

Advisor–Advisee Relationships in Graduate Training Programs

Journal of Career Development
38(1) 3-18

© Curators of the University
of Missouri 2011

Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0894845309358887
<http://jcd.sagepub.com>



Lewis Z. Schlosser,¹ Heather Z. Lyons,²
Regine M. Talleyrand,³ Bryan S. K. Kim,⁴
and W. Brad Johnson⁵

Abstract

Advisor–advisee relationships are an important aspect of the career development of professionals in many fields; however, limited scholarship has focused on these relationships. In the three articles of this special section, the authors attempt to help remedy this situation by articulating a culturally infused model of advising relationships in graduate training. This article lays the foundation for the authors' model by reviewing the literature relevant to advising and mentoring. In the subsequent articles, the authors propose that it is critical to understand how within-group cultural variables affect the advising relationship. Articulating a framework for understanding the advising relationship as a multicultural endeavor may help educators prepare the next generations of professionals and facilitate increased empirical attention to this important, yet underexamined construct.

Keywords

advising relationships, graduate training, mentoring relationships, multiculturalism, career development

¹ Department of Professional Psychology and Family Therapy, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ, USA

² Department of Psychology, Loyola University Maryland, Baltimore, USA

³ Graduate School of Education, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

⁴ Department of Psychology, University of Hawaii at Hilo, USA

⁵ Department of Leadership, Ethics, and Law, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, USA

Corresponding Author:

Lewis Z. Schlosser, Department of Professional Psychology and Family Therapy, Seton Hall University, 400 S. Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079, USA
Email: schlosle@shu.edu

Advisor–advisee relationships are an important aspect of doctoral training, but until recently, they have remained relatively unexamined (Knox, Schlosser, Pruitt, & Hill, 2006; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, 2005; Schlosser & Kahn, 2007; Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, & Hill, 2003). This is surprising, given that advising relationships have existed since the beginning of doctoral programs. We believe, as do other scholars (e.g., Gelso, 1979, 1993), that the doctoral-level advising relationship has the potential to profoundly affect a student’s professional development and career path (Burney et al. 2009; Kenny, Blustein, Haase, Jackson, & Peery, 2006); this potential should exist across academic disciplines. The multifaceted nature of the advising relationship underscores its importance; advisors typically facilitate advisees’ progress through the program, provide a link for students between the academic and professional worlds (e.g., encouraging conference attendance, professional networking), work with them on research requirements (e.g., dissertation), and serve in one of many potential capacities for their advisees (e.g., teaching, supervising professional activities, providing career guidance, facilitating professional development, modeling ethical practice, and providing culturally informed education). Therefore, career development scholars and practitioners alike could benefit from increased scholarly attention to advising relationships.

Structure of the Three Articles

In this, the first of three articles, we define the relevant terms and review the literature on advising and mentoring relationships in academia. Across the PsycInfo and Academic Search Premier databases, we searched for “graduate advisor,” “graduate advising,” and “graduate advising relationship” to locate articles for inclusion in our review. In the second article of this special section, we define the cultural constructs included in our model and critically review the relevant literatures on (a) within-group cultural variables, (b) cultural issues in faculty–student relationships, and (c) contextual and environmental variables. In the final article, we articulate a multicultural model of advising relationships. Within this model, we highlight the process and outcomes of advisor–advisee interactions and discuss the impact of within-group variables and cultural identities on the advising relationship. We conclude the final article with several implications for training and the professional development of graduate students as well as suggestions for future research.

Introduction to Graduate Advising

Schlosser et al. (2003) defined *advisor* as “the faculty member who has the greatest responsibility for helping guide the advisee through the graduate program” (p. 179). Interestingly, Schlosser and Gelso (2001) found that doctoral programs use several different terms to identify the person who performs the roles and functions of what we have termed an advisor (e.g., mentor, major professor, committee chair, and dissertation chair). However, definitions often fail to capture the myriad roles and

functions of the graduate advisor. In the course of their work together, the advisor often must negotiate a delicate balance between the advisee being a student and becoming a colleague (Gelso, 1979, 1993). Such complexity, which is typical of advising relationships (Knox et al., 2006), might contribute to the relative lack of empirical research on the topic. The extant research demonstrates that the advisor–advisee working alliance is associated with student research self-efficacy, positive attitudes toward research, interest in professional activities (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001), and advisor perceived benefits and costs associated with advising (Schlosser & Gelso, 2005). The advising relationship, then, is important for advisees and advisors and has the potential to affect advisees' career development, professional functioning, and the general quality of the discipline.

We believe that graduate advising is important for any discipline that uses an apprenticeship model. This is because we see advising as one way in which doctoral students are socialized into their respective professions. In this way, the advisor does much more than provide course selection advisement and/or dissertation supervision; the advisor occupies a complex position in which she or he fills many overlapping roles with the student, each designed to promote the student's professional development. As a result, the advisor typically becomes the repository for significant amounts of information about the advisee across domains and is generally the faculty member who is most familiar with a particular student. In sum, it is our contention that advising relationships are essential to the training and development of future professionals. What is lacking from the literature is a conceptual model of advising relationships, which is what we will offer in this group of articles.

Advising Is the Gateway to Mentoring

In the effort to articulate a beginning model of graduate advising, it is necessary to clarify the contours between advising and mentoring relationships. Whereas literature on advising in doctoral programs is sparse, the same is not true of theory and research on mentoring (Johnson, 2003; Johnson, Rose, & Schlosser, 2007). Research on faculty–student mentorships in graduate settings indicates a positive correlation between mentoring and a number of personal and professional benefits for graduate students and faculty mentors. Although mentoring suggests an inherently positive, mutual, and emotionally bonded relationship, it is clear that not all advising relationships are mentorships. As advising relationships become more globally positive, they begin to share characteristics with mentoring relationships (Schlosser et al., 2003; Schlosser & Foley, 2008). Hence, improving the overall quality of advising relationships stands to enhance the frequency of mentorships, which will, in turn, benefit both students and faculty. In addition, the general public will benefit from more mentorships via the production of more competent and confident professionals and more productive and satisfied faculty advisors.

Culture Matters

The United States is undergoing dramatic changes in terms of increasing number of racial and ethnic minority persons. Currently, Latino/a Americans represent 14.8% of the total U.S. population, with African Americans, Asian Americans, and American Indians representing 12.8%, 4.4%, and 1.0%, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008a). By the year 2042, however, it has been estimated that the number of racial and ethnic minority individuals will be more than 50% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008b). Already in California, Hawaii, New Mexico, and Texas, People of Color constitute over 50% of the state populations (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). Despite the potential barriers, it is possible that this increase might signal an increase in the pool of applicants to doctoral-level academic programs, and this trend poses potential challenges for advisors who must become aware of and sensitive to the unique needs of diverse students. It will also be important to consider greater faculty diversity, although it will take time before the faculty composition at U.S. colleges and universities mirrors the general population (National Opinion Research Center, 2007).

Because models of advising are only now emerging, there is a rare opportunity to infuse them with a clear multicultural emphasis at the formative stage—this is what we have done with our model of doctoral-level advising relationships (see article, this issue). It is our contention that within-group cultural variables (e.g., racial identity, acculturation) are important across all kinds of interpersonal relationships, including advisor–advisee interactions. Heretofore, there has been little attention to how within-group variables affect advising relationships. Inattention to the interaction of culture and advising is not surprising, given the limited scholarship on advising in general, yet this situation offers a rare opportunity to engage in culture-focused model building in an emerging area of training unencumbered by pre-existing models. We assume that racial and cultural socialization experiences influence advisor–advisee interactions, making it critical to understand these experiences within and outside of the advising relationship.

There are several reasons why it is vital to engage in culturally conscious advising relationships. First, because of the potential for emotionally laden interpersonal exchanges around culture (Fox, 2001), and because of the way that culture informs interpersonal interactions (Helms & Cook, 1999), cultural issues are critical to the development of a comprehensive advising framework. Second, because more students from diverse backgrounds will soon seek doctoral training (National Opinion Research Center, 2007), faculty members need to know how to effectively train these students, many of whom will be culturally different from the faculty. Third, it is important to infuse culture into our understanding of advising relationships to accurately portray the socialization experiences of all students and faculty, including those with dominant identities (e.g., Whites, heterosexuals, and men). Finally, we recognize that we must go beyond race in our understanding of cultural socialization experiences; clearly different cultural identities will be salient for different people.

Hence, our examination of cultural socialization experiences will include gender and sexual orientation identities as well. We acknowledge that there are many other dimensions of cultural identity that can and do affect the advising process (e.g., social class, ability status, native language, religion, spirituality, and generation status), but we limited our focus to those variables for which there is an adequate theoretical and research literature.

The Writing Team

We would like to note that very thoughtful consideration was taken in constructing the writing team. Specifically, we wanted a balanced team with multiple voices (i.e., men and women, People of Color, and Whites) and one that lacked an inherent power imbalance (e.g., a graduate student working with her or his advisor). Thus, no one on the team has had any supervisory capacity over any of the others. In addition to the members of the team knowing each other quite well (e.g., three of the five authors attended graduate school together), we frequently discussed our own process to ensure that each person felt that her or his voice was heard. The five authors on the team self-identify as (a) an European American Jewish male in his mid-30s, (b) a Black/Biracial Christian female in her mid-thirties, (c) an African American female in her late 30s, (d) an Asian American male in his late 30s, and (e) an European American Protestant male in his mid-40s. In addition, each author has experience being in culturally similar and dissimilar advising relationships as an advisee and/or advisor.

Advising and Mentoring in Academia

Definitions of Advising and Mentoring

Although not synonymous nor mutually exclusive, advising and mentoring are terms frequently used to label and describe the relationship between a graduate student and the faculty member who is primarily responsible for facilitating the student's progress through the program (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Recently, there has been some discussion in the literature regarding the nature and function of these terms (e.g., Johnson, 2002; Schlosser et al., 2003; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; Weil, 2001). Because the value of any model of advising hinges on a clear definition of terms, we now operationally define advising and contrast it with mentoring. In doing so, we intend to articulate similarities and differences between these two constructs.

Advising refers to a relationship that may be positive, neutral, or negative with regard to valence, and the content of said relationship will also vary based on the degree to which the advisor facilitates the advisee's professional development (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, 2005). In fact, the extent of the advisor's involvement in the life of a particular advisee can vary from minimal to extensive. At the most basic level, for example, an advisor might only help the student with course selection and limit her or his interactions to this purpose. At the other end of the spectrum, an

advisor might see her or his role as multifaceted; prominent roles may include guiding the student through coursework, comprehensive examinations, and the dissertation processes, as well as assisting the student to develop a program of research, select professional placements (as needed), and make other key career decisions. Obviously, these two advising perspectives are at opposite ends of a spectrum concerning student–faculty interactions, and faculty members are likely to find themselves at different locations on this continuum depending on the setting in which they work and the specific advisee with whom they interact.

To compare, *mentoring* refers to an inherently positive relationship (as the term *mentor* connotes a positive valence) in which the protégé learns professional skills from a more senior person (Green & Bauer, 1995). Although mentoring relationships are inherently positive, there has been some scholarship on dysfunctional mentoring (e.g., Eby & McManus, 2004; Simon & Eby, 2003). However, as noted by Simon and Eby (2003), this work is focused on unpleasant *aspects* of mentoring relationships, as opposed to negative or harmful *relationships*. In academia, negative or dissatisfying student–faculty relationships are most likely to be advising relationships that never take on the positive valence of a mentorship. This is an important distinction between advising and mentoring (i.e., advising allows for a wider range of relationship forms and experiences than does mentoring, which is limited to positive relationships).

Although very positive advising relationships are likely to be similar to mentoring relationships, very poor or negative advising relationships have very little, if anything, to do with mentorship. So, perhaps advising and mentoring relationships exist on a continuum of graduate student–faculty interactions (Schlosser & Foley, 2008). Recent research (Knox et al., 2006; Schlosser et al., 2003) reveals that a student’s relationship with her or his advisor can be negative, neutral, or positive, and as the relationship becomes increasingly positive, both members of the dyad are likely to describe it in ways that approximate a mentorship. It is important to note that the label *mentor* is applied as an honor by the protégé to the mentor, and it is often done retrospectively (Weil, 2001). This would be in stark contrast to assigning a mentor to a student, or a faculty member presuming that she or he is mentoring a student.

Three final distinctions between advising and mentoring concern setting, proximity, and prevalence; mentoring can occur informally and/or away from the academic setting, whereas advising tends to be formalized and generally occurs within an academic department. In addition, an advisor is almost always a part of the student’s program or department, whereas a mentor could be anywhere within or outside of the institution. Finally, while students almost always report having an advisor (e.g., Schlosser & Gelso, 2001), the prevalence of mentoring typically falls between 50% and 66% (e.g., Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000). Therefore, focusing on advising, in contrast to mentoring alone, allows for a more thorough sampling of the graduate student population and a greater range of student–faculty experiences.

Student–Faculty Relationships

We now review the literature on student–faculty relationships. This literature forms the foundation for a multiculturally infused model of advising. We limited our review to studies directly relevant to the academic environment, because advising relationships are contextually bound (Green & Bauer, 1995). We also limited our focus to graduate students, because the undergraduate advising relationship is qualitatively different from the graduate school experience.

Graduate Advising

Our literature review on student–faculty relationships netted several studies focused specifically on graduate advising. Briefly, we found studies describing instrument development, assessing how advising relationships influenced relevant professional outcomes and exploring the perceptions of the advising relationship. Each of these studies will be amplified below.

In one of the first published instrument development studies of graduate advising, Schlosser and Gelso (2001) constructed the Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version (AWAI-S), a paper-and-pencil, 30-item self-report measure to assess the working alliance between the advisor and advisee from the advisee’s perspective. The three subscales of the AWAI-S are *rapport* (measuring the degree of interpersonal connection between advisor and advisee), *apprenticeship* (measuring the tasks of the advising relationship and the degree of advisee professional development on the part of the advisor), and *identification–individuation* (measuring how much the advisee wants or does not want to be like his or her advisor). Major findings included positive correlations between the advisory working alliance and student research self-efficacy, attitudes toward research, and perceptions of the advisor’s expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. These findings, which come from two data collections totaling over 300 doctoral students, provide initial evidence of reliability and validity for the AWAI-S. This study highlights the role of the advisor in terms of facilitating relevant advisee outcomes, as well as the importance of the advisor’s personal and professional characteristics. This study was limited, however, in that only the advisees’ perceptions were assessed.

Schlosser and Gelso (2005) then created an advisor version for their AWAI-S, the 31-item Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Advisor Version (AWAI-A). The three subscales of the AWAI-A are *rapport* (measuring the degree of interpersonal connection between advisor and advisee), *apprenticeship* (measuring the degree to which the advisor perceives the advisee as an apprentice and facilitates the advisee’s professional development), and *task focus* (measuring the degree to which the advisor helps the advisee progress through graduate school and the productivity and efficiency of advisor–advisee meetings). Major findings included positive correlations between advisory working alliance and advisor benefits from advising, satisfaction with the advising relationship, and ratings of advisor–advisee meeting smoothness

and positivity. In addition, advisors' perceptions of advisory working alliance were related to students' research self-efficacy and interest in science and practice—as rated by the advisor. Finally, the AWAI-A score was negatively related to the costs (e.g., time, energy) associated with advising. This study highlighted the importance of outcome considerations for the advisor (i.e., costs and benefits, satisfaction). The initial estimates of reliability and validity were good using two data collections totaling 280 faculty advisors.

Schlosser and Kahn (2007) used the AWAI-S and AWAI-A to determine the degree to which advisors and advisees saw their relationship similarly. Their results of nearly 50 advisor–advisee dyads yielded a moderate level of agreement between student and faculty. In addition, alliance ratings correlated with several training variables that are important for doctoral education (e.g., research self-efficacy and competence). More recently, Rice et al. (2009) sought to assess the psychometric properties and factor structure of the AWAI-S with a diverse international student population. The scale demonstrated good reliability and validity estimates with the sample of nearly 300 international students. Furthermore, the AWAI-S factor structure was replicated across the data collections of Schlosser and Gelso (2001) and Rice et al. Taken together, these studies provide sound support for these two instruments (AWAI-S and AWAI-A) that career development researchers can use to quantify the advising relationship.

Our literature review also revealed two qualitative studies of advising relationships. The first of these (Schlosser et al., 2003) examined the graduate advising relationship from the advisee's perspective. Sixteen third-year doctoral students were interviewed about their relationships with their advisors. This study yielded telling differences based on the student's perceived satisfaction with their advising relationship. For example, students satisfied with their advising relationships described their advising experience as being akin to a mentor–protégé relationship, where they felt respected, supported, and encouraged. The advisor served as a positive role model, who helped the advisee navigate the demands of graduate school effectively. In contrast, students dissatisfied with their advising relationships described their advising experiences as harmful; these students often felt ignored, unimportant, and neglected. They felt a lowered self-efficacy for professional activities and a lack of guidance for progressing through their graduate program. Results from this research suggest that it may be preferable for students to select their advisors than for the program to make assignments. This is because giving students ownership in the process might positively affect their commitment to the advising relationship.

In the second qualitative study (Knox et al., 2006), 19 faculty members were interviewed about advising relationships. These faculty members were asked about their approach to advising in general, and then to speak specifically about relationships with two advisees, one that was positive and one that was negative or difficult. Participants saw their role as advisors to be one in which they supported and advocated for their advisees and facilitated their advisees' progress through the doctoral program. These advisors identified personal satisfaction as a benefit for advising and

time demands as the biggest cost. Positive/good advising relationships were characterized by mutual respect, open communication, a lack of conflict, and similarity in career path between advisor and advisee. In contrast, negative or difficult relationships were characterized by a lack of respect, communication problems, and an avoidance of conflict between advisor and advisee. Furthermore, these students often had difficulties with research and these advisors often felt ineffective working with these students.

Two other studies revealed relevant findings vis-à-vis the graduate advising relationship. Specifically, there was a significant correlation between the quality of the advising relationship and the students' progress on their dissertation projects (Faghihi, 1998). Peacock (1996) noted similar findings related to timely completion of the dissertation. Hence, as noted previously, the advisor-advisee relationship is related to relevant training outcomes.

In sum, advising relationships are important for students and faculty, and there are salient outcomes of the advising relationship for both. In addition to general professional development and socialization, students with positive relationships with their advisors report increased research self-efficacy and interest in science and practice, as well as more positive attitudes toward research (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; Schlosser & Kahn, 2007). Benefits for faculty include personal satisfaction and increased feelings of generativity (Schlosser & Gelso, 2005; Schlosser & Kahn, 2007). Across these studies, it appears that *interpersonal* (i.e., psychosocial) and *instructional* (i.e., career-related) functions are present in most advising relationships, even in the most negative and difficult ones. The essential difference between positive and negative advising relationships, however, seems to be the valence and quality of these functions.

Mentoring

As previously discussed, advising is not equivalent to mentoring; in fact, most formal student-faculty relationships are advising relationships. Advisors are expected to perform technical guidance functions and facilitate a student's progress through a program as the primary contact point with the larger faculty (Weil, 2001). A broad role that is often formalized and structured, advising does not always signal the presence of mentoring; one can be an advisor without being a mentor and certainly, one can be a mentor to a student without being that student's advisor (Schlosser et al., 2003; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). In contrast to advising relationships that may ultimately be positive, negative, or insignificant in the graduate student's view, the term "mentor" nearly always signifies a person who has been instrumental and developmentally helpful, even invaluable, in the student's life. Because the term mentor connotes an inherently positive relationship and because it is often applied retrospectively or honorifically (Weil, 2001), speaking of "bad" mentoring may be oxymoronic. So, although the constructs of advising and mentoring are conceptually distinct, they are not mutually exclusive (Schlosser & Foley, 2008). In fact, very positive

advising relationships appear to share several characteristics with a mentoring relationship (Schlosser et al., 2003). Hence, we deemed that the mentoring literature might help us in our developing a theory of advising relationships.

Excellent mentoring relationships (mentorships) in graduate settings are dynamic, mutually rewarding personal relationships in which a more experienced faculty mentor acts as a guide, role model, teacher, and sponsor of a less experienced student (protégé). Mentors provide a range of career and relational functions to students, and mentoring signifies intentional and generative career development in the context of an increasingly bonded and reciprocal relationship (Johnson, 2002). Previous theoretical and empirical writing on mentoring consistently highlights several distinctive components of mentoring relationships in graduate education settings (Bode, 1999; Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Kram, 1985; Wilde & Schau, 1991). These include the following: (a) mentorships are enduring personal relationships, (b) mentorships are increasingly reciprocal over time, (c) relative to protégés, mentors demonstrate greater achievement and experience, (d) mentors provide protégés with direct career assistance (e.g., coaching, providing information), (e) mentors provide protégés with social and emotional support (e.g., affirmation, encouragement), (f) mentors serve as models of professional skills, (g) mentoring results in a positive identity transformation on the part of the protégé, (h) mentorships offer a safe harbor for self-exploration in the service of growth and development, and (i) the most highly rated mentorships are the most comprehensive—in the sense of covering a wide range of topics (professional and personal) and a wide range of contexts. In sum, mentoring can be differentiated from other relatively discrete roles of the graduate advisor (e.g., supervising, research oversight, and advice giving) in that mentoring signifies a strong, positive relationship characterized by intentional and generative career development (Johnson, 2002, 2003).

Mentoring benefits. There are numerous benefits associated with mentoring relationships in graduate school. Academic benefits include dissertation success and more timely degree completion (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Tenenbaum, Crosby, & Gilner, 2001). Mentored graduate students also evidence greater research productivity (Cameron & Blackburn, 1981, Hollingsworth & Fassinger, 2002; Tenenbaum et al., 2001). For instance, Hollingsworth and Fassinger (2002) found that the strength and valence of the research mentoring relationship had a significant impact on a student's research productivity. In addition, graduate students with a research mentor are significantly more likely to engage in productive research during their careers (Dohm & Cummings, 2002, 2003). Developing salient professional skills for both one's discipline and the institution is another benefit of having a mentor (Newby & Heide, 1992).

Mentored graduate students report greater networking in the sense of having access to sources of power, greater resources, and essential insider information (Wright & Wright, 1987), which, in turn, might facilitate securing initial employment (Newby & Heide, 1992). At least one study indicated that a student's level

of pre-doctoral productivity is less important in securing a first academic job than the mentor's eminence in the field (Long, 1978). In addition, protégés themselves are likely to enjoy greater career eminence during their careers than nonmentored graduate students (Cameron & Blackburn, 1981). Mentored graduate students also report greater confidence and a positive sense of self in the profession (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Peluchette & Jeanquart, 2000). Finally, mentored students are consistently more satisfied with their graduate programs and institutions (Clark et al., 2000; Tenenbaum et al., 2001).

Prevalence of mentoring. As noted previously, not everyone enjoys the benefits of being mentored in graduate school. In psychology, for example, counseling and clinical graduate students reported less frequent mentoring than experimental and other psychology doctoral students (Johnson, Koch, Fallow, & Huwe, 2000), and students in professional programs are less often mentored than those in traditional university-based programs (Clark et al., 2000). One possible explanation would be the student-to-faculty ratio and the potential availability of mentors. Beyond that, however, are other potential explanations as to why some graduate students are more likely to be mentored than others. Research on the attributes of attractive protégés suggests that potential mentors are drawn to talented and high-performing students who demonstrate considerable aptitude and strong potential for career success (Green & Bauer, 1995). In addition to seeking out talented students, faculty members are often attracted to students who remind them of themselves in important ways. Blackburn, Chapman, and Cameron (1981) found that when professors are asked to identify their "most successful" protégés, they consistently identify those highly productive protégés who have gone on to careers most similar to the mentor's. Dubbed "cloning" in graduate settings, Blackburn et al. suggested that "bringing up" protégés in one's own image helps us to justify personal career choices while simultaneously creating a network of like-minded researchers and colleagues.

In sum, mentoring relationships in academia are defined by (a) positive emotional valence, (b) increasing mutuality, (c) a range of career and psychosocial functions, and (d) an intentional focus on the development of the protégé's career and professional identity. Although nearly all graduate students report having an advisor, only half to two thirds of students report being mentored. Not only are the most talented students most likely to be mentored, outstanding mentoring relationships seem most prone to develop through informal student-faculty interaction. In contrast to advising relationships (which are more prevalent and more variable in quality), mentoring relationships are nearly always defined as career and life enhancing. Extant research indicates that mentoring and positive advising relationships are related to a variety of good outcomes related to professional development. However, professionals are currently unable to make many predictions about the negative consequences of poor advising relationships. There is little research on poor or mediocre advising relationships and such relationships share little in common with mentorship. Career counselors potentially could use this information to assist clients who are considering

doctoral education—especially as they seek to find a good fit with a particular program and advisor (or mentor).

The articles in this special section were designed to summarize existing research on student–faculty advising relationships in graduate settings with an emphasis on a multicultural framework. In this article—the first in this special section—we have summarized extant research on advising, and where relevant to advising, mentorship. The two articles that follow build on this foundation. In the second article, we explore the intersection between advising and multiculturalism. Specifically, we consider the interface of cultural variables such as race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation within the student–faculty advising relationships. The final article in this collection proposes a multiculturally infused model of advising relationships. In this summative contribution, the authors offer an integration of the literatures bearing on advising and multiculturalism. The article concludes with several recommendations for graduate educators, career counselors, and career development researchers.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Dr. Donald R. Atkinson, Dr. Jamila N. Codrington, and Dr. Pamela F. Foley for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

Declaration of Conflicting Interest

The authors declared no conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors declared no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

- Blackburn, R. T., Chapman, D. W., & Cameron, S. M. (1981). “Cloning” in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. *Research in Higher Education, 15*, 315-327.
- Bode, R. K. (1999). Mentoring and collegiality. In R. J. Menges & Associates (Eds.), *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support* (pp. 118-144). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burney, J. P., Celeste, B. L., Johnson, J. D., Klein, N. C., Nordal, K. C., & Portnoy, S. M. (2009). Mentoring professional psychologists: Programs for career development, advocacy, and diversity. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*, 292-298.
- Cameron, S. W., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). Sponsorship and academic career success. *Journal of Higher Education, 52*, 369-377.
- Clark, R. A., Harden, S. L., & Johnson, W. B. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology doctoral training: Results of a national survey. *Teaching of Psychology, 27*, 262-268.

- Dohm, F. A., & Cummings, W. (2002). Research mentoring and women in clinical psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 163-167.
- Dohm, F. A., & Cummings, W. (2003). Research mentoring and men in clinical psychology. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 42, 149-153.
- Eby, L. T., & McManus, S. E. (2004). The protégé's role in negative mentoring experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 255-275.
- Faghihi, F. Y. (1998). A study of factors related to dissertation progress among doctoral candidates: Focus on student research self-efficacy as a result of their research training and experiences. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 59(5-A), 1456.
- Fox, H. (2001). *"When race breaks out": Conversations about race and racism in college classrooms*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Gelso, C. J. (1979). Research in counseling: Methodological and professional issues. *Counseling Psychologist*, 8, 7-35.
- Gelso, C. J. (1993). On the making of a scientist-practitioner: A theory of research training in professional psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 24, 468-476.
- Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisers: Relationships with doctoral student potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 537-561.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hollingsworth, M. A., & Fassinger, R. E. (2002). The role of faculty mentors in the research training of counseling psychology doctoral students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 324-330.
- Johnson, W. B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33, 88-96.
- Johnson, W. B. (2003). A framework for conceptualizing competence to mentor. *Ethics & Behavior*, 13, 127-151.
- Johnson, W. B., & Huwe, J. M. (2003). *Getting mentored in graduate school*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Johnson, W. B., Koch, C., Fallow, G. O., & Huwe, J. M. (2000). Prevalence of mentoring in clinical versus experimental doctoral programs: Survey findings, implications, and recommendations. *Psychotherapy*, 37, 325-334.
- Johnson, W. B., Rose, G., & Schlosser, L. (2007). Theoretical and methodological issues in student-faculty mentoring relationships. In T. Allen & L. Eby (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. London: Blackwell.
- Kenny, M. E., Blustein, D. L., Haase, R. F., Jackson, J., & Perry, J. C. (2006). Setting the stage: Career development and the student engagement process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53, 272-279.
- Knox, S., Schlosser, L. Z., Pruitt, N., & Hill, C. E. (2006). A qualitative study of the graduate advising relationship: The advisor perspective. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34, 489-518.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

- Long, J. S. (1978). Productivity and academic position in the scientific career. *American Sociological Review*, 43, 889-908.
- National Opinion Research Center. (2007). *Survey of earned doctorates*. Retrieved August 19, 2007, from <http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/NR/rdonlyres/B40E56EC-9A4F-4892-B871-E330BB689CD9/0/SEDFactSheet.pdf>
- Newby, T. J., & Heide, A. (1992). The value of mentoring. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 5, 2-15.
- Peacock, S. Y. (1996). The timely completion of the dissertation among graduates of five Ph.D. programs at Saint Louis University: The relationships among psychological type, life experiences, support group participation, and perceptions of advisor/advisee relationships. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 56, 3474.
- Peluchette, J. V. E., & Jeanquart, S. (2000). Professionals' use of different mentor sources at various career stages: Implications for career success. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 549-564.
- Rice, K. G., Choi, C.-C., Zhang, Y., Villegas, J., Ye, H. J., Anderson, D., et al. (2009). International student perspectives on graduate advising relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56, 376-391.
- Schlosser, L. Z., & Foley, P. F. (2008). Ethical issues in multicultural student-faculty mentoring relationships in higher education. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16, 63-75.
- Schlosser, L. Z., & Gelso, C. J. (2001). Measuring the working alliance in advisor-advisee relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 157-167.
- Schlosser, L. Z., & Gelso, C. J. (2005). The Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Advisor version: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 650-654.
- Schlosser, L. Z. & Kahn, J. H. (2007). Dyadic perspectives on advisor-advisee relationships in counseling psychology doctoral programs. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 211-217.
- Schlosser, L. Z., Knox, S., Moskovitz, A. R., & Hill, C. E. (2003). A qualitative study of the graduate advising relationship: The advisee perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 178-188.
- Simon, S. A., & Eby, L. T. (2003). A typology of negative mentoring experiences: A multidimensional scaling study. *Human Relations*, 56, 1083-1106.
- Tenenbaum, H. R., Crosby, F. J., & Gilner, M. D. (2001). Mentoring relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 326-341.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2007). *Minority population tops 100 million*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/010048.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2008a). *State and country quickfacts*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>

- U.S. Census Bureau. (2008b). *An older and more diverse nation by mid-century*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/012496.html>
- Weil, V. (2001). Mentoring: Some ethical considerations. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 7, 471-482.
- Wilde, J. B., & Schau, C. G. (1991). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentees' perceptions. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 59, 165-179.
- Wright, C. A., & Wright, S. D. (1987). The role of mentors in the career development of young professionals. *Family Relations*, 36, 204-208.

Bios

Lewis Z. Schlosser received his PhD in counseling psychology from the University of Maryland, College Park, in August, 2003. Dr. Schlosser is a New York State licensed psychologist, and is Board Certified in Counseling Psychology by the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP). He is a Fellow in the American Academy of Counseling Psychology. Dr. Schlosser is currently Associate Professor and Practicum Coordinator for the PhD Program in Counseling Psychology in the Department of Professional Psychology and Family Therapy at Seton Hall University. Current research interests include professional training relationships (i.e. advising, mentoring, and supervision), multicultural psychology, Jewish issues, and Christian privilege. Dr. Schlosser currently serves on the editorial boards of *The Counseling Psychologist*, *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *Counseling and Values Journal*, and *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. He was the recipient of the 2008 Early Career Mentoring Award from Division 17's Section on Ethnic and Racial Diversity, the 2008 Researcher of the Year Award from Seton Hall University's College of Education and Human Services, and the 2007 Emerging Researcher Award from the New Jersey Psychological Association. In his free time, Dr. Schlosser enjoys spending time with his wife, Kim, and their daughters, Emma and Lindsey.

Heather Z. Lyons completed her PhD in counseling psychology at the University of Maryland, College Park. She is currently Associate Professor and Director of the Practitioner Track of the Master's Program at Loyola University Maryland. She has published and presented research related to culture, discrimination and person-organization fit in the workplace; social cognitive influences on career expectations; the work experiences of African Americans, those experiencing chronic unemployment, and lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees; and training issues in multicultural psychology. She sits on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Black Psychology*, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, and *The Counseling Psychologist*. In her free time, Dr. Lyons enjoys traveling, hiking, and quilting.

Regine M. Talleyrand received her PhD in counseling psychology from the University of Maryland, College Park, in August, 2001. She currently is Associate Professor and Program Coordinator for the Counseling and Development MED and PhD Programs in the College of Education and Human Development at George Mason University. Her primary area of study includes examining the relationship between stress, race, and eating disorders in Black women and she has received grant funding to support this work. She has published and presented in the areas of eating disorders in African American women, multicultural counseling, career counseling, and mentoring relationships. Dr. Talleyrand also serves as an ad-hoc

reviewer for the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *The Counseling Psychologist*, and the *Journal of Black Psychology*. In her free time, Dr. Talleyrand enjoys spending time outdoors with her husband Ed, daughter Nicolette, and son Colin.

Bryan S. K. Kim received his PhD in counseling, clinical, and school psychology with an emphasis in counseling psychology from the University of California, Santa Barbara, in June 2000. He currently is Professor and Director of the MA Program in Counseling Psychology in the Department of Psychology at the University of Hawaii at Hilo. Dr. Kim has over 60 publications and 80 presentations in the areas of multicultural counseling process and outcome, measurement of cultural constructs, counselor education and supervision, and immigrant experiences. His current research examines the effects of culture-specific counseling interventions and client enculturation/acculturation (e.g., cultural values) on counseling process and outcome. Dr. Kim is currently Associate Editor of *The Counseling Psychologist*, *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, and *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*. In addition, he serves on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *Psychotherapy Theory, Research, Practice, and Training*, and *Educational Researcher*. Dr. Kim has been awarded early career awards by the Society of Counseling Psychology, Society of the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues, and Asian American Psychological Association, and research awards by the American Counseling Association and the Association for Assessment in Counseling and Development. Most recently in 2008, Dr. Kim was awarded the Fellow status by the American Psychological Association (via Division of Psychotherapy). In his free time, Dr. Kim enjoys playing with his two young daughters, Sydney (6 years old) and Courtney (4 years old).

W. Brad Johnson is Professor of Psychology in the Department of Leadership, Ethics and Law at the United States Naval Academy, and a Faculty Associate in the Graduate School of Education at Johns Hopkins University. A clinical psychologist and former Lieutenant Commander in the Navy's Medical Service Corps, Dr. Johnson served as a psychologist at Bethesda Naval Hospital and the Medical Clinic at Pearl Harbor where he was the division head for psychology. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and recipient of the Johns Hopkins University Teaching Excellence Award. He has served as Chair of the American Psychological Association's Ethics Committee and as President of the Society for Military Psychology. Dr. Johnson is the author of numerous publications including 10 books in the areas of mentoring, professional ethics, and counseling. His most recent books are *The Elements of Mentoring* (Rev. ed., 2008) and *The Elements of Professional Ethics* (2008).