Mentoring in Academia:
Considerations for Diverse Populations

William E. Sedlacek
University of Maryland

Eric Benjamin
Montgomery College

Lewis Z. Schlosser
Seton Hall University

Hung-Bin Sheu
University of Maryland

Sedlacek, W. E., Benjamin, E., Schlosser, L. Z., & Sheu, H. B. (2007). Mentoring in academia:Considerations for diverse populations. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 259-280). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Mentoring has become widely accepted as an important process in professional development across a number of fields. In fact, theoretical and empirical research on mentoring has grown significantly in recent years. Some noteworthy areas include models of mentoring relationships, research on the mentor-protégé relationship, the process and outcome of mentoring relationships, and dysfunctional mentoring, to name a few (Barnett, 1984; Bode, 1999; Healy & Welchert, 1990; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Kram, 1985; Stafford & Robbins, 1991; Wilde & Schau, 1991). This increased attention to mentoring has improved the quantity and, more importantly, the quality of the research being conducted on mentoring. Therefore, it appears that mentoring is an important construct worthy of further discussion.

Because of the diversity of arenas within which mentoring can occur, we believe that it is important to limit our work to retain a sharp focus. Hence, this chapter will concentrate on mentoring in academic settings, specifically the student-faculty relationship. Within academia, student-faculty relationships tend to be more formalized, with the most common type being the advisor-advisee relationship in graduate school (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, & Hill, 2003; Schlosser, Talleyrand, Lyons, Kim, & Johnson, 2005). Research has shown that students almost always have an advisor (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001), but only 50 to 66 percent report having a mentor (Atkinson, Casas, & Neville, 1994; Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000; Cronan-Hillix, Davidson, Cronan-Hillix, & Gensheimer, 1986; Hollingsworth & Fassinger, 2002; Johnson, Koch, Fallow, & Huwe, 2000). So, while our focus is on mentoring, it is important to note that many mentors are also advisors, and researchers

have speculated that positive advising relationships and mentoring relationships are quite similar (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; Schlosser & Gelso, in press).

In addition to focusing on academic settings, we are also limiting our work to mentoring relationships in graduate training. Although mentoring relationships can and do occur between student and faculty members at all levels of higher education, we are focusing on mentoring in graduate school for several reasons. First, the extant research on student-faculty mentoring is overwhelmingly focused on the graduate-level mentoring relationship. Second, student-faculty mentoring relationships are an inherent part of the graduate training models for many disciplines. As such, graduate school is typically viewed as an extension of the apprentice-master model of learning a trade; as such, it naturally follows that the relationship between mentor and protégé is a variable of critical importance. Third, graduate-level mentoring relationships are qualitatively different than those at the undergraduate level. Mentors are likely to be more invested in their graduate student protégés than their undergraduate ones because (a) the relationship will be longer with a graduate student protégé, (b) many graduate student protégés will become colleagues with their mentor after graduation (Schlosser et al., 2003), and (c) graduate student protégés come to their mentoring relationships with more complex and sophisticated thinking abilities than do their undergraduate counterparts. For all of these reasons, we are focusing on graduate-level mentoring relationships. That being said, some of our conclusions may be applicable to the undergraduate mentor-protégé relationship. Readers interested in undergraduate mentoring and diversity issues are directed to the relevant literature (e.g., Good, Halpin, & Halpin, 2000; Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997; Kim, Goto, Bai, Kim, & Wong, 2001; Santos & Reigadas, 2002).

Mentoring and Advising

In preparing our work here, we reviewed relevant literature on both mentor-protégé and advisor-advisee relationships in graduate school. We chose this course because, as noted above and elsewhere, students are much more likely to have an advisor than they are to have a mentor, especially in academia where such relationships are formalized (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). In addition, while advising and mentoring are not synonymous, they do share certain characteristics and thus the advising literature can be informative vis-à-vis mentoring. For example, a positive advising relationship is characterized by good advisor-advisee rapport and by the advisor facilitating the advisee's professional development (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; Schlosser & Gelso, in press), as well as the advisee feeling supported, respected, and valued by the advisor (Schlosser et al., 2003). The descriptions of the important aspects of advising relationships appear quite similar to how mentoring relationships are frequently described by the two-factor model (i.e., *psychosocial* and *career-related* functions). In the advising literature, these factors are typically referred to as *interpersonal* and *instructional* aspects, respectively. In fact, advisees might refer to their advisors as mentors, even if their formal relationship and means of coming together was for advising. It is unlikely, however, that someone who disliked their advisor would refer to that person as a mentor because of the inherent positive connotation contained within the word mentor (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Advising and mentoring, then, share some characteristics, but also diverge in certain areas. Material from both of these literatures can and will enhance our discussion of diversity issues in academic mentoring relationships.

Noncognitive Variables and Diversity

One way to understand the notion of developmental level, as well as other important contextual variables that can affect the student-faculty relationship, is through the use of noncognitive variables (Sedlacek, 1996, 2003a, 2004a). Briefly, the noncognitive variables include (a) positive self-concept, (b) realistic self-appraisal, (c) understands and deals with racism and other "-isms", (d) preference for long-range goals, (e) availability of strong support person, (f) successful leadership experience, (g) demonstrated community service, and (h) knowledge acquired in a field. These noncognitive variables have been shown to assess the potential abilities of students from diverse backgrounds, specifically those whose racial and cultural socialization experiences differ from the "traditional" White, male, heterosexual, Christian, middle-to upper-middle-class Eurocentric experience (Sedlacek, 1996, 2003a, 2004a). For the purposes of our work here, we will refer to people from diverse backgrounds as *nontraditional students*.

Mentoring and Noncognitive Variables

There are several advantages to employing noncognitive variables in mentoring nontraditional students. First, since noncognitive variables have been shown to correlate with the academic success of nontraditional students the mentor can emphasize the very attributes that relate to desirable protégé outcomes (Sedlacek, 2004a). Second, the noncognitive variables are developmental in nature and students can be evaluated on their progress along the dimensions (Sedlacek, 1991, 1994; Westbrook & Sedlacek, 1988). Third, there are methods available to assess each of the noncognitive variables in several ways (Sedlacek, 2004a). Fourth, using noncognitive variables allows for the training of mentors around a structure that can be practiced and duplicated for many mentors so they

are operating in a similar and coordinated manner. Exhibit 1 contains a description of the noncognitive variables suggested in this chapter.

Having defined the noncognitive variables, we can now examine some ways that we might introduce them into a mentoring relationship. Students can be mentored by identifying behaviors associated with good or poor performance on each of the variables (see Exhibit 2). Mentors can do a self-assessment on each of the variables to determine their strengths and weaknesses in working on each dimension. For example, one advisor may be particularly effective at helping protégés set long-term goals while another might be better at assisting them in learning to negotiate the system. While most of the research with these noncognitive variables has been with undergraduate students, Sedlacek (2003a, 2004a,b) has discussed the value of the noncognitive variables in working with graduate and professional students of color, including a number of principles, techniques, and examples in working with the variables.

The noncognitive variables can be used along with any other variables, models, or techniques that are employed in whatever role or type of mentoring is involved. Teachers, advisors, or counselors who use the system can expect to obtain better student outcomes in terms of grades, retention, and satisfaction, as well as greater satisfaction themselves in employing something systematic with demonstrated utility in an area that often produces confusion and anxiety.

The noncognitive variables provide an important link between the two main foci of our chapter; that is, mentoring and issues related to cultural diversity. So, while we are concerned with student-faculty mentoring relationships in general, we are going to be focusing our discussion on diversity issues in mentoring. This includes attending to issues

being faced by nontraditional students, especially People of Color, women, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons. The use of noncognitive variables with these students is discussed in Sedlacek (2004a). While we also believe that other cultural variables such as religion, social class, and ability status are important to consider vis-à-vis the mentoring relationship, the extant literature focuses more on issues pertaining to race, gender, and sexual orientation (Schlosser et al., 2005). In addition, our space limits a complete discussion of all diversity variables. Hence, we have used race as the primary cultural characteristic in the two case examples in this chapter. We made this decision because of the ways that race informs culturally-appropriate interpersonal interactions (Helms & Cook, 1999) and the extent to which our understanding of race has historically served to advance our understanding of culture along other dimensions (e.g., sexual orientation identity development, Mohr, 2002). It is important to note that this discussion could be applied to other nontraditional student groups (e.g., LGBT individuals).

We believe that it is important to concentrate on diversity issues in mentoring for a number of reasons. First, nontraditional students have been historically under-represented in academia, and as a result, we don't know as much about mentoring for these groups of people, including what works for whom and under what set of circumstances. Second, students of color represent a small, but growing number of new doctorates in psychology (Kohout & Wicherski, 2003). If this trend holds true for other disciplines, then it appears critical for all academics to know how mentoring relationships for nontraditional students differ from those relationships with a traditional student, as well as knowing how to mentor nontraditional and traditional students with equal effectiveness. This latter issue is especially important because the extant research (e.g.,

Atkinson et al., 1994; Pope-Davis et al., 1997; Schlosser et al., 2005) suggests that mentoring experiences are different for those in socially- privileged groups (e.g., Whites, men, Christians, heterosexuals) than those in socially-oppressed groups (e.g., People of Color, women, LGBT persons, religious minorities). Finally, we also know that the presence (or absence) of mentors of color is an important variable in the professional development of psychology doctoral students of color (Pope-Davis et al., 1997). This need for mentors for students of color has been stressed in other scholarly work as well (e.g., Blackwell, 1989; Brinson & Kottler, 1993). Therefore, it appears that addressing the under-representation of nontraditional students and faculty in academia is critical, and one in which mentoring can play an important role.

Research on Mentoring

In general, research on student-faculty relationships shows a number of benefits associated with mentoring. Some examples include academic success (e.g., timely completion of one's degree; Johnson & Huwe, 2003), research productivity (Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986), positive professional development (Schlosser et al., 2003), and satisfaction with graduate school (Clark et al., 2000; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986).

With regard to gender, it is somewhat surprising to report that no significant gender differences have been found in terms of (a) finding a mentor (Clark et al., 2000; Cronan-Hillix et al., 1986; Ragins, 1999), (b) initiating and maintaining mentoring relationships (Clark et al., 2000, Gilbert, 1985; Ragins, 1999), (c) functions provided by mentors (Ragins, 1999), and (d) outcomes of mentoring relationships (Ragins, 1999). Despite these findings, several key issues may emerge for female protégés, including

dealing with sexism, gender-role stereotypes, and potential sexual attraction in cross-sex mentoring relationships.

With regard to race, research reveals several obstacles for students of color to obtain mentoring. Some examples include (a) a lack of faculty role models of color (Pope-Davis et al., 1997), (b) differences in cultural values between mentor and protégé (Goto, 1999), (c) not understanding the importance of good mentoring to success in one's career (Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997), and (d) reluctance entering a cross-race advising or mentoring relationship (Brinson & Kottler, 1993). In addition, faculty members may believe one or more myths about mentoring students of color (see Brown, Davis, and McClendon, 1999), and faculty of color may be overwhelmed with requests for mentorship from students of color.

Finally, recent research from the advising literature has indicated that the student-faculty advising relationship is related to a number of important outcomes for both faculty-advisor (e.g., Knox, Schlosser, Pruitt, & Hill, 2005; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001) and student-advisee (Schlosser et al., 2003; Schlosser & Gelso, in press). Specifically, the advising relationship has been shown to be related in theoretically consistent ways to (a) student research self-efficacy, attitudes toward research, and interest in science and practice, and (b) advisor satisfaction with the advising relationship, as well as the costs and benefits for advising. These findings suggest it is important to consider the needs of both mentor *and* the protégé, even though the overwhelming majority of research in this area is focused on the protégé-student-advisee.

In the next section and for the remainder of our chapter, we will shift our focus to a more specific discussion of mentoring nontraditional students in academia, and will

include examples of how noncognitive variables can help in conceptualizing aspects of the mentor-protégé relationship. Then, we will include specific sections on mentoring African Americans and Asian Americans, drawing both on professional literature and personal experiences.

Mentoring African Americans

Traditionally, the selection of a mentor or protégé has followed the dictum of shared interests, values or traits (Olian, Carroll, Giannantonio, & Feren 1988). The rationale behind this is that the greater the commonality of the relationship, the greater the ability to foster empathy. The mentor-protégé relationship for African American students has tended to be defined racially (Collins, Kamya, & Tourse, 1997). However, as the enrollment of African Americans on college campuses increases, the ability to achieve same group mentoring has decreased. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2003), there are only 1.6 African American faculty members for every 100 African American students although the ratio is better at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) (Provasnik, Shafer, & Snyder, 2004). This is in contrast to the experience of White students who have 4.4 White faculty members for every 100 students. The ratio for African American students to African American faculty becomes even more disproportionate in math and empirical sciences.

Previous research has shown that the presence of a mentor is related to retention for African American students across majors and types of institutions (Vann Lynch, 2002; Sedlacek, 2004a) However, it appears that same-race mentor-protégé relationships for students and academic faculty at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) require greater effort on the part of African American faculty and students than do their

counterparts at HBCUs. This implied racial and cultural affirmation of HBCUs has traditionally been seen as an additional "selling point" for these institutions. According to research cited at the official website for the United Negro College Fund,

> HBCUs, because of their unique sensibility to the special needs of young African American minds, remain the institutions that demonstrate the most effective ability to graduate African American students who are poised to be competitive in the corporate, research, academic, governmental and military arenas (http://www.uncf.org/aboutus/hbcus.as).

The simple mathematic reality of same-race mentoring for African American students is that they will be waiting in a long line for the time and attention of a faculty member who will probably either be non-tenured or not on a tenure track. This last demographic trend is important to note because it further demonstrates that the majority of available African American academic faculty mentors may be relatively young in their professional development, not seeking academic advancement, or have been unsuccessful at achieving academic advancement for whatever reasons. Collins, Kamya, & Tourse (1997) found that 79% of the African American students in their study had a mentor. Of those African American students who had a mentor, 80% of their mentors were African American. However, there were only 35 participants in their study. When the number of students increases, the ability of African American faculty to provide mentoring becomes not only onerous, but potentially detrimental to their scholarly productivity and professional advancement (Vann Lynch, 2002). So many of the African American faculty members available to serve as mentors may be encountering the same issues of mentoring and professional development that their protégés are negotiating.

Psychosocial and Career Aspects of Mentoring African Americans

As was discussed earlier, a two factor model of the relationship between mentor and protégé provides a useful, but limited framework. The psychosocial/interpersonal and career-related/instructional does define very important aspects of the relationship, but there is also the interaction among interpersonal and instructional roles and identities. Benjamin (1995) found that African American students at PWIs construct bipartite identities that consist of a personal/cultural self and an academic/institutional self. However, one key area both selves shared in common is how racism influences their identities on both a personal and institutional level. This appears consistent with the noncognitive variable of learning how to navigate the explicit and implicit values and practices of academic institutions, and by realizing that all institutions of higher education are firmly embedded in larger cultural systems.

Psychosocial Aspects

An important aspect of the professional development of the protégé may not be just their career development, but the role that race may or not consciously play in their identity development. As was mentioned previously, the common trait between the otherwise discrete paths of career development and personal identity for African American college students is the experience of racism. More succinctly, the experiences of personal racism and institutional racism may be connected for many African American protégés. In order to understand the dynamics of race in the mentor/protégé relationship, the area of counselor training and therapeutic supervision may provide an instructive model. According to Bradley (as cited in Cook, 1994, p.4), "…supervision is intended to assist supervisees in integrating their personal and professional identities." In order to

explore the supervisory relationship, Cook (1994) applied a *mainstream approach* (Constantine, Richards, Benjamin, & Wilson, 1998) which is characterized by the development of ego statuses that reflect varying degrees of racial self-awareness ranging from internalized feelings of inferiority to feelings of cultural acceptance of one's self and others (Cross, 1995; Helms, 1994). The combination of different racialized ego-statuses on between mentor and protégé according Cook can be both predictive and descriptive of possible strengths and limitations of the dyad.

Although the mainstream approaches have become popular conceptualizations of racial identity for African Americans and People of Color, there exist many other types of theories. For example, African-Centered models (Akbar, 1979; Baldwin, 1984) do not focus on the process of identity development per se, but on the role that African and African American culturally defined values and practices of African Americans. Applying African-Centered theories to the mentor/protégé relationship would be based not only on understanding the beliefs and values of African American protégés and mentors, but also on understanding the role and relevance of African American culture in defining the sense of self for both the mentor and protégé. For example, an African American mentor at a conformist ego-status would place a different value on the role of African American cultural values in defining their professional identity than a protégé at the internalization status. This incongruity could be a source of conflict, but the process of negotiating and ameliorating the incongruity could be a necessary component for future professional development for the protégé.

Career Aspects

On a prima facie level this seems to be the most straight forward part of the relationship between mentors of any race and African American protégés. It would seem that the steps needed to become an engineer (for example) are clear and prescriptive. “In order to become an engineer, you should do this, this, and that at this time.” However, the basis of noncognitive predictors of college student retention demonstrates that different groups of students employ different skills at different times to solve the same problem (Sedlacek, 2004a). Both the publishers of the most widely used career inventory, the Strong Interest Inventory (SII) (Prince, 1995), and subsequent empirical attempts to validate the SII (Lattimore & Borgen, 1999) have reservations about the validity of the instrument with African American populations. According to Lattimore and Borgen (1999, p. 186), “The combination of the diverse research findings and numerous limitations makes final conclusions about cross-cultural validity difficult.” They further assert more research needs to examine the effect that racial differences have on SII scores. Additionally, to confound matters, there appears to be more in-group than between-group racial variability in career interests, and it is within these vague areas of understanding racial differences that the mentor-protégé relationship exists.

Regardless of the race of the mentor, the belief that two people should make the assumption of similar career motivations, goals, and values, because they share the same demographic racial group is naïve at best, and racist at worst. This is not to deny that within same race mentor-protégé relationships there may be the benefit of the normalization of common racial experiences, which potential benefit is not without the possible cost of resource and time demands on both the mentor and protégé. Also, because the influence and role of race is a ubiquitous issue in not just career

development, but in human development, it is benefited by the mentor understanding the racial transference and counter-transference that exists between them and their protégé in terms of psychosocial development (Ladany, Constantine, Miller, Erickson, & Muse-Burke, 2000). The role of race may not be the primary issue within all mentor and protégé relationships, but the agreement on the role of race in the mentor-protégé relationship should be a function of the needs and role of the relationship. Additionally, the exploration of racial development should not be limited by unresolved issues of race, power, and entitlement.

Within all of the aforementioned theories of racial identity, the one core theme is that race can play a role in defining both same and cross-race mentor/protégé relationships in both psychosocial and career development. Race may not be an overt feature of the relationship, but racial issues should not be ignored in order to explore career development for African American college students. Failure to address the role of race in the relationship can limit what the experience of supervision/mentoring has to offer. Concurrently, working through the parallel process of race may serve as a vehicle for both the protégé and mentor to better understand the interpersonal and career aspects of their own identity development.

Mentoring Asian Americans

As of 2001, 12.5 million U.S. residents identified themselves as Asian Americans, which was 4.4% of the total population and represented an increase of more than 50% since 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002; 2003). For individuals 25 years and older, Asian Americans have the highest proportion that held a bachelor's degree or more (49.8%) in comparison with other racial groups (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). Furthermore, in 2001,

more than 937,000 Asian Americans were enrolled in college, which represented a 54% increase since 1991 (American Council on Education, 2005). Despite these data, literature on mentoring Asian American students in educational settings is scarce. Researchers (e.g., Goto, 1999) have offered possible explanations for the lack of attention in this area, including the model minority myth and culturally incongruent mentorship. Nevertheless, Asian American college students do have their adjustment concerns and needs (Liang & Sedlacek, 2003b). Successful mentorship can help Asian American students in many ways, including easing difficulties in transition to college, improving their satisfaction with college life and a chosen major, and developing their professional skills, confidence, and personal and professional identity.

Model Minority Myth

For years, Asian Americans have been perceived as the "model minority" group, members of which are supposed to perform well in educational settings (Liang & Sedlacek, 2003a; Sedlacek, 2004a). This stereotype may perpetuate the impression that Asian Americans have encountered very few barriers in higher education and that mentoring programs should be targeting other minority students who do not perform as well (Kodama, McEwen, Liang, & Lee, 2002). Also, the academic success of Asian Americans may mask the complete picture of their college experiences, excluding issues related to psychosocial adjustment and psychological well-being (Sandhu, 1997, Kim, Goto, Bai, Kim, & Wong, 2001).

However, a closer and deeper scrutiny of the status of Asian American students often yields a different story that contrasts sharply with popular views of their academic successes. Many writers have indicated the importance of recognizing the extreme diversity

within the Asian American population as reflected by country of origin, language, socio-economic status, and so forth (e.g., Maki & Kitano, 2002; Uba, 1994). Despite the high percentage of Asian Americans who hold a bachelor's degree, some Asian American subgroups constitute a large undereducated mass. For example, of those individuals over 25, 42.9% of all Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders had at least a bachelor's degree, whereas fewer than 10% of individuals from some Southeast Asian subgroups, such as Cambodians, Laotians, and Hmongs had such degrees (Le, 2005a, 2005b). This bimodal distribution clearly indicates the enormous within-group differences among Asian Americans. It may also imply that Asian American students could benefit from mentoring and that mentoring programs should be tailored to fit the differing needs of Asian American subgroups.

Mentoring: A Culturally Incongruent Path to Success?

In her review, Goto (1999) suggested that cultural reasons (e.g., incompatibility between Asian and U.S. mainstream cultures) might explain why some Asian Americans are reluctant to seek guidance and help from mentors, especially from those who are White. Through interviewing 25 first-year Asian American college students, Goto found that most interviewees believed that they would benefit from participation in a mentoring program for better adjustment, and 54% of them thought the program would help them develop cultural identity. However, several Asian American students later dropped out of the program because they worried that the program brought undesired attention to cultural differences and participation might result in separation and pressure from peers. A possible explanation is that a formal mentoring program as such might introduce the cultural conflict between individualism (seeking mentoring/help for oneself) and collectivism

(fitting in with the ethnic group) for Asian American students. Another survey study showed that Asian American college students were more likely to participate in peer mentoring programs when these programs were designed to meet their needs (e.g., ease transition to college, strengthen ethnic identity, counter the model minority myth) (Kim, Goto, Bai, Kim, & Wong, 2001). In spite of the paucity of empirical research, findings from the above two studies suggest that Asian American college students have their psychosocial needs, face unique adjustment issues, and can benefit from mentoring programs that are compatible with their cultural values.

Asian Cultural Values

Cultural values, such as collectivism versus individualism, have significant effects on social relationships (Chen, Brockner, & Chen, 2002). Research reviewed in the previous section and other literatures (e.g., counseling psychology) suggest the importance of considering the cultural values of Asian American students when developing mentoring programs (Atkinson, Lowe, & Matthews, 1995; Bui & Takeuchi, 1992). Therefore, it is imperative that non-Asian mentors familiarize themselves with Asian cultural values and understand the role these values might have on the mentoring relationship with Asian American students. Although the Asian American population is composed of many different subgroups, individuals who can trace their cultural roots back to Asia may share some cultural patterns and a sense of commonality (Chung, 1992; Sue & Sue, 2003). Below is an overview of core Asian cultural values and how they might influence the mentoring relationship.

Collectivism versus individualism as a cultural value

Major differences between U.S. and Asian societies can be found in contrasting individualist versus collectivist cultures, in which individuals in collectivist cultures tend to value the needs and desires of the group over the needs and desires of the individual, whereas people in individualist cultures have the opposite tendency (Kim, Triandis, Kâğitçibaşi, Choi, & Yoon, 1994). Collectivist relationships are characterized by loyalty and obligation, and friendships are kept within the in-group, a set of people with whom one belongs and identifies (e.g., relatives, friends). On the other hand, individualists tend to see relationships opportunistically, and friendships are by personal choice, unconstrained by in-group ties (Myers, 1996). As suggested by Goto's (1999) study, Asian American students were reluctant to single themselves out of their cultural groups when participating in a mentoring program. Therefore, mentors and student service professionals should try to resolve this dilemma and develop new approaches to maintain the connection of Asian Americans to their cultural groups while offering necessary mentoring and guidance.

Hierarchical nature of relationships and well-defined social roles

Embedded in Asian cultures is a hierarchical social structure, where authority, leadership and responsibility are at the top. Asian Americans tend to behave passively toward their superiors and show deference to their elders, which is often how mentors are perceived by their Asian American students. Every individual in this hierarchical structure has distinct obligations; and the role of each member in the hierarchical social structure is clear and apparent, and remain relatively stable (Paniagua, 1994). The hierarchical nature of relationships is in sharp contrast to the egalitarian and horizontal social structure of White American culture.

One-way communication from an authority figure to persons in a group is also more the norm in Asian society (Chung, 1992; Sue & Sue, 2003). Silence and lack of eye contact often occur when Asian American students listen or speak to someone higher in the hierarchy, such as parents, instructors, and mentors. Obedience and compliance may prompt Asian American students to await instructions from their mentors. Therefore, non-Asian/Asian American Mentors should keep in mind that they may be expected to play a more active and directive role and should prepare themselves for the possibility of developing a more formal relationship with their Asian American students at the beginning stage of their mentoring relationship. While it may be beneficial for non-Asian/Asian American mentors and Asian American students to find a middle ground in the collectivist-individualist continuum, failure to meet Asian American student cultural needs may result in the premature termination of the mentoring relationship.

Public repression of problems

In general, individuals heavily influenced by Asian cultural values tend to restrict any discussion of personal problems, including physical and mental illness (Paniagua, 1994). Members of the family are not encouraged to express their problems to people outside the group, especially to strangers. Also, one way to fulfill one's family obligations is not to create problems (Chung, 1992; Uba, 1994). This tendency plays an important role in prohibiting Asian American students from expressing and admitting their problems in settings outside their family, such as in mentoring. Non-Asian/Asian American mentors need to be culturally sensitive and develop their skills in creating a safe mentoring relationship in which Asian American students can feel freely to seek help and explore themselves.

Acculturation and Ethnic Identity Development

In addition to cultural values, acculturation level appears relevant in developing an effective mentoring relationship with Asian Americans given that many are foreign born (Sue & Sue, 2003). The concept of psychological acculturation may be particularly useful as it emphasizes the effect of acculturation on individual adaptation (Berry, 1980; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978). The four types of adaptation – assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization – provide non-Asian/Asian American mentors a framework to understand the various issues that Asian American protégés might encounter in adjusting to college. Counseling research has supported the hypothesis that more acculturated Asian American college students perceived counseling professionals more favorably as sources of help for personal/emotional issues than less acculturated ones (Atkinson & Gim, 1989; Tracey, Leong, & Glidden, 1986; Zhang & Dixon, 2003). It seems reasonable that non-Asian/Asian American mentors could apply findings from the counseling literature and should take acculturation levels into consideration when mentoring Asian American students.

Another variable that might have an effect on the mentoring relationship is the racial/ethnic identity of mentors and protégés. As suggested by Helms and Cook (1999), where the therapist and the client stand in their own racial identity development process has bearing on the nature and quality of the therapeutic relationship, which, in turn, would predict therapy outcomes. The same logic could be argued for the cross-cultural mentoring relationship as it represents one form of various helping relationships. It would be most helpful when non-Asian/Asian American mentors are at a more advanced (or at least equal) status of racial/ethnic identity development than their Asian American

students. The mentoring relationship could be problematic if Asian American students were at a more mature identity status than their mentors, as this disparity might create tension in the relationship and it might be difficult for students to receive useful guidance on their identity development from mentors. Therefore, it is important for mentors to understand themselves as racial/ethnic beings and attend to how their own racial and cultural socialization experiences might play a positive or negative role in developing an effective mentoring relationship with Asian American students (Schlosser, Lyons, Talleyrand, Kim, & Johnson, 2005). Furthermore, several racial/ethnic identity development models have been proposed specifically for Asian American (e.g., Lee, 1989; Kim, 1981; S. Sue & Sue, 1971). These models may provide guidance for mentors to help their students explore who they are as Asian Americans and help mentors better understand the process that Asian American students go through to achieve a clear racial identity.

The Big Bang or Another Universe?

Are we able to use general references on the mentoring/advising/counseling process and apply them to People of Color, or do we need research and models unique to those students? As with conceptions of diversity, we feel that both are useful. By examining the evidence on the mentor/protégé relationship for all groups we set a context to study and analyze useful ideas and limitations in those studies and models. In turn, as we examine some of the issues specific to students of color, we find research evidence and theory that goes beyond the overall models. We feel that by employing the noncognitive variable approach discussed above and shown in Exhibits 1 and 2, mentors of any race or gender and protégés from any nontraditional group can come together for

mutual development. It is a bicultural experience for both to consider general and specific principles in that relationship.

References

American Council on Education (2005). *Annual ACE report shows minority college Enrollment continues to climb, but gaps still persist*. February 27 http://www.acenet.edu/hena/readArticle.cfm?articleID=1223

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

Atkinson, D. R., Lowe, S., & Matthews, L. (1995). Asian-American acculturation and willingness to seek counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 23*, 130-138.

Akbar, N. (1979). African roots of Black personality. In W. D. Smith, K. Burlew, M. Mosely, & W. Whiteney (Eds.), *Reflections on Black psychology.* (pp. 79-87) Washington DC: University Press of America.

Barnett, S. K. (1984). The mentor role: A task of generativity. *Journal of Human Behavior and Learning, 1,* 15-18.

Baldwin, J. A. (1984). African self-consciousness and the mental health of African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies. 15*, 177-194.

Benjamin, E. M. (1995*). The relationship between African-centered self-concept and the perceptions of socially based power for black students on predominantly White college campuses.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe, 75,* 8-14.

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.

Brinson, J., & Kottler, J. (1993). Cross-cultural mentoring in counselor education: A strategy for retaining minority faculty. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 32,* 241-253.

Brown, M. C., Davis, G. L., & McClendon, S. A. (1999). Mentoring graduate students of color: Myths, models, and modes. *Peabody Journal of Education, 74*, 105-118.

Bui, H. T., & Takeuchi, D. T. (1992). Ethnic minority adolescents and the use of community mental health care services. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 20*, 403-417.

Chen, Y. R., Brockner, J, & Chen, X. P. (2002). Individual-collective primacy and ingroup favoritism: Enhancement and protection effects. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *38(5),* 482-491.

Chung, D. K. (1992). Asian cultural commonalities: A comparison with mainstream American culture. In D. K. Chung, K. Murase, & F. Ross-Sheriff (Eds.), *Social work practice with Asian Americans* (pp. 27-44). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

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.

Collins, P. M., Kamya, H. A., & Tourse, R. W. (1997) Questions of racial diversity and mentorship: An empirical exploration. *Social Work, 42(2)* 145-152.

Constantine, M.; Richards, T.; Benjamin, E.; & Wilson, J. (1997). An overview of Black racial identity theory: Limitations and considerations for future theoretical change. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 7*, 95-99.

Cook, D. A., (1994). Racial identity in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision. 34(2)*, 1-7.

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

Cross, W. E. (1995) The psychology of Nigrescence: Revising the Cross model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), Handbook of multicultural counseling (pp. 93-122). Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Gilbert, L. A. (1985). Dimensions of same-gender student-faculty role-model relationships. *Sex Roles, 12*, 111-123.

Good, J., Halpin, G., & Halpin, G. (2000). A promising prospect for minority retention: Students becoming peer mentors. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*, 375-383.

Goto, S. (1999). Asian Americans and developmental relationships. In A. J. Murrell, F. J. Crosby, & R. J. Ely (Eds.), *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations* (pp. 46-62). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grant-Thompson, S. K. & Atkinson, D. R. (1997). Cross-cultural mentor effectiveness and African American male students. *Journal of Black Psychology, 23,* 120-134.

Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisers: Relationships with doctoral student potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 537-561.

Healy, C. C., & Welchert, A. J. (1990). Mentoring relations: A definition to advance research and practice. *Educational Researcher, 19,* 17-21.

Heisserer, D. L., & Parette, P. (2002). Advising at-risk students in college and university settings. *College Student Journal, 36*, 69-83.

Helms, J. E. (1994). Racial identity and career assessment. *Journal of Career Assessment, 2*, 199-209.

Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hill, R. D., Castillo, L. G., Ngu, L. Q., & Pepion, K. (1999). Mentoring ethnic minority students for career in academia: The WICHE doctoral scholars program. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*, 827-845.

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.

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research, 64,* 505-532.

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. (2002). Toward a typology of mentorship dysfunction in graduate school. *Psychotherapy: Theory/Research/Practice/Teaching, 39,* 44-55.

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.

Kim, C. Y., Goto, S. G., Bai, M. M., Kim, T. E., & Wong, E. (2001). Culturally congruent mentoring: Predicting Asian American student participation using the theory of reasoned action. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*, 2417-2437.

Kim, J. (1981). The process of Asian American identity development: A study of Japanese-American women's perceptions of their struggle to achieve personal identities as Americans of Asian ancestry. *Dissertation Abstract International, 42*, 155 1A. (University Microfilms No.81-18080)

Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kâğitçibaşi, Ç, Choi, S. C., Yoon, G. (Eds.) (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kodama, C. M., McEwen, M. K., Liang, C. T. H., & Lee, S. (2002). An Asian American perspective on psychosocial development theory. In M. K. McEwen, C. M. Kodama, A. N. Alvarez, S. Lee, & C. T. H. Liang (Eds.), *Working with Asian American college students* (pp. 45-60). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kohout, J. & Wicherski, M. (2003). *1999 Doctorate employment survey*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Knox, S., Schlosser, L. Z., Pruitt, N., & Hill, C. E. (2005).*A qualitative study of the graduate advising relationship: The advisor perspective*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

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

Ladany, N., Constantine, M. G., Miller, K., Erickson, C. D., & Muse-Burke, J. L. (2000). Supervisor countertransference: A qualitative investigation into its identification and description. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 102-115.

Lattimore, R. R., & Borgen, F. H. (1999). Validity of the 1994 Strong Interest Inventory with racial and ethnic groups in the United States. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 146,* 185-195.

Le, C. N. (2005a). The model minority image. *Asian-Nation: The landscape of Asian America*. http://www.asian-nation.org/model-minority.shtml (April 8, 2005)

Le, C. N. (2005b). Socioeconomic statistics & demographics. *Asian-Nation: The landscape of Asian America*. http://www.asian-nation.org/demographics.shtml (April 8, 2005)

Lee, E. (1989). Assessment and treatment of Chinese American immigrant families. *Journal of Psychotherapy and the Family, 6*, 99-122.

Liang, C. T. H., & Sedlacek, W. E. (2003a). Attitudes of White students services

practitioners toward Asian Americans. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 40*(3), 30-42. http://publications.naspa.org/naspajournal/vol40/iss3/art2.

Liang, C. T. H., & Sedlacek, W. E. (2003b). Utilizing factor analysis to understand the needs of Asian American students. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 260-266. http://publications.naspa.org/naspajournal/vol40/iss3/art2.

Maki, M. T., & Kitano, H. H. L. (2002). Counseling Asian Americans. In P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures* (5th ed., pp. 109-131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2003), *Digest of education statistics, 2003: Chapter 3. Postsecondary education*. Retrieved December 3, 2004, from http://nces.ed.gov//programs/digest/d03/ch_3.asp

Olian, J.D., Carroll, S. J., Giannantonio, C. M. & Feren, D. B. (1988). What do protégés look for in a mentor? Results of three experimental studies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior 33*, 15-37.

Paniagua, F. A. (1994). *Assessing and treating culturally diverse clients: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Prince, J. P. (1995). *Strong Interest Inventory resource.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Provasnik, S., Shafer, L. L., Snyder, T. D. (2004). *Historically Black colleges and universities, 1976 to 2001*(National Center for Education Statistics Publication No. NCES 2004062). Washington, DC: ED Pubs.

Ragins, B. R. (1999). Gender and mentoring relationships. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of Gender and Work* (pp. 347-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sandhu, D. S. (1997). Psychocultural profiles of Asian and Pacific Islander Americans: Implications for counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 25*, 7-22.

Santos, S. J. & Reigadas, E. (2002). Latinos in higher education: An evaluation of a university faculty mentoring program. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 1,* 40-50.

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. (in press). The Advisory Working Alliance Inventory – Advisor Version: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.

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.

Schlosser, L. Z., Talleyrand, R. M., Lyons, H. Z., Kim, B. S. K., & Johnson, W. B. (2005). *Advisor-Advisee relationships in counseling psychology doctoral programs: Toward a multicultural theory*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). Using noncognitive variables in advising nontraditional students. *National Academic Advising Association Journal*, *11* (1), 75-82.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1994). Advising nontraditional students: The big bang or another universe? *National Academic Advising Association Journal*, *14* (2), 103-104.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1996). An empirical method for determining nontraditional group status. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 28*, 200-210.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1996). An empirical method for determining nontraditional group status. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 28*, 200-210.

Sedlacek, W. E. (2003a). Alternative admission and scholarship selection measures in higher education. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 35*, 263-272.

Sedlacek, W. E. (2003b). Negotiating admissions to graduate and professional schools. In V. L. Farmer (Ed.). *The Black student's guide to graduate and professional school success*. (pp. 13-22). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Sedlacek, W. E. (2004a). Beyond the big test: Noncognitive assessment in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sedlacek, W. E. (2004b) Why we should use noncognitive variables with graduate and professional students. *The Advisor: The Journal of the National Association of Advisors for the Health Professions*. *24* (2), 32-39.

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

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Sue, S., & Sue, D. W. (1971). Chinese-American personality and mental health. *American Journal, 1*, 36-49.

Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M. A., Kurtines, W., & Aranalde, M. A. (1978). Theory and measurement of acculturation. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 12*, 113-120.

Uba, L. (1994). *Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health*. New York: The Guilford Press.

U.S. Census Bureau (2003). *Census brief: Current population survey*. Retrieved February 27, 2005, from *http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/c2kbr01-16.pdf*.

U.S. Census Bureau (2003). *Factors for features (CB03-FF.05)*. Retrieved February 27, 2005, from *http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/facts_for_features/001627.html*.

U.S. Census Bureau (2004). *Educational attainment in the United States: 2003*. Retrieved February 27, 2005, from *http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/p20-550.pdf#search='Educational%20attainment%20in%20the%20United%20States:%202003'*

Westbrook, F. D., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1988). Workshop on using noncognitive variables with minority students in higher education. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 13, 82-89.

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

Exhibit 1

Description of Noncognitive Variables

Variable	Variable Name
1	***Positive Self-Concept*** ➢ Demonstrates confidence, strength of character, determination, and independence.
2	***Realistic Self-Appraisal*** • Recognizes and accepts any strengths and deficiencies, especially academic, and works hard at self-development. Recognizes need to broaden his/her individuality.
3	***Understands and Knows How to Handle Racism (the System)*** • Exhibits a realistic view of the system based upon personal experience of racism. Committed to improving the existing system. Takes an assertive approach to dealing with existing wrongs, but is not hostile to society, nor is a "cop-out." Able to handle racist system.
4	***Prefers Long-Range to Short-Term or Immediate Needs*** • Able to respond to deferred gratification, plans ahead and sets goals.
5	***Availability of Strong Support Person*** • Seeks and takes advantage of a strong support network or has someone to turn to in a crisis or for encouragement.
6	***Successful Leadership Experience*** • Demonstrates strong leadership in any area of his/her background (e.g. church, sports, non-educational groups, gang leader, etc.).
7	***Demonstrated Community Service*** • Participates and is involved in his/her community.
8	***Knowledge Acquired in or about a Field*** • Acquires knowledge in a sustained and/or culturally related ways in any field.

Exhibit 2

Positive and Negative Evidence of Each Noncognitive Variable

VARIABLES 1 THROUGH 8

In the following , you will find the definition of the variable and a list of questions to guide you in the assessment of each variable

Variable Item #1: POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPT

This variable assesses the protégé's confidence, self-esteem, independence, and determination, all vital components of future achievement and success.

Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Does the protégé feel confident of making it through graduation?		Does the protégé express any reason he/she might not complete school or succeed and attain his/her goals?
Does the protégé make positive statements about him/ herself?		Does the protégé express concerns that other students are better than he/she is?
Does the protégé expect to achieve his/her goals and perform well in academic and non-academic areas?		Does the protégé expect to have marginal grades?
Does the protégé provide evidence how he/she will attain his/her goals?		Does the protégé have trouble balancing his/her personal and academic life?
Does the protégé link his/her interests and experiences with his/her goals?		Does the protégé appear to be avoiding new challenges or situations?

Does the protégé assume he/she can handle new situations or challenges?		

Variable #2: REALISTIC SELF-APPRAISAL *This variable assesses the protégé's ability to recognize and accept his/her strengths and deficiencies, especially in academics, and works hard at self-development to broaden his/her individuality.*		
Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Is the protégé aware of his/her strengths and weaknesses?		Is the protégé unaware of how evaluations are done in school?
Does the protégé know what it takes to pursue a given career?		Is the protégé not sure about his/her own abilities?
Is the protégé realistic about his/her abilities?		Is the protégé uncertain about how his/her peers or superiors rate his/her performances?
Does the protégé show an awareness of how his/her service, leadership, extracurricular activities, or schoolwork has caused him/her to change over time?		Does the protégé overreact to positive or negative reinforcement rather than seeing it in a larger context?
Has the protégé learned something from these structured or unstructured activities?		Is the protégé unaware of how he/she is doing in classes until grades are out?
Does the protégé appreciate and understand both positive and negative feedback?		Is the protégé unaware of positive and negative consequences of his/her grades, actions, or skills?
Does the protégé provide evidence of overcoming anger, shyness, and lack of discipline?		
Does the protégé face a problem, like a bad grade, with determination to do better?		

Variable #3: SUCCESSFULLY HANDLES THE SYSTEM (RACISM) *This variable assesses the protégé's ability to understand the role of the 'system' in life and to develop a method of assessing the cultural/racial demands of the system and respond accordingly/assertively.*		
Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Is the protégé able to overcome challenges or obstacles he/she is confronted with as a result of racism in a positive and effective way?		Is the protégé unaware of how the "system" works?

Does the protégé understand the role of the "system" in his/her life and how it treats nontraditional persons?		Is the protégé preoccupied with racism or does not feel racism exists?
Does the protégé reveal ways that he/she has learned to "deal" with the "system" accordingly?		Does the protégé blame others for his/her problems?
		Does the protégé react with the same intensity to large or small issues concerned with race?
		Is the protégé's method for successfully handling racism that does not interfere with personal and academic development nonexistent?

Variable #4: PREFERENCE FOR LONG-TERM GOALS *This variable assesses the protégé's persistence, patience, long term planning, and willingness to defer gratification and success in college.*		
Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Does the protégé reveal experience setting both academic and personal long-term goals?		Does the protégé lack evidence of setting and accomplishing goals?
Does the protégé provide evidence that he/she is planning for the future?		Is the protégé likely to proceed without clear direction?
Has the protégé determined a course of study and anticipate the type of career or path he/she might or could pursue?		Does the protégé rely on others to determine outcomes?
Is the protégé aware of realistic and intermediate steps necessary to achieve goals?		Does the protégé focus too much attention to the present?
Has the protégé participated in activities (volunteer work, employment, extra courses, community work) related to his/her anticipated career goal?		Is the protégé's plan for approaching a course, school in general, an activity, etc. nonexistent?
		If the protégé states his/her goals, are the goals vague or unrealistic?

Variable #5: AVAILABILITY OF STRONG SUPPORT PERSON *This variable assesses the protégé's availability of a strong support network, help, and encouragement, and the degree to which he/she relies solely on her/his own resources.*		
Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Does the protégé have a strong support system? (This can be a personal, professional, academic support as long as it is someone the protégé can turn to for advice, consultation, assistance, encouragement etc.)		Does the protégé avoid turning to a support person, mentor, or close advisors for help?
Is the protégé willing to admit that he/she needs help and able to pull on other resources, other than him/herself, to solve problems?		Does the protégé keep his/her problems to himself?
		Does the protégé state that he/she can handle things on his/her own?
		Does the protégé state that access to a previous support person may have been reduced or eliminated?
		Is the protégé unaware of the importance of a support person?

Variable #6: LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE *This variable assesses the protégé's skills developed or influence exercised from his/her formal and informal leadership roles.*		
Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Has the protégé taken leadership initiative, for example by founding clubs/organizations? What evidence is there?		Is the protégé unable to turn to others for advice or direction?
Does the protégé describe the skills s/he has developed as a leader, skills such as assertiveness, effectiveness, organizing, and time management?		Does the protégé lack confidence or leadership skills?
Has the protégé shown evidence of influencing others and being a good role model?		Is the protégé passive or does he/she lack initiative?

Is the protégé comfortable providing advice and direction to others?		Is the protégé overly cautious?
Does the protégé describe a commitment to being a role model for siblings, community members, or schoolmates?		Does the protégé avoid controversy?
Does the protégé show sustained commitment to one or two types of organizations with increasing involvement, skill development and responsibility?		
Does the protégé take action and initiative?		

Variables #7: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT *This variable assesses the protégé's identification with a cultural, geographic, or racial group and his/her demonstrated activity within that community grouping.*		
Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Does the protégé show sustained commitment to a service site or issue area?		Does the protégé lack involvement in cultural, racial or geographical group or community?
Does the protégé demonstrate a specific or long-term commitment or relationships with a community?		Is the protégé involved in his/her community in name only?
Has the protégé accomplished specific goals in a community setting?		Does the protégé engage more in solitary rather than group activities (academic or non-academic)?
Does the protégé's community service relate to career or personal goals?		

Variable #8: KNOWLEDGE ACQUIRED IN A FIELD *This variable assesses the protégé's experiences gained in a field through study and experiences beyond the classroom. This variable pays particular attention to the ways the protégé gains non-traditional, perhaps culturally or racially based views of the field.*		
Positive Evidence		**Negative Evidence**
Does the protégé use his/her knowledge to teach others about the topic?		Does the protégé lack evidence of learning from the community or non-academic activities?
Is the protégé working independently in his/her field? (Be sensitive to variations between academic fields and the experiences that can be gained. For example, if in the sciences, by doing independent research, or if in the arts or crafts, by participating in competitions or compositions.)		Is the protégé traditional in his/her approach to learning?
		Is the protégé unaware of his/her possibilities in a field of interest?

Author's Note:

William E. Sedlacek, College of Education, University of Maryland; Eric Benjamin, Counseling Department, Montgomery College – Rockville Campus; Lewis Z. Schlosser, Department of Professional Psychology and Family Therapy, Seton Hall University; Hung-Bin Sheu, Department of Counseling and Counseling Psychology, Arizona State University.

The order of authorship for the second, third, and fourth authors was determined alphabetically; each of the second, third, and fourth authors contributed equally to the chapter.. Electronic mail may be sent to wsed@umd.edu.