

Applying ISPAR Model of Service Dominant Logic on Mentoring a Part of Training and Development Function of HRM Functions

Taimoor Basharat, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

This is a conceptual article written to apply I-S-P-A-R model which was presented in 2009 by research scholars Maglio, Vargo, Caswel and Spohrer on the Mentoring in Service Dominant Logic (SDL) perspective. The author has taken a deep insight of mentoring which is a part of training and development: a function of the Human Resource Management in Good Dominant Logic (GDL) perspective. For this research, a wide range of literatures is reviewed and many disciplines have been explored which include mentoring roles, need, responsibilities, and context. Here, it is worthy to mention that mentoring and supervision are two different terms and both have different roles, too. Roles of supervisors are: boss, teacher, evaluator, expert and counselor; whereas mentoring consisted of assisting, befriending, guiding, advising and counseling. In service science, all the service systems do not fulfill the requirement to be a service system. There is also presented I-S-P-A-R which stands for Interact-Serve-Propose-Agree-Realize model of service system interactions episodes. This model is applied on mentoring in SDL perspective. At the end of this article, a conclusion is drawn and areas for further research have been mentioned.

KEYWORDS

Good Dominant Logic, Interactions, Mentoring, Service Dominant Logic, Service System

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, mentoring is used widely, putting “supervision” a side in educational degrees (Price & Chen, 2003; Walkington, 2005b; Zeegers, 2005). Mentoring, if we talk about a teacher training institute in a teacher-student perspective where a student will join teaching profession, it happens when students are being placed with teachers as assistant teachers to learn, list, develop skills and then practice them in an institute where they will go and perform the same things (The Queensland College of Teachers, 2007). For this research, a wide range of literature is reviewed and many disciplines have been explored to have a look on studies which include mentoring role, need, responsibilities and context. To ensure research credibility, it is ensured that recent work is based on preferred and peer reviewed scholarly articles which outline was similar or giving us a point about our study. Although, some articles are also reviewed as they do not fit on our criteria but have something in them about how mentoring works. In some articles mentoring workplace and context is well explained and elaborated (for example Eby, McManus, Simon & Russell, 2000; Allen, 2003). The aim of the study is to examine:

DOI: 10.4018/IJSSMET.2020010104

Copyright © 2020, IGI Global. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global is prohibited.

1. How mentoring works in Goods Dominant Logic (GDL), its context, need and role.
2. How it will when we apply I-S-P-A-R Model in Service Dominant Logic (SDL).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. What is Mentoring in Goods Dominant Logic?

It is very difficult for anyone to have a single definition of “Mentoring” (Ambrosetti & Dekker, 2010). In most of the definition by different researchers, generally, it is observed that mentor has a hierarchical relationship with mentee and mentor is an experienced person than mentee (Ambrosetti & Dekker, 2010). It is also observed that mentor can give and develop mentee’s knowledge and skills which a mentee is seeking or wanted to learn (McCormack & West, 2006; Aladejana, Aladejana & Ehindero, 2006; Fowler & O’Gorman, 2005; Hayes, 2001; Billett, 2003; Price & Chen, 2003). A researcher, named Smith (2007, p.277) defines mentoring as ‘a particular mode of learning wherein the mentor not only supports the mentee, but also challenges them productively so that progress is made’. Different other scholars including Fairbanks, Freedman and Kahn (2010) had defined mentoring differently. In their point of view, mentoring is “complex social interaction that mentor, constructs and negotiates for a variety of professional purposes and in response to the contextual factors they encounter.” Kram (1985) defined mentoring as extreme interpersonal relationship. Smith (2007) defined mentoring as series of steps which develop a whole person instead of doing this task in parts. Mentoring is reviewed as a relation and a process, both by Kwan and Lopez (2005). In 2000, Fairbank et al. outlined mentoring parts and declared that context is also a vital element of mentoring. In spite of abovementioned definitions, most of the definitions do not think three parts (context, relationship and process) which exactly suits mentoring’s definition.

There are three elements of mentoring, relational, developmental and contextual, as Lai (2005) mentioned in a research. Relational term means the relationship which exists between mentor and mentee; development term means how the mentor and mentee develop themselves while keeping in mind the goals, professionally and personally; and the last term contextual refers to cultural and situational background of mentoring accomplishing specific goals and targets (Ambrosetti & Dekker, 2010). According to Lai (2005), all these elements (relational, developmental and contextual) have a deep effect and impact upon the relationship of mentor and mentee. Although, after reviewing the literature, author observed that it is unclear how these three elements are operated and can create an impact on the relationship on mentor and mentee (Ambrosetti & Dekker, 2010; Walkington, 2005b; Hudson, 2004). Many authors have discussed the difference between mentoring and supervision (Bray and Nettleton, 2006). Different roles which a supervisor offers are: “boss, teacher, evaluator, expert and counselor” (Bray and Nettleton, 2006); and mentors consisted of “assisting, befriending, guiding, advising and counseling” (Bray and Nettleton, 2006). Literature described mentoring as supporting someone, providing help and giving feedback to the person who is called mentee without keeping in view any measurement (Ambrosetti & Dekker, 2010). “Being the issue of assessment” is a difference between a supervisor and a mentor which is identified by Walkington in 2005 in her study. Supervisors make assessment whereas mentors do not practice it (Walkington, 2006). She explained that supervisor measures the performance of the subordinates or assistant against any criteria; but the mentors do not do the same. Mentors build trust between them and mentees, but the supervisors key purposes are to analysis performances and evaluate the performance against given criteria (Hudson and Millwater, 2008). Keeping this view in observation, Sanfor and Hopper (2001) also explained the term “supervision” in negative aspect which is watching someone or fixing something while following a hierarchical system in any organization. Zeegers (2005) has declared in his study “supervision” an old-fashioned practice and observed that a mentee learns particular skills set and gain knowledge in mentoring process. Regardless of all above mentioned differences and definitions, leaders of organizations, use both, the mentoring and supervisory roles (Ambrosetti & Dekker, 2010). A mentor

7 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/article/applying-ispar-model-of-service-dominant-logic-on-mentoring-a-part-of-training-and-development-function-of-hrm-functions/240613

Related Content

Key Challenges for Delivering Web-Based IT Support Services: The Provider Perspective

Vanessa Cooper, Sharman Lichtenstein and Ross Smith (2011). *Developing Technologies in E-Services, Self-Services, and Mobile Communication: New Concepts* (pp. 30-50).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/key-challenges-delivering-web-based/54956

National Interoperability Approach for Social Services Information Management in Finland

Juha Mykkänen, Konstantin Hyppönen, Pekka Kortelainen, Antero Lehmuskoski and Virpi Hotti (2011). *Interoperability in Digital Public Services and Administration: Bridging E-Government and E-Business* (pp. 254-278).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/national-interoperability-approach-social-services/45793

Proposing a Knowledge Amphora Model for Transition towards Mobile Government

Tunc D. Medeni, I. Tolga Medeni and Asim Balci (2011). *International Journal of E-Services and Mobile Applications* (pp. 17-38).

www.irma-international.org/article/proposing-knowledge-amphora-model-transition/51565

Adoption of a Comprehensive Web-Based Wealth Management Service

Tomi Dahlberg and Anssi Öörni (2012). *Innovative Mobile Platform Developments for Electronic Services Design and Delivery* (pp. 53-70).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/adoption-comprehensive-web-based-wealth/65941

E-Markets as Meta-Enterprise Information Systems

Martin Grieger, Evi Hartmann and Herbert Kotzab (2010). *Electronic Services: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools and Applications* (pp. 2003-2013).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/markets-meta-enterprise-information-systems/44058