

Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012)

Volume 2
Number 1 *Journal of Business & Leadership*

Article 8

1-1-2006

Transformational Mentoring: What Role Does Mentoring Play In The Development of Transformational Leaders?

Lynda St. Clair
Bryant University

Ronald Deluga
Bryant University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/jbl>



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

St. Clair, Lynda and Deluga, Ronald (2006) "Transformational Mentoring: What Role Does Mentoring Play In The Development of Transformational Leaders?," *Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012)*: Vol. 2: No. 1, Article 8.

DOI: 10.58809/OGHR3194

Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/jbl/vol2/iss1/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer-Reviewed Journals at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012)* by an authorized editor of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

TRANSFORMATIONAL MENTORING: WHAT ROLE DOES MENTORING PLAY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERS?

Lynda St. Clair, Bryant University
Ronald Deluga, Bryant University

This paper introduces the concept of "transformational mentoring," an alternative to traditional mentoring, as a tool for developing transformational leaders. Transformational mentoring differs from traditional mentoring in its emphasis on risk-taking rather than refuge-seeking and its encouragement of self-sacrifice rather than self-promotion. Our conceptual model identifies key mentor actions, anticipated mediators, and expected outcomes of the transformational mentoring process. We argue that current organizational leaders will need to address both cultural and structural barriers to transformational mentoring if they wish to support the development of future transformational leaders in their organizations.

INTRODUCTION

In today's highly competitive business environment, long-term organizational success depends on the development of a stream of transformational leaders (Bass, 1985, 1998) who can guide organizational adaptation to continually changing environments (Charan, Drotter, Noel, 2001; Cohen, St. Clair, & Tichy, 1996; Fulmer, 1997; Kuhnert, 1994; Maccoby, 2000; McCall, 1998). Leaders are needed to motivate and inspire employees who have seen traditional expectations about job security and advancement shattered (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Consequently, fostering the career development of transformational leaders who possess the ability to create, communicate, and gather follower support for a compelling vision is an ongoing concern in organizations (Maccoby, 2000).

In addition, recent research suggests that leaders who have charisma (a key characteristic frequently associated with transformational leaders) may be better able to succeed in conditions of environmental uncertainty (Waldman, Ramirez, House, & Puranam, 2001). Following Bass (1985), we view charisma or idealized influence as a key descriptive attribute of transformational leadership. Thus, transformational leaders are charismatic but charismatic leaders are not necessarily transformational. Thus, the development of transformational leaders is even more important as the business environment continues to change at a rapid pace. Understanding more about how to develop transformational leaders who are willing to take risks and are able to obtain the support of their followers without

explicit extrinsic rewards (House, 1995) is therefore a critical area that warrants additional research.

Different types of leaders evolve in different ways and may emerge at different times as the result of various kinds of experiences (Mumford et al., 2000b). Bass (1998) notes that transformational leadership can be learned, but exactly how transformational leadership develops has received minimal theoretical and empirical attention and remains little understood (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000). In fact, very little is known about the developmental precursors fostering transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000; Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, 2000) and it remains ambiguous why certain individuals engage in transformational leadership while others do not (Bommer, Rubin, & Baldwin, 2004). Our goal is to address this research void. As a starting place for learning more about the development of transformational leaders, this paper focuses on mentoring and asks the question: What is the role of mentoring in the development of transformational leaders?

We chose to focus on mentoring, rather than other variables that are likely to influence the development of transformational leaders (e.g., personality, background, past experience, executive training and development, organizational culture, context, etc.), for four main reasons. First, mentoring has long been seen as valuable for leadership development in general (e.g., Bass, 1985; Kotter, 1988; Kram, 1985; Yukl, 2002) and for individual career success in particular (Collins & Scott, 1978; Roche, 1979; Wilbur, 1987). Yet, how mentoring actually facilitates leadership competencies in protégés

has received little research attention (Yukl, 2002). Second, practitioner interest in mentoring in organizations has grown substantially in recent years. For example, Ragins, Cotton, and Miller (2000) note that formal mentoring programs are growing in popularity and suggest that as many as one third of the nation's major companies have formal mentoring programs. Third, academic interest in mentoring has also increased in recent years, providing a fertile basis from which to begin to develop connections to concepts such as transformational leadership that have not previously been linked directly to mentoring activities.

Unlike the executive development and training literature, little has been done to directly link mentoring and transformational leadership. Finally, because mentoring is a variable that can be influenced directly (as opposed to personality or past experience), this focus provides an opportunity for a proactive response to developing future transformational leaders. Thus, establishing a more explicit link between mentoring and the development of transformational leaders is both a theoretically valuable and practically worthwhile pursuit (Wofford, Goodwin, & Whittington, 1998).

We begin with a brief review of the concept of transformational leadership and discuss why mentoring may be an important variable to consider when exploring the process by which transformational leaders develop. We propose the phrase "transformational mentoring" as a way of talking about mentoring focused on developing transformational leaders. We then consider traditional approaches to mentoring and discuss how different types of mentoring activities may enhance or hinder the development of transformational leaders. Four propositions related to the role that mentoring plays in the development of transformational leaders are presented. The paper concludes with discussion, implications for practice, and ideas for future research.

Transformational Leaders: Who They Are and What They Do

Grounded in moral foundations (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999), transformational leadership augments the idea of an exchange or transactional relationship between a leader and her or his followers (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; House & Podsakoff, 1994; Tichy & Devanna, 1986). As defined by Burns (1978: 4), transformational leadership results in "mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents." Transformational leaders align follower self-

interest in development with the larger interest of the group, organization, or society. Similarly, transformational leaders engage in self-sacrificial behaviors for transcendental shifts in followers needs (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999). These leaders create a clear and compelling vision, thereby channeling the collective energies of followers toward a common goal (Bass, 1985, 1998).

In addition, transformational leaders demonstrate confidence in the followers' ability to achieve goals and motivate followers to work so the goals become reality (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). For example, followers are both inspired and empowered to take the initiative in completing their responsibilities (Yukl, 2002). The effectiveness of transformational leaders has been linked to their ability to clearly articulate desirable goals for their followers. Transformational leaders then convey images of how those goals can be reached to the mutual benefit of the followers, leader, and the wider organizational context (e.g., Bass, 1998).

A considerable body of empirical field (e.g., Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Howell & Avolio, 1993) and laboratory (e.g., Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Sosik, Avolio, & Kahai, 1997) research supports the effectiveness of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership has been linked with subordinate satisfaction (Hater & Bass, 1988), trust in the leader (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996), affective commitment (Barling et al., 1996), performance and organizational citizenship behavior (Whittington, Goodwin, & Murray, 2004) as well as combat team performance in main contexts (Beng-Chong & Ployhart, 2004). Similarly, transformational leaders have been rated as more effective communicators (Berson & Avolio, 2004) and positively associated with organizational innovation (Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003). Finally, Yukl (1999: 287) concluded "...there is considerable evidence that transformational leadership is effective."

Different researchers have focused on various aspects of transformational leaders. For example, Bass (1985) defined transformational leadership in terms of the leader's impact on followers. Furthermore, Bass and Avolio (1994) identified individual consideration, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation as the four primary characteristics of transformational leaders. By contrast, research by Tichy and Devanna (1986) as well as Bennis and Nanus (1985) offer a descriptive approach to transformational leadership. Based on interviews with organizational

leaders, Tichy and Devanna (1986) described transformational leaders as having the ability to recognize the need to change, creating an appealing alternative vision, making the change, and institutionalizing the new state of affairs. Similarly, Bennis and Nanus (1985) used unstructured interviews and observation of top-level corporate and public sector leaders. The common themes emerging from their research include creating a vision, developing commitment and trust, and facilitating organizational change.

The above overview of transformational leadership is not intended to be exhaustive. Our goal is to provide a thumbnail sketch of these highly influential and effective leaders. We now turn our attention to the development of transformational leaders.

Developing Transformational Leaders

Organizations have historically shown a considerable interest in the development of transformational and charismatic leaders (Kelloway & Barling, 2000; Kelloway, Barling, & Helleur, 2000; Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001). Transformational leadership appears in varying degrees at all organizational levels and has been observed in diverse organizational settings (Bass, 1985, 1990). Moreover, aspects of transformational leadership can be learned according to many (but not all) leadership researchers (see Conger & Kanungo, 1988 for a discussion of the different perspectives related to training as a way to develop charismatic leadership qualities). Discussions in the literature have addressed issues such as individual differences and experiences through the life span (Avolio & Gibbons, 1988). With respect to proactive means of developing transformational leaders, more attention has been directed to training programs (e.g., Kelloway & Barling, 2000; Kelloway, Barling, & Helleur, 2000) than mentoring, although Avolio & Gibbons (1988: 284) do include mentors in their "model of life span events that contribute to leadership."

Evidence reported by Bass (1998) using biodata studies suggests that learning to be a transformational leader takes place over the life course, with experiences early in life and in school playing a role. Beyond these life experiences, some researchers have suggested that certain competencies which can be taught in formal training and education programs also may affect the development of transformational leaders. For example, Conger and Kanungo (1988) suggest five key competencies that can be taught: (1) critical evaluation

and problem detection; (2) envisioning; (3) skillful communication of the vision; (4) impression management; and (5) appropriate uses of empowerment. Research studies that have looked at workshop formats for training transformational leaders "provide considerable evidence that individuals can learn how to become more transformational in their behavior with positive effects on their colleagues' and followers' performance" (Bass, 1998: 108). In their review of five years of research on training transformational leaders, Kelloway and Barling (2000) came to the same conclusion.

The effectiveness of workshop-style training that takes place over the course of a few days suggests that similar training by a mentor may also be an effective means for developing transformational leaders. The increased frequency of interaction possible with mentor-based training may be especially valuable when developing transformational leaders. In addition, a mentor will have insights into the specific organizational context that might not be available in a more formal training program. Indeed, Avolio and Gibbons (1988: 303) suggest that "Optimally, training can take place on the job, making appropriate changes in context and culture to accommodate the developmental aspirations of the leader." Before considering specifically how mentoring may affect the development of transformational leaders, we will take a moment to highlight some key concepts from the mentoring literature.

Mentoring

The importance of mentoring processes is reflected in the increasing levels of empirical attention and theoretical development the area has received in recent years (e.g., Aryee, Lo, & Kang, 1999; Feldman, Folks, & Turnley, 1999; Payne & Huffman, 2005; Ragins, 1997; Ragins et al., 2000; Ragins & Scandura, 1997; Scandura, 1998; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). In the words of Kirchmeyer (2005: 639) "To call mentoring 'fashionable' may not be an exaggeration." She notes that research on mentoring has increased exponentially over the past 20 years and that surveys indicate that managers believe strongly in the benefits of mentoring.

Mentors are typically defined as experienced individuals with advanced knowledge who are committed to providing assistance and progress to their protégé's career (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1985; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). Mentoring relationships are both

complex and developmentally important (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978). In some cases, direct supervisors may serve as mentors. In other cases, mentors may be peers (Bryant, 2005) or may be from totally different areas in the organization (Ragins et al., 2000). Allen and Poteet (1999) recognized that the characteristics of the ideal mentor closely resemble those of good parents, i.e., listening and communication skills, patience, honesty, and trustworthiness.

The mentoring relationship is a mutual mentor-protégé investment characterized by the sharing of values, knowledge, and experience. In addition, mentoring ranges from the informal, based on mentor-protégé mutual identification and the fulfillment of career needs, to the formal, where the mentor is assigned to work with the protégé (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Next, mentoring may not just be the consequence of a single mentor-protégé relationship, but also may involve multiple mentors for a given protégé (Higgins & Kram, 2001). Mentoring is not inflexible phenomenon, but falls along a continuum of effectiveness (Levinson et al., 1978; Ragins, et al., 2000) such that good mentoring may yield positive outcomes and bad mentoring may be destructive (Scandura, 1998).

Although mentor relationships can impact both the protégé and the mentor (e.g., Ragins & Scandura, 1999), we focus on the protégé because of our interest in the development of transformational leaders. The benefits protégés receive from being mentored focuses on two primary aspects of the mentoring process. First, mentors provide guidance and resources related to career development. Washburn and Crispo (2006) argue that research supports the connection between mentoring and positive outcomes for the protégé compared to employees who are not mentored, including more job satisfaction, rapid promotions, and higher salaries. Kirchmeyer (2005) notes that the effect sizes in studies of the impact of mentoring career success have been small. Less empirical research has focused on the second aspect of mentoring, providing psychosocial support to help the protégé cope with the stresses of organizational life, despite the fact that the connection between stress and physical and mental health as well as cognitive ability, motivation, and performance are well established (Quinn et al., 2007).

Career Development Benefits for the Protégé

A vital aspect of the mentoring relationship is guiding protégé career advancement. Indeed, research has demonstrated that career mentoring is positively related

to promotion rates and total compensation (Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991). In focusing on the career enhancing aspects of mentoring, Kram (1985) identified five activities that promote career development. First, sponsorship activities by the mentor are direct interventions intended to provide the protégé with opportunities to advance within the organization. In contrast to directly advocating for a protégé, mentors frequently are in a position to arrange opportunities for challenging assignments as well as exposure and visibility. Orchestrating challenging assignments and encouraging calculated risks give the protégé critical learning experiences. High profile assignments facilitate the development of relationships with other senior managers within the organization. In many, but not all cases, providing challenging assignments and providing exposure and visibility may overlap. Fourth, on a day-to-day basis, coaching is a vital part of every mentor's activities. By offering specific suggestions, advice, and feedback, the mentor assists the protégé in building both technical and political skills needed to succeed in the corporation. Finally, mentors may engage in protecting the protégé when, for example, a project is unsuccessful or behind schedule. The protection function is a critical one for maintaining trust between the mentor and the protégé. Mentors who protect their protégés are also likely to serve as sources for other types of more personal support, as described below.

Psychosocial Support for the Protégé

In addition to directly supporting career advancement, mentors are also valuable sources of psychosocial support - helping protégés mature as competent, effective, members of the organization. Psychosocial support can be provided through role modeling, giving acceptance and confirmation, offering counseling, and contributing friendship (Kram, 1985). Although a senior person may consciously attempt to serve as a role model, it is just as likely that this process is unconscious. Likewise, the protégé may not even realize how closely he or she is identifying with the mentor and how much his or her behavior is influenced by the model portrayed by the mentor (Kram, 1985). In contrast to role modeling, the other psychosocial support functions are much more conscious. Providing acceptance and confirmation, supplying counseling, and offering friendship all imply conscious intent on the part of the mentor.

The activities identified as psychosocial support cultivate protégé self-perceptions of competence in their

professional roles. They also help alleviate some of the pressure that results from an intense focus on career development activities. Effective psychosocial support depends upon the quality of the interpersonal relationship between the mentor and the protégé. As compared to career development activities, mentors need not be in powerful positions or have access to many resources to provide psychosocial support. Conventional wisdom suggests, however, that having a prominent organizational leader as a mentor can be very beneficial.

Degrees and Quality of Mentoring

As noted above, mentoring is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon (Levinson et al, 1978; Ragins, et al., 2000). The degree to which career development and psychosocial support are provided may vary across relationships and over time in a given relationship. Some mentors may provide career development but not psychosocial support, or visa versa. Others may provide both, but may emphasize one more than the other. Furthermore, mentoring may not be publicly recognized or observable and may not even be recognized by the participants until brought to their attention (Ragins, 1997). Just as importantly, not all mentoring relationships result in positive outcomes (McManus, Eby, & Russell, 2000; Ragins et al., 2000; Scandura, 1998). In reviewing existing mentoring programs, Washburn and Crispo (2006) note that formal mentoring programs may seem paternalistic, implying that the protégé is not capable of seeking out assistance when needed, an assumption that may undermine the protégé's self-confidence. Informal mentoring programs, however, may result in less mentoring for women and people of color. Formal mentoring programs that are designed to ensure that no employees are left out of the mentoring process, however, may pair up individuals with incompatible personalities - leaving both the protégé and the mentor dissatisfied with the experience (Washburn and Crispo, 2006).

While the mentoring literature has expanded to address a variety of issues related to the degrees and quality of mentoring, no extant research considers how mentoring might differ if it was focused on developing transformational leaders, rather than on helping protégés obtain career success. In the next section, we discuss how links can be made between traditional mentoring activities and activities typically associated with transformational leadership. The overlap between these two concepts suggests that research on mentoring and

transformational leadership might profitably be integrated.

Mentoring as Method for Growing Transformational Leadership

Although intuition suggests that mentoring and transformational leadership are close cousins, existing research has done little to clarify their relationship. This is surprising, because mentoring frequently is identified as a central element in transformational leadership. For example, Bass (1998) identified mentoring as a key aspect of individualized consideration. Deluga (1992) likewise noted that individual consideration was descriptive of the transformational leader's mentoring orientation. Next, Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) suggest that mentoring and transformational leadership are developmental in nature. That is, both enhance the growth and learning of others through specifying and manifesting appropriate functions as well as behaviors. Similarly, Sosik, Godshalk, & Yammarino (2004) indicate that mentors and transformational leaders serve as role models who endeavor to develop others' self-confidence, personal identity and well-being. Sosik and Godshalk (2004) reported that a mentor's self-awareness of their transformational leadership impacted protégé's career satisfaction and managerial aspirations. Lastly, Popper and Mayseless (2003) contend that developmental processes are central to the relationship between transformational leadership and followers.

Despite these connections, there has been little integration of the research on mentoring and transformational leadership. As discussed above, the mentoring literature devotes itself to understanding how employees are developed, but does not specifically emphasize the development of transformational leadership. Similarly, the leadership literature has focused on what transformational leaders do to lead their organizations and, more recently, on how these leaders mentor others (e.g., Godshalk & Sosik, 2000; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000; Sosik & Godshalk, 2004). However, prior work has paid less attention to the development of transformational leaders (Avolio & Bass, 1995), particularly with respect to the mentoring process. For example, Conger (1999) observed that there has been little discussion regarding the effectiveness of transformational leaders in developing successors. Conger & Kanungo (1998) noted that it is very rare to find organizations where a charismatic leader is not succeeded by a more managerially-oriented individual.

Beyer (1999) also discussed the problems associated with succeeding highly charismatic leaders.

Why is it that mentoring has received so little attention in the development of transformational leaders? One possible explanation for the limited emphasis of mentoring as a technique to develop transformational leaders may be related to the fact that mentoring is a process that is difficult to study. Thus, researchers have focused more attention on training programs, where large numbers of people are subjected to the same activities. This provides a more controlled setting in which to test the effectiveness of these techniques for developing transformational leaders.

The fact that transformational leaders are still relatively rare while both leadership training programs and mentoring efforts in organizations have grown substantially in recent years suggests that more research on this topic is warranted. The fact that not all organizations can afford to send potential leaders to expensive training programs also suggests that more attention be paid to activities such as mentoring that can be accomplished with minimum additional costs.

Are Mentoring and Transformational Leadership Really the Same Thing?

Conceptually, transformational leadership and mentoring have a great deal in common. Thus, it is critical it identify how these two concepts differ. First, traditional mentoring is focused on supporting the protégé; this may or may not lead to the type of "mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into

leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" as specified by Burns (1978: 4) in his definition of transformational leadership. Similarly, while transformational leaders must, by definition, serve as mentors to their followers, the motivation behind that mentoring is not to benefit the protégé, per se, but to advance the larger interests of the organization. While these two motivations sometimes may overlap, in some cases they may be contradictory. For example, the best interest of the organization may be better served if an employee challenges the status quo. In many cases, this type of behavior will not be rewarded in terms of career success. Because the path to transformational leadership is not necessarily the same path that leads to short-term career success, we hypothesize that these traditional mentoring activities, while potentially valuable, are not sufficient for developing transformational leaders. We argue that "transformational mentoring" is necessary for the development of transformational leaders.

Transformational Mentoring

We coined the phrase "transformational mentoring" to refer to a set of mentoring behaviors that are designed to promote the development of transformational leaders. Allen & Poteet (1999) suggest that three variables are critical to the success of mentoring relationships: trust, open communication, and setting standards and expectations. Effective transformational mentoring is also expected to depend on these three variables; the difference, as described below, is in what standards and expectations the mentor sets.

Figure 1: Activities, Mediators, and Outcomes of the Transformational Mentoring Process

Transformational Mentoring Activities	Mediators	Outcomes of the Transformational Mentoring Process
Career Development: Sponsorship*, Exposure & Visibility*, Protecting**: (<i>Converting blame to praise</i>), Coaching and Challenging**: (<i>Long-term, holistic thinking, Critical evaluation, Problem detection, Envisioning, Communication of vision, Impression management, Empowerment of followers</i>) Psychosocial Support: Counseling*, Friendship*, Role Modeling**: (<i>Charisma, Risk-taking Self sacrifice</i>), Acceptance and Confirmation**: (<i>Risk-taking, Self-sacrifice</i>) * Traditional mentoring activities identified by Kram (1985) ** Modified versions of Kram's (1985) traditional mentoring activities	Mentor: Narcissism, Stereotypes, Tacit, Knowledge, General individual factors Protégé: Childhood experiences, Prior leadership experiences, Commitment, Vision, Charisma, Narcissism, General individual factors Relationship: Quality of dyadic relationship Organization: Culture, Structure & reward systems	Transformational Competencies of Protégé: Long-term, holistic thinking, Critical evaluation***, Problem detection***, Envisioning***, Communication of vision***, Impression management***, Empowerment of followers*** Transformational Characteristics of Protégé: Charisma, Risk-taking, Self-sacrificing *** Core competencies of charismatic leaders identified by Conger and Kanungo (1988)

Figure 1 provides an overview of the transformational mentoring process and includes mediating variables that are likely to impact the effectiveness of transformational

mentoring attempts to develop transformational competencies and characteristics of protégés. For the purpose of this paper, we focus our attention primarily on

the transformational mentoring activities identified in the model. This includes the traditional categories of mentoring activities identified by Kram (1985) as well as some new activities that help distinguish transformational mentoring from traditional mentoring. With respect to traditional mentoring activities, we suggest that some of the specific actions of transformational mentors will differ somewhat, as described below.

Career Development Activities

From a transformational mentoring approach, career development for the protégé no longer means seeking refuge in a comfortable and steady climb up the organizational ladder. Rather, for the transformational leader-in-training, career development means at a minimum learning to shake the ladder and, in all likelihood, figuring out ways to change ladders in mid-ascent. Two of the five career development behaviors identified by Kram (1985) and discussed in the mentoring literature are directly consistent with our concept of transformational mentoring. Providing sponsorship and visibility are just as important for developing transformational leaders as they are for more traditional career success. Budding transformational leaders need to gain access and visibility before they can begin to practice their skills of transformation. The remaining three career development behaviors (i.e., protecting the protégé, coaching, and providing challenging assignments), require expansion because traditional models of mentoring emphasize career success in terms of moving up the organizational ranks, rather than altering the status quo.

Protecting. With respect to protecting the protégé, rather than serving as a “blame-taker,” transformational mentors will be most effective if they are able to reconstruct potentially damaging situations from ones of blame to ones of praise. That is, the mentor works to convince other top-level managers that the actions of the protégé are praise-worthy rather than blame-worthy, thereby building the reputation of the protégé and reinforcing the value of taking risks. For example, the mentor can remind top-level management of the intangible, yet critical role of challenging job assignments (e.g., Vicino & Bass, 1978), failure (e.g., McCall & Lombardo, 1983), and risk-taking in leadership development.

Proposition 1: Mentors who re-frame apparent failures by protégés as successes will be more

likely to develop protégés who become transformational leaders.

Coaching and Challenging. Heifetz (1994) argues persuasively that effective leaders, rather than telling people what to do, help them discover their own way through problems without easily apparent solutions. Similarly, becoming a transformational leader requires a perspective that goes beyond understanding how to master existing tasks facing the organization. The key to leader performance is the acquisition, development, and application of organizational problem-solving skills (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000a). Consequently, coaching and challenging assignments must be refocused, going beyond the development of specific skills and techniques (e.g., Mumford et al., 2000a, 2000b). A greater emphasis on more long-range and holistic ways of thinking about different situations is needed. The mentor can coach the protégé to consider the long-term, organizational-wide implications of decisions, rather than focusing only on short-term costs and benefits. In particular, successful transformational mentoring efforts are expected to emphasize career development activities that facilitate the development of the core competencies identified by Conger and Kanungo (1988): critical evaluation and problem detection, envisioning, communication of vision, impression management, and empowerment of followers. In contrast, mentoring for traditional career success is likely to focus far less on long-term, holistic thinking than on solving immediate problems and developing technical competencies.

In many instances, the difference in mentoring activities to develop transformational leaders is one of degree, rather than of kind. All effective mentors are likely to provide some coaching on presenting the right impression. For mentors who desire to develop the transformational power of their protégés, the emphasis of the importance of managing impressions will be magnified. For example, the transformational mentor will emphasize the central role of image-building techniques for transformational leadership because deliberately fostering an image of competence can increase follower compliance and confidence in the leader (e.g., Bass, 1985; Gardner & Avolio, 1998).

Proposition 2: Mentoring activities associated with coaching and providing challenging assignments that are designed to promote long-term, holistic thinking, critical evaluation skills,

problem detection skills, the ability to envision the future and communicate that vision, and impression management skills in protégés will increase the probability that the protégé will develop into a transformational leader.

In addition to the competencies described above, the transformational mentoring process should also provide psychosocial support for protégés. In particular, we expect that the psychosocial support behaviors will be most critical for developing the personal characteristics of charisma, risk-taking propensity, and willingness to be self-sacrificing. All three of these characteristics are embedded in the definition of what it means to be a transformational leader.

Psychosocial Support Activities

Given the increased uncertainty associated with new paradigms of career development, psychosocial support for employees in general has grown in importance. For potential transformational leaders, the importance of having a mentor who can provide psychosocial support is amplified even more because of the higher risk associated with attempts to transform organizations. The psychosocial support behaviors of counseling and friendship identified by Kram (1985) are expected to be directly applicable to the transformational mentoring model. However, as discussed below, the role modeling and accepting and confirming psychosocial support behaviors (Kram, 1985) are expected to differ in transformational mentoring, especially if the mentor is a transformational leader.

Role Modeling. The concept of role modeling would seem to imply that the mentor be a transformational leader for transformational mentoring to occur. For example, role modeling charisma would require the mentor be charismatic. However, because there are a variety of aspects of transformational leadership, it may be that some individuals who are not themselves transformational leaders still may be able to provide some degree of transformational mentoring. That said, it seems likely that the most effective role modeling could be done by current transformational leaders. This suggests some important differences in the types of behaviors that the mentor will display for the protégé to observe and emulate. As role models, transformational leaders would tend to exhibit behaviors that are likely to be detrimental to traditional measures of career success in many (but certainly not all) instances. These kinds of leaders should be just the type to encourage risk-taking

and self-sacrifices in their protégés (Godshalk & Sosik, 2000; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000).

Proposition 3: Role modeling that shows charisma, risk-taking, and self-sacrificing will increase the probability of the development of transformational leaders.

Accepting and Confirming. Although Kram (1985: 35) suggests that one mentor function, "acceptance-and-confirmation" allows "a junior person to experiment with new behaviors," it is not evident that traditional notions of acceptance-and-confirmation extend to cover situations where the protégé is proposing radical change for the organization. In fact, it seems much more likely that most traditional mentors would strongly counsel against "rocking the organizational boat." In the traditional mentoring model, acceptance and confirmation often appear to be tacitly associated with maintaining the status quo, or at most making small incremental improvements. Typically, radical change is viewed as threatening because it implicitly challenges the wisdom and skill of the existing generation of organizational leaders. In contrast, transformational mentors must demonstrate their acceptance of protégés' efforts to change organizational practices, rather than efforts to perpetuate existing practices. This tension between following one's own values and conforming to the norms of the organization must constantly be faced by transformational leaders. Mentors seeking to develop this talent in others must encourage, rather than discourage boat-rocking behavior. Boat-rocking activity, however, runs contrary to most conventional mentor wisdom advising how to succeed in many organizations. (Of course, context must be taken into account. In organizations that have a culture of innovation and risk-taking, failure to rock the boat may be more detrimental to success than taking risks.) Transformational mentoring is expected to necessitate encouraging calculated risk-taking over supporting the status quo. Similar to role modeling behaviors, the mentor can inspire the protégé by sharing personal experiences and recounting the successes of historically prominent leaders. Therefore, the basic activity of accepting and confirming has not changed, but the types of behaviors encouraged by the mentor have changed in transformational mentoring.

Proposition 4: Acceptance and confirmation by the mentor that emphasizes making changes to the status quo will increase the probability of

the development of transformational leaders.

Mediators in the Transformational Mentoring Process

The foregoing propositions notwithstanding, we do not believe that transformational mentoring attempts automatically result in the creation of a new transformational leader. The conceptual model shown in figure 1 includes four categories of anticipated mediators - the characteristics of the mentor, the protégé, the relationship, and the organization. Due to space limitations, we have not provided propositions related to the mediator variables, but we refer to them below in our discussion of the implications for practice and directions for future research.

DISCUSSION

In our model of transformational mentoring, our primary emphasis is on mentoring to encourage risk-taking and self-sacrificing. We recognize that this approach seems counterintuitive, given traditional ideas about mentoring. Aren't mentors supposed to keep their protégés out of trouble? Don't mentors help their protégés seek refuge, rather than encouraging them to seek out risk? Won't being self-sacrificing undermine the protégé's credibility in a world where competition is the name of the game? Don't mentors help protégés hone their skills in self-promotion, rather than supporting the protégé's decision to put aside their own needs for the good of the collective?

We recognize that engaging in these types of behaviors seems counterintuitive, but transformational leadership is, itself, counterintuitive to everyday behavior in organizations. Despite the emergence and growth of academic research on transformational leadership (Piccolo and Colquitt, 2006) and the popularity of books and articles about leaders transforming organizations in the business press, we are convinced that there is still a significant gap between what companies say people aspiring to leadership positions should be doing and what those companies actually reward individuals for doing. What is right is not always popular, and what is popular is not always what is practiced.

In many ways, organizations and their leaders are at a crossroads. Global competition combined with high shareholder expectations for performance can result in enormous pressure to take shortcuts and hide problems. At the same time, social norms and regulatory constraints

are calling for more honesty, integrity, and openness in the corporate world. As Quinn et al. (2007) note, leaders must find ways to transcend the apparent paradoxes that result in a world where companies need to compete at the same time they need to collaborate and need to create new opportunities at the same time that they need to control existing processes (Quinn et al., 2007). Transcending those paradoxes requires a new way of thinking about leadership and a new way of developing leaders - transformational leaders who can inspire followers to put the good of the collective above their personal self-interest.

Implications for Practice

Over the last two decades a stream of research has convincingly demonstrated the extraordinary effects of transformational leadership on followers, organizations, and social systems (e.g., Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Bass & Avolio, 1994; House & Howell, 1992; Yukl, 2002). If transformational leadership is recognized as a valuable resource, then it follows that organizations would have an interest in acquiring more transformational leaders. Unfortunately for practice, research has little to say about how to identify transformational leaders *a priori*. If, however, transformational leadership can be developed, then understanding more about how existing members of an organization can become transformational leaders may be at least as important as learning how to identify individuals who are likely to become transformational leaders. The proposed conceptual model of transformational mentoring is a first step in this direction.

Recognizing the role of mentoring in the development of transformational leaders is particularly important for two reasons. First, because of their emphasis on self-interested career development, traditional mentoring activities may actually discourage the development of transformational leaders who are self-sacrificing. Second, mentoring can be used to proactively develop more transformational leaders at a lower cost than existing executive training programs for transformational leaders. As a consequence, identifying those transformational mentoring activities that are most critical to the development of transformational leaders can have a significant impact on practice in organizations. The proposed transformational mentoring model implies not only that current leaders need to learn new ways to mentor protégés, but also that changes to organizational culture and structure may be required.

Traditional beliefs about mentoring have a long history and are not likely to be abandoned lightly. Encouraging current leaders to engage in transformational mentoring will require significant changes in mindset. For some, the issue may be whether to spend time on any type of employee mentoring, as implied by the title of a recent Wall Street Journal column: "Today's Bosses Find Mentoring Isn't Worth the Time and Risks" (Hymowitz, 2006). One CEO, for example, argues that today's flatter organizations have stretched bosses too thin for them to be spending much time mentoring employees. He contends that the manager's time could be better spent in other ways. To counter this position, Hymowitz (2006) quotes academic Jeffrey Pfeffer who argues that not mentoring employees is short sighted. As companies continue to try to do more with less, however, it seems likely that choices will be influenced more by the pressures of practice than by theoretical ideals.

Of course many people do consider mentoring to be worthwhile, but even they may hesitate to adopt some of the proposed transformational mentoring activities which suggest that they encourage risk-taking and self-sacrifice rather than offering more traditional advice focused on safer ways to traverse the political terrain. Past experience in the workplace is likely to have reinforced the benefit of those traditional behaviors for helping protégés advance in their careers. Proposed transformational mentoring activities simply do not have that type of track record. In fact, past results for risk-taking are likely to have been negative. What conscientious mentor would want to hurt her protégé's chances by suggesting that the protégé follow course of action that has resulted in penalties for individuals in the past?

In addition to convincing current leaders that transformational mentoring activities will benefit their protégés, those leaders will also need to be convinced that this new approach to mentoring will not harm their own careers. Because protégés who fail can make their mentors look bad, mentors have a personal interest in the consequences of the protégé's actions. As a result, more than a new personal mindset is needed. Fundamental changes in organizational culture and structure will be required.

Traditional approaches to mentoring did not develop in a vacuum. They reflect the realities of organizational culture and structure. For example, many reward systems clearly signal that risk-taking is not a valued behavior in organizations. Thus, it is little wonder that mentors have

traditionally avoided encouraging risk-taking. Even when there is evidence that taking risks can be very beneficial to the organization as a whole, there often is little incentive for any one individual to be willing to take risks. If one of the protégé characteristics that increases the likelihood of developing into a transformational leader is a high propensity for taking risks, organizations that fail to encourage and reward risk-taking may be at a double disadvantage. In addition to not benefiting from taking appropriate risks, these organizations may find that their most promising employees are the most likely to be penalized for their actions. This may result in those employees leaving the organization, perhaps for a more open-minded competitor.

As with risk-taking, there are likely to be rewards for acts of self-sacrifice within an organizational context. In some organization cultures, acts of self-sacrifice may even be derided or misconstrued as attempts to curry favor. In these organizations, self-sacrifice by the protégé may result not only in the loss of some current benefit, but may also have a negative impact on the reputation of the protégé in the long term.

Directions for Future Research

The concerns raised in the previous section about implementing transformational mentoring processes, on top of existing criticism of traditional mentoring approaches, suggest that much more research is needed to ensure that future attempts at transformational mentoring have positive outcomes for both mentors and protégés. Fortunately, the depth and breadth of existing research on transformational leadership and on mentoring provide ample opportunity for valuable future research on this issue. Below we identify a few of the areas that seem especially promising.

Effective transformational leaders lucidly articulate goals for their followers, convey images of how those goals can be reached, demonstrate confidence in their ability to achieve those goals, and motivate followers to work to make those goals a reality (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). These skills seem self-evident when reviewing the histories of successful transformational leaders. The acquisition of these skills, however, has been subject to less scrutiny because it is difficult to identify, *a priori*, who will become a transformational leader. Simply put, we do not know whom we should be watching. Consequently, future research is needed to systematically track and evaluate the development of potential transformational leaders. Specifically, longitudinal

qualitative investigations examining formal as well as informal mentor-protégé relationships (e.g., Ragins & Cotton, 1999) are needed for advancing research on traditional, as well as transformational mentoring. Experimental programs designed specifically to implement the elements of transformational mentoring would be especially valuable. In addition, historiometric studies assessing the role of influential mentors identified in the biographies of transformational leaders would similarly clarify these mentor-protégé relationships.

Measurement issues will always be a challenge when studying the development of leaders and transformational, or even traditional, mentoring processes. In addition to difficulties associated with the length of time these processes take, many of the activities associated with these processes occur out of sight. Most mentoring studies rely on protégé satisfaction with the mentoring process or recalled examples and stories. Problems with retrospective research, however, have been well documented. A more effective approach might be to experiment with using time diaries to have more contemporaneous documentation that will help researchers understand the transformational mentoring process. Of course, this practice would also serve to make more salient the fact that the protégé is being mentored, so the data collection itself would then become one variable that might affect the eventual outcomes.

Because the transformational mentoring process outlined here includes so many different variables, initially it may be beneficial to focus on one or two activities. Piccolo and Colquitt's (2006) recent research connecting research on transformational leadership and job characteristics suggests that managing meaning is a key variable in terms of translating transformational leadership into better task performance and increased organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, focusing on transformational mentoring activities that address envisioning and communication of vision might be a good place to begin.

One possibility would be to design an experimental study within an organization that has a formal mentoring program whereby some mentors were encouraged to focus on talking with protégés about the importance of managing meaning while a control group of mentors was not given that instruction. Pretests of each protégé's subordinates could be used to establish a baseline for Hackman and Oldham's (1980) job characteristics as well as for intrinsic motivation (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Through observations over time, it would be possible to observe if those protégés in the

experimental group tended to spend more time trying to manage meaning for their subordinates. After some period, subordinates could be surveyed again to see if their levels of task significance and identity had increased and measures of their task performance and organizational citizenship behavior could be obtained.

Also of interest would be work that addressed whether or not transformational leaders are more likely to have a single mentor or a network of different mentors (see Higgins & Kram, 2001 for a discussion of the developmental network perspective of mentoring). Because supervisor-subordinate demographic dissimilarity influences the nature of their relationship (e.g., Tsui & O'Reilly, 1989), issues such as age, race, and gender differences between the transformational leader and protégé require attention. The effects of protégé career stage seem worthy of investigation as well.

Finally, given the criticality of role modeling in the mentoring process, follow-up work is needed to address an important question: Can individuals who are not transformational leaders foster transformational leadership in protégés? The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) might be one measure that could be used to assess different aspects of leadership relative to different types of mentoring activities (see Lowe, Kroeck, Sivasubramaniam, 1996 for a meta-analysis of studies that used the MLQ). Prior literature does not imply that only transformational leaders can be effective mentors. Indeed, it seems apparent that effective leaders can and do engage in career development activities and provide psychosocial support to protégés, whether or not those leaders are transformational leaders. The extent to which leaders can develop leaders more transformational than themselves, however, is open to question.

CONCLUSION

The ideas proposed here suggest that traditional mentoring models may not be adequate for developing transformational leaders. The limited discussion targeting transformational leaders as developers of other transformational leaders (Conger, 1999) as well as the restricted literature linking leadership and mentoring are ripe areas for additional research. Leadership has historically attracted much attention (Yukl, 2002). Work illuminating mentoring is beginning to expand as well. Now it seems appropriate to combine these two fruitful streams of research to advance our understanding of two very critical issues for organizations as they move into

the future. The nature of transformational leadership is consistent with the behaviors needed for effective mentoring (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). In this respect, prior work has considered the mentoring activities of transformational leaders (e.g., Godshalk & Sosik, 2000; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000; Sosik & Godshalk, 2004). However, the research literature has not yet addressed the question of whether existing models of mentoring are sufficient for the actual development of transformational leaders.

To address this gap in the literature, we introduced the concept of "transformational mentoring" that merges existing theories of mentoring and transformational leadership. Building on these two literatures, our model suggests a relationship between transformational mentoring activities and protégé outcomes. Moreover, we reformulated several mentoring activities and argued that these are uniquely required to nurture transformational leadership. Because transformational mentoring does not take place in a vacuum, potential mediators related to the characteristics of the mentor, protégé, relationship, and organization were proposed as potentially mediating the impact of transformational mentoring on the outcomes of transformational leadership competencies and characteristics in the protégé.

We believe that the overlap between mentoring and the activities identified with transformational leadership provides fertile ground for future research on an issue of critical practical concern to organizations: how to generate a stream of transformational leaders to move their organizations successfully into the future.

Our primary contribution lies in our emphasis on mentoring for risk-taking and self-sacrificing. We recognize that these are counterintuitive activities for traditional mentors to be focusing on, but the very nature of transformational leadership is counterintuitive to current practice in most organizations. Current practice, in turn, leaves much to be desired, as evidenced by the growing number of scandals reported in the business press. Transformational mentoring that encourages risk-taking and self-sacrificing may be a useful tool for developing the type of leaders who can transform business practices so they are more ethical as well as more effective in the future.

REFERENCES

Allen, T., & Poteet, M. 1999. Developing effective mentoring relationships: Strategies from the mentor's

viewpoint. *Career Development Quarterly*, 48: 59-73.

Aryee, S., Lo, S., & Kang, I. 1999. Antecedents of early career stage mentoring among Chinese employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20: 563-576.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. 1995. Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6: 199-218.

Avolio, B., & Gibbons, T. 1988. Developing Transformational Leaders: A life span approach. In J. Conger, J., & R. Kanungo, (Eds.), **Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organization effectiveness**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, pp. 276-308.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. 1996. Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 827-832.

Bass, B. 1985. **Leadership and performance beyond expectations**. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. 1990. **Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership**. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. 1998. Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. 1994. Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B., Avolio, B., Jung, D., & Berson, Y. 2003. Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 207-218.

Bass, B., & Steidlmeier, P. 1999. Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10: 181-217.

Beng-Chong, L., & Ployhart, R. 2004. Transformational leadership: Relations to the five-factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 610-621.

- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. 1985. **Leaders**. New York: Harper and Row.
- Berson, Y., & Avolio, B. 2004. Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: A case study of a telecommunication firm. **Leadership Quarterly**, 15: 625-646.
- Beyer, J. 1999. Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. **Leadership Quarterly**, 10: 307-330.
- Bommer, W., Rubin, R., & Baldwin, T. 2004. Setting the stage for effective leadership: Antecedents of transformational leadership behavior. **Leadership Quarterly**, 15: 195-210.
- Bryant, S. 2005. The impact of peer mentoring on organizational knowledge creation and sharing. **Group & Organization Management**, 30: 319-338.
- Burns, J. 1978. **Leadership**. New York: Harper and Row.
- Charan, R., Drotter, S., & Noel, J. 2001. **The leadership pipeline: How to build the leadership-powered company**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. 1999. The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: An empirical test. **Leadership Quarterly**, 10: 397-421.
- Cohen, E., St. Clair, L., & Tichy, N. 1996. Leader development as a strategic initiative: Building the company while building the business. In **1997 Handbook of business strategy**, (pp. 143-155). New York: Faulkner and Gray.
- Collins, E., & Scott, P. 1978. Everyone who makes it has a mentor. **Harvard Business Review**, 56: 89-101.
- Conger, J. 1999. Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. **Leadership Quarterly**, 10: 145-179.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. 1988. Training charismatic leadership: A risky and critical task. In J. Conger, J., & R. Kanungo, (Eds.), **Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organization effectiveness**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, pp. 309-323.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. A. 1998. Charismatic leadership in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deluga, R. 1992. The relationship of leader-member exchanges with laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational leadership in naval environments. In K. Clark, M. Clark, & D. Campbell, (Eds.), **Impact of leadership**. (pp. 237-247). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Feldman, D., Folks, W., & Turnley, W. 1999. Mentor-protégé diversity and its impact on international internship experiences. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 20: 597-611.
- Fulmer, R. 1997. The evolving paradigm of leadership development. **Organizational Dynamics**, 25: 59-72.
- Gardner, W., & Avolio, B. 1998. The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. **Academy of Management Review**, 23: 32-58.
- Godshalk, V., & Sosik, J. 2000. Does mentor-protégé agreement on mentor leadership behavior influence the quality of mentoring relationship? **Group & Organization Management**, 25: 291-317.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. 1980. **Work Redesign**. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hater, J., & Bass, B. 1988. Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 73: 695-702.
- Heifetz, R. 1994. Leadership without easy answers. **Harvard University Press**, Cambridge, MA.
- Higgins, M., & Kram, K. 2001. Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. **Academy of Management Review**, 26: 264-288.
- House, R. 1995. Leadership in the twenty-first century. In A. Howard, (Ed.), **The changing nature of work**. (pp.411-450). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- House, R., & Howell, J. 1992. Personality and charismatic leadership. **Leadership Quarterly**, 3: 81-108.
- House, R., & Podsakoff, P. 1994. Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions

- for research. In J. Greenberg, (Ed.), **Organizational behavior: The state of the science.** (pp. 45-82). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Howell, J., & Avolio, B. 1993. Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 78: 891-902.
- Hunt, D., & Michael, C. 1983. Mentorship: A career training and development tool. **Academy of Management Review**, 8: 475-485.
- Hymowitz, C. 2006. Today's bosses find mentoring isn't worth the time and risks. **Wall Street Journal**, March 13: B1.
- Judge, T., & Bono, J. 2000. Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 85, 751-765.
- Jung, D., Chow, C., & Wu, A. 2003. The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. **Leadership Quarterly**, 14: 525-544.
- Kelloway, E., & Barling, J. 2000. What we have learned about developing transformational leaders. **Leadership and Organization Development Journal**, 21: 355-362.
- Kelloway, E., Barling, J., & Helleur, J. 2000. Enhancing transformational leadership: The roles of training and feedback. **Leadership and Organization Development Journal**, 21: 145-149.
- Kirchmeyer, C. 2005. The effects of mentoring on academic careers over time: Testing performance and political perspectives. **Human Relations**, 58: 637-660.
- Kirkpatrick, S., & Locke, E. 1996. Direct and indirect effects of charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 81: 36-51.
- Kotter, J. 1988. How leaders grow leaders. **Across the Board**, 25: 38-42.
- Kram, K. 1985. **Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life.** Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.
- Kuhnert, K. W. 1994. Transforming leadership: Developing people through delegation. In B. Bass, & B. Avolio, (Eds.), **Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.** (pp. 10-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuhnert, K., & Lewis, P. 1987. Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. **Academy of Management Review**, 12: 648-657.
- Levinson, D., Darrow, C., Klein, E., Levinson, M., & McKee, B. 1978. **The seasons of a man's life.** New York: Knopf.
- Lowe, K., Kroeck, K., & Sivasubramaniam, N. 1996. Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. **Leadership Quarterly**, 7: 385-425.
- Maccoby, M. 2000. Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. **Harvard Business Review**, 78, 68-77.
- McCall, M. 1998. **High flyers: Developing the next generation of leaders.** Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCall, M., & Lombardo, M. 1983. **Off the tract: Why and how successful executives get derailed. Technical Report #21.** Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- McManus, S., Eby, L., & Russell, J. 2000. **Stormy weather: Dysfunctional mentoring experiences from the mentor's perspective.** Paper presented at National Academy of Management Meeting, Chicago: IL.
- Morrison, E., & Robinson, S. 1997. When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. **Academy of Management Review**, 22: 226-256.
- Mumford, M., Zaccaro, S., Harding, F., Jacobs, T., & Fleishman, E. 2000a. Leadership skills for a changing

- world: Solving complex social problems. **Leadership Quarterly**, 11: 11-35.
- Mumford, M., Zaccaro, S., Johnson, J., Diana, M., Gilbert, J., & Threlfall, K. 2000b. Patterns of leader characteristics: Implications for performance and development. **Leadership Quarterly**, 11: 115-133.
- Payne, S., & Huffman, A. 2005. A longitudinal examination of the influence of mentoring on organizational commitment and turnover. **Academy of Management Journal**, 48: 158-168.
- Piccolo, R., & Colquitt, J. 2006. Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. **Academy of Management Journal**, 49: 327-340.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., & Bommer, W. 1996. Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. **Journal of Management**, 22: 259-298.
- Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. 2003. Back to the basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. **Leadership Quarterly**, 14: 41-65.
- Popper, M., Mayseless, O., & Castelnovo, O. 2000. Transformational leadership and attachment. **Leadership Quarterly**, 11: 267-289.
- Quinn, R., Faerman, S., Thompson, M., McGrath, M., & St. Clair, L. 2007. **Becoming a master manager: A competing values approach**. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Ragins, B. 1997. Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. **Academy of Management Review**, 22: 482-521.
- Ragins, B., & Cotton, J. 1999. Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 84: 529-550.
- Ragins, B., Cotton, J., & Miller, J. 2000. Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. **Academy of Management Journal**, 43: 1177-1194.
- Ragins, B., & Scandura, T. 1997. The way we were: Gender and the termination of mentoring relationships. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 82: 945-953.
- Ragins, B., & Scandura, T. 1999. Burden or blessing? Expected costs and benefits of being a mentor. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 20: 493-509.
- Roche, G. 1979. Much ado about mentors. **Harvard Business Review**, 57: 14-28.
- Scandura, T. 1998. Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. **Journal of Management**, 24, 449-467.
- Scandura, T., & Schriesheim, C. 1994. Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complementary constructs in leadership research. **Academy of Management Journal**, 37: 1588-1602.
- Sosik, J., Avolio, B., & Kahai, S. 1997. Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 82: 89-103.
- Sosik, J., & Godshalk, V. 2000. Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 21: 365-390.
- Sosik, J., & Godshalk, V. 2004. Self-other rating agreement in mentoring: Meeting protégé expectations for development and career advancement. **Group & Organization Management**, 29: 442-469.
- Sosik, J., Godshalk, V., & Yammarino, F. 2004. Transformational leadership, learning goal orientation, and expectations for career success in mentor-protégé relationships: A multiple levels of analysis perspective. **Leadership Quarterly**, 15: 241-261.
- Tejeda, M., Scandura, T., & Pillai, R. 2001. The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations. **Leadership Quarterly**, 12: 31-52.
- Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. 1986. **The transformational leader**. New York: Wiley.

- Tsui, A., & O'Reilly, C. 1989. Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. **Academy of Management Journal**, 32: 402-423.
- Vicino, F., & Bass, B. 1978. Lifespace variables and managerial success. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 63: 81-88.
- Waldman, D., Ramirez, G., House, R., & Puranam, P. 2001. Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. **Academy of Management Journal**, 44: 134-143.
- Washburn, M., & Crispo, A. 2006. Effective mentoring. **Review of Business**, 27: 18-25.
- Whitely, W., Dougherty, T., & Dreher, G. 1991. Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress. **Academy of Management Journal**, 34: 331-351.
- Whittington, J., Goodwin, V., & Murray, B. 2004. Transformational leadership, goal difficulty, and job design: Independent and interactive effects on employee outcomes. **Leadership Quarterly**, 15: 593-606.
- Wilbur, J. 1987. Does mentoring breed success? **Training and Development Journal**, November: 38-41.
- Wofford, J., Goodwin, V., & Whittington, J. 1998. A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. **Leadership Quarterly**, 9: 55-84.
- Yukl, G. 1999. An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. **Leadership Quarterly**, 10: 285-305.
- Yukl, G. 2002. **Leadership in organizations**. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. 2000. Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. **Leadership Quarterly**, 11: 211-226.

Lynda St. Clair is an associate professor of management at Bryant University. She received her Ph.D. in organizational behavior and human resource management from University of Michigan. Her current research interests focus on leadership skills, competing values in organizations, corporate social responsibility, and careers. She has published in *Journal of Management Education*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Organizational Dynamics*, and *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*. She has co-authored, "Becoming a Master Manager: A Competing Values Approach", and co-edited 2 other books.

Ronald Deluga is professor of psychology at Bryant University. He received his Ed.D. in counselor education from University of Cincinnati. His research interests include leadership, subordinate-supervisor relationships, and outcomes. He has published in *Leadership Quarterly*, and *Journal of Research in Personality*.