) preparation of mentees,
9) delineation of roles to prevent problems, and
10) careful monitoring of the program.

The list is hard to unpack—for example, is "careful selection" the same as Gray's "what to look for in a mentor"—but these features all suggest a high ownership of the program by the organization, the mentors, and the mentees, and also a degree of control by all three parties over the mentoring process. The relationship takes its own form, but within a program structure with built-in safeguards that do not endanger its overt success. Very significantly, it is carried out within larger training or career development efforts.

Critiques of Planned Mentoring. A number of serious questions about the possibilities for successful planned mentoring have been raised (Kram, 1985; Hunt & Michael, 1983). Their focus is on the possibility of engineering what under normal circumstances evolves idiosyncratically, through mutual attraction, salience, and chemistry. Questions like:

- Can a formal system create selection and screening criteria which are able not only to create good interpersonal matches, but are sensitive to finding only those people who are at an appropriate point in their personal and career lives to engage in an effective mentoring relationship?
- How can mentors and mentees pair up without that long preparatory stage in which they informally get acquainted?
- Can an organization realistically give two virtual strangers six months or even two years to develop a mentor-like relationship?
- Can a formal system that is endorsed by an organization's management can ever feel completely voluntary?

Out of the numerous criticisms of planned mentoring, several authors have suggested that it might be more effective if alternative organizational policies were created to promote spontaneous mentoring (Alleman et al., 1984; Kram, 1985). Such policies would include removing organizational obstacles to natural mentoring through: 1) creating a reward system that emphasizes human resource development; 2) instituting work designs that encourage interaction between individuals; and 3)

evolving an organizational culture, including the behavior of its leaders, that makes mentoring seem essential.

Critiques of mentoring in the organizational literature have also led to suggestions for alternatives to mentoring itself. It has been argued that for individual reasons some people may not react well to having, or being, a mentor; in addition, one-on-one mentoring may not be the most, or only, efficient way of gaining the emotional support, information, and access to networks that mentors are said to give. For Kram (1985), the weak or looser ties of networks offer an individual a number of benefits not available through the strong ties of mentoring. Having a mentor, for example, usually offers access to a group of people who are all interconnected by shared ties, but creating a number of weak ties with people who don't necessarily know each other offers several other advantages, particularly for those who are seeking to move out of their small world. One develops an extended network, which becomes a channel for new ideas and new influences, and very important, provides new resources for mobility. Finally, from a larger social perspective, weak ties are the foundations of social cohesion, since they are the relationships that connect otherwise different social worlds (Granovetter, 1973). And as Kram (1985) suggests, most people are more likely to develop a variety of relationships that provide some mentoring functions, rather than try to meet all their developmental needs through one relationship.

Peer relationships are another alternative to mentoring. Kram and Isabella (1985) compare both the career-enhancing and the psychosocial functions of mentoring and peer relations. As their findings on the chart below indicates, many of the goals of mentoring are achieved by a slightly different route in peer relationships:

MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS	PEER RELATIONSHIPS
Career-enhancing functions	**Career-enhancing functions**
• sponsorship • coaching • exposure and visibility • protection • challenging work assignment	• information sharing • career strategizing • job-related feedback
Psychosocial functions	**Psychosocial functions**
• acceptance and confirmation • counseling • role modeling • friendship	• confirmation • emotional support • personal feedback • friendship
Special Attribute	**Special Attribute**
• complementarity	• mutuality

Source: *Developmental Functions—Comparison of Mentoring and Peer Relationships* (Kram & Isabella, 1988, p. 117).

Finally, it has been suggested that, for some individuals, the bonding in both mentoring and peer relationships may not occur. These individuals may have had experiences in their childhood or more recent past which make the trust and respect necessary for both mentoring and peer relationships difficult or impossible; at best, peers and colleagues are used as information sources. More often, such people mentor themselves: they talk to relevant others, watch how they behave, read useful books, take classes, figure things out, and look for new experiences to test themselves (Darling, 1986). As Harrington (1987) points out, there are many paths to success, not one which all must follow.

Mentoring in Organizations: A Commentary

Organizations establish formal mentoring programs to artificially create the circumstances of natural mentoring. For the organization, this can lead to greater productivity and efficiency and the creation of a new generation of workers; for the individual, this provides an opportunity for self-enhancement. We are, however, left with several questions: Is mentoring always equitable? Can it be formalized? Are there viable alternatives to mentoring that can achieve the same ends?

Organizations are hierarchies which narrow opportunity as one reaches the top. Potential mentors who act as ladders up into increasingly restricted opportunity are scarce resources. Competition, which is part of most professional careers, is thus also inherent in the mentoring system. Not everyone by any means receives a mentor; certainly only a few go to the top. In traditionally structured organizations, these limited opportunities at the top are seized by educated white men. Even when a corporation or academic institution attempts to recast the gender and color of its high-ranking employees, women and minorities are generally token: a few are allowed on the ladder, and perhaps with the help of mentors, move upward.

As Nieva and Gutek (1981, pp.58-59) point out, tokenism offers greater advantages to the sponsor than to the few tokens: it creates a progressive and egalitarian image, while doing little to alter the discriminatory reward system which, by its very nature, "restricts the number of people from the nondominant group who will be allowed inclusion." (This may help to explain why women only appear in a few studies of mentoring, and why there is little research on mentoring minorities.) Moreover, although the cultural styles of women and minorities may not prevent them from performing in high status jobs, they may hinder these individuals from acting appropriately competitive or prevent them from being recognized as having "leadership" qualities. For example, Gilligan (1982) points out that some women's apparent reluctance to compete comes from a concern with relationships and responsibilities; thus they may be less able to compete for and use mentors as steps on a ladder.

The organizational literature in planned mentoring argues for establishing an ideal construction of mentor and mentee characteristics. Yet, in the end, we can say little with certainty about whether these characteristics exist or are important. The how-to-do-it literature on planned mentoring suggests that the mentor should ideally be generous, nonjudgmental, and caring; yet case studies and interviews of natural mentoring suggest that mentors actually may be far more diverse in their behavior—including some who use a "sink or swim" method of mentoring—than this idealization suggests. As one executive says of his mentee in the famous "Everyone Who Makes It..." article, "I'd let him make a mistake and he'd never make the same mistake twice'" (Collins & Scott, 1978). Similarly, despite some findings in the research pointing to similarity of personality as a ground for good matches, the argument is not very compelling. Again, the *Harvard Business Review* article seems salutary. Here is a former mentee speaking of his mentor: "'Although we were very different people, we got along fine'" (p. 90). Mentees may simply "get along"

better with their mentors when they are being useful to them. This argues that a kind of instrumental compatibility, rather than personality similarity, might be the glue that holds the relationship together.

Beyond interpersonal attractiveness or instrumental compatibility, similar demographic characteristics (race, gender, social class, cultural background) may affect the mentoring relationship. However, we know little about blacks, Hispanics, and Asians as either mentors or mentees, and not much more about women. The question about whether it is important for women and minorities to mentor each other is still unresolved; it likely obscures a more important question about the fit between mentor resources and mentee needs. Sometimes these resources belong to people of the same sex or race, sometimes not. Moreover, it is important to remember that in a heterogeneous society interracial and intercultural relations are themselves a value. In fact, if mentoring relationships resist such integration, then one might well argue that other methods of teaching/learning should be considered. However, we must also note that the style and content of a mentoring relationship may differ for minorities and women. For example, Fordham and Ogbu (1986) suggest that an important aspect of helping blacks succeed (they are talking about school success, but the point extends beyond that) is helping them cope with the "burden of acting white." And much might be said of the conflicts token woman might be helped with in an organization.

Planned mentoring programs are characterized by their reliance on training. Training cannot compensate for the lack of spontaneity of the connection but it makes sure that a mentor will exhibit certain appropriate behaviors. It also defines and regulates the activity between the mentor and mentee, and thus makes sure that certain objectives in mentoring will be met. The question here is whether we, in fact, know enough about mentoring behaviors, including their variation, to develop successful training. Though some training would appear to be common sense, what often seems equally the case is that mentoring behaviors are arbitrarily delimited, simply for the security of setting limits.

Of course, the very possibility of successful planned mentoring remains an open question. Though there is a growing literature on "how to do it," evaluations of planned mentoring programs for adults are thin, at best. Models of the stages in mentoring, show little resemblance to real mentoring relationships (Parham, 1982). Delineating stages is a heuristic device for describing complex realities; they can too easily be reified and given properties they really do not have. Most of all, they

interfere with the important task of discerning mentoring as a dynamic process with a variety of paths and functions.

Finally, mentoring may not be the only way to develop the potential of employees. A good professional development program, a good performance appraisal system, or an egalitarian culture with a benevolent reward system can achieve much that mentoring can. Here one eliminates the inequalities that stem from mentoring programs' lack of availability to some employees. It also may not always be in the best interest of employees to be mentored, since mentoring can marry them to an organization and limit their occupational mobility outwards. For some, finally, networks of relationships, not individual attachments, may be best, providing weak, but important, instrumental ties to many people.

CHAPTER III: PLANNED MENTORING FOR TENACIOUS AND OTHER YOUTH

We have reviewed the psychological and social underpinnings of mentoring, and have pointed to some of the main findings on natural and planned mentoring in organizations and the professions, where the literature is richest. Here, our analysis of mentoring is drawn from concerns raised by existing evaluations, research reports, promotional literature, and other information on planned mentoring for youth, particularly for those from disadvantaged backgrounds, but we also include material on mentoring for the gifted and talented, which includes youth of various backgrounds. Where relevant, the literature on professional adults is used highlight related concerns and issues.

Natural Mentoring of Tenacious and Other Disadvantaged Youth

It is common knowledge that Martin Luther King, Jr., acted as a mentor to some of our strongest black leaders today, Jesse Jackson, Julian Bond, and Andrew Young, among them. In fact, among successful individuals natural mentoring is no less common in disadvantaged than in advantaged groups. As with advantaged individuals, poor and minority people are generally mentored by others in their own organizations and communities. At times, mentoring of those from disadvantaged backgrounds appears to have a greater effect than for those from advantaged backgrounds, simply because there is greater possibility for mobility (Harrington, 1987).

Obviously, natural mentoring can also be asocial or anti-social in both poor inner-city and more advantaged communities. For every Jesse Jackson who finds a minister as his mentor, there are many other youth who latch onto drug dealers and petty criminals, using these older individuals as sponsors and guides as they make their way into an alternative, illegal world of power and prestige. Thus formal mentoring programs that provide students with "positive" mentors can also be working against students' more negative natural mentoring relationships. The effect of these countervailing influences deserves attention by program planners, as well as serious research.

Rationale and Goals for Planned Mentoring Programs

Formal mentoring programs for tenacious and other disadvantaged youth can be based on a view of society as either open, organic, or blocked—and at times

opposing views can be seen in a single program. Most programs assume that these youth need social assistance—to remediate or compensate for poor prior socialization, to provide needed "enrichment," or to prevent failure as they begin to assume adult roles. Although this compensatory strategy often seems from a view of the individual as the source of the problem, and society as open, it can also be used by those who see society as organic or blocked, and are using the social assistance to create closer fits between individual skills and societal openings, or as an appendage to affirmative action strategies. By contrast, there are also mentoring programs that are fully grounded in a view of society as blocked; they provide mentoring only as a means of breaking down social barriers and helping youth advance through educational, work, and social institutions that might otherwise be barred to them. Here, mentoring clearly operates as a form of affirmative action.

Mentoring is also a frequent component in large-scale programs with broadly-defined goals that may stem from a variety of social views: improving students' attitudes toward schooling, lowering high school dropout rates, increasing the college graduation rates of ethnic minority students, making students more knowledgeable about changes in the work world, and increasing the number of ethnic minority professionals in the larger society. All of these concerns are more likely to be felt by those who view society as blocked, but they may also contain an "open society" view that lays stress on the faults or deficits of the individual.

Problems with the Research on Mentoring Programs for Youth

Several weaknesses in the literature immediately become evident when attempting to analyze existing mentoring programs for youth. They make it difficult to draw conclusions with any assurance, and often require posing questions hypothetically, rather than based on real research data, or even on casual but full descriptions.

First, because mentoring has become a fashionable concept, there is a tendency to call a wide range of program initiatives "mentoring." Thus, grandmothers sharing childcare with teenage mothers, community women "hanging out" with pregnant teenagers, lawyers interacting with a class several times a semester, job supervisors talking about more than simply work assignments to their adolescent workers, college students discussing college prospects to high school students, and teachers expanding their concern for students are among the many interactions called mentoring. Though in all of these instances an older individual, other than a family member, is guiding and/or caring for the younger person, it is not at all clear that

all the relationships are sufficiently intense for any attachment or identification to take place. In fact, an indication of the uncertainty of program directors themselves about whether or not they are talking about mentoring can be glimpsed in the common use of mentoring combined with another term. Thus Project Redirection uses "community women/mentors" to indicate older women who form loose friendships with as many as 15 teenagers (Quint & Riccio, 1985). Rodriguez (1986) speaks of a "mentoring/counseling" program, which is really a proactive version of traditional counseling, in which the counselor initiates regular appointments. And the STEP program, which uses "advocates/mentors," sees the role of these individuals as maintaining a loose contact with 20-30 youth (Public/Private Ventures, n.d.). Because these relationships are of necessity diluted, it is unlikely that they can have the closeness of one-on-one mentoring. The question obviously becomes: should we be considering all of these activities as mentoring and, if not, what criteria should we use to call one relationship "mentoring" and another simply very useful "help"?

For the purposes of this research review, we include a wide range of what are now considered mentoring programs, at the same time as we strongly urge greater care in using the term. Mentoring does not preclude concrete and practical help, but it presupposes an interpersonal attachment. Most important, the relationship must be of sufficient intensity or magnitude that some identification can take place.

Second, mentoring is generally only one programmatic intervention among several, and this mix of mentoring with several other interventions—job placement and training, a special educational program, classroom tutoring, peer group support, psychological counseling, medical assistance, and so on--makes it difficult to evaluate the power of mentoring alone. Instead, even when the programs have been reviewed or evaluated in some way, the power of the mentoring component can rarely be isolated from that of the other components. More confusing still, schools generally operate a number of enrichment and compensatory education programs simultaneously, and students may easily be involved in other programs besides the one being studied. Thus improvements in test scores or grade point averages are extremely hard to attribute to any single intervention. Although a report on the city of Rochester's mentoring program makes the understandable mistake of attributing to it improvement in student attendance averages, higher scores on state competency tests, and larger numbers of Regents graduates ("Rochester", 1988), there is no evidence that the mentoring brought about this change. This is particularly so, since not all children were mentored, and other school improvement

actions may well have taken place that were more powerful to the mentored students.

Third, even when mentoring is the sole enrichment offered a group of students, as in Gray's (1984) research on mentoring for gifted students, or in Flaherty's (1985) study of a faculty mentoring program for students taking basic courses, the results are confused by events not within the control of the program. As Flaherty herself notes, students not in the program who were used as controls may have been mentored informally by other members of the school staff. Despite efforts to formalize mentoring relationships, some students in the experimental group may not have formed genuine relationships with their mentors, and so may not have benefited from the supposed intervention. And the intervention itself—the mentor's particular approach to mentoring various students—can never be uniform or entirely measurable.

Fourth, most planned programs for youth, even those for which we have some kind of evaluation, have generated only vague and partial descriptions. In collecting literature on mentoring programs for youth, we were able to find few studies that described all the program's components with sufficient clarity to be able to relate them to the program's success. One reason for the paucity of good descriptions and evaluations may be the low funding level of these programs—evaluations are often the last thing to spend money on. It is also possible, however, that the crest of good-will on which mentoring rides has created a tendency to assume that any useful relationship should be called mentoring, to believe that once the relationship is called mentoring it must be effective, and to belittle the importance of solid information that can be subjected to critical tests.

Finally, although mentoring is invariably assumed to be beneficial to all kinds of youth, its specific goals are not always clear, or easy to separate from the goals of the program in which it is embedded. Moreover, even when the program is simply mentoring and the goal is clear—increasing the number of minorities in college science programs, for example—it may be only indirectly related to the program evaluation. In the case of using mentors to increase minority enrollment in college science, high school students who spent the summer with science "mentors" were tested at the end of the program about their knowledge of the requirements for careers in science (Berger, Beard, Moore, & Van Vorhees, 1986). No longitudinal information was generated, however, about whether students' increased knowledge would translate into greater science enrollment once they entered college.

In another example, Rodriguez (1986) compared the effects on high risk students of an experimental mentoring/counseling program with those of traditional counseling. The experimental group tested significantly better than the controls on "academic and social integration" at the end of the program. However, by the next year there was no significant difference in school re-enrollment, the bottom line of success with high risk students.

Clearly, the broader the goal of the program, the more dependent the mentoring is on the other program features, as well as social forces outside the control of the program, and the more difficult it is to give mentoring an independent coherence, or to measure its impact. However, the goals of mentoring can also be more circumscribed: providing an enrichment activity to a gifted child, helping community college students make the transition to a four-year college, getting someone a summer job. The more circumscribed the program goal, the more likely the mentoring is independent and can be translated into observable behavior which can be evaluated for its impact.

Despite these research limitations, we review a number of components of mentoring programs below, both as a way of helping us establish some of the critical issues in program planning and evaluation, and as an introduction to the discussion of the power of mentoring for these youth in Chapter IV.

Recruitment

Mentors. Of necessity, recruitment is the first step in every planned mentoring program. Most mentoring programs that contain programmatic descriptions include information on the recruitment of mentors. Not surprisingly, this is done by both formal and informal mechanisms: flyers, posters, mailings, word-of-mouth, and so forth. One mentoring program for at-risk students in an alternative learning center on a college campus enlisted as mentors college students in a child study class (Silverstein, 1986). Another had an actual course with college credit for those who wanted to be mentors (Kwalick, Sanchirico, Collymore, & McNoir, 1988).

Sometimes incentives to participate are overt or covert aspects of the recruiting process: for example, on most sites Project Redirection's community women receive $15 a week per mentee, to be used for lunches, transportation, and entertainment; thus when a woman has five mentees, as is common, she earns $75 a week in spending money. As an indication of the importance of this incentive, on one site,

where cuts in funding made this impossible, women actually dropped out of the mentoring program (Branch, Riccio & Quint, 1984). Atlanta's Allies in Education Program uses corporate employees as mentors for students. Although participation is neither a job requirement nor necessary for job advancement, a report on the program states that "employees are often recognized for their service in company newsletters" (Snyder & Rosenblum, 1987, p.H-19). Obviously, this recognition facilitates recruitment of the next generation of mentors. To cite another example, the City University of New York/Board of Education's student mentor program uses college students as mentors: the students receive college credit for mentoring, take a related course throughout the 10-week mentoring period, and are graded, as their handbook states, not on the success of their relationship, but rather on their "commitment to making it work," as well as on their fulfillment of other program obligations (Kwalick, et al., 1988, p.6).

In fact, recruitment policies appear to tread a fine line between incentives that might base the choice to become a mentor on extrinsic considerations, and a situation where people volunteer to mentor only because they want to help. As the Project Redirection report notes, its community women are, paradoxically, "paid volunteers" (Branch, et al., 1984, p. 65). Although the general assumption is that mentoring, even in planned mentoring projects, is a voluntary activity, the possibility of raising one's achievement in a college course, being noticed by a company newsletter, or increasing one's weekly income, place some of the rewards outside of the mentoring relationship. These extrinsic rewards may help extend the mentor's patience during a difficult period, but they may also encourage "volunteers" who are less interested in mentoring and the individual mentee than in the extrinsic rewards. The mentees' feelings about their mentors' rewards have not been studied.

Mentees. Obviously, the recruitment of mentees is also at issue. Students become mentees because they are perceived as needing special enrichment or help in overcoming social barriers. Thus becoming a mentee is often part of receiving a larger-scale multiple intervention: students acquire a mentor in tandem with other program services. Although a number of program descriptions make clear that receiving a mentor should be voluntary, and include policies for the recruitment of students, few mention whether or how it is explained to students what mentors do, or indicate whether students are asked if they would like a mentor. Nor do program descriptions suggest a means of diagnosing in advance which students will do better with mentors than with, say, peer help or even working on their own.

Qualities of a Mentor and a Mentee

Clearly, the qualities needed by mentors differ, depending on the goals of the project. Common sense would suggest that mentors trying to help minority youth into science careers, for instance, are most likely to be effective if they themselves have experience in science. Whatever a program's instrumental goals, however, psychological qualities are often spoken of as important to mentors. A study of workplace mentoring for youth, for example, found that both mentors and students most frequently mentioned that mentors should be patient; other qualities included caring, a willingness to understand, acceptance, and enjoying young people (Evanson, 1982). Quint and Riccio (1985, p.9) report that when mentoring pregnant and parenting teens, "an impartial approach and an ability to communicate with the teens and to understand their concerns are the most important criteria of success in forming close relationships with the teens." Mentees are also said to profit most from the mentoring experience when they have certain qualities—among them, eagerness to learn, curiosity, ability to listen and ask questions, receptivity to new ideas, enthusiasm, and commitment are mentioned by one study (Evanson, 1982). However, these qualities are not any different from those that make for a smooth teacher-student, or peer-tutoring, relationship, for example, or from any successful relationship in which learning takes place. They are not finely-tuned to distinguish those who can profit from mentoring from those who would do better with another intervention.

Matching Mentors and Mentees

The matching of each mentor and mentee, which occurs through "chemistry" in natural mentoring, is of great a concern in the literature on mentoring youth, as it is in the professional and organizational literature. Through formal and informal means—interviews, personal profiles, "comparative interest inventories," and get-acquainted sessions in which mentors and mentees interview each other—youths are given, or choose, their mentors. In a report on the City University of New York's mentoring program for potential school dropouts, Richardson (1987) describes an interesting shift toward greater mentee control in the selection process; while initially mentees were chosen by their mentors through written personal profiles, mentees now choose mentors on the basis of oral presentations given by mentors during a group session. In programs in which mentors and mentees are given a chance to choose each other, the planned mentoring becomes more like spontaneous natural mentoring. But whether this is preferred, or whether mentors and mentees should

be matched by program staff, has not yet been studied and deserves systematic attention.

Perhaps based on common wisdom or prejudice, perhaps on findings from the literature on professional mentoring, the principle of similarity is the most often used to pair mentors and mentees. Age, sex, race, cultural similarities, geographic proximity between mentee and mentor, similarities of likes and hobbies, career aspirations, and hours available for meeting, are all aimed at systematizing the bases on which mentor and mentee can meet. When mentoring relationships fail, distance, gaps in understanding, inconsistencies of personalities, and a lack of common perspective are most often cited as the cause (Branch, et al., 1984; Cameron, 1988; Snyder & Rosenblum, 1987). Project Redirection's information on the matching of teens and community women is particularly revealing. In one community, a racial imbalance between minority teens and white community women was "perceived as problematic," and program staff engaged in an unsuccessful attempt to recruit more black and Hispanic community women. In the end, white women had to work with the teenagers. Nevertheless, no information suggests that the mentoring of minority teens by white women had negative effects on the teenagers' progress. In another community, however, a social class disparity between the low-income teens and the affluent community women apparently caused difficulties for both program staff and the teens. For instance, according to the report, these affluent women were not useful in helping the teens negotiate the public assistance bureaucracy, and they were overwhelmed by "the world of domestic violence, housing project, homelessness, and in many cases, abject poverty" (Branch, et al., 1984, pp. 66,77). The question here is whether what looks like class differences on the surface might more correctly be described as differences in the ability of the community women to give teenagers the resources they need. That is, some middle-class women might well have been effective, and some working class women ineffective, in negotiating the welfare bureaucracy or providing empathy.

Unfortunately, material on the unusual Penn Partners Program, which uses Ivy League graduate students with unconventional career and educational histories, currently in a post-baccalaureate pre-health career program, to mentor ambitious, upwardly-mobile minority students does not treat the issue of matching (Theophano, 1988). One can only wonder how the socially conscious mentors, who have had the security to experiment with moderately alternative lifestyles, interacted with their "straight" mentees, who often were even too busy with various school and extracurricular activities to keep their appointments. Did they find common ground

in their interest in science? Did the mentees see their mentors as role models, or did they form fairly superficial personal relationships with them? Was the opportunity to be in a program in which they could go to science demonstrations more important than the relationship with the mentor? What did the mentees, and mentors, learn about their different social worlds?

Taken together, the existing research on mentoring youth has almost nothing to say about either cross-race or cross-sex mentoring. In fact, what emerges from the literature is really how little is known about matching individuals at all. When a mentor and mentee complete a program together without difficulties the matching process is assumed to be adequate; when one or both parties ask to be rematched, failure is usually still attributed to "bad chemistry." Fortunately, we do have information from other contexts, such as peer tutoring and cooperative learning, that suggest successful ways to structure learning for minorities and women (Cole & Griffin, 1987). Here the fit between what the learner wants to learn and what the peer "teacher" can give is more important than race or gender similarity. And research suggests that students who learn from those of another race through these nontraditional methods are more likely to have other cross-race interactions and friendships (Ascher, 1986).

When reports on mentoring projects contain testimonials by participants, we can get a glimpse of an elusive and deeper aspect of the mentoring relationship that implies its psychosocial dimension. Both parties are likely to speak of a "friendship" having emerged, and mentees commonly testify to being "able to say everything" to the mentor, who is "just like" a sister, mother, father, and so forth. Though these testimonials are not analyzed, it is important to point out some of the psychological dynamics that may be at work.

The mentor and mentee appear to form a identity, whether or not the two individuals are "similar" by objective standards. That is, the mentee may see himself or herself as becoming someone like the mentor, who has turned into a role model, while the mentor sees his or her past struggles in the mentee. The fantasy affects how the participants act in the relationship and how they talk about it. In addition, few people participate in mentoring programs without learning the "ideal" of the relationship; that is, ambitious mentees quickly understand that they are supposed to look up to their mentors, be grateful to them, and feel close; similarly, mentors rapidly comprehend that they are supposed to feel protective and proud of their mentees. The effect of these expectations on how the mentoring relationship is

spoken about has not been studied, nor has anyone studied the effect of these expectations on the dynamics of the relationship itself, for ill or for good.

Training

Virtually all programs for mentoring disadvantaged youth contain a training component. However, this component varies widely in its seriousness, and the reports vary enormously in the detail in which they are described. At a minimum, most programs offer short workshops or introductory get-togethers; however, many provide longer and more complicated training programs. In a mentoring program for freshmen minority students, college faculty who had volunteered to mentor were given a one-day workshop covering such issues as the previous experiences of minority students at the university, the need for sensitivity to culturally diverse students, available support services on campus, and meeting with a mentee for the first time (McKenna, 1988). Before being matched with a teenager, Project Redirection's community women received several days' training on such topics as their attitudes toward teen pregnancy and parenthood, the needs of teenage mothers, available social services, communication skills, and documentation procedures. In addition, community women had periodic in-service training sessions during which they refreshed their skills and shared problems and solutions.

Mentors and mentees have also been matched *after* training, as it provides both project staff and mentors with more knowledge on which to make the pairings. As a result of the training, project staff can determine who is an inappropriate mentor, and anyone else can decide to leave gracefully if he or she decides not to be a mentor (Quint & Riccio, 1985).

Some mentoring programs do a kind of training of mentors and mentees together, through asking them to develop goals for their relationship: for instance, the mentee might want to learn a skill possessed by the mentor, or the two may decide to work together to clarify the mentee's career goals. The relationship may continue in this direction; each party may turn in diaries and evaluations or report for regular "debriefing" sessions. This kind of planning and control can help to set objectives and provide boundaries for the mentoring relationship, although it may well also take some of the spontaneity out of the relationship.

Again, as with the training for planned adult mentoring, training programs here appear to be driven by instinct and good common sense, rather than by a sound knowledge base. Training for the instrumental and the psychological aspects of

mentoring is usually mixed, though it is not clear how the proportion relates to the proportion in the expected mentoring relationship.

Length and Frequency of Contact

As we have seen, the organizational literature on natural mentoring suggests that most mentoring occurs through daily contacts over two to eight years. It is over this length of time that the rich, complicated mentoring relationships of those individuals who become successful take place. Planned mentoring programs are much shorter, and the frequency of contacts, though it is not always clear, apparently far less. Often planned mentors have more than one mentee. It has also been suggested that, because these relationships are being created and monitored from outside of the relationships, they ought to be ended, or at least renegotiated, after six months.

In the reports on mentoring programs for youth, the length of time can be as short as six weeks—which may be a relief to those who want out, but is hardly enough time to develop any deep or lasting connection. Understandably, the most common mentor relationship spans either the summer vacation or the academic school year, but some programs attempt to build relationships over more than a year (Center for Human Resources, n.d.), although it is unclear how the relationships are sustained through school or summer breaks, as the case may be. In some programs, mentors must agree to meet with their mentees, say, one or two hours weekly; in others, like Project Redirection, mentors are available nearly all day long at the centers where the teenagers spend their time (Branch, et al., 1984). But, as we have seen, "mentors" may be responsible in some way for up to twenty "mentees."

Though we have no data relating the length and frequency of contacts to the types of relationships that develop between mentors and mentees, the psychosocial aspects of mentoring are clearly not built in a few well-spaced meetings, partly consumed by responding to evaluation forms. In fact, testimonials of great friendship at the end of six-week programs are unlikely to mean much more than attempts by mentors and mentees to please project staff.

Mentoring and Tenacious Youth: A Commentary

According to Erikson (1963, 1980), just as the task of the various stages of childhood development is to successfully form an identity within the family, the task of adolescence is to determine where one fits into the larger social context outside

of the family. Earlier social learnings, identifications and personal endowment place limits on the adolescent identity, but because it is a social formulation, opportunities offered by the environment offer a second chance for new social learnings and internal identifications.

For "advantaged" middle class youth, the current experiences of adolescence can modify, but more likely reinforces, earlier identities and roles. Because the values and content in all of the youth's areas of experience are similar, there is little incongruity or confusion about their meaning or about what roles are appropriate, however much these youth may experiment with them. For less socially, economically, and educationally advantaged youth, often from an urban and minority background, available social roles may be less congruent and more confusing. Differences among their socializing institutions may make defining an identity and a role for themselves a far greater task and more deeply conflictual for them than for advantaged youth (Ianni, 1983). As they move between two or more conflicting worlds, they may find themselves transferring their reading of social rules and conventions from one setting to another without a sense of cohesion or equilibrium (Ianni, 1983). Role confusion and ego diffusion, in Erikson's terms, are the likely consequences.

The potential place of planned mentoring for many tenacious youth in the face of these conflicts is important to understand. Such youth who become successful adults are often fortunate enough to have had a combination of opportunities and resources, such as their family, social networks, and education, on the one hand, and a particular personality and character, on the other (Harrington, 1987). In their families, these resources are adults who acted as role models, advocates, and sponsors; in the community these resources are churches, social agencies, and ethnic or youth organizations, which offered mentors, peer support, and other help. More to the point, however, for most tenacious youth, is the relative absence of such psychological and social resources. Highly advantaged people have redundant social supports and opportunities; if the family fails, other kin, peers, teachers, or employers supply the needed resources and fill the gap (Harrington, 1987). Well-planned and sustained mentoring programs can provide the tenacious youth with resources similar to those available to the more advantaged, and can compensate for other deficiencies. Because such youth often have a patchy reservoir of social resources, the psychosocial and instrumental aspects of planned mentoring may be even more critical to their individual success than for others.

One implicit goal of most programs for tenacious youth would thus be to instill an orientation to individual achievement, and to provide the support to make this individual achievement possible. In the traditional view, such an orientation is accompanied by a motivation to attempt moderately difficult tasks and to view one's success as part of a long-range plan, fully aware of the instruments needed to do so. Success is measured against a self-standard; the achiever is autonomous, independent, and initiating, not dependent on others' standards or on pleasing them, or feeling a strong need to affiliate with them (McClelland, 1961). Very significantly, individuals with such an achievement orientation often feel personally efficacious and responsible for what happens to them; external forces are not in control but rather individual action, internally controlled, determines one's ability to succeed or fail (Rotter, 1966).

Yet not all tenacious and other disadvantaged youth have this individualistic achievement orientation. Many minority youth (girls particularly) frame their social and personal understanding in the context of relationships and connections. Instead of a "self-contained individualism," they have an "ensembled individualism"—which, however, may be equally able to produce high achievement (Sampson, 1988). Identity, then, is not only individual and personal: the group has an identity and ideals with which individual members maintain solidarity. Achievement is viewed as the fruits of cooperation in which each person's acts help move the entire group to meet its goals.

Ethnic categories *ipso facto* are group identities because individuals share a common history and experience a sense of sameness in different social situations, particularly ones in which they are treated the same despite their individual diversity (Gurin & Epps, 1975). The personal ideals and values of an individual member of a minority group may be linked to the group, no matter what other identifications exist. The dream of Jesse Jackson as president of the United States is not only a young minority person's dream of personal success but also one of group success. Thus, planners of mentoring programs for minority youth must realize that these youth have a group, as well as individual, identity and orientation. For many minority youth the symbol of the Freedom March, in which many people banded together to achieve an ideal, may be more real and durable than the message of the Horatio Alger myth.

On the other hand, out of a skepticism about ever having access to the opportunity structure of the society, some blacks and other low status minority

groups may also develop a social identity which inverts the symbols and meanings of the dominant population. Ogbu (1988) includes in this "cultural inversion" finding hidden meanings in "white" words and statements, valuing different dialects and communication styles, rejecting what is considered appropriate behaviors in schools and workplaces, and investing negative images with positive values. He sees all these as ways of drawing a boundary between the dominant and subordinate culture. For youth to cross the boundary may mean to be perceived as acting "white" and as repudiating their group identity.

For many who want to achieve, the circumstances of being minority in this country can lead to several conflicting choices: to reject family background and break allegiances to the family and community, if they provide few resources; to maintain a group identification and achieve for the group and thus maintain solidarity and a continuity with its ideals; or to invert the norms of individual success and remain loyal to the group by not submitting to the majority culture. It may very well be that many tenacious minorities make all of these choices at different times and act out different identities.

Many successful tenacious youth chose the precarious solution of acting as if they are participating in some action by improvising the required behavior and taking on the characteristics of whomever can help them. They do what is required of them without making the action or motive part of the self. They can switch identities, depending on the circumstances; their social relationships become shallow and brittle, and some become emotionally isolated.

What, then, is the place of mentoring in these circumstances? Clearly, because other beliefs, values, and even facts, may contradict the message of mentoring mentees may screen it out. Such a message must compete with other messages which may be more powerful, more homogeneous, more realistic, and even more supportive. Yet some mentoring messages may be accepted, if they clarify ambiguities and resolve contradictions. Then they can make new identities available, leading mentees to re-evaluate their beliefs and reshape their social perceptions. But for the youth to consolidate their multiple identities, the mentoring must offer a mode of behavior that makes coherent personal rules and conventions, as well as those of the family and community (Ianni, 1983). The tenacious youth, like all adolescents, need modeling and cultural support to reduce the confusion of the conflicting paths before them.

Thus the intervention of a supportive and constant adult still remains critical. The presence of an adult mentor, who has a mode of behavior that reduces contradictions and resolves conflicts, may at least partially counter the "as if" orientation of some youth, and may create a psychological opening to a new level of integration.

Yet, psychosocial interventions alone are not enough. Mentoring must lead to real opportunities if mentees are not to be disenchanted, cynical about access to opportunities, and confirmed in their own personal powerlessness. We must also consider that the strong ties between mentor and mentee associated with classical mentoring may be too difficult to develop in programs for tenacious urban and minority youth. Moreover, these youth also need an extended network of social resources in which they can have access to ideas, influences, information, people and other resources that are frequently socially distant from them (Granovetter, 1973). Linking to a network also acknowledges that a single mentor may have had a set of alien experiences and thus can not be useful to the youth.

Finally, tenacious and other disadvantaged students are diverse in their gifts and needs. As with all groups, some individuals are alloplastic and others autoplastic in their social and psychological makeup. Those who are alloplastic reach out and are receptive to information and help from other people; they appear to want to be helped. Autoplastic individuals, by contrast, need to feel that they are helping themselves, either because they lack sufficient trust or because they change more easily as a result of a critical experience or event, or as part of a group, than through the more narrow, but intense, individual encounter. In designing any intervention, it is therefore as dangerous and short-sighted to assume that all youth will be helped by mentoring as it is to assume that a single cognitive style or temperament or social orientation is a prerequisite for success.

CHAPTER IV: THE POWER OF MENTORING

Because extraordinary claims have been made for mentoring when used with adults as well as youths, it is important to pause to evaluate the intervention's possible power. Though we have little hard data on the effects of any mentoring program for youth, we can separate out analytically which areas might be looked at in order to investigate its power. We do so here from two perspectives: the salience of the mentoring in meeting the youth's needs, and the place of mentoring in a larger intervention.

The Salience of Mentoring

Most of the popular as well as the research literature on mentoring argues for the importance of matching mentors and mentees. It is maintained that the similarity and difference in the characteristics of mentor and mentee may determine the quality of the relationship. The mentor's socioeconomic status, class, ethnicity, race, gender, and cultural orientation all influence whether the mentor's experiences and presentation will make the mentoring message valid and applicable to the mentee as well. The mentor's interpersonal attractiveness also affects the formation of the mentoring relationship. In addition, the mentor needs to be an interpersonally ideal authority—benign, smart, helpful, accessible, successful—worthy of emulating or listening to. Equally, the individual personality and social characteristics of mentees affect their capacity to be mentored. And because the mentoring message reaches the individual at a particular point in his or her development, and is affected by an existing personality structure and belief system, how the mentee will evaluate, interpret, admit, or reject the message depends on his or her cognitive style, social position, and prior experiences.

In our view, however, the salience of a mentoring relationship is less dependent on the individual characteristics of the two parties than on the fit between the mentor's resources and the needs of the mentee. In fact, when the mentor can offer both instrumentally and psychosocially what the mentee needs, the two will be quite likely "fit." This is especially so if the mentor's resources—power, expertise, access to networks—are visible and accessible. This goodness of fit establishes an appropriate social tie between mentor and mentee. It makes the relationship a function of the provision of resources at a time when there is a personal or developmental need for them, and not just the sharing of experiences.

The salience of instrumental and psychosocial mentoring also depends, in part, on the immediacy of the payoff. A mentor whose advice is concrete, who says he or she knows of a job, and who then arranges the interview and takes the mentee to the place of business, will have greater salience in the mentee's life than a mentor who discusses possible college careers several years hence, or worse, merely advocates that correct living will lead to a better life somewhere along the road. A mentor's message can also be extremely powerful and salient if it simply resolves other conflicting messages with which the mentee has long been unsuccessfully battling, or suggests a new strategy for coming to terms with conflict.

Mentoring also takes place in the context of other relationships with teachers, peers, the family, the media, social agencies, and so forth. Mentors can provide information that is informative and values that are neutral, and so can be automatically added to already existing knowledge and values. Or mentors can create psychological and cultural conflict and force mentees to maintain contradictory ideas or perceptions, or to reject either what they have believed until now or are currently learning. We indicated in Chapter III that some youth have negative mentors in their communities. When this is so, planned mentors will have to work against that strong natural relationship. Of course, youth may also have very positive mentors in their own community; these may be embedded in a different value system, which might make the less intense arranged mentoring relatively powerless. For example, because Project Redirection's community women advised on sensitive and personal matters, they frequently were in conflict with the teenagers' interested natural mothers. Some youth, however, so lack meaningful adult contact that the special interest shown by a mentor can have a profound effect.

The Place of Mentoring

The power of mentoring depends on its place in large-scale interventions and its salience as a solution to the problem being addressed by the program. We can amplify this point by briefly examining three types of interventions for tenacious and other disadvantaged youth: dropout prevention programs, college preparation programs, and programs for entry-level workers.

With dropouts, we know that family poverty and unemployment are important precursors, and that poor schooling often prompts students to drop out. As a matter of fact, by third grade, misbehavior, truancy, and poor performance can usually identify a potential dropout. We now believe that the most powerful school interventions for preventing a student from dropping out are early childhood

education programs and effective elementary schooling—essentially school-based strategies grounded in district educational policies and local school efforts. By contrast, mentoring is usually a later dropout prevention intervention, and operates at the periphery of schooling, in work experience programs, career exploration efforts, programs for pregnant students, and so forth. It can help resocialize at-risk students, but it cannot provide them with the education they should have been receiving for ten or eleven years. Nor obviously can it affect their larger social and economic lives. We are reminded of the recommendation of one urban school superintendent: "If you're really talking about what would reduce the dropout rate the most, it would be getting the daddies of our kids a job " (Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1987, p. 5). We might also add that affordable housing and strong parental involvement in schooling will have a greater impact than mentoring on students at risk of dropping out.

Mentoring becomes less peripheral and more salient in college entry programs for tenacious youth. These youth do not always consider themselves college material, or know how to use available resources to gain access to college. For them, mentoring can work in tandem with tutoring, campus visits, and enrichment activities to motivate them to consider college, and help them get admitted, and even choose a course of study. The mentoring is potentially more powerful here than in a dropout prevention program because it fits the needs of the student and functions closer to the source of the problem. Its goals are also more circumscribed and reachable and the appropriate behaviors of the mentor more apparent. Most important, perhaps, the power to help the youth is within the control of the mentor (or at least the program), not in an institution like the schools over which the mentor has little control. Similarly, in programs for entry-level workers, the mentoring is not a peripheral intervention, an add-on, but is operating at the source of the young worker's problem. Good mentoring for entry-level workers provides psychosocial support, at the same time as it offers concrete, instrumental help with the codes, culture and demands of the workplace.

Nevertheless, the power of mentoring is significantly reduced when the source of the problem is the college student's learning problems or the youth's poor preparation for work. Here the mentoring must operate in tandem with remedial or developmental education or compensatory on-the-job training. It becomes an adjunct to and a support for other interventions, and its power will depend somewhat on their success. Many students in collegiate developmental education programs, for example, need the environmental support that the mentor can provide. The

mentoring builds a safety net for the student to prevent alienation and conflicts over meeting new demands, but it is not the essential intervention as long as students need help in developing cognitive skills.

As we have learned in programs for many youth, particularly youth without substantial social resources, there is no single essential intervention. One can only speak of multiple interventions working constructively in tandem. Here the Head Start experience is informative. From the beginning it was designed to provide cognitive, social, and health programs and services, and these programs and services have always been maintained in relationship to one another. We should think about the elements of mentoring in comprehensive programs in the same way. Alone they obviously cannot compensate for the difficulties students have in doing college work or provide technical skills to a young worker, but they can be part of an overall intervention that offers multiple educational opportunities.

As is already clear, formal mentoring is not an independent intervention in most programs for young people. It often "leans on" and works in tandem with other program components; its success often depends on the power of other program features and, less obviously, on the coherence of their organization. In many school-business partnerships, for example, individual mentors from the corporate world act as advisors, counselors, or role models to students, but the mentoring is frequently only a small factor—a weak and ambiguous one at that—in a large-scale intervention. In these collaborations, the school system or some local schools usually institute improvement efforts, such as the creation of a better school environment and effective instruction strategies. The corporations, from their side, generate public support and awareness of school activities, and, most concretely, make jobs available to students. Many of these programs are broad and evolutionary: their shifting forms leave room to correct their path, depending on results. The relationships among various activities are usually rhetorical and logical—they seem to be good and make sense—rather than being constructed in some necessary relationship to one another. This results in ambiguous program goals and unbounded activities (Snyder & Rosenblum, 1987), with a lack of clarity about the role, and resulting power, of mentoring—or any other initiative—within the larger program.

The problem of unbounded activities and ambiguous goals may also occur within smaller, more clearly defined programs. For example, mentoring programs for college freshmen are often provided as part of a potpourri of supports for the

newly-arrived students, and the mentoring can take whatever form the mentor and mentee choose. Although these interventions are benevolent and helpful, the programs do not define the goals of mentoring and are not clear about reasonable expectations for the performance of the mentor, the support of the mentee, and the success of the program for the planners. Inevitably, the power of arranged mentoring remains ambiguous and dependent on unknown factors over which it has no control.

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As we end this exploratory review of planned mentoring programs for tenacious and disadvantaged youth, we return to the questions with which we began: What is the nature of mentoring for these groups? What roles should mentors play in these programs? What particular characteristics should mentors have, if any? and, What can we expect mentoring to accomplish? Our attempts to answer these questions about mentoring programs have led us through the literature on both natural and planned mentoring for adults, as well as planned mentoring programs for youth. Here we bring together what we have learned.

Mentoring Tenacious and Disadvantaged Youth

Throughout the country, mentoring has come to be considered a powerful way to provide adult contacts for youth who are isolated from adults in their schools, homes, communities, and workplaces. For those instituting mentoring programs, the goals are to help socialize and otherwise prepare these youth for dignified adult social roles and, conversely, to prevent them from giving up, dropping out, or otherwise becoming socially marginal. These are ambitious goals—and can only begin to be achieved if we understand the conditions under which mentoring can work.

At the beginning of this paper, we gave mentoring the following working definition: a relationship between a youth or young adult and someone more senior in age and experience, who offers support, guidance, and concrete assistance as the younger partner goes through a difficult period, enters a new experience, or takes on an important task. During mentoring, the mentees identify with their mentor, and, as a result, become able to do for themselves what these older persons have done for them.

As a result of our literature analysis, we now add to this definition in the following manner: To succeed, mentoring must occur between a younger person and an older person who is ahead of the mentee, but not removed by great social distance. Through the mentoring relationship the mentee can achieve a modest targeted goal, already achieved by the mentor.

By subscribing to the popular belief that mentoring can compensate youth for the absence of caring and knowledgeable adults during their development, we may be asking mentoring to do what it cannot do, and losing sight along the way of

what it can provide to youth. Mentors can offer resources to youth who need to overcome limited personal deficiencies or identifiable social barriers, but these resources must be very specific and salient to the youth's needs.

This limited goal for planned mentoring is precisely the basis for its success in organizations. For example, the organization arranges for senior employees to take younger workers under their wings to provide the organizational know-how, networks, and protection to enable these young people to advance in the organization. Often in planned corporate mentoring, a new employee is simply helped through an early stage of adaptation into the culture, codes, and demands of the firm. The mentoring provides just what the young person needs. The mentor is not socially apart from the mentee—actually just ahead. Moreover, because the goals of the mentoring are bound within the environment in which it takes place, they are clear and achievable.

Salience and Social Distance. The most well-publicized mentoring of disadvantaged youth these days is provided by prominent and successful figures in the community. These individuals are supposed, by their very presence, to motivate youth who might otherwise be stopped by life's difficulties. However, in the attempt to generate these almost mythic connections between poor youths and powerful figures, we lose sight of the fact that successful natural mentoring is most likely to occur between individuals in the same environment who do not have that much social distance between them. In fact, the black college president, who began life as a sharecropper's son and expresses gratitude to a mentor for his meteoric rise, is not talking about having been mentored by another college president while he was still in high school. Instead, his significant mentor was probably his high school teacher, who drove three hundred miles out of her way to take him to a college interview, and then made sure that he went to that college. Perhaps there were other mentors later on, but each mentor was likely operating relatively close to the mentee by meeting a particular need at a particular time. In general, we need to consider the effect of the social distance between mentor and mentee. Certainly, most young people can benefit from a close relationship with an adult, but unless it is clear how the mentor's skills, knowledge, or networks are salient to the tenacious youth, the relationship will not have its desired impact.

As we have indicated, in a planned intervention mentor and mentee do not have to be of the same race, gender, or social class. However, if the social distance causes a mentor to mis-identify a mentee's most severe problems, greatest needs,

and most impressive strengths, the mentee will only superficially cooperate in the relationship or even be outright indifferent. A mentor may also assume that his or her way of life is so superior that any mentee would naturally aspire to it. However, even when mentees might want to emulate their mentors, they may see themselves under greater constraints than are visible to the mentors, and so find the assumption that they can achieve their mentors' situations naive, and a false promise. Social distance can also make the highly specialized knowledge of mentors seem nonsensical in the mentee's environment. Conversely, when the social distance is too great, mentors may act to change an aspect of a mentee's life without realizing the functions it currently serves. For example, a mentor assigned to help a teenager avoid pregnancy may not realize that pregnancy gives the adolescent a sense of adulthood and creates a bond with her boyfriend. Unless the mentor can address other ways to deal with these latent functions of pregnancy—and show the mentee how to do so—the mentee may only experience increased conflict and despair in the relationship.

It is not that prominent white middle class businessmen cannot mentor black lower class youth; rather, the mentor's behavior and values have to appear meaningful and visible to the youth, and the youth must be able to emulate the mentor without conflict, cynicism, and failure. Even apparent social distance can be breached when the mentor provides those concrete resources that the mentee most needs; then the mentee can realize that, through a series of small steps, a distant end goal may be within reach. Thus, unless we recognize the possible effects of the perceived and real distance between mentors and mentees, we will have the appearance of mentoring without its reality.

Natural and Planned Mentoring. Our definition of mentoring allows that mentoring can succeed with tenacious and disadvantaged youth under both natural and planned conditions. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient scientific studies of either natural or planned mentoring of this population to derive lessons for planned mentoring. Drawing from natural and planned mentoring in organizations, we can hypothesize that there are some areas in which natural and planned mentoring are too different to expect equivalent results. In general, the bonds between natural mentors and mentees are stronger, because they have found each other, rather than having been assigned; also, because their relationship proceeds without the structures of a programmatic arrangement, it can become more intense, more fluid, broader in scope, and exist over a longer period. Although we believe that some of the intensity of natural mentoring should be approximated in planned

mentoring, we caution that, for this population, the most effective mentoring may be that which is linked to clear, well-articulated, and achievable goals. Thus natural mentoring may simply be too non-directive.

Clearly, positive natural mentoring may not always be available to many youth. Natural mentoring is, by definition, selective—a scarce resource. Paradoxically, though natural mentoring opens up opportunities for mentees, it inevitably leaves many youth out, because no mentor is drawn to them or they find no one to turn to. While programmatic mentoring can be more open, by increasing the availability of mentoring to a greater number of youth, it still may be a limited intervention. Even should mentors be found for every young person, the youth must find their way to the mentoring programs, want to be helped, and find the psychosocial and instrumental resources of the mentors responsive to their needs.

The Context of Mentoring. Both planned and natural mentoring are embedded in larger social contexts: other relationships, institutions, and the real and perceived opportunity structure of society. Youths' self-concepts, for example, are formed from the social life in their community, school, and home, and the outcomes of either planned or natural mentoring will be affected by these natural relationships and environments.

Planned mentoring also often leans on, is linked to, or works in tandem with, other program components, and its success then is affected by these other programmatic features. Although the power of mentoring in these contexts is hard to isolate, the degree to which it is integrated with other interventions and supports seems to affect the likelihood that it will succeed.

The Role of Mentors

Socialization and skills development are the general goals of most mentoring programs for tenacious and disadvantaged youth. Implicitly, there is a desire to create a social situation where neither the youths' prior deficiencies nor the structure of the society interfere with their growth and achievement. The mentoring should contain both instrumental and psychosocial components, their proportions depending on the needs of the mentees.

In their *instrumental* role, mentors should be teacher, adviser, coach, sponsor, guide, patron, advocate, dispenser and sharer of resources. Instrumental mentoring has direct and observable consequences on the circumstances of the mentees'

educational progress, career, or social life. The *psychosocial* role of mentoring involves role modeling, confirmation, counseling, and providing emotional support. Here, mentors give mentees opportunities to evaluate their attitudes, values, behaviors and beliefs. As role models, mentors make it possible for mentees to identify with them and to imitate their behaviors. In supporting roles, mentors can accept and confirm the behaviors and attitudes of the mentees. In their counseling roles, they can explain how the mentees' behaviors may interfere with, or achieve, their long-term educational and work goals, and more generally, their emotional growth.

The specific roles of the mentors, however, cannot be defined unless the social assumptions underlying the program are clear to the program planners. A mentor cannot just be a substitute for a missing adult, and still meaningfully help the youth. If the program planners assume that the youth is not able to function in an *open* society in which all have an equal chance, then the mentoring needs to compensate for poor prior socialization and treat deficits internal to the mentee. By contrast, in programs established to break down barriers to youth in a *blocked* society, the mentoring needs to be directed to preparing youth to take advantage of opportunities that the mentor can provide and to increasing these external advantages. Finally, in programs that assume an organic society, the mentoring must be directed to help the youth develop those strengths that are needed by the changing institutions. Particularly in large-scale programs, the appropriate role of the mentor must be articulated, if it is to be useful to the youth. Mentoring should not be a variety of unmetabolized interventions or activities. A mentor can be free to use any style he or she wants in working with the youth—and probably should—but within a clear arrangement about what the mentoring should be achieving.

There are few studies of what young mentees want from their mentors. However, we do know that the needs of these youth are diverse, and that to be salient mentoring programs must consider their cultural and personal backgrounds, learning styles, expectations, and ways of expressing ambition.

Mentor Characteristics

Traditionally, the issue of mentor characteristics has been viewed from two perspectives: those qualities mentors need to succeed, and the matching of mentors and mentees.

The program literature and common sense suggest that, in order to carry out their psychosocial and instrumental roles, mentors of tenacious and disadvantaged youth should be perceived as predictable, trustworthy, and salient by the mentees. They should communicate well, be confident, secure, flexible, patient, caring, and able to understand and accept the diverse needs of their mentees.

Trust. A critical aspect of any developing mentor-mentee relationship is trust. The development of this trust with tenacious and other disadvantaged youth probably also means the achievement of very modest goals—and goals that are wanted by the mentee—as the first step. Winning on something small can cement an otherwise problematic relationship. The mentor also needs to be personally predictable, and the program itself to be of some duration. Disadvantaged mentees often come to programs with high hopes, great suspicion, or, more likely, both. Any conflicts that they may experience are only exacerbated by erratic adults, loosely organized programs, or abandoned initiatives. All these serve to destroy a relationship and, worse, to harden mistrust.

Match. The literature on matching mentor and mentee characteristics is inconclusive. Although some of the organizational literature attempts to build a case for similarity of mentors and mentees, this case is not convincing. The heart of mentoring is a human relationship, and personality similarity may not be a predictor of a good mentoring relationship.

Similar race and gender may be characteristics that affect mentoring. There is considerable evidence that natural mentoring tends to occur between people of the same race and gender. This is probably because, despite great personality diversity among minorities and women, race and gender in American society are likely to lead to common experiences and trust. However, we find no convincing evidence from planned mentoring situations that would suggest the hazards of mixing race and gender in mentoring relationships. Moreover, for minorities and women, unless these barriers are crossed, there is little likelihood of their entering professions and arenas previously closed to them. As we pointed out earlier, in a democratic society, there is also a moral worth to be derived from cross-race and cross-sex relationships; in fact, should it be that mentoring is not congruent with such integration, then other types of relationships might well be fostered as more valuable.

More important than a personal match is how the social distance between mentor and mentee affects the delivery of resources. What is at stake here is the capacity of the mentor to empathize with the mentee, to identify the mentee's needs, and to provide small, workable steps in the achievement of a realistic goal.

Training. In planned mentoring programs, training is often used to generate what might occur spontaneously in natural mentoring: mentors are taught to have good mentoring behaviors, as well as to provide those resources that mentees may need. Training is unlikely to turn someone who is unsuitable for mentoring into a good mentor, but it can be used as part of a selection process to weed out those who are unfit.

Currently, training is driven by instinct and common sense, rather than by a sound knowledge base. There is little clarity about the differences in training needed for psychosocial and instrumental mentoring, for instance, or for the weight of training needed in each area.

Finally the issue of extrinsic rewards for programmatic mentoring is important. Although mentoring is traditionally thought of as an inherently altruistic activity, this need not be the case. In fact, even people who enter mentoring for altruistic motives may seek and find extrinsic rewards. So far we have no reason to believe that this has a detrimental effect. However, since seeking extrinsic rewards is probably inevitable, it might be useful for program planners to devote some attention to the effect, if any, that this has on the commitment and consistency of mentors who are seeking corporate recognition or course credit for their efforts.

The Value of Mentoring for Tenacious and Disadvantaged Youth

Planned mentoring should be considered a modest intervention. Unlike natural mentoring, its power to substitute for the missing adults in the lives of youths is limited: it occurs too infrequently and is not intense enough to do for these youth what natural mentoring is reputed to do. Planned mentoring for our population, however, can have two very important assets: it can improve the social chances of tenacious and disadvantaged youth by giving them resources they might not have had, and it can give them some psychosocial support for new behaviors, attitudes, and ambitions. When planned mentoring is intensive and extended, this support can help solve some of the contradictions of moving into the mainstream society. The possibility of achieving even these limited goals for planned mentoring depends, however, on accurately diagnosing the needs of potential mentee, and in ensuring

that mentoring—as opposed to other interventions—is best suited to the youth's problems.

To evaluate the power of mentoring, one should also look at it in both the short- and the long-run. Although current studies only report on short-term results of mentoring programs, it is clear that the effects of mentoring can grow, diminish, or be quite transformed with time as the youth moves through other corroborating, conflicting, or altering experiences.

Whatever mentoring can accomplish, it is important to realize that mentoring is not a panacea for the problems of youth, particularly at-risk youth. In embracing mentoring, we should remember that neither resources nor modest psychological support is of much use if schooling remains so poor that the youth lack necessary academic skills, or if they cannot fill the jobs in their communities that await them. If mentoring is oversold and diverts attention from such needed changes as the restructuring of schools or the creation of more and better jobs, then it will have a paradoxical effect.

Finally, the power of any planned mentoring program must be viewed in the larger social context in which it takes place. Mentors cannot pluck adolescents out of poor homes or disruptive communities. Mentoring is only effective insofar as it accommodates, transforms, vitiates, or expands, the influence of family, school, community, or job. Thus, we must always recognize the power of other influences in the lives of youth—whether these are programmatic, or beyond the power of program planners—before we can reasonably measure the accomplishments of mentoring.

REFERENCES

Adler, N., & Harrington, C. (1970). *The learning of political behavior.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Alleman, E. (1986). Impact of race on mentoring relationships. In W.A. Gray & M.M. Gray (Eds.). *Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions.* Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring (Vol. II). Vancouver, BC: International Association for Mentoring, pp. 74-80.

Alleman, E., Cochran, J., Doverspike, J., & Newman, I. (1984, February). Enriching mentoring relationships. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62* (6), 329-32.

Alleman, E., Newman, I., Huggins, H., & Carr, L. (1987, Autumn). The impact of race on mentoring relationships. *International Journal of Mentoring, 1* (2), 20-3.

Ascher, C. (1986). *Cooperative learning in the urban classroom.* ERIC/CUE Digest No. 30. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Bandura, A. (1969). Social learning theory of identification processes. In D.A. Gaslin (Ed.). *Handbook of socialization theory and research.* Chicago: Rand McNally, pp.213-62.

Basoe, S.A., & Glasser Howe, K. (1980, Summer). Role-model influence: Effects of sex and sex-role attitude in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 4* (4), 558-72.

Berger, B., Beard, B., Moore, S., & Van Vorhees, V. (1986, February). *The academy in mentoring: A model for encouraging the academic achievement of youth adolescent girls.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators. Atlanta, GA, February 1986. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. 271-446)

Bowen, D. (1986, March-June). The role of identification in mentoring female protegees. *Group and Organizational Studies, 11* (1-2), 61-74.

Branch, A., Riccio, J., & Quint, J. (1984, April). *Building self-sufficiency in pregnant and parenting teens.* Final Implementation Report of Project Redirection. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Brooks, L., & Haring-Hidore, M. (1987, Autumn). Mentoring in academe: A comparison of proteges' and mentors' perceived problems. *International Journal of Mentoring, 1* (2), 3-10.

Burke, R.J. (1984, September). Mentors in organizations. *Groups & Organizations Studies, 9* (3), 353-73.

Cameron, K. (1988). Education Initiative. *Annual Report of the Urban League of Rhode Island.* Providence: Urban League of Rhode Island, Inc.

Center for Human Resources, Brandeis University. (n.d.). *Career beginnings: Executive summary.* Waltham, MA: Author.

Clawson, J.G., & Blank, M. (1987, February-March). Interpersonal style and mentoring. *International Journal of Mentoring, 1* (1), 9-17.

Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (1987). *Contextual factors in education: Improving science and mathematics education for minorities and women.* Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

Collins, E., & Scott, P. (1978, July-August). Everyone who makes it has a mentor. *Harvard Business Review*, 89-101.

Cooper, C.C. (1985). Guest editorial: Mentors can serve black youth in many ways. *Journal of Negro Education, 54* (2), 115-6.

Darling, L.A. (1986). The mentoring mosaic: A new theory of mentoring. In W.A. Gray & M.M. Gray (Eds.). *Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Career Development, Business and the Professions* (Vol. II). Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring. Vancouver, BC, pp. 1-7.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (1986, August). *Teacher mentoring.* Digest #7. Washington, DC: Author.

Erikson, E.H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd Ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.

Erikson, E.H. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Evanson, J.S. (1982). *Mentors and students in the workplace.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (1986, Summer). California's mentor teachers: Two years of learning. *Reviews in Leadership*, 1-8.

Farylo, B., & Paludi, M.A. (1985). Developmental discontinuities in mentor choice by male students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125* (4), 521-2.

Flaherty, B.P. (1985). *An experiment in mentoring for high school students assigned to basic courses.* Doctoral dissertation, Boston University. University Microfilms #85-08907.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting white.'" *The Urban Review, 18* (3), 1-15.

Frey, B.A., & Woller, R.B. (1983). Mentoring: A legacy of success. *Journal of Creative Behavior, 17* (1), 60-4.

Fury, K. (1979). Mentor mania. *Savvy*, 42-7.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986, January-February). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 6-11.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Granovetter, M.S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*, 1360-80.

Gray, W.A. (1988, Summer). Developing a planned mentoring program to facilitate career development. *Career Planning and Adult Development Journal, 4* (2), 9-16.

Gray, W.A. (1984). *Educational psychology students as mentors of gifted, talented, creative students: Benefits of using a four-phase mentoring model.* Paper presented at the 13th International Congress of Psychology, Acapulco, Mexico (September 2-7).

Gurin, P., & Epps, E. (1975). *Black consciousness, identity and achievement.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Harrington, C. (1970). *Errors in sex-role behavior.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Harrington, C. (1987). *Pathways to success: Antecedents and consequences of extraordinary success in American men and women.* Final report to the Spencer Foundation, Chicago, IL. New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Hess, R.D., & Torney, J.V. (1967). *The Development of Political Attitudes in Children.* Chicago: Aldine.

Hunt, D.M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review, 8* (3), 475-85.

Ianni, F.A.G. (1983). *Home, school and community in adolescent socialization.* ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series No. 84. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Kaufman, D.R. (1985). Review of *The mentor connection* by Michael Zey. *Contemporary Sociology*—A Journal of Reviews, *14* (2), 238-9.

Kaufmann, F.A., Harrell, G., Milan, C.P., Woolverton, N., & Miller, J. (1986, May). The nature, role, and influence of mentors in the lives of gifted adults. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 64*, 65-7.

Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental Relationships in organizational life.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Kram, K.E., & Isabella, L.A. (1985). Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development. *Academy of Management Journal, 20* (1), 110-32.

Krupp, J.A. (1987). Mentor and protege perceptions of mentoring relationships in an elementary school. *International Journal of Mentoring, 1* (1), 35-38.

Kwalick, B., Sanchirico, S.M., Collymore, R.S., & McNair, M.L. (1988, Spring). *CUNY/BOE Student Mentor Program: A Collaborative Program.* Mentor Handbook. New York: City University of New York, Office of Urban Affairs.

Levinson, D.J. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York: Ballantine.

McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The achieving society.* Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

McKenna, P.G. (1988). *Mentoring: Recruiting and training faculty at a research university.* Storrs, CT: The University of Connecticut, Center for Faculty/Staff Development.

Merriam, S. (1983, Spring). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33* (3), 161-73.

Merriam, S.B., & Thomas, T.K. (1986). The role of mentoring in the career development of community college presidents. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 10* (3), 177-91.

Mertz, N.T., Welch, O.M., & Henderson, J. (1988, Summer). Mentoring for top management: How sex differences affect the selection process. *Career Planning and Adult Development Journal, 4* (2), 34-9.

Moore, K.M. (1982). The role of mentors in developing leaders for academe. *Educational Record, 63* (1), 23-8.

Nieva, V.F., & Gutek, B.A. (1981). *Women and work.* New York: Praeger.

Noe, R.A. (1988). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review, 13* (1), 65-78.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education. (1987). *Dealing with dropouts: The urban superintendents' call to action*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ogbu, J.U. (1988). Diversity and equity in public education: Community forces and minority school adjustment and performance. In R. Haskin, & D. MacRae (Eds.). *Policies for America's public schools: Teachers, equity, and indicators*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Orth, C.D., Wilkinson, H.E., & Benfari, R.C. (1987, Spring). The manager's role as coach and mentor. *Organizational Dynamics, 15*, 66-75.

Papa-Lewis, R. (1987). The relationships of selected variables to mentoring in doctoral level education. *International Journal of Mentoring, 1* (1), 22-6.

Parham, W. (1982, April). *Mentors and mentees: Stages of development in a mentoring Relationship*. Doctoral dissertation, S. Illinois University, Department of Psychology.

Pavan, B.N. (1987, Winter). Mentoring certified aspiring and incumbent female and male public school administrators. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7* (4), 318-31.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1983). Establishing a formalized mentoring program. *Training and Development Journal*, 37(2), 38, 40-42.

Public/Private Ventures. (n.d.). *STEP: Summer training and education program*. Philadelphia: Author.

Quint, J.C., & Riccio, J.A. (1985, April). *The challenge of serving pregnant and parenting teens: Lessons from Project Redirection*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Richardson, H.P. (1987). Student mentoring: A collaborative approach to the school dropout problem. In W.A. Gray & M.M. Gray (Eds.). *Mentoring: Aid to excellence in education, the family, and the community*. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring (Vol. I). Vancouver, BC: International Association for Mentoring.

Roche, G.R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 57* (1), 17-28.

Rochester: The city that decided to make something of it. (1988, Spring). *Alliance: The newsletter of Governor Mario M. Cuomo's School and Business Alliance.*

Rodriguez, R. (1986). *Effects of two counseling approaches on institutional integration and resistance of high risk college students.* Doctoral dissertation, Fordham Graduate School of Education. University Microfilms #86-16827.

Roskin, R. (1988, Spring). Corporate cloning: The manager as mentor. *International Journal of Mentoring, 2* (1), 29-33.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80* (1) 1-28.

Sampson, E.E. (1988, January). The debate on individualism: indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and social functioning. *American Psychologist, 43* (1), 15-22.

Shapiro, E.C., Haseltine, F.P., & Rowe, M.P. (1978). *Sloan Management Review, 19* (3), 51-8.

Silverstein, N.A. (1986). Establishing a mentoring dialogue with a campus school. In W.A. Gray & M.M. Gray (Eds.). *Mentoring: Aid to excellence in education, the family, and the community.* Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring (Vol. I). Vancouver, BC: International Association for Mentoring.

Snyder, P., & Rosenblum, S. (1987, September). *Allies in education: A profile of Atlanta Partnership of Business and Education, Atlanta, Georgia.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Theophano, J. (1988). *Penn Partners Program.* Jessie Ball duPont Fund Mid-Year Report. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, School of Arts and Sciences, College of General Studies.

Torrance, E.P. (1983). Role of mentors in creative achievement. *The Creative Cnild and Adult Quarterly, 8* (1), 8-18.

Watkins, H.D., Giles, W.F., & Endsleg, R.C. (1987). The career development relationships (CDR) Model: An expanded view of dyadic relationships in career development. *International Journal of Mentoring, 1* (1), 3-8.

Willie, C.V. (1987). *Effective education.* New York: Greenwood Press, pp. 99-109.

Winstone, C.L. (1986). Personal transformation of the protege: The mentoring relationship in context. In W.A. Gray & M. Gray (Eds.). *Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business, and the professions.* Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring (Vol. II). Vancouver, BC: International Association for Mentoring. pp. 102-12.

Yoder, J.D., Adams, J., Grove, S., & Priest, R.F. (1985, June). To teach is to learn: Overcoming tokenism with mentors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9* (1), 119-131.

Zey, M.G. (1985, February). Mentor Programs: Making the right moves. *Personnel Journal*, 64(2), 53-7.

ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS CONSULTED

Allies in Education
Public/Private Ventures
399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

American Chamber of Commerce Executives
4232 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22302

American Federation of Teachers
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Aspira of America
1112 16th Street, NW
Suite 340
Washington, DC 20036

Bank Street College of Education
Center for Leadership Development
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

A Better Chance, Inc.
419 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116-3301

The Board-Mentor Program
Association of Governing Boards of Universities & Colleges
One Dupont Circle
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

Bronx Community College and Bronx Regional High School Mentor Program
Bronx, NY

Business Roundtable
1615 L Street, NW
Suite 1350
Washington, DC 20036

Campus Compact: Project for Public and Community Service
Box 1975, Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

Career Explorations Program
Public/Private Ventures
399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Career Beginnings Program
National Program Office
Center for Human Resources
The Heller School
Brandeis University
P.O. Box 9110
Waltham, MA 02254-9110

The College Board
45 Columbus Avenue
New York, NY 10023-6992

Committee for Economic Development
477 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Commonwealth Fund
1 East 75th Street
New York, NY 10021

Community School District #3
300 West 96th Street
New York, NY 10025

Conference Board
845 3rd Avenue
New York, NY 10003

Council for the Advancement of Private Education
1625 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

CUNY/BOE Student Mentor Program
Office of Urban Affairs
The City University of New York
351 West 18th Street, Room 236
New York, NY 10011

Early Outreach Partnership Program
National Alliance of Business (NAB)
427 Skinner Building
1326 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street
Suite 300
Denver, CO 80295

Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, NJ 08541

Family Dynamics, Inc.
67 Irving Place
New York, NY 10003

Foundation Center
79 5th Avenue
Eighth Floor
New York, NY 10003

Graduate School of Education
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Hispanic Women's Center
611 Broadway, Room 814
New York, NY 10012

The Innovative Education Project
National Council of La Raza
Twenty F Street, NW
Second Floor
Washington, DC 20001

International Association for Mentoring
Gray & Associates
Suite 510
1200 West Pender
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6E 2S9

Interschools Consortium
139 West 91st Street
New York, NY 10024

IUE/The Work Connection
335 Central Street
Saugus, MA 01906

MENTOR
New York Alliance for the Public
Schools, Inc.
Suite 3600
180 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038

The Mentor Program
South Mountain Community College
Phoenix, AZ

Minority Mentor/Mentee Program
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI
McCallie School
285 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37404

National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People
4805 Mount Hope Drive
Baltimore, MD 21215

National Association of Independent
Schools
18 Tremont Street
Boston, MA 02108

National Center for Nonprofit Boards
1225 19th Street, NW
Suite 340
Washington, DC 20036

National Education Association
Instruction and Professional
Development
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

National Puerto Rican Forum
31 East 32nd Street
Fourth Floor
New York, NY 10016

National Urban League
500 East 62nd Street
New York, NY 10021

National Urban League of Flint,
Michigan
202 East Boulevard
Second Floor
Flint, MI 48503

National Urban League of Sacramento,
Inc.
3501 Broadway
Sacramento, CA 95817

New York City Mentoring Program
Office of College Collaboratives
High School Division
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

The New York City Partnership, Inc.
200 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10018

New York State Mentoring Committee
The Governor's School and Business Alliance (SABA)
11 West 42nd Street
Twenty-first Floor
New York, NY 10036

Peer Project
The Abell Foundation
Walter P. Carter Center
630 W. Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

Penn Partners Program
University of Pennsylvania
School of Arts and Sciences
College of General Studies
210 Logan Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6384

Portland Neighborhood Foster Grandparent Program
Harbor Terrace
284 Danforth Street
Portland, ME 04102

Positive Futures Program
Urban League of Eastern Massachusetts, Inc.
236 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115

Project RAISE (Raising Ambition Instills Self-Esteem)
Fund for Educational Excellence
616-D North Eutaw Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

Project Redirection
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation
3 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Public/Private Ventures
399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
P.O. Box 2316
Princeton, NJ 08540

School Volunteers for Boston
25 West Street
Boston, MA 02111

Senior/Youth Partnership
43 North Green Street
Sonora, CA 95370

Staff Intern Program in Government Relations
Independent Sector
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Stanford Urban Coalition
Peninsula Academy
860 Escondido Road
Stanford, CA 94305

Summer Training and Education Program (STEP)
Public/Private Ventures
399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Teenage Parent Alternative School Program (TPASP)
Foster Grandparent Program
9851 Hamilton
Detroit, MI 48202

TLC Mentor Program
Scarlet Intermediate School
3300 Lorraine
Ann Arbor, MI 48108

The Uncommon Individual Foundation
3 Radnor Corporate Center
Suite 400
100 Matsonford Road
Radnor, PA 19087

United Negro College Fund
500 East 62nd Street
New York, NY 10021

United States Chamber of Commerce
1615 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20062

Urban League Mentoring Program
Urban League of Rhode Island, Inc.
246 Prairie Avenue
Providence, RI 02905

Workplace Mentorship
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Clearinghouse on Urban Education

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027