

Leadership Responsibility in Mentoring Organization Newcomers

Roselynn S. Dow
Empire State College/SUNY

This paper reports on research on mentoring and a women's mentoring conference designed to address research implications for leadership by and for women. The conference addressed professional development concerns of young women that were identified in a prior qualitative and quantitative study on mentor experiences of young lawyers, their job satisfaction, and retention. Their descriptions of mentoring experiences formed the rationale for this event that was organized to develop proactive and assertive leadership skills for women faculty, students, and members of community organizations. Conference sessions offered training for becoming successful mentors and protégés. Participants identified strengths and weaknesses in working with mentors and mentees, and developed personal strategies for success.

INTRODUCTION

Organization leadership invests resources (personnel, money, and time) into identification, hiring, and training of new hires. Leadership often delegates human resource professionals to supervise recruitment, selection, training and in many cases, mentoring. This process that helps newcomers share in the organization's values, beliefs, and practices by establishing goals, modeling desired behavior and clearly outlining responsibilities for newcomers is termed socialization (Schein, 1968). Socialization incorporates understanding of organizational structure, culture, motivation and learning, values and expectations, and mentoring.

However, the most successful socialization occurs when top leadership identify outcomes of socialization and select those who will best serve as role models and mentors for newcomers. To minimize attrition and maximize the investment in recruitment, selection, and training, organization leadership should take the lead in providing positive organization support for newcomers by carefully matching mentor and protégé in this process. Training should be provided for these mentors.

This paper reports on a mentoring conference for women, sponsored by SUNY Empire State College, who either were currently in mentor roles or who were protégés and needed to find influential women who could fulfill the mentor role for them. The conference was developed as a response to results of research on associate lawyers and their mentors which suggested that training for mentors and good matching were important for developing job satisfaction and retention (Dow, 2010).

Women who attended the conference developed a clearer understanding of the mentor role, a strategy for finding good mentors for themselves, and/or a plan for providing productive mentoring to others. Participants learned how mentors were necessary for successful socialization, for promotion opportunity, job satisfaction, retention, and increased self-confidence. Faculty from Empire State College and other organizations explained and modeled mentoring behaviors that help in professional advancement and

success. Participants cycled through a series of workshops in which facilitators helped them develop systemized plans of action for achieving or providing better mentoring opportunities at work and better understanding of the skills they need to develop to make that happen.

MENTORS AND SPONSORS

The development of an adult professional is facilitated by the sponsorship of the new hire, or protégé, by an incumbent organization member. The benefits to the protégé is reported to be greater compensation, faster and better promotions, and greater career mobility—benefits that do not accrue as readily to new hires without mentors or with ineffective mentors. Mentors themselves also derive important benefits such as renewed commitment, a sense of helping a stellar protégé, and advancing the work of the organization (Ensher, 2011).

A sponsor, who may also be assigned, is entrusted with the job of evaluating the degree of excellence in a newcomer's performance in technical skills for a short term. When that time period is over, the newcomer may be left without support.

A mentor, as opposed to a sponsor, is a person who has developed a more personal interest in a new hire and will invest a good deal of time and energy guiding that person through one or more stages in his or her career. Since the mentor represents the organization, leadership must, first, be deliberate about deciding who mentors newcomers and, second, should recognize that there are stages to a mentoring relationship which must be considered when training mentors. Career stages include initiation, cultivation, and separation (Kram, 1983). In the "initiation" stage, the first six to twelve months, the mentor is admired and respected for competence and ability to provide support and guidance. During "cultivation" positive expectations of the protégé are tested against reality, career functions (such as challenging assignments, visibility, and professional growth) are addressed first, then psychosocial needs (such as empathy, trust, positive self-regard) are addressed as bonds strengthen between the mentor and protégé (two to five years.) In the final stage of "separation" the protégé demonstrates skills and operates independently. Although the mentor recognizes success in developing new talent and the protégé expresses satisfaction about his or her development, both may naturally experience some feelings of loss and anxiety as the relationship ends. The relationship then becomes redefined as a professional friendship which endures although some ambivalence may be felt as this redefinition period begins (Kram, 1983).

A mentor would typically provide either formal, informal, or both, kinds of training and supervision to the protégé who the mentor believes will subsequently serve the organization capably. In some cases, a mentor selects a protégé who displays characteristics or behaviors that are similar to those of the mentor at an earlier time. The formal relationship offers the protégé benefits of confirmation and acceptance, as well as the commitment to teach and give feedback. The formal relationship may sometimes lack sincerity depending on the degree of mentor involvement in the choice. Being able to have a voice in selecting the protégé makes the experience more enjoyable for the mentor (Parise, 2008). In informal mentoring relationships the protégé may select the mentor or the selection may be mutual. Protégés regard these voluntary match-ups as most valuable because they choose mentors who they believe can offer experience and networks they perceive as important (Scandura, 2001). Mentors make a commitment to value the protégé's achievements and encourage the protégé to be more innovative. They also model the behavior that newcomers are expected to adopt.

Another reason why mentors are critical to successful socialization is that protégés see the organization through the mentors' eyes. Each is exposed to their mentor's attitudes and beliefs about the organization. Supportive mentors represent the organization's commitment (positive organizational support,) which encourages the protégé to return that commitment (Baranik, 2011). When a mentor helps a protégé gain exposure to other important members of the organization, the protégé views this as caring and supportive organizational behavior. Newcomers who have influential mentors are able to acquire political savvy eventually becoming "insiders" unlike those, such as women and ethnic or racial minorities, who may find themselves closed out of the "political game" and permanently disadvantaged. The more disadvantaged newcomer should employ proactive behaviors to

narrow the discrepancies between groups and acquire a more supportive mentor. Benishek et al. (2004) looked at existing models of mentoring from a multicultural feminist perspective. They argued that, since individuals have a desire to be mentored by those who are similar to them, it is more difficult for women, women of color, ethnically diverse people, and different social classes to find mentors from similar backgrounds. If they do find a suitably similar mentor, it is likely that the mentor may be less effective in mentoring because he or she has less status and power in the organization than White male counterparts. Organizational leadership should be aware that traditional mentoring has been paternalistic and not responsive to the needs of marginalized sectors, particularly to those who choose a non-linear career path, perhaps choosing to take leaves of absence for child rearing, for example. Leadership must ensure that mentors recognize value in diversity and explore these differences for successful professional development of marginalized persons.

RESEARCH

In a study of the relationship between shared values, job satisfaction and successful mentoring experiences in a professional context, new lawyers (associates) were asked to describe their mentoring experiences (Dow, 2010). Shared values and job satisfaction formed the quantitative section of the study (congruence of work values between partners and associates as measured by the Organizational Culture Profile and the Job Diagnostic Survey) while the qualitative section of the study involved interviews with associates and was directed towards the hypothesis: A new lawyer who has a mentor experiences job satisfaction. Associate lawyers were interviewed to determine their satisfaction with their mentors and their vision of good mentoring. This paper reports on these interviews and discusses how the results formed the basis for developing the structure of a conference on mentoring for women.

INTERVIEWS ON MENTORING

Associate lawyers were asked three questions:

1. Do you have a mentor and, if so, how did you meet?
2. Describe positive aspects of your mentor relationship. Did you experience any disappointments in your mentor relationship?
3. How would you describe an ideal mentoring program?

The eight associates interviewed were in the age group of 26–37, had been employed for 6 months to 7 years at their respective firms, included 3 men and 5 women, and 7 Whites and 1 Black. Responses were categorized by five themes: type of relationship to a mentor, characteristics of mentors, positive experiences with mentors, disappointments in the mentoring experience, and the ideal mentoring program. Recurring responses for type of relationship to a mentor were identified by use of words such as “formal” and “assigned”; responses for characteristics of mentors were identified by the use of words such as “Type A,” “good teacher,” and “informative”; responses for positive experience were identified by the use of words such as “encouragement” and “caring”; and responses for disappointments were identified by the use of phrases such as “inadequate feedback”; the theme of ideal mentoring was recognized by use of phrases such as “individualizing programs” and “freedom to explore.”

All responses to the first question were positive. Every associate had been assigned a mentor (or, in some cases, two mentors had been assigned). Some associates had only a partner as mentor, and others had both a partner-mentor and an associate-mentor. If a new associate had an associate-mentor, that mentor was “senior” and had been with the firm for several years and was very knowledgeable about the firm, its partners, and accepted work practices. According to information provided by the interviewees, senior associate-mentors also represented safety to new associates because they are less intimidating than partners and they remember the anxiety and confusion of new associates.

Some associates said they did not have a formal mentor, but agreed that an assigned mentor was a formal relationship. Associates described how they had acquired a mentor as, “When you first join the

firm, you are given a mentor” or repeatedly mentioned the word “assigned.” The formal type of mentor is contrasted with the other partner-mentors whom associates acquire later as a result of work in their specialty practices.

Associates considered themselves to be similar to their mentors in personality and outlook toward work. One associate said, “We are all the same—Type A personality. We are ‘on’ all the time.” Another said, “I have a personality mesh with my mentors.” Other comments included the phrases “click with a partner” and “finding a partner you are comfortable with.”

The second interview question asked associates to “Describe positive aspects of your mentoring relationship.” Several subcategories were identified: learning to do the work and handle clients, getting feedback in their work, and socializing to build relationships. These are considered benefits derived from the mentor relationship because associates learn how partners expect work to be completed, receive important feedback to help them improve their work, and start to form new relationships with other partners and associates in a social setting.

Associates cited the benefits of working with their mentors as “having freedom to try things and get support,” “learning to meet and handle clients,” and “get involved in real work, like depositions.” They all agreed their mentors gave “good feedback” or they benefitted because they can “get credit” for their work. Regular contact with a mentor with whom they closely work was also frequently mentioned as a benefit.

Socializing after work hours was considered to be a way to “meet other partners through your mentor and get new work from them” or a way to meet other lawyers and judges, “to strengthen personal connections.” One associate described socializing as a way to “build community.” Associates regarded those occasions as opportunities to advance at work. Two associates noted they are seldom asked to socialize and they believed they missed out on prime assignments due to their exclusion.

Associates spoke about their mentors’ enthusiasm ‘and ‘about the interest their mentors took in helping them advance in ability. They characterized mentors as good teachers. Repeated comments focused on exceptional teaching ability, not only for the law but for technical aspects of submitting work. Associates said their mentors “were knowledgeable,” “will share information,” and were an “endless resource.” One first-year associate said mentors “look out for my interest.” The person she considered her primary mentor recognized she was “good at the work” and helped her get other assignments from other partners. A third-year associate said his mentor was “confident in my ability” and “gives encouragement.”

When asked to “Describe any disappointments in the mentoring relationship, they began to itemize some of the experiences with mentors that had fallen short of their expectations. Most attributed disappointment to the firms’ policies and not to the individual mentors. One associate did fault the mentor but only in the context of how the mentor was part of a “misguided mentoring program.” One associate firmly iterated that she had no disappointment. Recurring responses noted not enough personal contact, socializing with the intent of furthering professional work and relationships, or failing to provide adequate feedback.

Two associates complained about lack of inclusion in in-groups because “[I’m] not part of the ‘old boys’ club” and “[I’m] not included by my mentor in social activity like going out to impromptu lunches where the ‘good’ assignments are given out” to “[I’m] not from the same law school as the others” and “[I’m] not getting a chance to meet people outside the firm.” Other associates’ comments were focused on lack of feedback, minimal teaching, and the mentoring program itself.

Two associates indicated they were not satisfied with the structured mentoring program and that the “initial assignment [of a mentor and specialty] was disappointing” because it was a specialty the associate did not like. Associates did not like to be overly supervised, wanted freedom to choose mentors and specialties themselves, and sought to form personal connections with many partners quickly. Although associates wanted the freedom to choose, they acknowledged that one must “know what questions to ask” a partner because “there’s no hand-holding here.” None of the interviewed associates expressed interest in slowly learning the organization’s policies and practices.

When asked “What would an ideal mentoring program look like for you?” protégés expressed three themes: less formality, an individualized program, and selecting a mentor with power and an interest in

mentoring. Repeated comments highlighted the desire for autonomy: “The associate should find a mentor in his specialty by himself,” “[I] should have the freedom to contact partners with questions by myself,” and the “associate should be encouraged to be proactive and contact any partner they want.” Two associates sought a “not overly structured” introduction to the firm characterized as “informal openness.”

One described an ideal program as one that would “orbit around the person.” Another suggested “putting into place a facilitator who would make possible all the connections” to partners that the associate desired. A third-year believed associates should “have freedom to explore the firm” so they would not need mentors assigned to them immediately. The theme of individualizing programs was again noted by an associate who said, “There should be sensitivity to individual needs like diversity and gender.”

Associates wanted a mentor with “power in the firm” and who was highly regarded in the firm for his or her accomplishments. They acknowledged that powerful partners could open doors for associates within the firm and throughout the legal community. An associate who was nearing the time for becoming a partner in the firm said that a mentoring program “should include incentives for partners to mentor and teach. Some of their billable hours should go into this.”

Associates offered more details about their informal mentors whom they acquired once they had actually selected a practice that they would pursue as a permanent “calling. The mentors from the selected practice were admired for their knowledge, for their ability to introduce associates to clients and other professionals, and for their power within the firm. The usefulness of mentors as described in these associate interviews confirms Kram’s (1983) observations of the stages in the mentor relationship and is similar to what Kram called the “cultivation” phase when mentors expose newcomers to a range of functions.

Associates compared themselves to their mentors, noting that they had similar personalities or perspectives on the work. Kram called this the “initiation” phase when newcomers develop a positive fantasy about their mentors and try to behave like them. Associates liked to socialize with their acquired mentors because they had opportunity to meet on social occasions when work assignments were distributed and networking was nurtured. Two associates said that they knew they had missed out on getting the better assignments because their mentors either lacked power to help them or because they mentors simply did not include them in social activity such as a work-day lunch outside the office. Even though one associate had received positive feedback through a recent formal performance review, the associate felt the absence of meaningful feedback that would otherwise be revealed during those important social events to which the associate never received an invitation. Associates hinted at covert discrimination based on not being exactly like their partners. Although associates were hired ostensibly because they were highly recommended by their law schools and were expected to perform well for the firm, no associate could describe how the early socialization process helped integrate someone into the firm if they were from different schools, economic, social or racial backgrounds. Benishek, et al (2004) had found that mentors and mentees seek similarity; the differences of class and race present barriers to finding that similarity in firms lacking diversity. Associates’ comments also confirm what Blass (2007) had noted, that mentors could be useful in helping newcomers develop political savvy and networking skills. In other words, mentors could help associates become insiders. Clearly, some associates felt disadvantaged by not having mentors who shared their backgrounds of race or class. They also believed that they were not learning how to navigate office politics as successfully as others who had mentors more like them.

Associates mentioned how their law firms were not a place to work if associates were not proactive or if they needed “hand holding.” Feedback was the key to enhancing performance; associates needed to develop strong relationships with mentors and engage them in ongoing feedback. Batt and Katz (2004) described mentoring as being multi-layered, providing newcomers with information on their attitudes and work habits as well as on task related functions. The consummate mentor should assess the associate on many levels and provide feedback that was meaningful and specific. Associates who believed they were relegated to outsider status could not develop positive outlooks as explained by Griffin et al (2000) and would suffer a lack of self-confidence and self-efficacy. Other associates who had been included in social

networking were enjoying early career advancement identified by personal contact with clients and inclusion in important meetings and court appearances. These associates were very positive and enthusiastic about their work and very proud of their firms. Their need for professional growth was being met, they felt rapport with partners because they shared similar values, and their jobs had evolved to levels requiring full use of complex skills. Their experiences confirm the work of Bauer, et al (2007) who linked newcomer adjustment to clarity about role expectations (mentor feedback), self-efficacy, and social acceptance by peers.

They expressed a desire for autonomy not only in completing their work, but also in deciding what they needed in respect to resources or partner contact to accomplish their goals. One associate offered a solution that actually was hinted at by others, that the firms should assign one person to the task of providing associates with the experiences or resources they needed at the associates' requests. Rather than having the firm map out a socialization program for them, associates felt that they were capable of deciding what they wanted to learn and how the firm could facilitate that process. Mentors would be selected by associates when they were ready to commit to a practice. Their concept of an ideal mentoring program does not follow what Van Maanan (1978) or Jones (1986) proposed for socialization and mentoring programs that result in custodial roles for associates. They favored a collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, investiture program. Under that plan, associates would begin employment with formal group training, as in the summer program which corresponds to the collective and formal aspects of Van Maanan's and Jones' custodial socialization programs. Custodial programs would follow a fixed, precise time frame of learning that uses modeling as the method of achieving stability. Associates would also be offered validation of their usefulness through feedback from mentors. Associates, however, envisioned a different socialization plan. Associates would choose a path that Van Maanan and Jones would consider innovative, not custodial: individual, informal, less proscribed, less limiting, and more open to associates deciding what learning or experience would come next. Associates would also include modeling mentors' behaviors as a benefit to their professional growth.

CONFERENCE

The associate lawyer interview responses pointed out a need to have well trained mentors who understood protégé needs for exposure to the organization, new challenges, and frequent formative feedback. The mentoring conference, designed and marketed to women but open to anyone interested in mentoring, responded to needs of many different groups: women just starting out in their careers (or near ready to enter the job force) and those who need to find better, more responsive mentors to help further their already established careers. Eighty-six attendees represented faculty and administrators from fourteen colleges and several for-profit organizations. They ranged in age from mid- twenty year olds to 40 + year olds.

All conference registrants were women which made it possible to develop presentations that would meet their specific needs and address common concerns and interests. Benishek, Bieschke, Park, and Slatery (2004), looking at existing models of mentoring from a multicultural feminist perspective, argued that since individuals have a desire to be mentored by those who are similar to them, it is more difficult for women, women of color, ethnically diverse people, and different social classes to find mentors from similar backgrounds. If they do find a suitably similar mentor, it is likely the mentor may be less effective in helping the protégé find opportunity for showcasing her talent because the mentor has less status and power in the organization than his or her White male counterparts. Traditional mentoring has been paternalistic and not responsive to the needs of marginalized sectors, particularly to those who choose a nonlinear career path. An approach to mentoring that recognizes, values, and explores differences allows for successful professional development of marginalized persons. When the relationship is supportive, the protégé can focus on learning about the organization and its political and social requirements. Empowerment of the protégé and collaboration with the mentor is a path to increased job satisfaction. It is critically important for women in the work force to be proactive and self-reflective. Age, gender, race, or any other exceptionality may be a barrier to their success unless they master proactivity, self-

understanding, and self-efficacy. The short term goal of the conference was to help attendees develop an awareness of how mentoring helps them thrive in their professional lives and develops a sense of job satisfaction. Another short term goal was development of a personal plan for seeking appropriate mentor relationships, including discussion of being proactive, assessing one's own skills, and how to seek help. Lastly, participants were able to network with others throughout the day long event to find mentors or find opportunity to become mentors. A long term goal was for participants to put their plans and strategies into action and find caring and influential mentors who can help them in their work. Another long term goal was to create a new group of mentors who will "pay forward" to others because they understand how to mentor and are willing to do so.

The one-day conference was designed with an opening plenary, followed by sessions titled: Understanding Mentoring, Being a Great Mentor, What to Expect from Your Mentor, Communication for Mentoring Success, Conflict and Negotiation, and Working with Mentoring Tools. A networking lunch and ending reception provided time for further connections and sharing.

All participants were expected to develop a plan for professional success that focused on finding good mentors, developing fruitful relationships with them, and learning how to evaluate their progress periodically. They were asked to provide voluntary feedback in the next year on the use they have made of their strategic plan and the measure of success they have experienced. The participants were asked to fill out an evaluation sheet at the end of the day to let organizers know what features of the conference were most interesting and useful, which were not, and why. This was followed up by an interest survey via internet which allowed more time for reflection. Some survey participants agreed to engage in follow-up interviews about the success of their strategic plans to take place near the end of the first year post conference.

RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP

Responses from participants in the conference survey stressed their desire to become more effective as mentors or as protégés and wanted to learn what one woman termed "concrete steps" to achieve that goal. They recognized that newcomers who are mentored, as opposed to those who are not mentored, are more quickly sensitized to power and politics; the more intense the mentoring relationship, the greater the degree of the newcomer's learning and self-confidence. Participants shared details of socialization programs that assign mentors to newcomers in a formalized way sometimes requiring participation in a mentorship program and in other specified activities. The forced nature of this kind of relationship may serve a proscribed initiation goal; however, it may also decrease the mentor's motivation to help beyond the proscribed program. Informal mentorships, in which mentors select protégées with whom they identify and develop more authentic relationships, are more likely to provide psychosocial guidance and result in higher levels of career success and satisfaction (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992). A survey responder said that she had learned a protégé should "be honest about our role in the relationship and, if results were unsatisfactory, not to be afraid to seek another mentor." The conference protégé group noted that when the protégé receives psychosocial support as well as career-related support from the mentor, the likely result is a perception that his or her interests are being protected. One said that she would value "being interactive" with her mentor and another (who had been a long-time mentor) said the mentor should "remain approachable." Since receipt of rewards such as salary increases and promotion are the result of high performance levels and are related to job satisfaction, clearly, those who have either an informal or formal mentor will benefit over those who do not have a mentor. While some newcomers may be able to achieve desired rewards such as promotions and salary increases without a mentor, it is unclear about the length of time their advancements take and how much harder they must work to achieve their goals as compared to those newcomers with mentors to help guide them. Conference participants who were protégés wanted to learn how they could network to find influential mentors that would help them advance in skill and responsibility as well as learn successful tactics for salary negotiations. One woman's survey response indicated the conference taught her to "move away from unhealthy relationships" in the workplace. Another said that a mentor should "support in a positive way-don't treat the protégé as

competition.” Younger proteges commented on open ended questions that they wanted mentors who understood the need for “work-life balance” which is a frequently expressed desire in Gen Y groups. Another women wrote that “participating [in the conference] enabled me to increase my confidence interacting with new people.”

Dreher and Ash (1990) completed a study of business school graduates who had been in mentoring relationships and found that mentoring did contribute to career success, particularly in salary levels. However, they noted a difference between income levels of men and women, which they argued was the result of socialization programs that have not recognized the growing number of women in the labor force and their contributions to the organization’s profits.

Those mentors who have had experience with both high-performing students and struggling students were of most value in a mentoring role. This kind of mentor was also most useful in developing political understanding and networking skills (Blass, Brouer, Perrew, & Ferris, 2007). Those newcomers who have the mentoring advantage and are able to acquire political savvy eventually become insiders, unlike those, such as women and ethnic or racial minorities, who may find themselves closed out of the political game and permanently disadvantaged as a result. In that case, the newcomer should employ proactive behaviors to narrow the discrepancies between groups and acquire a supportive mentor who will recognize the newcomer’s lack of political understanding and opportunity for networking.

It also highlighted the expectations of members of Generation Y for more autonomy in the way their socialization is planned and a desire for faster professional development. Numerous comments during conference sessions stressed the need for frequent detailed feedback from mentors.

Managerial leadership should carefully assess how well their present socialization programs provide, not only technical training, but also how frequently feedback is given to newcomers and whether feedback effectively targets improved work quality and provides praise for outstanding performance.

Feedback is an area that warrants attention, especially if mentor and protégé are dissimilar in race, class, or gender, because differences sometimes result in communication barriers. Managerial leadership should develop a mentoring program that trains mentors how to develop job satisfaction in newcomers by increasing the frequency of feedback and improving the quality and detail of the feedback. Managers who hold important and powerful positions in the organization and mentors who can be matched by race or gender, for example should be encouraged to mentor. They should receive training on how to be effective mentors to protégés who share similar characters as well as with those who are different from them. They should be offered incentives such as recognition, time off, or other honors, to participate in mentoring programs because they can enrich newcomers’ perceptions of connection to the organization’s culture and goals.

Findings of this study suggested that management should examine the effect of generational differences on their organizational culture. Introducing a group of people, such as members of Generation Y, who share characteristics that are noticeably different from incumbents, most likely senior management (members of the Boomer Generation) can cause the organization to experience disequilibrium. Recent articles that examined this generation’s differences in the legal profession (Amron, 2008; Williamson, 2010) acknowledge that Generation Y members are less likely to desire a slow path and are more eager for advancement quickly. They also want to achieve a work–life balance that challenges the more traditional pattern followed by senior lawyers, who often worked long hours to the detriment of personal life. Managerial leadership must be sensitive to the desire for work-life balance and to different generational attitudes towards work and hierarchy. Developing a long term professional development plan for each newcomer will help the organization understand each newcomers’ goals and motivations. A timetable for achieving those goals while still functioning smoothly within the established work patterns of the organization will increase job satisfaction and assure newcomers that the organization cares about their careers. Managerial leadership with help from its human resource professionals should periodically seek feedback from a newcomer about satisfaction with his or her movement towards career goals and facilitate modification of the plan as needed. Similarly, it should seek feedback from mentors who will be able to offer advice for the improvement of the mentoring program.

REFERENCES

- Baranik, L.E., Roling, E.A. & Eby, L.T. (2010). Why does mentoring work?: The role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 76 (3), 336-373.
- Batt, C. & Katz, H.N. (2004). Confronting students: Evaluation in the process of mentoring student professional development. *Clinical Law Review*. 10,581-610.
- Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D, M. & Tucker, J. (2007). Newcomer Adjustment During Organizational Socialization: A Meta-Analytic Review of Antecedents, Outcomes, and Methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 92(3),707-721.
- Benishek, L., Bieschke, K., Park, J., & Slatery, S. (2004). A Multicultural Feminist Model of Mentoring. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*. 32, 428-442.
- Blass, F. R., Brouer, R., L., Perrewew, P. L., Ferris, Gerald, R. (2007). Politicis, understanding and networking ability as a function of mentoring: the roles of gender and race. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. 14(2),93.
- Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 539–546.
- Dow, R. S.. 2010. Socialization of new lawyers: The influence of values congruence and mentoring on job satisfaction. *ProQuest*.
- Ensher, E.A. & Murphy, S.E. (2011).The Mentoring Relationship Challenges Scales: The impact of mentoring stage, type, and gender. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 79, 253-266.
- Griffin, A. E. S., Colella, A., & Goparaju, S. (2000). Newcomer and organizational socialization tactics: An interactionist perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(4), 453–474.
- Jones, G. R. (1988) Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(2), 262-279.
- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the Mentor Relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*. 26(4), 608-625.
- Parise, M. R., & Forret, M. (2008). Formal mentoring programs: The relationship of program design and support to mentors' perceptions of benefits and costs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 225–40.
- Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A.(2001). An Investigation of the Moderating Effects of Gender on the Relationships between Mentorship Initiation and Protégé Perceptions of Mentoring Functions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 59, 342-363.
- Schein, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Industrial Management Review*, 9(2), 1-16.
- Schein, Edgar H. (1996). Culture: The Missing Concept in Organization Studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 41(2), 229-240.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). *Toward a theory of organizational socialization*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Yan, S. (2006). Understanding Generation Y. *The Oberlin Review* retrieved 3/5/2009 from www.oberlin.edu/stupub/ocreview/200g/12/08/features/Understanding_Generation_Y