

# 6

## MENTORING: MANAGING THE FACULTY-GRADUATE STUDENT RELATIONSHIP

MARK P. ZANNA AND JOHN M. DARLEY

Because supervising graduate student research is such a significant component of a faculty member's responsibilities, it is important to discuss, both explicitly and in more general terms, how to structure and manage the faculty-graduate student research relationship. In this chapter we suggest a model for advising graduate student research and describe some of the pitfalls, particularly for new faculty, in establishing a meaningful and productive research relationship.

Doing research with graduate students, and the professional and personal relationships that are formed in the process, is one of the most exciting and rewarding aspects of being an academic psychologist. The knowledge that you will interact with bright, creative, and eager-to-learn students throughout your teaching career will do a great deal to keep you fresh, motivated, and stimulated with new insights. Training graduate students is,

---

*We wish to thank Shelley Hymel, Louise Kidder, Arie Kruglanski, Ken Rubin, Nicole Shelton, and Betsy Zanna, who read and commented on previous drafts of the chapter.*

perhaps, the one aspect of academia that makes a professor's career sharply different from almost all others.

Having said this, it must seem that we are consigning our colleagues who teach at undergraduate colleges to a second-class existence. This is not so. In these colleges honors majors often take on many aspects of the graduate student role. They do research studies for their theses, and often there are college funds to pay undergraduates to serve as research assistants on faculty research projects. Committed senior undergraduates often function at the same level as many, particularly master's-level, graduate students. They may know less, on the average, about statistics and experimental design, but they may well know more about the theories near and dear to their professor's heart. Faculty working in colleges will need to make some adjustments to the recommendations that follow but will find that many of them are relevant in their research work with undergraduates.

## THE "MODIFIED APPRENTICESHIP" MODEL

We begin by describing a (perhaps idealized) model of advising graduate student research.

### Sources of Research Ideas in Faculty-Student Collaborations

The central issue to be dealt with initially by faculty members is how to identify a research project on which their graduate students will work. On the one hand, the faculty member might wait until the graduate student brings forward a research proposal of his or her own. Alternatively, the faculty member might assign the graduate student to work on the next experiment in the faculty member's research grant. We would suggest that neither of these options is sensible. The first is too unrealistic; the second is too authoritarian. Instead, we suggest a model for advising graduate students that we call the modified apprenticeship model, which lies somewhere between these two extreme alternatives.

When a graduate student begins graduate school, he or she is either explicitly matched with a faculty advisor or asked to seek one out. When we are paired with or approached by a graduate student, we certainly attempt to discover that graduate student's interests, but we also are quite firm in giving that student an initial project that derives primarily from our own research interests. We do this to ensure that the student gets the benefit of our time and expertise in an area that we know well and begins early in his or her graduate career to learn the multiple tasks of doing research.

Does this mean we "hand" our graduate students a project? Not exactly. Graduate students are *not* research assistants. Instead, we give our students

an idea with, perhaps, some thoughts about how that idea might be turned into a study. The student, then, does some background reading, develops some ideas of his or her own, and together we design the study. Although we may have thought (perhaps a lot) about a design and a procedure beforehand, our students are genuinely engaged in working with us on the design and procedure, and, in fact, their participation at this stage of the project almost invariably improves the study. Graduate students have often thought of ingenious solutions to the inevitable, unforeseen problems that arise in designing a study. Also, because they will eventually play the role of experimenter, it is useful for them to structure the experimenter-participant interactions. In doing so, they will create an experimenter's "personality" with which they are comfortable.

### The Number of Research Directions Possible

It is our goal to have a first-year graduate student begin collecting (most probably pilot) data by the end of the first term or the beginning of the second term. However, during this time, or as soon as possible, we also begin to discuss research that derives from the graduate student's own interests. We find it very important for graduate students to be working simultaneously on, at least, two lines of research. If one line of research bogs down, the other may be productive and students may be shielded from feeling anxious or depressed about their progress on research and, more important, their research abilities. If one line of research gets held up while waiting for the availability of participants, ethics committee clearance, or for a number of other reasons, the second line of research provides something else on which to work. As we have indicated, the first line of research usually stems from our interests, and we think it ought to be started quite quickly. The second line of research stems more from the interests of the graduate student, and the graduate student can be doing the reading and developing the research ideas while working on the first line of research. Typically, the graduate student's master's thesis comes from the first line of research. In fact, the master's thesis often reports the first study completed. If all goes well, the doctoral thesis comes from the second, more independent line of research developed by the graduate student. Incidentally, this latter line may change several times in the course of the graduate student's career. Students need not stick with initial ideas that prove experimentally or theoretically intractable. What this means is the relationship between a graduate student and a faculty member begins, as it must, unequally, but shifts toward a more equal-status relationship, that of research colleague, by the end of the graduate student's career.

When we suggest that a graduate student should have an independent line of research, we do not mean that the research line must necessarily be

divorced entirely from the research interests of the faculty advisor. In fact, particularly in the beginning of the faculty member's career, advising will probably go better if that line is related to one or more of the faculty member's interests. The simple point is that it should be a line of research, a set of studies, that the graduate student takes the lead in developing. When we say the first line of research should stem from the faculty member's interests, we do not mean to deny the possibility of what often happens: The graduate student sees the need for and designs a second research study (or set of studies) that might not have been conceived of by the graduate advisor. If we are playing our advising role properly, the graduate student can move that line of research forward in interesting and, possibly, unforeseen directions.

Later in this chapter, we will discuss the problems that arise when authorship credit and authorship order questions arise. But one element of good advice about it is to have discussions with graduate student collaborators early in the process of doing a study rather than leaving the discussion to the end stages of the process and discovering that different people have been operating under different assumptions. If we tie this into the present discussion about having two projects going simultaneously, because the faculty member is the major source of ideas and designs on the first project, it would be natural for the faculty member to be the first author. If the faculty member thinks that the tasks the graduate student will do on this project do not warrant an authorship, this needs to be clear in advance. In our experience, most advisors would include the student who does a good job on various aspects of the research as an author. On the second project, for which the graduate student has a more originating role, it would seem reasonable that the student emerges as first author, if the student's contributions are sustained throughout the course of the project.

### **Working With Other Faculty**

We encourage our students to work with at least one other faculty member. In fact, the graduate training programs that seem to us to work best are those in which the faculty take collective responsibility for each and every graduate student in the program. In such programs collaboration often develops between faculty members and graduate students, such that various teams of faculty and graduate students collaborate on various research projects. When possible, we sometimes try to facilitate this collaboration by having another faculty member designated as a second, or backup, advisor for each graduate student. The backup advisor can play various useful roles, ranging from friendly critic (or devil's advocate) to full-fledged collaborator.

For this system to work best, faculty members ought to be willing to play this role for each other's students. Thus, all faculty gain the benefits of having another advisor for their students, but must, in turn, be willing to serve as backup advisor for other faculty as well. This role proves particularly valuable when a faculty member goes away on leave; the backup advisor, who is well aware of the graduate student's research progress, can quite easily step in as the main advisor.

There is another important reason for our recommendation of a system in which students have a chance to work with one or more advisors. A graduate student who works only with a young, relatively unknown faculty member and does not seek the opportunity to work with a more senior, more internationally known faculty member, may be acquiring a severe handicap on the job market. Therefore, a system in which graduate students know that they have a chance to rotate advisors is, in fact, a system that makes it possible for them to choose to *begin* working with a younger faculty member. Otherwise, they, most likely, would have to choose against working with the beginning faculty member.

### **How Many Students to Advise?**

The modified apprenticeship system we have described has an important limit. We have found it works best when a faculty member has three or, at most, four graduate students to advise. In fact, we would be able to cope with three or four students only if the graduate students were at different stages of their graduate careers. In this way the more senior graduate students can "show the ropes" to the more junior graduate students and pass on some of their skills to those graduate students. This not only helps the faculty member and the junior graduate students, it also helps the senior graduate students learn some of the skills involved in training students to do research. In universities in which undergraduates do honors theses, many faculty members may also involve their graduate students in supervising undergraduate theses. The graduate student benefits from this opportunity to teach senior-level undergraduates as well. This can be overdone, however. Although it is perfectly appropriate for a graduate student to help supervise an independent honors thesis, especially if it is in an area of his or her own research expertise, the undergraduate may, rightfully, resent being advised primarily, or even solely, by a graduate student.

We might clarify for beginning faculty the implications of what we are saying. In spite of the irrepressible desire to begin rapidly and to get a great deal of research completed, we would advise the beginning faculty member not to take on three first-year graduate students. Far better to take on graduate students at the rate of one a year; some of the training done

with the senior graduate students can subsequently be passed along by them to the younger students. Put simply, do not overload yourself.

## DIFFICULTIES OF ADVISING GRADUATE STUDENTS

We now turn to some of the pitfalls in establishing a meaningful and production research relationship.

### The Mentor's Dilemma

One central aspect of the task of a faculty member who is training a graduate student is to turn that student into a researcher capable of designing incisive, conceptually clean experiments that help to reveal the underlying processes that are operating to produce the phenomenon of interest. (Earlier in this chapter we noted that it is precisely the task of designing and doing these sorts of experiments with graduate students that has given us so much joy during our careers.) To do this successfully, we often use pedagogical techniques. One prominent technique involves framing a problem in such a way that the student is led to discover on his or her own just how the experiment should be designed and operationalized. A variant of this ploy is to present competing hypotheses in such a way that leads the student to have an insight that pits the two hypotheses against each other in a fruitful way. There is a bit of licensed pedagogical deception practiced in this instance: The faculty member leads the student to an insight (or set of insights) that the faculty member already has had by framing the problem in a way (or, more generally, providing the background information) that led the faculty member to the insight in the first place. The faculty member then gasps in wonder at the student's brilliance! The rationale behind this sort of technique is that the student makes the resulting experiment his or her own, and carries it out with the dedication and tenacity that this identification has produced—and that is often necessary for the successful completion of a research project.

There is a wonderful description of this kind of benign deception in the obituary Charles Harris (2001) wrote about Hans Wallach. Harris was explaining why Wallach had been the source of so many students who went on to successful research careers.

With students, Wallach often conveyed the impression that he was simply thinking aloud, engaging with them in a spontaneous search for insights. He not only encouraged them to think incisively, he also made them feel that they were doing it on his level, collaborating with him in his analysis of a problem. A former student offered this description: "He would become utterly involved in whatever question we were

focusing on. . . . If any of us were ever able to contribute some glimmer of possible understanding, his face became radiant with delight—even when what we had thought of went directly against his favorite theory.”

Harris continued, “In retrospect, I surmise that he put considerable effort and planning—and even some play acting—into his teaching.” For example, on one occasion, at least, Wallach left the room, paced the hall, and returned to say, “I’ve been struggling to solve a problem. I know it’s not our topic for today, but I hope you can help me.”

Harris, a distinguished perceptual researcher in his own right, goes on: “Some years later I told him I was perplexed about that incident because I had since learned that he had solved the puzzle in an article he had published a year earlier. With a broad grin he replied, ‘Yes, I know.’”

In that charming case, the issue of publication credit did not arise. But suppose the faculty member had led a student to an insight on which he or she actually went on to do research? Who ought to be the first author on the resulting brilliant paper? We already know (cf. Ross & Sicol, 1979) that each participant in a joint enterprise, even a student and a faculty advisor collaborating on research, has a tendency to overestimate the degree, or the value, of his or her individual contribution. So this background tendency creates an authorship dilemma in any case. But the interesting irony is that the mentor, as good pedagogue, has greatly exacerbated the dilemma of authorship allocation by making the student believe that he or she has contributed the original idea, in addition to all the hard work that the student actually contributed to the execution of the project. So the student, benignly tricked at the beginning of the experiment, will carry it out with the induced hope that he or she will be the lead author. As Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985, p. 352) have noted, one of the most frequent sources of conflict, and of accusations of violations of ethics codes, arises from the authorship dilemma between student and faculty member. We suspect that many of these acrimonious disputes have their origins in the unintended consequences of the initial adoption of the mentoring stance by the faculty member. Irony indeed!

What to do about this dilemma is not easy to say. For senior faculty members, for whom the question of evaluation based on authorship is in the past, the situation is often resolved by giving the student first authorship. This is not so easy to do, however, for a younger faculty member struggling to establish an academic reputation—and to gain tenure. Our suggestion for younger faculty is to have a conversation very early in the faculty–student relationship that generally alludes to the faculty member’s lead role in the general area, perhaps one that has been staked out by the faculty member’s grant proposal. This conversation can be reinstated after the student’s “discovery” of the proper design or procedure of a specific experiment. As the data collection is completed, the faculty member might also take on some

of the paper drafting tasks, such as writing the introduction, to demonstrate a continuing involvement in the project.

One thing emerges clearly. Collaborations in which participants of unequal power are involved are fraught with this problem. They will be best avoided by early and clear understandings of the division of labor and the division of authorship credit for the project, and these understandings can and should be revisited if the division of labor shifts during the conduct of the project. Letting each participant form egocentric and unspoken "understandings" virtually guarantees corrosive misunderstandings. We all know this. What the concept of the mentor's dilemma introduces into the discussion is an understanding of how it is that the faculty member, originally functioning in the mentor role, induced the student to regard him- or herself as the conceptual origin of the study, a fact that the mentor now forgets.

Having realized the force of the mentor's dilemma, we do not think that our advice provides a complete solution about how it ought to be handled. We only can hope that by articulating the dilemma both student and faculty member are more likely to recognize the complexities of what is, in fact, a highly complex and emotion-laden issue.

### **The Psychological Situation of the New Faculty Member**

This is our vision of how the graduate student-faculty advising relationship would work in an ideal situation. But, of course, there are many ways in which the relationship could go wrong. Because many of the difficulties are likely to arise from the complexities of the personal relationship that develops between the new faculty member and the graduate student, we need to analyze the particularly difficult transition that is being made by the new faculty member. In our view, this transition is likely the source of a number of these complexities.

As new faculty members move to their new teaching setting, they are likely to experience a great deal of situationally induced loneliness as well as a good deal of ambiguity about the demands being made on them. That ambiguity produces a lot of additional anxiety. Because of their age and lifestyle similarities, new faculty members are often drawn to graduate students as potential friends. Yet, because of the recently acquired status of the faculty member, a gap has been created that is not only difficult, but also inadvisable, to bridge.

Many of the problems encountered by new faculty in establishing a professional research relationship with graduate students stem from this tendency to look to graduate students for friendships. The necessary but sad truth that the new faculty must recognize is that they have taken a place on the opposite side of the desk from graduate students. This is enormously hard to appreciate because a mere two or three months earlier



the new faculty member was him- or herself a graduate student. Nonetheless, the beginning faculty member must recognize that the essence of his or her job is to teach and train graduate students and, in so doing, they must advise, direct, and *evaluate* graduate students. The responsibility to sanction a student—for example, to place a student on probation—is one responsibility that we all hope will occur rarely. Nonetheless, evaluation, both positive and negative, is one of the essential components of the relationship between faculty and students, and it is one that almost always is underestimated by beginning faculty. The following is a classic manifestation of the problem.

A faculty member may become involved in a hand-holding relationship with a graduate student, giving advice on his or her personal life. More than giving advice, the faculty member may be drawn into giving sympathy, even therapy. Not only does this take an emotional toll on the new faculty member, it can also consume an inordinate amount of time. Time spent providing therapy is time not spent in providing graduate education. More to the point, time spent in this way implicitly, but in fact absolutely, undermines the essential evaluative nature of the relationship between faculty and student. (Although we cannot expand on it, it is important to point out an obvious fact: This trap may be harder to avoid for female or minority faculty members, if only because such faculty are often in “shorter supply.”)

It is interesting (and, perhaps, ironic) to note that if a new faculty member is perceived by other faculty members as not having an appropriately role-limited relationship with graduate students, then that faculty member is limiting his or her effectiveness as an advocate for graduate students. Every faculty member will, at some time, want to be an advocate for a particular graduate student; will want to convince other faculty that this student has talents and skills and potential that other faculty may not have glimpsed. In addition, most faculty will be drawn, at some time, into mediating a conflict between another faculty member and a graduate student (perhaps even at the request of a graduate student). Neither task is effectively accomplished by any faculty member who is seen by faculty colleagues as having an inappropriately personal relationship with the graduate student in question. The faculty member's ties to the graduate student provide an all-too-ready alternative explanation for the advocacy. Thus, exactly because the junior faculty member will want to act as an advocate and, possibly, a mediator, it is advisable to establish appropriately structured relationships with graduate students from the beginning.

Finally, it is difficult for the beginning faculty member who identifies closely with a graduate student to do academic advising. For example, sometimes it is necessary for a faculty member to explain to a graduate student that although he or she has been struggling under vast and real personal problems, nonetheless, as a consequence of the lack of academic

progress, he or she must be put on academic probation or leave graduate school. As well, sometimes it is necessary to advise a graduate student that, notwithstanding his or her conflict with a particular faculty member, the graduate student has been assigned a teaching assistantship with that faculty member or that the faculty member will (or ought to) be a member of the student's thesis committee. A relationship with a graduate student that makes it difficult to carry out any of these communications or, worse, makes the faculty member appear to have betrayed the student, is symptomatic of role confusion on the part of the graduate student and, most certainly, the new faculty member.

### Prototypical Examples

We will illustrate several possible beginnings of disaster. Shortly after arriving at his or her first teaching institution, the faculty member is likely to be subject to a flattering approach from one or more mid-career graduate students, all of whom seek to have the faculty member work with them in various ways. Many acute problems lie herein. If the graduate student has not successfully met the demands of the faculty, he or she may have no one with whom to work. Facing the necessity to work out some sort of thesis project, such a student is often somewhat desperate to find a faculty advisor and is willing, often unconsciously, to be very seductive to do so.

A related case is one we might label the rescue mission. A graduate student who has many talents and a well-developed interest pattern may be a "misfit" in the particular graduate program that the new faculty member has just joined. That is, although in a perfect world, there ought to be a faculty member willing to work with the graduate student on the problem that interests the graduate student, no such faculty member, in fact, exists. This may be particularly poignant for the new faculty member who may recall a graduate student within his or her own graduate program who was similarly misfitted. Moreover, feeling a commitment to the success of this newly joined graduate program, the new faculty member may see this situation as a waste of the graduate student's talents. Given these factors, and given a belief that there is a general obligation of the system to help every graduate student, the new faculty member may feel that the obligation to help rests with him- or herself. Such an obligation or commitment, we might add, could last several years!

Such obligations are not unequivocal and it is frequently unwise for the new faculty member to take responsibility for advising graduate students in such circumstances. Let us add a personal note. Both of us, when we began teaching, took on graduate students because we were subject to the feelings we have just described. Many of our colleagues report to us that they also have done so. The simple fact of the matter is that it is very difficult

to say "no," especially when one is a new faculty member. Nevertheless, and interestingly, most of us report that we acted very differently when we moved to our second teaching institution or grew more experienced in our first. Given a second chance, we tended to be very cautious about taking responsibility for students who had been admitted some years before we arrived or had bounced around among several other advisors.

We have suggested that there are highly idealistic reasons for supervising graduate students. Let us now suggest that there are some less idealistic ones as well. All of us have an image of how much work we could accomplish on our own research if we could simply have another pair of hands helping with the task. That, too, can be a motivation for taking on graduate students. Put simply, we think this is a rather poor motivation. Almost every experienced graduate advisor we know would suggest that advising graduate students is not an efficient way of getting one's own work done. Although this may be less true when a student is just beginning graduate school, it certainly becomes more and more true as the graduate student gets closer to doing his or her PhD thesis. This is as it should be, because it is appropriate that graduate students work on their own problems for their theses. For these reasons, both structural and personal, a number of difficulties lie in wait for the beginning faculty member in establishing relationships with graduate students, particularly graduate students who are already some distance through the graduate program.

These problems are exacerbated when a new faculty member is not merely friendly with, but, in fact, is a close friend of a graduate student. Not only will difficulties arise from the disproportionate amount of power possessed by the faculty member, but such friendships can generate additional problems among both other graduate students and faculty colleagues. Some graduate students, concerned about the distribution of resources and entitlements within the graduate student program, may feel that a faculty member's friendship gives one of their peers an unfair advantage. Faculty colleagues may fear that information confidential to the faculty community will be transmitted to the graduate student community. The ambiguous role of the junior faculty member may also confuse faculty colleagues about the junior faculty member's commitment to faculty member status. They also may not know how to treat, or interact with, the graduate student friend.

### Partial Solutions to the Problem

Our first and, perhaps, best advice is straightforward: Maintain a professional distance from the graduate students. Although it is appropriate to discuss professional ambitions and personal matters insofar as they affect the graduate student's training and alternate job preferences, it is inappropriate to dwell on discussions of personal matters if they provide what may become

an excuse for doing inadequate work in graduate school. Short of medical and life-threatening emergencies, it is most important for graduate students to keep their careers on track. Should a graduate student have serious personal or psychological problems, the best thing a faculty member can do is advise the student to seek professional help.

One other consideration that ought to be kept in mind that will naturally limit interactions with graduate students is the effective management and allocation of time. All of us are prone to make commitments to graduate students that are not completely warranted. At the very least, we should recognize that this ought to limit taking on other commitments. Although a commitment to an occasional rescue mission may be appropriate and even honorable, a sequence of such commitments signals an inappropriate orientation in a faculty member.

In any event, *before* agreeing to advise a graduate student it is wise to discuss the student's past performance with relevant faculty members, consult the student's records and files and, if you have any misgivings whatsoever, commit yourself only to a trial period, during which time the student knows he or she must demonstrate an ability and motivation to progress on some research project.

### Testing a Student's Research Ideas

To help you decide whether to commit yourself to advising a graduate student, especially a mid-career student, you might ask the student the following six questions (developed by a colleague for just such an occasion):

1. "What are you interested in doing/finding out?" (i.e., "What's the big question?")
2. "Why are you interested in doing this?" (i.e., "What's so important about this topic/question?")
3. "How does what you are interested in doing relate to what's already known?" (i.e., "What does the literature tell us—or what's old?")
4. "How does this research differ from and/or extend previous research?" (i.e., "What new knowledge is likely to result—or what's new?")
5. "How are you going to do this?" (i.e., "What's the design and, possibly, the procedure?")
6. "What do you expect to find?" (i.e., "What are the hypothesized results?")

By posing these questions, one can assess the amount and, more important, the quality of thought that has gone into the research being proposed by the graduate student. A student who does not pass this test is not likely

to convince our colleague to be his or her advisor (or even, for that matter, to serve as a member of his or her thesis committee).

Finally, before taking on a PhD student it makes sense to serve on a few MA and PhD thesis committees to gain a perspective on what is, and what is not, considered acceptable as a thesis; how much direction it is normative for the advisor and committee members to give; and so on. We strongly recommend that new faculty members do this as soon as possible.

### Danger Signals

Let us try to mark certain danger signals for any new faculty member.

1. If you find you are consistently committing yourself to advising graduate students on PhD theses that are outside your own area of expertise, watch out! You do not have the time to learn these areas, and you are unrealistic if you think that you can successfully advise people without knowing the areas. You are saying “yes” too often and run the risk of spreading yourself too thin.
2. If, in your first year, you find yourself advising a host of students who were admitted before your arrival, beware! If these students are genuinely going to do work in your interest area, that is one thing. If, however, they are doing work in a scattered range of fields, that is a problem. You certainly run the risk of being perceived as the person on whom to “dump” problematic graduate students—and, if your time is taken up with senior students, you will not be able to admit students for whose entire graduate education you will be responsible.
3. If you find yourself advising a number of students and are disappointed by the rate at which those students are progressing toward their theses, you may need to examine what is going on! You may have committed yourself to a number of students who are highly competent excuse-givers but who are not equally competent graduate students.
4. Finally, if you find yourself, out of a sense of duty, advising a number of students from whom you are not getting any enjoyment, any intellectual stimulation, or any personal benefit, something is wrong. You may be overestimating your resources, overestimating your available time and, it is important to note, overestimating your skills and knowledge in the areas outside your own expertise. Advising students is a major responsibility that you should not take lightly; but it should also be a challenging and stimulating activity.

## Avoiding Difficulties

We recognize that this advice may appear to be inordinately dispassionate. It is. However, there are many strategies that will allow junior faculty members to become less deeply embroiled in the lives of the graduate students in their departments or programs. First, we would suggest that junior faculty members consciously develop professional and personal relationships with individuals, other than graduate students, who share the faculty members' concerns. Beginning faculty members might recall their own graduate student peers. Although relationships with these individuals may have been competitive in the last year or two of graduate school, chances are that at least some of these individuals are experiencing many of the same feelings of isolation and uncertainty. These friends are but a phone call (or e-note) away.

Second, one can seek friendships with other assistant professors in your department as well as other departments within the university. This is sometimes quite difficult to do because assistant professors are busy, and members of academic departments frequently stay to themselves. Still, with a certain amount of effort one can turn up some very interesting people with whom one can talk about mutual anxieties and concerns and who may even become friends.

## CONCLUSION

In the first half of this chapter we discussed a model of advising graduate student research. Doubtless there are other equally effective models. Because this is one of the central aspects of a faculty member's professional life, we urge beginning faculty members to develop their own model for graduate training and to strive to make it work. We hope that by discussing problems often encountered by beginning faculty in establishing research relationships with their graduate students, we will have helped beginning graduate advisors adapt to this critical new role.

Because the second half of this chapter is concerned with the pitfalls of being too close to graduate student advisees, if we have erred in our advice, we have probably erred on the side of suggesting that the faculty-graduate student relationship be too distant. But if our modified apprenticeship model, described in the first half of this chapter, works, this distant relationship will, in fact, evolve over time into a closer, more collegial relationship, especially by the time students complete their PhD theses. So, by the end of a student's graduate career the relationship between the faculty member and the (now former) graduate student ought to be no different from the relationships the faculty member has with his or her faculty colleagues.

Sometimes faculty colleagues become close friends; often not. But always there ought to be mutual trust and respect.

#### REFERENCES

- Harris, C. (2001). Hans Wallach (1904–1998). *American Psychologist*, 56, 73–74.
- Keith-Spiegel, P., & Koocher, G. (1985). *Ethics in psychology: Professional standards and cases*. New York: Random House.
- Ross, M., & Sicoly, F. (1979). Egocentric biases in availability and attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 322–326.