

1
2
3
4

CHAPTER

39



Relational Mentoring

A Positive Approach to Mentoring at Work

5 Belle Rose Ragins

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Abstract

Like other relationships, the quality of mentoring relationships falls along a continuum ranging from high quality to dysfunctional. Although most mentoring research has focused on relationships that are average in quality, at its best, mentoring personifies the very essence of positive relationships at work. Using a positive lens, this chapter offers an overview of the construct of relational mentoring. Relational mentoring represents the relational state of high-quality mentoring and is defined as an interdependent and generative developmental relationship that promotes mutual growth, learning, and development within the career context. The construct of relational mentoring is presented and contrasted with traditional approaches to mentoring. The antecedents, functions, processes, and characteristics of relational mentoring are examined. Mentoring schema theory, the self-structures of mentoring framework, and the relational cache cycle are applied to relational mentoring. A preliminary measure of relational functions is presented, along with an agenda for future research on mentoring relationships and mentoring episodes.

Keywords: Mentoring relationships, positive relationships at work, relational mentoring, high-quality mentoring, developmental relationship, mentoring schema theory, self-structures of mentoring, relational cache cycle, relational functions, mentoring episodes

22 When asked to reflect on relationships that have
23 made a difference in their lives, many people think
24 about their mentoring relationships. However, like
25 other work relationships, mentoring relationships
26 fall along a continuum of quality (Ragins & Verbos,
27 2007). Mentoring researchers have focused on
28 understanding the qualities, characteristics, and
29 outcomes of average relationships but have not
30 examined the high-quality end of the continuum.
31 At its best, mentoring has the capacity to be a life-
32 altering relationship that inspires and transforms
33 individuals, groups, and organizations (Ragins &
34 Kram, 2007). High-quality mentoring exemplifies
35 positive relationships at work (Dutton & Ragins,
36 2007; Ragins & Verbos, 2007). By neglecting
37 the high end of the quality continuum, we unneces-
38 sarily restrict our understanding of high-quality

relationships, which in turn curtails our ability to
cultivate and sustain these critical work relation-
ships. 40 41

The field of positive organizational scholarship 42
(POS) offers an important lens for understanding 43
high-quality mentoring (Cameron, Dutton, & 44
Quinn, 2003). Using a positive lens, this chapter 45
offers an overview of the construct of relational 46
mentoring. Relational mentoring represents the 47
relational state of high-quality mentoring and is 48
defined as an interdependent and generative devel- 49
opmental relationship that promotes mutual 50
growth, learning, and development within the 51
career context (Ragins, 2005). The antecedents, 52
functions, processes, and characteristics of relational 53
mentoring will be presented, along with an agenda 54
for future research. 55

1 The chapter proceeds as follows. It first begins
2 with an overview of mentoring relationships and
3 the distinction between relational and traditional
4 mentoring. Following this, the antecedents of rela-
5 tional mentoring are presented and integrated with
6 mentoring schema theory and the self-structures of
7 mentoring. I then examine the functions, processes,
8 and characteristics of relational mentoring. To pro-
9 mote research in this area, a preliminary measure of
10 relational mentoring is presented and an agenda for
11 future research is provided.

12 **Mentoring and the Relational Perspective**

13 In this section, I first offer an overview of mentoring
14 and define mentoring using a traditional perspec-
15 tive. I then describe some of the limitations of the
16 traditional approach and present the construct of
17 relational mentoring as an alternative frame for
18 viewing mentoring relationships at work.

19 ***What Is a Mentor?***

20 Traditionally, mentoring is defined as a relationship
21 between an older, more experienced mentor and a
22 younger less experienced protégé for the purpose of
23 helping and developing the protégé's career (Kram,
24 1985; Ragins, 1989). Mentors may or may not
25 be employed in the same organization as the protégé
26 or be in the protégé's profession or chain of
27 command.

28 Mentoring relationships may develop informally
29 or may be assigned as part of a formal mentoring
30 program (Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007). Formal
31 mentoring relationships are generally not as effec-
32 tive as informal relationships (Ragins & Cotton,
33 1999; Wanberg, Welsh, & Hezlett, 2003). However,
34 the quality of the relationship has been found to
35 matter more than whether the relationship is for-
36 mally assigned or informally developed (Ragins,
37 Cotton, & Miller, 2000); high-quality formal rela-
38 tionships can be more effective than low-quality
39 informal relationships. Those with mentors, be they
40 formal or informal, generally have more positive
41 work and career attitudes than those lacking men-
42 tors (cf., Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima 2004;
43 Underhill, 2006).

44 A key feature that defines mentoring and distin-
45 guishes it from other types of work relationships is
46 that mentoring is a relationship that is embedded
47 within the career context (Ragins & Kram, 2007).
48 Another distinction is that mentoring relationships
49 evolve through stages that eventually result in the
50 relationship either terminating or becoming rede-
51 fined as a peer relationship (Kram, 1983, 1985).

Finally, it should be noted that mentoring rela- 52
tionships are part of a developmental network of 53
relationships that exist within and outside the work- 54
place (Higgins & Kram, 2001). At a given point in 55
time, individuals may have a constellation of devel- 56
opmental relationships that offer career guidance 57
and support. As discussed later, these relationships 58
change individuals, and these changes are carried 59
with the individual across life thresholds and the 60
other relationships in their developmental network. 61
As we will see, a key tenet of relational mentoring 62
theory is that the outcomes associated with rela- 63
tional mentoring have the capacity to transform 64
other relationships in the individual's developmen- 65
tal network. 66

Mentoring Episodes 67

Like other relationships, mentoring relationships 68
can be viewed at the level of a single interaction, 69
which are called *mentoring episodes* (Fletcher & 70
Ragins, 2007). Mentoring episodes involve short- 71
term developmental interactions that occur at a spe- 72
cific point in time. 73

Although all mentoring relationships involve 74
mentoring episodes, individuals can engage in a men- 75
toring episode without necessarily being in a men- 76
toring relationship. Individuals may come to define their 77
relationship as an informal mentoring relationship 78
after they reach a "tipping point" in the number, 79
length, and quality of mentoring episodes. For exam- 80
ple, a junior faculty member may seek advice about a 81
career-related dilemma from a more senior member 82
of her department. Both individuals may agree that 83
the senior faculty member engaged in mentoring 84
behaviors during the specific episode, but neither 85
may view it as a mentoring relationship at that point 86
in time. However, with repeated positive interactions, 87
they may begin to view their relationship as a men- 88
toring relationship. 89

Like mentoring relationships, mentoring epi- 90
sodes fall along a continuum of quality. High- 91
quality mentoring episodes are similar to 92
high-quality connections (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003) 93
and growth-fostering interactions (Jordan, Kaplan, 94
Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991; Miller, 1976). High- 95
quality connections are characterized by high emo- 96
tional carrying capacity (i.e., the capacity to 97
withstand both positive and negative emotions), 98
tensility (i.e., the capacity to withstand strain), and 99
high connectivity (i.e., the capacity to be open to 100
new ideas and deflect behaviors that shut down gen- 101
erative processes) (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). 102
Growth-fostering interactions are characterized by 103

1 mutual empathy, authenticity, and empowerment,
 2 and lead to states of zest, empowered action,
 3 increased sense of self-worth, new knowledge, and
 4 the desire for more connection (Jordan et al., 1991;
 5 Miller, 1976). The higher the quality of the mentor-
 6 ing episode, the more likely individuals are to view
 7 their relationship as a mentoring relationship. Low-
 8 quality episodes are unlikely to lead to mentoring
 9 relationships. Episodes that are mixed in quality
 10 may lead to mentoring relationships, but as dis-
 11 cussed next, these relationships are more likely to be
 12 characterized as average in quality.

13 ***The Continuum of Quality***

14 Relational mentoring theory holds that mentoring
 15 relationships involve three relational states (dys-
 16 functional, traditional, and relational) that reflect
 17 low, medium, and high ends of the quality contin-
 18 uum (Ragins, 2005). Like other relationships, no
 19 two mentoring relationships are the same or stay the
 20 same over time. Mentoring relationships provide
 21 different functions based on the needs of their mem-
 22 bers, which are continually evolving. Not only are
 23 there differences between relationships in terms of
 24 quality, but relationships also transform over time
 25 to reflect various states of quality (Ragins & Verbos,
 26 2007). The continuum of mentoring quality there-
 27 fore reflects not only differences across relationships
 28 but also within them. The field of mentoring has
 29 generally focused on mentoring relationships that
 30 reflect the midpoint of the quality continuum.
 31 There has been a significant amount of research
 32 directed toward understanding dysfunctional men-
 33 toring (e.g., Eby, 2007; Eby, Butts, Lockwood, &
 34 Simon, 2004; Eby, Evans, Durley, & Ragins, 2008;
 35 Scandura, 1998), but less is known about high-
 36 quality relationships. One reason for this is that,
 37 like other fields in organizational science, the field
 38 of mentoring focuses on phenomenon experienced
 39 by the majority of workers (e.g., average phenome-
 40 non). Although this captures the experiences of
 41 more workers, it curtails our understanding of the
 42 full range of mentoring experiences, and as dis-
 43 cussed next, creates methodological problems and
 44 issues in our research.

45 ***The Need for a Positive Organizational
 46 Scholarship Perspective***

47 The field of POS (Cameron et al., 2003) illuminates
 48 the problems with focusing on average phenome-
 49 non: Not only do we lose sight of the extraordinary,
 50 but the very description of our constructs suffers
 51 from conceptual and methodological inadequacy.

This problem is aptly illustrated in the field of men- 52
 toring. Traditional perspectives on mentoring 53
 describe ordinary relationships of average quality, 54
 but by focusing on average relationships, our very 55
 definition and measurement of mentoring becomes 56
 limited to these types of relationships. For example, 57
 traditional perspectives on mentoring view it as a 58
 hierarchical, one-way relationship in which the 59
 mentor serves as a “godfather” in helping the pro- 60
 tégé’s career and advancement. However, research 61
 on high-quality relationships questions this view 62
 and points to its limitations in understanding the 63
 processes and outcomes associated with high-quality 64
 relationships (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Dutton 65
 & Ragins, 2007; Fletcher & Ragins, 2007; Miller & 66
 Stiver, 1997). Because our theory explains aver- 67
 age relationships, our measurement soon follows, 68
 and our empirical base of knowledge becomes 69
 limited to explaining average relationships. High- 70
 quality relationships fall off our conceptual and 71
 empirical map. 72

73 ***A Relational Approach to Mentoring***

74 Relational mentoring puts high-quality mentoring
 75 back on the map. It does not reject traditional per-
 76 spectives; these approaches explain average or mar-
 77 ginally effective relationships, but do not explain
 78 high-quality relationships (Ragins & Verbos, 2007).
 79 By widening the conceptual lens of mentoring, rela-
 80 tional mentoring allows us to assess the processes,
 81 characteristics, and outcomes of high-quality men-
 82 toring. Let us now turn to the four key principles
 83 that define relational mentoring and distinguish it
 84 from traditional approaches (Ragins, 2005; Ragins
 85 & Verbos, 2007).

86 **USE OF A DYADIC AND RECIPROCAL
 87 PERSPECTIVE**

88 First, relational mentoring challenges the view that
 89 all mentoring is a one-sided relationship, and instead
 90 points to the mutuality and reciprocity inherent in
 91 growth-producing relationships (cf., Fletcher &
 92 Ragins, 2007). Instead of viewing the mentor as a
 93 prevailing source of power and influence, relational
 94 mentoring recognizes that high-quality relation-
 95 ships involve the capacity for mutual influence,
 96 growth, and learning. Both members enter the rela-
 97 tionship expecting to grow, learn, and be changed
 98 by the relationship, and both feel a responsibility
 99 and a desire to contribute to the growth and devel-
 100 opment of their partner.

Although the overall level of expertise between 101
 the mentor and protégé may be asymmetrical, 102

1 a relational perspective recognizes that expertise
 2 shifts within a given mentoring episode, which
 3 allows for mutual learning for both members
 4 (Fletcher & Ragins, 2007). For example, a faculty
 5 mentor may help a protégé with publishing an arti-
 6 cle, but the protégé may offer expertise in new sta-
 7 tistical analyses. Influence is shared, with the mentor
 8 using “power with” rather than “power over” influ-
 9 ence strategies that characterize high-quality rela-
 10 tionships (Follett, 1924; Miller, 1976). An example
 11 of mutual growth can be found in diverse mento-
 12 ring relationships; diverse mentoring relationships
 13 involve individuals who differ in group member-
 14 ships associated with power (e.g., race, ethnicity,
 15 gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability)
 16 (Ragins, 1997). These relationships offer an ideal
 17 platform for both mentors and protégés to learn
 18 about diversity and to grow from the unique experi-
 19 ences of those with different backgrounds, cultures,
 20 nationalities, and experiences.

21 **RELIANCE ON COMMUNAL NORMS AND** 22 **GENERATIVE PROCESSES**

23 Second, relational mentoring calls to question
 24 *exchange paradigms* and the *instrumental approach* to
 25 mentoring. An instrumental approach uses a trans-
 26 actional frame and values the relationship for what
 27 it can *do* rather than what it can *be*. Instrumental
 28 approaches use a social exchange framework (Blau,
 29 1964, Homans, 1958, 1974) that relies on exchange
 30 norms in the relationship. With exchange norms,
 31 partners give to each other with the expectation that
 32 they will receive a “return on their investment.” For
 33 example, mentors may expect allegiance in return
 34 for the favors bestowed on their protégés. In turn,
 35 protégés may be advised to use their mentors as a
 36 career resource and to “trade them in” when a better
 37 mentor comes along. In contrast, relational mento-
 38 ring is a close relationship that is governed by com-
 39 munal norms (Clark & Mills, 1979, 1993), in
 40 which individuals give to their partners on the basis
 41 of need rather than on the basis of expected
 42 returns.

43 **EXTENDED RANGE OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

44 Third, relational mentoring expands the range of
 45 dependent variables used to capture the effective-
 46 ness of mentoring relationships. Current approaches
 47 use traditional criteria of career success, such as
 48 advancement and compensation, which fail to cap-
 49 ture the outcomes associated with high-quality
 50 relationships (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Miller &
 51 Stiver, 1997). Relational mentoring draws on the

relationship and the POS literatures to identify a 52
 broad range of dependent variables that reflect per- 53
 sonal growth and development, as well as the acqui- 54
 sition of relational skills and competencies that may 55
 be transportable across work roles and organiza- 56
 tional boundaries (Fletcher, 1996; Kram & Ragins, 57
 2007). A POS perspective offers an array of poten- 58
 tial outcomes that include positive psychological 59
 capital (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007), thriving 60
 (Spreitzer, Sutcliffe, Dutton, Sonenshein, & Grant, 61
 2005), flourishing (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008; 62
 Keyes & Haidt, 2003), resilience (Luthans, 2002; 63
 Luthans et al., 2007), and a host of other POS out- 64
 comes identified in this volume. 65

Expanding the criteria base allows for a more 66
 accurate assessment of the effectiveness of mento- 67
 ring relationships. For example, a high-quality rela- 68
 tionship may help its members develop a professional 69
 identity or balance work and family, but may not 70
 lead to a change in compensation or advancement. 71
 Researchers who use compensation or advancement 72
 as evidence of effective mentoring may conclude 73
 that the relationship is ineffective, when in fact the 74
 relationship may be exceptionally effective in meet- 75
 ing the unique needs of its members. 76

A HOLISTIC APPROACH

77
 78 Finally, a relational perspective takes a holistic
 79 approach that incorporates and acknowledges the
 80 interaction between work and nonwork domains
 81 (Ragins, 2008). Although traditional perspectives
 82 view work relationships only in terms of work out-
 83 comes, a holistic perspective recognizes that high-
 84 quality relationships can influence the quality of life
 85 within and outside the workplace (Ragins & Dutton,
 86 2007). Relationships change people, and these
 87 changes are not left at the workplace door. The reach
 88 of high-quality mentoring may extend beyond the
 89 workplace and may influence the individual’s ability
 90 to cope with challenges that spill over across his or
 91 her life domains (Ragins, Lyness, & Winkel, 2010).
 92 For example, high-quality mentoring may build
 93 an individual’s self-efficacy and her capacity for com-
 94 passion (Boyatzis, 2007), as well as her emotional
 95 intelligence (Cherniss, 2007), her capacity to cope
 96 with stress (Kram & Hall, 1989), and her ability to
 97 balance work and family demands (Greenhaus &
 98 Singh, 2007). Although this chapter focuses on work
 99 relationships, a developmental network perspective
 100 holds that people have constellations of developmen-
 101 tal and mentoring relationships that exist within and
 102 outside the workplace (Higgins & Kram, 2001).
 103 Using a holistic perspective, high-quality mentoring

1 relationships outside the workplace can build an indi-
2 vidual's relational resources, which can be carried into
3 the workplace and influence her ability to develop
4 high-quality relationships at work.

5 In sum, in contrast to traditional, one-sided
6 approaches to mentoring that use exchange models
7 to predict a restricted range of instrumental out-
8 comes, a relational approach widens the lens of
9 mentoring to include high-quality, interdependent
10 relationships that use communal norms to facilitate
11 mutual growth, learning, and development within a
12 career context. Relational mentoring incorporates a
13 holistic perspective, and views mentoring as a posi-
14 tive work relationship that influences the quality of
15 life within and outside the workplace. Let us now
16 turn to a more in-depth review of the antecedents,
17 processes, and outcomes that may be found in high-
18 quality mentoring relationships.

19 **Antecedents of Relational Mentoring**

20 In this section, I review the individual, relational,
21 and organizational factors that may lead to high-
22 quality mentoring relationships. A number of indi-
23 vidual variables may predict people's ability to
24 develop and sustain high-quality mentoring rela-
25 tionships (cf., Fletcher & Ragins, 2007; Ragins,
26 2005, 2009; Ragins & Verbos, 2007). These include
27 their self-structures of mentoring, their relational
28 skills and knowledge, and other individual differ-
29 ences variables, such as personality, attachment
30 styles, and emotional intelligence.

31 ***The Self-structures of Mentoring***

32 Self-structures of mentoring involve three compo-
33 nents: mentoring identities, mentoring schemas,
34 and mentoring as possible selves (Ragins, 2005,
35 2009; Ragins & Verbos, 2007).

36 **MENTORING IDENTITIES**

37 Individuals vary with respect to the degree to
38 which they incorporate relationships into their
39 identity structures (Anderson & Chen, 2002;
40 Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Individuals who define
41 themselves in terms of others are viewed as having
42 interdependent self-construals (Cross, Bacon, &
43 Morris, 2000) or relational identities (Brewer &
44 Gardner, 1996). Since relationships are central to
45 their sense of self, these individuals should place
46 greater importance on relationships than others
47 (Anderson & Chen, 2002).

48 Mentoring identities are a type of relational
49 identity that involves individuals defining them-
50 selves in terms of their mentoring relationships

(Ragins, 2009). Both mentors and protégés have
51 mentoring identities, and these identities may range
52 from positive to negative. Positive mentoring iden-
53 tities involve states of positive self-cognition (e.g.,
54 "Who am I? I am a good mentor."). The individual
55 not only defines him- or herself in terms of the
56 mentoring relationship, but this self-structure also
57 gives the individual positive cognitive and affective
58 associations. Individuals who have positive mentor-
59 ing identities are posited to be more motivated and
60 better able to develop high-quality mentoring rela-
61 tionships than are those who do not have a positive
62 mentoring identity (Ragins, 2009). 63

64 **MENTORING SCHEMAS**

65 Mentoring schemas are the second self-structure
66 that influences relational mentoring. Mentoring
67 schemas are "fluid cognitive maps derived from past
68 experiences and relationships that guide mentor's
69 and protégés' perceptions, expectations, and
70 behaviors in mentoring relationships." (Ragins &
71 Verbos, 2007, p. 101) Drawing on relational schema
72 (Baldwin, 1992; Planalp, 1985, 1987) and social
73 cognition theory (Fiske, 1992; Markus, 1977;
74 Markus & Zajonc, 1985), mentoring schema theory
75 holds that individuals hold mental maps of mentor-
76 ing that shape their expectations, frame their experi-
77 ences, and motivate their behaviors in mentoring
78 relationships (Ragins & Verbos, 2007). Essentially,
79 mentoring schemas are knowledge structures of
80 what mentoring relationships "look like." Mentoring
81 schemas involve expectations about what mentors
82 and protégés do in the relationship, what the rela-
83 tionship provides, and how it functions. As dis-
84 cussed later, relational mentoring involves a unique
85 set of functions that distinguish it from average or
86 dysfunctional relationships. Individuals who incor-
87 porate relational functions into their mental maps
88 of mentoring should be more likely to develop high-
89 quality mentoring relationships than are those who
90 do not incorporate relational functions (Ragins,
91 2005). An example of a mentoring schema that
92 would predict the development of a high-quality
93 relationships is "Good mentors learn from their
94 protégés and are able to grow in the relationship."
95 An example of a schema that would be less likely to
96 result in a high-quality relationship is "Protégés
97 should always listen to their mentors as the mentor
98 knows best."

99 **MENTORING AS POSSIBLE SELVES**

100 Possible selves reflect the selves we wish to become,
101 as well as the selves we fear becoming (Markus &

1 Nurius, 1986). Mentoring as a possible self is defined
 2 as “a future oriented representation of oneself in a
 3 mentoring relationship” (Ragins, 2009, p. 243). The
 4 possible selves of mentoring range from positive to
 5 negative, reflecting the best and worst visions of
 6 oneself in a future mentoring relationship. Examples
 7 of different possible selves include: “I see myself as
 8 an effective, wonderful mentor,” “I can’t picture
 9 myself as a mentor,” and “I would be an awful
 10 mentor.” Those who hold positive self-visions should
 11 be more motivated to enter and sustain a high-
 12 quality mentoring relationship than are those who
 13 lack visions or hold negative visions of themselves in
 14 mentoring relationships (Ragins, 2005).

15 These three self-structures influence one another
 16 and are also affected by past and current experiences
 17 in mentoring relationships (Ragins, 2005). Those
 18 who have had high-quality mentoring relationships in
 19 the past, either as mentors or as protégés, may be more
 20 likely to have positive self-structures that allow them
 21 to develop and sustain high-quality relationships in
 22 the future. In contrast, those who lack these experi-
 23 ences may be less likely to incorporate mentoring into
 24 their identity structures; mentoring becomes tangen-
 25 tial to who they are and who they aspire to be.

26 Even the experience of witnessing high-quality
 27 relationships can help individuals develop mentor-
 28 ing self-structures that offer a foundation for high-
 29 quality mentoring relationships. For example,
 30 high-quality mentoring relationships can be a source
 31 of role modeling for others in the organization, par-
 32 ticularly if such relationships occur in high-ranking,
 33 visible positions. To the extent that mentoring cul-
 34 ture is driven from the top, the presence of high-
 35 ranking relational mentoring may create mentoring
 36 cultures that both value and model high-quality
 37 relationships.

38 Although cognitive structures are important for
 39 guiding and framing expectations, individuals also
 40 need a certain skill set in order to develop high-
 41 quality mentoring relationships.

42 *Relational Skills, Caches, and Differences*

43 RELATIONAL SKILLS

44 Mentors and protégés should be more likely
 45 to develop and sustain high-quality relationships
 46 when they have the ability to engage in effective
 47 communication, empathic listening, personal learn-
 48 ing, and self-reflection (Kram & Ragins, 2007).
 49 Emotional intelligence, emotional competence, and
 50 the ability to be compassionate may also help indi-
 51 viduals develop high-quality mentoring relation-
 52 ships (Boyatzis, 2007; Cherniss, 2007; Fletcher,

1998; Fletcher & Ragins, 2007). Boyatzis (2007) 53
 observes that, by exhibiting compassion, mentors 54
 and protégés help each other engage in intentional 55
 change behaviors that allow them to achieve their 56
 dreams and aspirations. 57

Using Stone Center relational cultural theory 58
 (RCT) (Jordan et al., 1991; Miller & Stiver, 1997), 59
 Fletcher and Ragins (2007) identified a set of indi- 60
 vidual antecedents to relational mentoring. These 61
 include the ability to be authentic, adaptive, empa- 62
 thetic, interdependent, and vulnerable in the rela- 63
 tionship (see also Fletcher, 1998, 1999). Another 64
 key antecedent is the ability to engage in fluid exper- 65
 tise; fluid expertise allows individuals to move from 66
 an expert to nonexpert role, to acknowledge help, 67
 and to give credit to others without losing self- 68
 esteem or needing to engage in “face-saving gam- 69
 bits” (Fletcher, 1998). Mentors in particular need to 70
 be able to put aside their hierarchical roles and 71
 formal position in order to enter the relationship 72
 from a place of mutual vulnerability, interdepend- 73
 ence, and fluid role relationships. They must have 74
 the emotional stability and self-awareness necessary 75
 to allow for mutual influence in the relationship; 76
 influence that is based on needs and abilities, rather 77
 than on hierarchically prescribed roles and tradi- 78
 tional power relationships. 79

80 THE RELATIONAL CACHE CYCLE

High-quality mentoring relationships are not only 81
 built on relational skills, they may also generate the 82
 relational skills needed to build other high-quality 83
 relationships. We call this *relational caches*, which 84
 are a transportable set of relational skills and com- 85
 petencies that transfer across time, relationships, 86
 and settings (Kram & Ragins, 2007). This reflects 87
 the idea that individuals carry their skill set with 88
 them across relationships. 89

Relational caches are likely to be developed in 90
 high-quality relationships, and because people share 91
 and build relational skills in growth-producing rela- 92
 tionships (Miller & Stiver, 1997), they are also likely 93
 to be passed between members of these relation- 94
 ships. Moreover, since mentoring relationships exist 95
 within a broader network of other relationships 96
 (Higgins & Kram, 2001), members in high-quality 97
 mentorships may pass their relational caches to 98
 others in their social network. This becomes an iter- 99
 ative process in which mentors and protégés help 100
 each other broaden and build their skill caches, and 101
 in so doing develop relational caches that are passed 102
 along to members of their other relationships both 103
 within and outside the workplace. 104

1 In essence, a holistic perspective recognizes that
 2 individuals do not leave their relational skills at the
 3 workplace door, but carry them into other relation-
 4 ships nested within their homes, communities, and
 5 professional networks. Similarly, relational skills
 6 that are developed outside the work domain can be
 7 carried back into the workplace and can influence
 8 the quality of workplace mentoring. This suggests
 9 that the ability to develop high-quality relationships
 10 outside the workplace should spill over and influ-
 11 ence relationships within the workplace and vice
 12 versa. An iterative cycle of positive relation-
 13 ships could therefore be developed that includes
 14 relationships nested in the workplace, the home, the
 15 community, and the profession.

16 **INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES**

17 A number of individual difference variables may
 18 influence an individual's ability to develop and sus-
 19 tain high-quality relationships. Although there has
 20 been a lack of research on personality characteristics
 21 that predict high-quality mentoring, a recent review
 22 of the literature on mentoring and personality
 23 suggests that individuals who exhibit prosocial per-
 24 sonalities, altruism, other-oriented empathy, and
 25 openness to experience may be more likely to engage
 26 in relational mentoring than are those who lack
 27 these attributes (cf. Turban & Lee, 2007; Allen,
 28 2003; Aryee, Chay, & Chew, 1996; Bozionelos,
 29 2004).

30 Given the relational skill set identified earlier, it
 31 would be reasonable to expect that individuals who
 32 had strong self-esteem, emotional stability, and
 33 emotional intelligence would be more likely to seek
 34 and develop high-quality mentoring relationships
 35 than would those who lack these attributes.
 36 Individuals with strong learning goal orientations
 37 (Godshalk & Sosik, 2003) should be attracted to
 38 the mutual learning processes inherent in high-
 39 quality mentoring relationships. Finally, attachment
 40 styles may influence the closeness of the mentoring
 41 relationship (Noe, Greenberger, & Wang (2002)
 42 and the motivation to enter a mentoring relation-
 43 ship (Wang, Noe, Wang, & Greenberger, 2009).
 44 According to attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969),
 45 individuals with secure attachment styles may be
 46 better able to develop close relationships than would
 47 those who either avoid close relationships or experi-
 48 ence anxiety in the presence of intimacy. Those with
 49 secure attachment styles are also better able to
 50 adhere to the communal norms that characterize
 51 close relationships (Bartz & Lydon, 2008). It is
 52 therefore reasonable to expect that individuals with

secure attachment styles should be better able and
 more motivated to enter high-quality mentoring
 relationships than would those with insecure attach-
 ment styles.

Relationship Antecedents

At least four characteristics of the relationship
 should affect its ability to achieve high-quality
 states. First, relationships are likely to be of higher
 quality when the mentor and protégé share similar
 mentoring schemas (Ragins, 2005; Ragins &
 Verbos, 2007). As discussed earlier, both mentors
 and protégés have mentoring schemas that reflect
 expectations about their respective roles, as well as
 the behaviors, purpose, and outcomes of the rela-
 tionship. Schema congruency should not only influ-
 ence the satisfaction and quality of the relationship,
 but also its effectiveness; members may be more
 likely to work at cross-purposes when they do not
 share a common frame of reference or set of expect-
 ations about the relationship.

Second, mentoring relationships are likely to be
 of higher quality when both members hold com-
 munal norms. Communal norms involve members
 giving to their partners without the expectation or
 obligation of repayment (e.g., Clark & Mills, 1979)
 and represent a key process in relational mentoring
 (Ragins, 2005). Existing research indicates that
 commitment is a key predictor of quality of rela-
 tionship (Allen & Eby, 2008), and communal
 norms reflect the deepest form of relational com-
 mitment (Clark & Mills, 1979, 1993); so, it is rea-
 sonable to expect that relationships will be of higher
 quality when *both* members hold communal rather
 than exchange norms. However, a state of norm
 incongruency, in which one member uses exchange
 norms while the other relies on communal, should
 lead to restricted levels of relational quality.

Third, the similarity of values, personality, and
 learning orientations should affect the quality of the
 mentoring relationship. Mentoring researchers have
 found that perceived and actual similarity in learn-
 ing goal orientations and other personality and
 value attributes predict relationship satisfaction and
 liking, which are often predictors of high-quality
 relationships (Godshalk & Sosik, 2003; Lankau,
 Riordan, & Thomas, 2005; Wanberg, Kammeyer-
 Mueller, & Marchese, 2006). Demographic dis-
 similarity creates a challenge for many mentoring
 relationships as individuals may not be aware of
 "deep level" types of diversity (e.g., personality,
 values, interests) that can be the basis for developing
 a close mentoring relationship (Ragins, 1997).

1 However, related research indicates that, over time,
2 individuals find deep-level similarities that form the
3 basis of effective work relationships (Harrison, Price,
4 & Bell, 1998). This suggests that members of diverse
5 mentoring relationships may need to make a more
6 concerted effort to discover similarities involving
7 personality, values, and interests, and that diverse
8 relationships may take more time to develop into
9 high-quality mentoring relationships than demo-
10 graphically homogeneous relationships (Clutterbuck
11 & Ragins, 2002; Ragins, 1997).

12 The fourth characteristic that may influence rela-
13 tional quality is the structure of the mentoring rela-
14 tionship. For example, whereas informal relationships
15 often develop on the basis of shared interests and
16 commonalities, formal mentoring relationships are
17 usually assigned by a third party and are therefore
18 less likely to have this advantage. In recognition of
19 this limitation, some formal programs involve men-
20 tors and protégés in the matching process, and exist-
21 ing research indicates that this procedure may yield
22 higher-quality relationships (Allen et al., 2006).
23 Even so, formal relationships are usually con-
24 tracted to last between 6 months and a year, which
25 restricts the time needed to reach a high-quality
26 state (Ragins, 2005). In contrast, informal mentor-
27 ing relationships usually span between 3 and 5 years,
28 which allows more time for members to establish
29 trust, reciprocity, and interdependence in the men-
30 toring relationship.

31 Electronic or virtual mentoring, which occurs
32 over the Internet, also faces unique challenges to
33 achieving high-quality states (cf. review by Ensher
34 & Murphy, 2007; see also Ensher, Heun, &
35 Blanchard, 2003; Hamilton & Scandura, 2003).
36 Because of the lack of face-to-face interaction and
37 nonverbal cues, electronic relationships are more
38 susceptible to miscommunication, and it is more
39 difficult and time-consuming to establish trust and
40 rapport in these relationships than in face-to-face
41 mentoring (Buche, 2008). Given these differences,
42 it may not be fair to compare formal and electronic
43 mentoring with informal mentoring. Perhaps a
44 better approach would be to examine the predictors
45 and the range of quality within a particular type of
46 mentoring relationship (e.g., what does high-quality
47 electronic mentoring look like, and what factors
48 predict the ability of individuals to attain these
49 relationships).

50 **Organization Antecedents**

51 Mentoring relationships do not exist in a vacuum
52 but are nested within the organizational context.

Some organizations promote a mentoring culture 53
that values shared knowledge, collaboration, and 54
learning (Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006). These 55
cultures should be more likely to promote relational 56
mentoring than organizations that are characterized 57
by competitiveness, hierarchical relationships, and 58
traditional forms of power that restrict mutual 59
learning, reciprocity, and interdependence in work 60
relationships (Fletcher & Ragins, 2007). 61

In sum, characteristics of the individual, rela- 62
tionship, and organization may influence the ability 63
of individuals to develop high-quality mentoring 64
relationships. Let us now turn to a more in-depth 65
examination of the functions and processes of high- 66
quality mentoring relationships. 67

Functions and Processes in High-quality mentoring Relationships

The Evolution of Mentoring Functions

Over 25 years ago, Kathy Kram (1985, p. 22) defined 71
mentoring functions as “those aspects of a develop- 72
mental relationship that enhance *both* individuals’ 73
growth and advancement” (italics added). Although 74
this definition took a dyadic perspective, the func- 75
tions described in her landmark book focused pri- 76
marily on what the mentor provides to the protégé. 77
Kram described two classifications of mentor func- 78
tions, career development and psychosocial, and 79
identified discrete functions or behaviors within 80
each of these categories. *Career development* func- 81
tions help protégés advance in the organization and 82
include five subcategories: sponsoring advancement, 83
providing job coaching, increasing positive exposure 84
and visibility in the organization, offering protec- 85
tion, and giving challenging assignments. Mentors 86
also provide *psychosocial* functions, and the four sub- 87
categories here include role modeling, acceptance 88
and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. 89

Building on Kram’s (1983) groundbreaking work, 90
instruments were soon developed that allowed 91
researchers to measure these functions from the men- 92
tor’s perspective (Noe, 1988; Ragins & McFarlin, 93
1990; Scandura & Ragins, 1993). Twenty years later, 94
we know that mentors do indeed provide these func- 95
tions and that these functions predict protégés’ career 96
outcomes and their satisfaction with the mentor and 97
the relationship (cf., Allen et al., 2004; Wanberg 98
et al., 2003). *However, although high levels of these* 99
functions represent greater levels of relational quality, 100
high-quality relationships may involve more than just 101
these functions. 102

Relational mentoring builds on this existing 103
work in two key ways. First, hearkening back to 104

1 Kram's (1985) initial definition, relational mentor-
 2 ing examines the functions and processes provided
 3 by *both* members of the relationship. Second,
 4 because relational mentoring seeks to explain pro-
 5 cesses involved in high-quality relationships, the
 6 range of functions in the relationship are extended
 7 to include the qualities, behaviors, and characteris-
 8 tics found in close interpersonal relationships
 9 (Duck, 1994; Mashek & Aron, 2004), high-quality
 10 connections (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003), growth-
 11 fostering interactions (Jordan et al., 1991; Miller,
 12 1976), and positive relationships at work (Dutton
 13 & Ragins, 2007).

14 Relational mentoring offers a third category of
 15 mentoring functions: relational functions. *Relational*
 16 *functions do not substitute for career development or psy-*
 17 *chosocial functions, but represent an additional category*
 18 *that reflects high-quality relationships.* From the nega-
 19 tive side of the spectrum, research has presented new
 20 measures that capture the functions, behaviors, and
 21 characteristics found in dysfunctional mentoring
 22 relationships (Eby et al., 2004, 2008). Mirroring this
 23 work from a positive perspective, this section describes
 24 relational functions, and a preliminary measure of
 25 relational functions is provided in Table 39.1.

26 **Relational Functions**

27 Relational functions represent a third category of
 28 mentoring functions that reflects the characteristics,
 29 behaviors, and attributes that may be found in high-
 30 quality mentoring relationships. The list of such
 31 characteristics can be extensive, but here I am only
 32 identifying key functions that may be displayed by
 33 *both* mentors and protégés in high-quality relation-
 34 ships and episodes. This list is not meant to be
 35 exhaustive, but reflects core attributes drawn from
 36 related research and theory in the relationships,
 37 social psychology, social cognition, and mentoring
 38 literatures. Drawing on this work, relational
 39 functions may include six subcategories: personal
 40 learning and growth, inspiration, affirmation of
 41 selves, reliance on communal norms, shared influ-
 42 ence and mutual respect, and relational trust and
 43 commitment.

44 **PERSONAL LEARNING AND GROWTH**

45 Learning can be both a process and an outcome of
 46 mentoring relationships (Kram & Ragins, 2007;
 47 Lankau & Scandura, 2007). In terms of process,
 48 high-quality mentorships differ from traditional
 49 relationships in the mutuality, type, and degree of
 50 learning. Traditional approaches view the mentor as
 51 the teacher or guide and the protégé as the learner.

In contrast, a relational approach recognizes that, in
 high-quality mentoring, both members may learn
 and grow from the relationship. High-quality rela-
 tionships involve fluid expertise, in which expertise
 shifts depending on the mentoring episode or inter-
 action (Fletcher & Ragins, 2007). For example, in a
 given episode, a protégé may show the mentor how
 to use the latest technology, or may offer insights
 into generational differences among new entrants
 into the workforce. Greater levels of mutual learn-
 ing should occur in high-quality relationships
 because learning is based on the individual's task
 expertise or knowledge, rather than on their hierar-
 chical position or role in the relationship.

The type of learning should also differ in high-
 quality mentoring relationships. Although there are
 many ways to define learning in mentoring relation-
 ships (cf., review by Lankau & Scandura, 2007),
 high-quality relationships are more likely to pro-
 duce personal learning (Carmeli, Brueller, &
 Dutton, 2009; Kram & Cherniss, 2001), which
 involves the individual's insights into their values,
 strengths, and weaknesses, as well as their develop-
 mental needs, reactions, and patterns of behaviors
 (Kram, 1996; Higgins & Kram, 2001). Learning
 therefore can involve not only the sharing of infor-
 mation and knowledge, but also the potential for
 personal growth and development. By providing
 personal learning functions, members help each
 other learn more about themselves and others. For
 example, in high-quality relationships both mentors
 and protégés may provide their partner with feed-
 back that illuminates the "blind spots" in their re-
 lationships with others, while giving them insights
 into their personal strengths and weaknesses.

87 **INSPIRATION**

88 Inspiration is an evoked psychological state derived
 89 from an episode with an object, event, or person
 (Thrash & Elliot, 2003, 2004). Inspiration involves
 seeing different and better possibilities, and can lead
 to a positive motivational state that involves the
 energization and direction of behavior (Thrash &
 Elliot, 2003, 2004). Inspiration scholars distinguish
 between being "inspired by" and being "inspired to"
 (e.g., one can admire a person or an object without
 being moved to action) (Thrash & Elliot, 2004). In
 a relational context that involves mutuality and
 reciprocity, there may be an additional process of
 mutual inspiration (e.g., "inspired with."): 100

Mentors and protégés have the capacity to inspire
 each other in their mentoring episodes and relation-
 ships. Traditional perspectives on mentoring hold 103

Table 39.1 The Relational Mentoring Index

Instructions: The following questions ask about your experience in mentoring relationships. Mentoring is a developmental relationship that pairs a more experienced and knowledgeable mentor with a less experienced protégé. The relationship supports the protégé’s career, but also offers important benefits for the mentor. Both members may learn, grow, and develop from the mentoring relationship.

Some mentoring relationships develop spontaneously and informally, whereas others are part of a formal mentoring program. In formal mentoring programs, mentors and protégés are matched and assigned in some way.

(Introductory Questions)

- Do you currently have an ongoing mentoring relationship? (options: yes/no/unsure)
- When did the relationship begin?
- If you have more than one mentoring relationship, please answer the following questions in terms of your strongest relationship.
- What is your role in this relationship? (options: mentor, protégé)
- Is this relationship formally assigned as part of a formal mentoring program? (options: yes it is a formally assigned relationship/no it is not a formally assigned relationship/unsure)

Relational Mentoring Index

When thinking about this particular mentoring relationship, please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements using the following scale: 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

(Relational Functions and Items)

(Function: Personal Learning and Growth)

1. My partner is helping me learn and grow as a person.
2. My partner helps me learn about my personal strengths and weaknesses.
3. My partner helps me learn more about myself.

(Function: Inspiration)

4. My partner has inspired or been a source of inspiration for me.
5. My partner gives me a fresh perspective that helps me think “outside the box.”
6. I am often inspired by my partner.

(Function: Self-affirmation^a)

(Sub-function: Affirmation of Ideal Self)

7. My partner is helping me become the person I aspire to be.
8. My partner sees me not only for who I am now, but also for who I aspire to be.

(Sub-function: Affirmation of Best Self)

9. My partner always sees the best in me.
10. My partner seems to bring out the best in me.

(Sub-function: Affirmation of Authentic Self)

11. My partner accepts me for who I am.
12. I can be myself with my partner.

(Function: Reliance on Communal Norms)

13. In our relationship, we help each other without expecting repayment.
14. We never keep score of who gives and who gets in our relationship.

Table 39.1 The Relational Mentoring Index (continued)

15. We give to each other without expecting repayment.
(Function: Shared Influence and Respect)
16. My partner and I respect and influence each other.
17. We respect each other, and we value what each person has to say.
18. There is mutual respect and influence in our relationship.
(Function: Trust and Commitment)
19. Our relationship is founded on mutual trust and commitment.
20. My partner and I trust each other, and we are committed to the relationship.
21. Trust and commitment are central to our relationship.

* Affirmation items may all load on same factor.

1 that mentors may serve as role models for their
 2 protégés. Role modeling approaches, but does not
 3 fully capture the possibilities for inspiration in
 4 high-quality mentoring relationships; members are
 5 not only “inspired by” others (e.g., the mentor serv-
 6 ing as a role model), but can also be “inspired to”
 7 engage in new and creative behaviors and may also
 8 engage in a reciprocal and synergistic process of
 9 mutual inspiration (e.g., “inspired with”). Traditional
 10 perspectives on role modeling ignore the possibil-
 11 ity of mutual inspiration in which the mentor
 12 both inspires and is inspired by his or her protégé.
 13 Another distinction is that role modeling involves
 14 emulation and admiration, whereas inspiration
 15 can involve sparks of creativity that allow both
 16 members of the relationship to think about things
 17 in fresh and new ways (Thrash, Maruskin, Cassidy,
 18 Fryer, & Ryan, 2010). Mutual inspiration can
 19 involve synergistic “thinking outside the box”
 20 behaviors that can be beneficial for both mentors
 21 and protégés (Thrash, Elliot, Maruskin, & Cassidy,
 22 2010). High-quality relationships offer the psycho-
 23 logical space in which inspiration can thrive (Dutton
 24 & Heaphy, 2003), and it is reasonable to expect that
 25 both mentors and protégés will report that their
 26 partner inspires them, gives them a fresh perspec-
 27 tive, and helps them think about work and life in
 28 new ways.

29 **AFFIRMATION OF IDEAL, BEST,
 30 AND AUTHENTIC SELVES**

31 The self is not formed in a vacuum, but is crafted
 32 through relationships with others (Cooley, 1902;
 33 Mead, 1934). High-quality mentoring relation-
 34 ships may help their members develop three aspects
 35 of the self: their ideal selves (Markus & Nurius,

1986), their best selves (Roberts, Dutton, Spreitzer, 36
 Heaphy, & Quinn, 2005), and their authentic selves 37
 (Goffman, 1959; Harter, 2002). 38

Ideal selves represent the selves we wish to 39
 become in the future; they reflect our hopes, dreams, 40
 and aspirations, as well the skills, abilities, achieve- 41
 ments, and accomplishments that we wish to attain 42
 (Higgins, 1987; Markus & Nurius, 1986). Research 43
 from the close relationships literature indicates that 44
 partners play a key role in helping each other reach 45
 their ideal selves. Drawing on interdependence 46
 theory (Kelley, 1983; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; 47
 Rusbult & Van Lange, 1996) and the ideal self liter- 48
 ature (Higgins, 1987; Markus & Nurius, 1986), 49
 Drigotas and his colleagues offer the idea of the 50
Michelangelo phenomenon (Drigotas, Rusbult, 51
 Wieselquist, & Whitton, 1999). Using the meta- 52
 phor of the sculptor who helps the true form emerge 53
 from the stone, the Michelangelo phenomenon 54
 describes the role that close partners play in affirm- 55
 ing one another’s pursuit of the ideal self and the 56
 means by which the self is shaped by a close part- 57
 ner’s perceptions and behaviors (Drigotas, 2002; 58
 Drigotas et al., 1999). 59

The Michelangelo phenomenon has great utility 60
 for explaining the processes involved in high-quality 61
 mentoring. This phenomenon holds that an indi- 62
 vidual can help his partner reach his ideal self by 63
 offering affirmations that confirm the partner’s 64
 beliefs about himself and by behaving in ways that 65
 are congruent with his partner’s ideal self (Drigotas, 66
 2002; Drigotas et al., 1999). Partner affirmations 67
 take the form of *perceptual* affirmation, in which 68
 partners view each other in terms of their ideal 69
 selves, and *behavioral* affirmations, in which indi- 70
 viduals help their partners engage in behaviors that 71

1 are aligned with their ideal selves by directly eliciting
2 or creating opportunities to engage in desired
3 behaviors, or by decreasing the opportunity to
4 engage in behaviors that conflict with ideal selves.
5 Existing research has found support for this phe-
6 nomenon and has found that movement toward
7 ideal selves predicts positive outcomes reflecting
8 relational and personal well-being (e.g., life satisfac-
9 tion, emotional well-being, self-esteem, vitality,
10 relational stability, relational satisfaction) (Drigotas,
11 2002; Drigotas et al., 1999; Kumashiro, Rusbult,
12 Finkenauer, & Stocker, 2007; Rusbult, Kumashiro,
13 Kubacka, & Finkel, 2009).

14 By providing affirmation, high-quality mentoring
15 relationships may also help their members develop
16 their “reflected best self.” Reflected best selves are
17 defined as “an individual’s cognitive representation of
18 the qualities or characteristics an individual displays
19 when at his or her best” (Roberts et al., 2005,
20 p. 713). Reflected best selves share some features of
21 the ideal self, but focus more on the qualities and
22 characteristics the person currently has rather than
23 on those they wish to possess (cf. Higgins, 1987).
24 According to Roberts and colleagues, mentoring
25 relationships are relational resources individuals can
26 use to develop portraits or mental representations of
27 who they are when they are at their personal best.
28 Through behavioral and perceptual affirmation,
29 mentors and protégés may help each other expand
30 their collective constellation of possible selves and
31 provide the opportunity to bring their best selves
32 forward in their mentoring relationship.

33 In addition to best and ideal selves, high-quality
34 mentoring relationships may also affirm the pre-
35 sentation of the authentic self. The authentic self
36 represents one’s “true or real self” (Gergen, 1991;
37 Mitchell, 1992). Unlike ideal and best selves,
38 authentic selves include not only our best, but also
39 our worst traits, characteristics, and attributes.
40 High-quality relationships allow for the affirmation
41 of the authentic self (Mitchell, 1992; see also
42 Roberts, 2007). Unlike other relationships in which
43 the authentic self is repressed, hidden, or distorted
44 (Goffman, 1959; Schlenker, 1980), high-quality
45 relationships offer the relational space, affirmation,
46 and acceptance needed to close the space between
47 the presented and the actual self (Roberts, 2007;
48 Roberts, Cha, Hewlin, & Settles, 2009). Drawing
49 on self-verification theory, such congruence may
50 lead to positive outcomes for the individual (Swann,
51 1983, 1987) and their work relationships (Swann,
52 Polzer, Seyle, & Ko, 2004).

RELiance ON COMMUNAL NORMS

53 53
54 A key factor that distinguishes high-quality relation-
55 ships from other relationships is the reliance on
56 communal norms (Clark & Mills, 1979, 1993). In
57 relationships governed by communal norms, the
58 focus is on the partner’s well-being, and benefits are
59 given in response to the partner’s needs without
60 expecting repayment (Clark & Mills, 1979). In
61 contrast, in exchange relationships benefits are given
62 with the expectation that a comparable benefit will
63 be provided in return. The individual receiving the
64 benefit incurs an obligation or debt to return a com-
65 parable benefit to his or her partner. Clark and Mills
66 point out that communal relationships vary in
67 strength (Clark & Mills, 1993; Mills, Clark, Ford,
68 & Johnson, 2004); in strong communal relation-
69 ships individuals feel a strong responsibility for
70 the welfare of their partner, whereas in weak com-
71 munal relationships, people take on less responsibil-
72 ity for their partner’s welfare. They observe that
73 norms vary across relationships, with communal
74 norms being more likely to be enacted in close rela-
75 tionships involving family members and friends,
76 whereas exchange norms prevail in relationships
77 between employers and their employees (Clark &
78 Jordan, 2002).

79 Like other relationships, mentoring relationships
80 may vary by the type and strength of relationship
81 norms. Since mentoring relationships can range
82 from close personal relationships to formally
83 assigned relationships that embody a contractual
84 relationship, it is reasonable to expect that high-
85 quality mentoring relationships are more likely to
86 rely on communal rather than exchange norms, and
87 that the stronger the communal norm, the higher
88 the quality of the relationship (Ragins, 2005). As a
89 related construct, reciprocity can be governed by
90 either communal or exchange norms, and it is
91 expected that mentoring relationships that use
92 exchange-based norms for reciprocity should be of
93 lower quality and have more problematic outcomes
94 than relationships that rely on communal-based
95 norms for reciprocity. For example, mentors who
96 expect or require that their protégés return a com-
97 parable benefit may be viewed as exploiting their pro-
98 tege (cf., Shore, Toyokawa, & Anderson, 2008),
99 whereas protégés who give to their mentor but later
100 expect a benefit in return may be viewed as manipu-
101 lative (Eby et al., 2008). In contrast, mentors and
102 protégés who give to each other because of concern
103 for the well-being of their partner and their relation-
104 ship not only reflect a state of relational mentoring,

1 but also offer a foundation for other relational pro-
 2 cesses that further enhance the relationship. The use
 3 of social exchange models may therefore explain
 4 average, marginal, or even dysfunctional mentoring
 5 relationships, but do not capture the relational pro-
 6 cesses inherent in high-quality relationships.

7 SHARED INFLUENCE AND MUTUAL RESPECT

8 Relational mentoring is characterized by shared influ-
 9 ence, which involves the process by which members
 10 influence and are influenced by each other (Ragins,
 11 2005). Mutuality is the norm in high-quality men-
 12 toring, and influence is based on the individual's
 13 expertise in a given mentoring episode, rather than
 14 on their hierarchical position (Fletcher & Ragins,
 15 2007). Although by definition mentors have more
 16 experience in work or career domains, protégés bring
 17 their own insights, life experiences, and talents to the
 18 table, and mentors in high-quality relationships value
 19 and are influenced by their protégés' perspectives.

20 Hand-in-hand with shared influence is mutual
 21 respect. Respect involves elements of admiration,
 22 appreciation, and encouragement (Ferguson, 2003),
 23 and in close personal relationships, incorporates a
 24 perception that the partner has "admirable moral
 25 qualities" that include wisdom, self-discipline, honor,
 26 patience, and self-knowledge (Frei & Shaver, 2002).
 27 Mutual respect is a prerequisite for shared influence
 28 in mentoring relationships, and these characteristics
 29 should be associated with mutual growth, learning,
 30 and development in the mentoring relationship.

31 Shared influence reflects interdependence in
 32 the relationship. Interdependence in close relation-
 33 ships involves vulnerability (Rusbult & Van Lange,
 34 2003) and may also involve the ability of individu-
 35 als to empower one another in a relational sense.
 36 Relational empowerment involves reciprocal influ-
 37 ence, mutual empathy, concern, and vulnerability
 38 in the relationship (Surrey, 1991), and therefore dif-
 39 fers from other forms of empowerment that focus
 40 more on control over work functions (Spreitzer,
 41 2008). Although empowerment is often used inter-
 42 changeably with shared influence, it is important to
 43 preserve this distinction when examining mentor-
 44 ing relationships. Mentors who are supervisors may
 45 empower their protégés by giving them more con-
 46 trol over their work functions. This may be in addi-
 47 tion to, or in place of, shared influence, which is a
 48 mutual process that is not limited to work functions
 49 (Jordan, 1991). Shared influence is broader in scope
 50 than empowerment, and is better able to describe
 51 processes in a range of mentoring relationships.

RELATIONAL TRUST AND COMMITMENT

52 Although there are many different conceptualiza-
 53 tions of trust (Lewicki Tomlinson, & Gillespie,
 54 2006), trust is commonly defined as "a psychologi-
 55 cal state comprising the intention to accept vulner-
 56 ability based upon positive expectations of the
 57 intentions or behavior of another" (Rousseau,
 58 Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998, p. 395). Rousseau
 59 and colleagues observe that trust is not a behavior
 60 or a choice, but rather a psychological condition
 61 that reflects the willingness to be vulnerable under
 62 conditions of risk and interdependence.

63 Relational trust may best reflect the processes in
 64 high-quality mentoring, as this type of trust comes
 65 from the relationship itself (Lewicki, McAllister, &
 66 Bies, 1998; McAllister, 1995). *Calculus-based trust*
 67 involves the individual making a rational decision
 68 to trust using an economic transaction approach,
 69 whereas relational trust has an affective foundation
 70 based on emotional bonds and the degree to which
 71 members express genuine care and concern for their
 72 partners (Lewis & Wiegert, 1985; McAllister,
 73 1995). Relational trust reflects communal norms
 74 (Clark & Mills, 1979), in that individuals perceive
 75 their partners as being committed to the relation-
 76 ship and that they give on the basis of need rather
 77 than self-interest (McAllister, 1995), and also incor-
 78 porates elements of respect (Frei & Shaver, 2002).
 79 Relational trust develops through repeated interac-
 80 tions (Rousseau et al., 1998), or in the case of men-
 81 toring, mentoring episodes (Fletcher & Ragins,
 82 2007). Lewicki and colleagues observe that trust is
 83 influenced not only by the length of the relation-
 84 ship, but also by the frequency and depth of interac-
 85 tions, and the diversity of challenges that are
 86 successfully faced in the relationship (Lewicki et al.,
 87 1998).

88 Relational trust is intricately connected to com-
 89 mitment in high-quality work relationships and
 90 other close relationships (Wieselquist, Rusbult,
 91 Foster, & Agnew, 1999). In their analyses of trust
 92 processes in positive relationships at work, Pratt and
 93 Dirks (2007) point out that traditional perspectives
 94 on trust use a social exchange perspective (e.g., "I'll
 95 trust you if you trust me"), which does not explain
 96 how trust can be broken and then repaired in high-
 97 quality relationships. They offer the idea that trust is
 98 a relationship-based commitment in high-quality
 99 relationships. The commitment to the relationship
 100 allows individuals to experience both the negative
 101 effects of personal vulnerability as well as the posi-
 102 tive benefits of being in a trusting relationship.

1 Applying these perspectives to the mentoring
2 arena, it is reasonable to expect that high-quality
3 mentoring relationships involve affective forms of
4 relational trust that are grounded not only in the
5 commitment to the partner, but also in the commit-
6 ment to the relationship. The development of this
7 type of trust not only takes time, but the opportu-
8 nity to engage in mentoring episodes that challenge
9 the relationship and allow members to illustrate their
10 commitment to each other and the relationship.

11 **Future Directions**

12 Future research could examine the antecedents, pro-
13 cesses, and outcomes of high-quality mentoring
14 relationships. Researchers could use the self-struc-
15 ture of mentoring framework (Ragins, 2009) and
16 mentoring schema theory (Ragins & Verbos, 2007)
17 to examine how mentoring identities, schemas, and
18 possible selves combine to influence the develop-
19 ment of high-quality relationships. Self-structures
20 are shaped by past relationships and episodes,
21 but what types of specific experiences are most
22 important for developing relational mentoring? Can
23 individuals develop positive self-structures from
24 observing others, or do they need direct experience?
25 Do these relationships differ for those in formal
26 mentoring relationships, and how can organizations
27 promote the development of positive self-structures
28 in the workplace?

29 Future research could also empirically examine
30 the relational cache cycle (Kram & Ragins, 2007).
31 Do the relational competencies developed in high-
32 quality mentoring relationships help individuals
33 create and sustain other high-quality relationships
34 within and outside the workplace? Are relational
35 caches passed between partners in high-quality
36 mentoring relationships, and can these caches be
37 passed across relationships to social networks within
38 and outside the workplace? Do these processes build
39 on each other to create an iterative cycle of positive
40 relationships across life domains?

41 The Relational Mentoring Index (RMI; Table 39.1)
42 provided here offers a first step in examining the
43 functions and processes of high-quality mentoring
44 relationships. Future research needs to validate the
45 instrument and assess its ability to predict out-
46 comes of high-quality relationships. The RMI could
47 also be tested in conjunction with traditional mea-
48 sures of mentoring roles and functions in order to
49 assess the added variance in outcomes that can be
50 accounted for by an inclusion of measures that tap
51 the characteristics of high-quality relationships.
52 Since the measure taps relational functions provided

by both members of the relationship, a dyadic 53
approach can be used to assess the psychometric 54
properties of the instrument for both mentors and 55
protégés. 56

A relational approach to mentoring also opens 57
the doors to examining an expanded array of 58
outcomes associated with the fields of POS 59
(Cameron et al., 2003), positive psychology (Snyder 60
& Lopez, 2002), and positive organizational behav- 61
ior (Luthans, 2002; Nelson & Cooper, 2007). 62
Mentoring scholars have assessed the quality of 63
mentoring relationships using traditional measures 64
that reflect protégés' job attitudes, compensation, 65
and advancement, but a relational approach offers 66
an array of outcomes that reflect personal growth, 67
learning, and development for both members of the 68
relationship (Fletcher & Ragins, 2007; Ragins, 69
2005; Ragins & Verbos, 2007). Using a holistic per- 70
spective (Ragins, 2008; Ragins & Dutton, 2007) 71
the reach of relational mentoring may extend 72
beyond the workplace to influence quality of life in 73
the nonwork domain, and may predict such out- 74
comes as life satisfaction, physical and psychological 75
health, balance, and well-being. The affirmation of 76
identity in high-quality relationships has particular 77
resonance among those in marginalized identity 78
groups (Ragins, 2007; Roberts, 2007), and future 79
research could examine the conditions under which 80
mentoring helps workers manage marginalized and 81
stigmatized identities (Ragins, 2008). Finally, by 82
providing relational functions that build resilience 83
and capacity, high-quality mentoring may be a rela- 84
tional resource that buffers both protégés and men- 85
tors from stressful life events and challenges that 86
originate from within and outside the workplace. 87

88 **Conclusion**

89 In conclusion, the field of POS expands the lens
90 used to view mentoring relationships. Relational
91 mentoring offers mentoring and relationship schol-
92 ars an unobstructed vision of the possibilities of
93 mentoring relationships and the potential of these
94 relationships to influence the quality of life across
95 domains.

96 **References**

- 97 Allen, T.D. (2003). Mentoring others: A dispositional and
98 motivational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62,
99 134–154.
100 Allen, T.D., & Eby, L.T. (2008). Mentor commitment in formal
101 mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72,
102 309–316.
103 Allen, T.D., Eby, L.T., & Lentz, E. (2006). Mentorship behaviors
104 and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring

- 1 programs: Closing the gap between research and practice. 64
2 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 567–578. 65
- 3 Allen, T.D., Eby, L.T., Poteet, M.L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). 66
4 Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta 67
5 analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 127–136. 68
- 6 Anderson, S.M., & Chen, S. (2002). The relational self: An 69
7 interpersonal social-cognitive framework. *Psychological* 70
8 *Review*, 109, 619–645. 71
- 9 Aryee, S., Chay, Y.W., & Chew, J. (1996). The motivation to 72
10 mentor among managerial employees: An interactionist 73
11 approach. *Group & Organization Management*, 21, 261–277. 74
- 12 Baldwin, M.W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of 75
13 social information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 461–484. 76
- 14 Bartz, J.A., & Lydon, J.E. (2008). Relationship-specific attach- 77
15 ment, risk regulation, and communal norm adherence in 78
16 close relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 79
17 44, 655–663. 80
- 18 Baugh, S.G., & Fagenson-Eland, E.A. (2007). Formal mento- 81
19 ring programs: A “poor cousin” to informal relationships? In 82
20 B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring* 83
21 *at work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 249–272). Thousand 84
22 Oaks, CA: Sage. 85
- 23 Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: 86
24 Wiley. 87
- 25 Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss*: Vol. 1: *Attachment*. New 88
26 York: Basic Books. 89
- 27 Boyatzis, R.E. (2007). Mentoring for intentional behav- 90
28 ioral change. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The hand-* 91
29 *book of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 92
30 447–470). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 93
- 31 Bozionelos, N. (2004). Mentoring provided: Relation to mentor’s 94
32 career success, personality and mentoring received. *Journal of* 95
33 *Vocational Behavior*, 64, 24–46. 96
- 34 Brewer, M., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this “we”? Levels of 97
35 collective identity and self representations. *Journal of* 98
36 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 83–91. 99
- 37 Buche, M.W. (2008). Development of trust in electronic 100
38 mentoring relationships. *International Journal of Networking* 101
39 *and Virtual Organisations*, 5, 35–49. 102
- 40 Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., & Quinn, R.E. (Eds.). (2003). 103
41 *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new* 104
42 *discipline*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler. 105
- 43 Carmeli, A., Brueller, D., & Dutton, J. (2009). Learning behav- 106
44 iours in the workplace: The role of high-quality interpersonal 107
45 relationships and psychological safety. *Systems Research and* 108
46 *Behavioral Science*, 26, 81–98. 109
- 47 Cherniss, C. (2007). The role of emotional intelligence in the 110
48 mentoring process. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The* 111
49 *handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice* 112
50 (pp. 427–446). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 113
- 51 Clark, M.S., & Jordan, S.D. (2002). Adherence to communal 114
52 norms: What it means, when it occurs, and some thoughts 115
53 on how it develops. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent* 116
54 *Development*, 95, 3–26. 117
- 55 Clark, M.S., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in 118
56 exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality* 119
57 *and Social Psychology*, 37, 12–24. 120
- 58 Clark, M., & Mills, J. (1993). The difference between communal 121
59 and exchange relationships. *Personality and Social Psychological* 122
60 *Bulletin*, 19, 684–691. 123
- 61 Clutterbuck, D., & Ragins, B.R. (2002). *Mentoring and* 124
62 *diversity: An international perspective*. Oxford: Butterworth- 125
63 Heinemann/Elsevier. 126
- Cooley, C.H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New 64
York: Scribner. 65
- Cross, S.E., Bacon, P.L., & Morris, M.L. (2000). The relational- 66
interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of* 67
Personality and Social Psychology, 78, 791–808. 68
- Diener, E.D., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2008). *Happiness: Unlocking* 69
the mysteries of psychological wealth. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 70
- Drigotas, S.M. (2002). The Michelangelo phenomenon and per- 71
sonal well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 70, 59–77. 72
- Drigotas, S.M., Rusbult, C.E., Wieselquist, J., & Whitton, S.W. 73
(1999). Close partner as sculptor of the ideal self: Behavioral 74
affirmation and the Michelangelo phenomenon. *Journal of* 75
Personality and Social Psychology, 77, 293–323. 76
- Duck, S. (1994). *Meaningful relationships: Talking, sense, and* 77
relating. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 78
- Dutton, J.E., & Heaphy, E.D. (2003). The power of high- 79
quality connections. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, & 80
R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship:* 81
Foundations of a new discipline (pp. 263–278). San Francisco: 82
Berrett-Koehler. 83
- Dutton, J.E., & Ragins, B.R. (Eds.). (2007). *Exploring posi-* 84
tive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research 85
foundation. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 86
- Eby, L.T. (2007). Understanding relational problems in mento- 87
ring. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of* 88
mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice (pp. 323–344). 89
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 90
- Eby, L.T., Butts, M., Lockwood, A., & Simon, S.A. (2004). 91
Protégés’ negative mentoring experiences: Construct devel- 92
opment and nomological validation. *Personnel Psychology*, 93
57, 411–447. 94
- Eby, L.T., Evans, S.C., Durley, J.R., & Ragins, B.R. (2008). 95
Mentors’ perceptions of negative mentoring experiences: 96
Scale development and nomological validation. *Journal of* 97
Applied Psychology, 93, 358–373. 98
- Eby, L.T., Lockwood, A.L., & Butts, M. (2006). Perceived 99
support for mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach. 100
Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68, 267–291. 101
- Ensher, E.A., Heun, C., & Blanchard, A. (2003). On-line mento- 102
ring and computer mediated communication: New directions 103
in research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 264–288. 104
- Ensher, E.A., & Murphy, S.E. (2007). E-mentoring: Next- 105
generation research strategies. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram 106
(Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research* 107
and practice (pp. 299–322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 108
- Ferguson, E.D. (2003). Work relationships, lifestyle and mutual 109
respect. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 59, 501–506. 110
- Fiske, A.P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: 111
Framework for a unified theory of social relations. 112
Psychological Review, 99, 689–723. 113
- Fletcher, J.K. (1996). A relational approach to developing the 114
protean worker. In D.T. Hall (Ed.), *The career is dead—Long* 115
live the career: A relational approach to careers (pp. 105–131). 116
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 117
- Fletcher, J.K. (1998). Relational practice: A feminist reconstruc- 118
tion of work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7, 163–187. 119
- Fletcher, J.K. (1999). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power and rela-* 120
tional practice at work. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 121
- Fletcher, J.K., & Ragins, B.R. (2007). Stone Center rela- 122
tional cultural theory: A window on relational mentoring. In 123
B.R. Ragins, and K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mento-* 124
ring at work: Theory, research and practice (pp. 373–399). 125
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 126

- 1 Follett, M.P. (1924). *Creative experience*. New York: Longmans
2 Green.
- 3 Frei, J.R., & Shaver, P.R. (2002). Respect in close relationships:
4 Prototype definition, self-report assessment, and initial corre-
5 relates. *Personal Relationships*, 9, 121–139.
- 6 Gergen, K.J. (1991). *The saturated self*. New York: Basic Books.
- 7 Godshalk, V.M., & Sosik, J.J. (2003). Aiming for career success:
8 The role of learning goal orientation in mentoring relation-
9 ships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 417–437.
- 10 Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*.
11 Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- 12 Greenhaus, J.H., & Singh, R. (2007). Mentoring and the work-
13 family interface. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The*
14 *handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*
15 (pp. 519–544). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 16 Hamilton, B.A., & Scandura, T.A. (2003). E-mentoring:
17 Implications for organizational learning and development in
18 a wired world. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31, 388–403.
- 19 Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity. In C.R. Snyder, & S.J. Lopez
20 (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382–394).
21 London: Oxford University Press.
- 22 Harrison, D.A., Price, K.H., & Bell, M.P. (1998). Beyond rela-
23 tional demography: Time and the effects of surface- and
24 deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of*
25 *Management Journal*, 41, 96–107.
- 26 Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and
27 affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319–340.
- 28 Higgins, M.C., & Kram, K.E. (2001). Reconceptualizing men-
29 toring at work: A developmental network perspective.
30 *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 264–288.
- 31 Homans, G.C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American*
32 *Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597–606.
- 33 Homans, G.C. (1974). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New
34 York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- 35 Jordan, J.V. (1991). *The movement of mutuality and power*. Work
36 in progress, No. 53. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working
37 Paper Series.
- 38 Jordan, J.V., Kaplan, A.G., Miller, J.B., Stiver, I.P., & Surrey, J.L.
39 (1991). *Women's growth in connection*. New York: The
40 Guilford Press.
- 41 Kelley, H.H. (1983). The situational origins of human tenden-
42 cies: A further reason for the formal analysis of structures.
43 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 8–30.
44 doi:10.1177/0146167283091003.
- 45 Kelley, H.H., & Thibaut, J.W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations:*
46 *A theory of interdependence*. New York: Wiley.
- 47 Keyes, C.L.M., & Haidt, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Flourishing: Positive*
48 *psychology and the life well lived*. Washington, DC: American
49 Psychological Association.
- 50 Kram, K.E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy*
51 *of Management Journal*, 26, 608–625.
- 52 Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relation-*
53 *ships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- 54 Kram, K.E. (1996). A relational approach to career development.
55 In D.T. Hall (Ed.), *The career is dead—Long live the career: A*
56 *relational approach to careers* (pp.132–157). San Francisco:
57 Jossey-Bass.
- 58 Kram, K.E., & Cherniss, C. (2001). Developing emotional com-
59 petence through relationships at work. In C. Cherniss, & D.
60 Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to*
61 *select for, measure and improve emotional intelligence*
62 *in individuals, groups and organizations* (pp. 254–285). San
63 Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kram, K.E., & Hall, D.T. (1989). Mentoring as an antidote to
stress during corporate trauma. *Human Resource Management*,
28, 493–510.
- Kram, K.E., & Ragins, B.R. (2007). The landscape of mentoring
in the 21st century. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The*
handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice
(pp. 659–692). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kumashiro, M., Rusbult, C.E., Finkenauer, C., & Stocker, S.L.
(2007). To think or to do: The impact of assessment and
locomotion orientation on the Michelangelo phenomenon.
Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24, 591–611.
- Lankau, M.J., Riordan, C.M., & Thomas, C.H. (2005). The
effects of similarity and liking in formal relationships between
mentors and protégés. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67,
252–265.
- Lankau, M.J., & Scandura, T.A. (2007). Mentoring as a forum
for personal learning in organizations. In B.R. Ragins, and
K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory,*
research and practice (pp. 95–122). Thousand Oaks, CA:
Sage.
- Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J., & Bies, R.J. (1998). Trust and
distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of*
Management Review, 23, 438–458.
- Lewicki, R.J., Tomlinson, E.C., & Gillespie, N. (2006). Models
of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches,
empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of*
Management, 32, 991–1022.
- Lewis, J.D., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social*
Forces, 63, 967–985.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organi-
zational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23,
695–706.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2007). *Psychological*
capital: Developing the human competitive edge. New York:
Oxford University Press.
- Markus, H.R. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information
about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35,
63–78.
- Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self:
Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation.
Psychological Review, 98, 224–253.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American*
Psychologist, 41, 954–969.
- Markus, H., & Zajonc, R.B. (1985). The cognitive perspective in
social psychology. In G. Lindzey, & E. Aronson (Eds.),
Handbook of social psychology Vol. 1 (3rd ed., pp. 137–230).
New York: Random House.
- Mashek, D.J., & Aron, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of closeness*
and intimacy. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as
foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations.
Academy of Management Journal, 38, 24–59.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University
of Chicago Press.
- Miller, J.B. (1976). *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston:
Beacon Press.
- Miller, J.B., & Stiver, I. (1997). *The healing connection*. Boston:
Beacon Press.
- Mills, J., Clark, M.S., Ford, T.E., & Johnson, M. (2004).
Measurement of communal strength. *Personal Relationships*,
11, 213–230.
- Mitchell, S.A. (1992). True selves, false selves, and the ambiguity
of authenticity. In N.J. Skolnick, & S.C. Warshaw (Eds.), 126

- 1 *Relational perspectives in psychoanalysis* (pp. 1–20). Hillsdale,
2 NJ: Analytic Press.
- 3 Nelson, D.L., & Cooper C.L. (Eds.). (2007). *Positive organiza-*
4 *tional behavior: Accentuating the positive at work*. Thousand
5 Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 6 Noe, R.A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of suc-
7 cessful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*,
8 *41*, 457–479.
- 9 Noe, R.A., Greenberger, D.B., & Wang, S. (2002). Mentoring:
10 What we know and where we might go. *Research in Personnel*
11 *and Human Resources Management*, *21*, 129–173.
- 12 Planalp, S. (1985). Relational schemata: A test of alternative
13 forms of relational knowledge as guides to communication.
14 *Human Communication Research*, *12*, 3–29.
- 15 Planalp, S. (1987). Interplay between relational knowledge and
16 events. In R. Burnett, P. McGhee, & D. Clarke (Eds.),
17 *Accounting for relationships: Explanation, representation, &*
18 *knowledge* (pp. 175–191). New York: Methuen.
- 19 Pratt, M.G., & Dirks, K.T. (2007). Rebuilding trust and
20 restoring positive relationships: A commitment-based
21 view of trust. In J. Dutton, & B.R. Ragins (Eds.),
22 *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical*
23 *and research foundation* (pp. 117–136). Mahwah, NJ:
24 Erlbaum.
- 25 Ragins, B.R. (1989). Barriers to mentoring: The female manager's
26 dilemma. *Human Relations*, *42*, 1–22.
- 27 Ragins, B.R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships:
28 A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*,
29 482–521.
- 30 Ragins, B.R. (2005). *Towards a theory of relational mentoring*.
31 Unpublished manuscript.
- 32 Ragins, B.R. (2007). Diversity and workplace mentoring rela-
33 tionships: A review and positive social capital approach. In
34 T.D. Allen, and L.T. Eby (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of men-*
35 *toring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 281–300).
36 Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- 37 Ragins, B.R. (2008). Disclosure disconnects: Antecedents and
38 consequences of disclosing invisible stigmas across life
39 domains. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 194–215.
- 40 Ragins, B.R. (2009). Positive identities in action: A model of
41 mentoring self-structures and the motivation to mentor. In
42 L.M. Roberts, & J.E. Dutton (Eds.), *Exploring positive iden-*
43 *ties and organizations: Building a theoretical and research*
44 *foundation* (pp. 237–263). New York: Routledge Press.
- 45 Ragins, B.R., & Cotton, J.L. (1999). Mentor functions
46 and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal
47 and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied*
48 *Psychology*, *84*, 529–550.
- 49 Ragins, B.R., Cotton, J.L., & Miller, J.S. (2000). Marginal men-
50 toring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship,
51 and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of*
52 *Management Journal*, *43*, 1177–1194.
- 53 Ragins, B.R., & Dutton, J. (2007). Positive relationships
54 at work: An introduction and invitation. In J. Dutton, &
55 B.R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work:*
56 *Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 3–25).
57 Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 58 Ragins, B.R., & Kram, K.E. (2007). The roots and meaning
59 of mentoring. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The*
60 *handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice*
61 (pp. 3–15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 62 Ragins, B.R., Lyness, K.S., & Winkel, D. (2010, August). *Life*
63 *spillovers: The impact of fear of home foreclosure on attitudes*
towards work, life and careers. Paper presented at the 2010
64 Academy of Management meeting, Montreal, Canada. 65
- Ragins, B.R., & McFarlin, D.B. (1990). Perceptions of mentor
66 roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of*
67 *Vocational Behavior*, *37*, 321–339. 68
- Ragins, B.R., & Verbos, A.K. (2007). Positive relationships in
69 action: Relational mentoring and mentoring schemas in the
70 workplace. In J. Dutton, & B.R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring*
71 *positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research*
72 *foundation* (pp. 91–116). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 73
- Roberts, L.M. (2007). From proving to becoming: How posi-
74 tive relationships create a context for self-discovery and self-
75 actualization. In J. Dutton, & B.R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring*
76 *positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research*
77 *foundation* (pp. 29–45). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 78
- Roberts, L.M., Cha, S.E., Hewlin, P.F., & Settles, I.H. (2009).
79 Bringing the inside out: Enhancing authenticity and positive
80 identity in organizations. In L.M. Roberts, & J.E. Dutton
81 (Eds.), *Exploring positive identities and organizations: Building*
82 *a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 149–169). New
83 York: Routledge Press. 84
- Roberts, L.M., Dutton, J.E., Spreitzer, G.M., Heaphy, E.D., &
85 Quinn, R.E. (2005). Composing the reflected best-self por-
86 trait: Building pathways for becoming extraordinary in work
87 organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*(4), 712–
88 736. 89
- Rousseau, D.M., Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.S., & Camerer, C. (1998).
90 Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust.
91 *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 393–404. 92
- Rusbult, C.E., Kumashiro, M., Kubacka, K.E., & Finkel, E.J.
93 (2009). “The part of me that you bring out”: Ideal similarity
94 and the Michelangelo phenomenon. *Journal of Personality &*
95 *Social Psychology*, *96*, 61–82. 96
- Rusbult, C.E., & Van Lange, P.A.M. (1996). Interdependence
97 processes. In E.T. Higgins, & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social*
98 *psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 564–596). New
99 York: Guilford Press. 100
- Rusbult, C.E., & Van Lange, P.A.M. (2003). Interdependence,
101 interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*,
102 *54*, 351–375. 103
- Scandura, T.A. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships
104 and outcomes. *Journal of Management*, *24*, 449–467. 105
- Scandura, T.A., & Ragins, B.R. (1993). The effects of sex and
106 gender role orientation on mentorship in male-dominated
107 occupations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *43*, 251–265. 108
- Schlenker, B.R. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept,*
109 *social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Belmont, CA:
110 Brooks/Cole. 111
- Shore, W.J., Toyokawa, T., & Anderson, D.D. (2008). Context-
112 specific effects on reciprocity in mentoring relationships:
113 Ethical implications. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in*
114 *Learning*, *16*, 17–29. 115
- Snyder, C.R., & Lopez, S.J. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of positive*
116 *psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press. 117
- Spreitzer, G. (2008). Taking stock: A review of more than twenty
118 years of research on empowerment at work. In J. Barling, &
119 C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organization behav-*
120 *ior: Vol. 1: Micro approaches* (pp. 54–72). London: Sage. 121
- Spreitzer, G., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S., & Grant,
122 A.M. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at
123 work. *Organization Science*, *16*, 537–549. 124
- Surrey, J.L. (1991). Relationship and empowerment. In J.V. Jordan,
125 A.G. Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I.P. Steiver, & J.L. Surrey (Eds.), 126

- 1 *Women's growth and connection: Writings from the stone center*
2 (pp. 162–180). New York: Guilford Press.
- 3 Swann, W.B., Jr. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality
4 into harmony with the self. In J. Suls, & A.G. Greenwald
5 (Eds.), *Social psychological perspectives on the self* Vol. 2
6 (pp. 33–66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 7 Swann, W.B., Jr. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two
8 roads meet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*,
9 1038–1051.
- 10 Swann, W.B., Jr., Polzer, J.T., Seyle, D.C., & Ko, S.J. (2004).
11 Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social
12 self-views in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Review*,
13 *29*, 9–27.
- 14 Thrash, T.M., & Elliot, A.J. (2003). Inspiration as a psychologi-
15 cal construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*,
16 871–889.
- 17 Thrash, T.M., & Elliot, A.J. (2004). Inspiration: Core character-
18 istics, component processes, antecedents, and function.
19 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 957–973.
- 20 Thrash, T.M., Elliot, A.J., Maruskin, L.A., & Cassidy, S.E.
21 (2010). Inspiration and the promotion of well-being: Tests of
22 causality and mediation. *Journal of Personality and Social*
23 *Psychology*, *98*, 488–506.
- 24 Thrash, T.M., Maruskin, L.A., Cassidy, S.E., Fryer, J.W., &
25 Ryan, R.M. (2010). Mediating between the muse and the
masses: Inspiration and the actualization of creative ideas. *26*
Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *98*, 469–487. *27*
- Turban, D.B., & Lee, F.K. (2007). The role of personality in *28*
mentoring relationships: Formation, dynamics, and out- *29*
comes. In B.R. Ragins, & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of* *30*
mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice (pp. 21–50). *31*
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *32*
- Underhill, C.M. (2006). The effectiveness of mentoring pro- *33*
grams in corporate settings: A meta-analytical review of the *34*
literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 292–307. *35*
- Wanberg, C.R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J., & Marchese, M. (2006). *36*
Mentor and protégé predictors and outcomes of mentoring *37*
in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational* *38*
Behavior, *69*, 410–423. *39*
- Wanberg, C.R., Welsh, E.T., & Hezlett, S.A. (2003). Mentoring *40*
research: A review and dynamic process model. *Research in* *41*
Personnel and Human Resources Management, *22*, 39–124. *42*
- Wang, S., Noe, R., Wang, Z., & Greenberger, D. (2009). What *43*
affects willingness to mentor in the future? An investigation *44*
of attachment styles and mentoring experiences. *Journal of* *45*
Vocational Behavior, *74*, 245–256. *46*
- Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C.E., Foster, C.A., & Agnew, C.R. *47*
(1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust *48*
in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social* *49*
Psychology, *77*, 942–966. *50*