INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**CARLETON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

**MENTORING:
An Examination of the Mentoring Construct from the
Perspective of Protégé using the Act Frequency
Approach**

THESIS

SUBMITTED BY:

**Brian Russell
B. Comm (Honours) 1998**

**In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master in Management Studies**

January 19, 2001

**© Copyright
2001, Brian Russell**

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-61011-X

Canada

The undersigned recommend to
the faculty of graduate studies
acceptance of the thesis

**MENTORING:
An Examination of the Mentoring Construct from the
Perspective of Protégé using the Act Frequency
Approach**

submitted by
Brian Russell B.Comm. (Honours)
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Management Studies

Thesis Supervisor

School of Business
Department

Director, School of Business

**Carleton University
January, 2001**

Abstract

This thesis examined the mentoring construct from the perspective of protégés using the act frequency approach. The objectives of this research were to clarify the roles of mentoring by using the act frequency approach, and to determine which mentoring behaviours are most important in order to incorporate them in a new scale of mentoring and then to attempt to validate the scale.

Thirty-six behaviors were identified by protégés as important to the construct of mentoring. Two scales of mentoring were created: a 30-item scale, and a 23-item scale. Nine roles of mentoring were identified by junior managers who have been mentored: feedback, integrity, openness, professional growth, encouragement, support, knowledge, coach, and career and goal attainment. Of these nine roles, the roles of integrity and knowledge were viewed as important by junior managers who have been mentored. Recommendations for future research were made.

Acknowledgments

They say that it takes a village to raise a child and just like raising a child, there have been many people who have helped me complete my research. I would like to take this opportunity to thank my thesis supervisor, Professor Lorraine Dyke, for her expertise, her time, her patience and support. I would also like to thank my thesis committee members Professor David Cray, Professor Moses Kiggundu, and Professor Tim Pychyl for their advice and support.

I would like to thank all of my friends for helping me realize that there is more to life than school and research on the weekend. I would especially like to thank Shikhar Agarwal, Jason Barton, and Jason Ianni for giving me their time and support.

Last but not least I would like to thank my family: my parents for their continued love and support; my brother Winston for doing whatever it took to help me finish; my brother Jeffrey for making me laugh no matter how bad the situation was; all my relatives for their love and support; and my grandmother Mary Elizabeth Samuel for her love, and her encouraging words.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Literature Review	4
2.1	Origins of the Term Mentor	4
2.2	Mentoring: Two Schools of Thought	5
2.3	Dimensions of the Mentoring Construct	8
2.3.1	Mentor Roles	8
2.3.2	Functions of Mentoring	12
2.3.2.1	Changing Mentor Functions Throughout the Phases of the Mentoring Relationship	13
2.3.3	Dissension regarding the Functions of Mentoring	15
2.4	Formal versus Informal Mentoring	16
2.4.1	Relationship Initiation	16
2.4.2	Relationship Structure	18
2.4.3	Processes in the Relationship	19
2.5	Mentoring Outcomes	21
2.5.1	Formal and Informal Mentoring and Mentoring Outcomes	23
2.6	Mentoring and Gender Differences	26
2.7	Conclusion	29
3	Objectives of This Study	32
4	Methodology	34
4.1	An Overview of the Act Frequency Procedure	34
4.2	A Comparison of the Act Frequency Approach and Traditional Methods	37
4.3	Criticisms of the Act Frequency Approach	39
4.4	Samples	41
4.5	Measures	42
4.6	Control Variables	45
5	The Four Phases of the Study	46
5.1	Phase I - Act Nomination	46
5.1.1	Purpose and Procedures	46
5.1.2	Phase I Analysis	47
5.1.3	Phase I Respondents	47
5.1.4	Phase I Results	49

5.2	Phase II - Prototypicality Ratings	50
5.2.1	Purpose and Procedures	50
5.2.2	Phase II Analysis	52
5.2.3	Phase II Respondents	52
5.2.4	Phase II Results	54
5.2.5	Subsidiary Analysis	59
5.2.5.1	Purpose and Procedures	59
5.2.5.2	Analysis	61
5.2.5.3	Subsidiary Analysis Respondents	61
5.2.5.4	Subsidiary Analysis Results	62
5.3	Phase III - Measure Validation	66
5.3.1	Phase III Purpose and Procedures	66
5.3.1.1	Measures	68
5.3.2	Phase III Analysis	69
5.3.3	Phase III Respondents	69
5.3.4	Phase III Results	71
5.3.4.1	Item Correlation with Mentor Effectiveness	71
5.3.4.2	Assessment of New Scales of Mentoring	75
5.3.4.3	Validation of the New Mentoring Scales	75
5.3.4.3.1	Correlations Between Mentoring and the Original Outcome Variables	76
5.3.4.3.2	Control variables and Outcomes	77
5.3.4.3.3	Correlations Between Mentoring and the Residualized Outcome Variables	80
5.3.5	Phase IV - Exploratory Classification	82
5.3.5.1	Respondents	83
5.3.5.2	Classification of Items	84
5.3.5.3	Relationship of Clusters and Mentor Scales	87
5.3.5.4	Correlation of Clusters to Outcomes	90
5.4	Summary of Results	93
6	Discussion and Conclusions	94
6.1	Phase I and Phase II	94
6.2	Phase III	95
6.3	Phase IV	97
6.3.1	Nine Roles and Roles from past research	97
6.3.1.1	Kram	99
6.3.1.2	Levinson	101
6.3.1.3	Burke	103
6.3.1.4	Leibowitz and Schlosberg	104
6.4.1	Conclusions Drawn from this Research	105

6.4.2	Recommendations for Future Research	105
7	Benefits and Limitations of the Study	107
7.1	Benefits of this Study	107
7.2	Limitations of this Study	107
	References	109

List of Tables

Table 1	99 Unique Acts of Mentoring	55
Table 2.1	Act Frequency Items compared to Kram's Roles	63
Table 2.2	Act Frequency Items compared to Levinson et al.'s Roles	64
Table 2.3	Act Frequency Items compared to Burke's Roles	64
Table 2.4	Act Frequency Items compared to Leibowitz and Schlosberg's Roles	65
Table 3	Reliabilities for Outcome Measures	68
Table 4	30-item and 23-item scale	73
Table 5	Mentoring Scales vs Outcome Variables	77
Table 6	Control Variables vs Outcome Variables	78
Table 7	Residualized Outcome Variables	79
Table 8	Outcome vs Mentor Scales	91
Table 9	New Clusters of Mentoring Items	85
Table 10	Cluster vs Mentor Scales	88
Table 11	Clusters vs Outcome Variables	92

List of Appendices

Appendix A	114
Appendix B	118
Appendix C	127
Appendix D	136
Appendix E	145
Appendix F	155
Appendix G	
G.1 Kram	164
G.2 Levinson	168
G.3 Burke	172
G.4 Leibowitz and Schlossberg	176
Appendix H	179
Appendix I	188

1 Introduction

Career development is important to organizations. It helps its employees to develop their careers and to feel valued by the organization, and it helps employers to develop the skills they need to staff key positions. Through career development, the organization saves the costs of recruiting human resources from outside the organization. This contributes to the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the firm (Ulrich, 1997). Mentoring is an important career development tool that facilitates upward professional progression in organizations. Mentoring allows organizations to integrate, develop, and retain their brightest employees (Hunt and Michael, 1983). According to Kram (1985), mentors in growing organizations can be critical to the socialization of its new members. In mature organizations, where hiring and promoting are infrequent, mentoring offers a creative alternative to keep managers who have plateaued in their career involved with the organization.

The outcomes of mentoring can be both positive and negative for the protégé, the mentor, and the organization. The positive and the negative outcomes of mentoring are affected by the roles and the functions that are performed by the mentor (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and MCKee, 1978; Leibowitz and Schlossberg, 1980; Burke, 1984; Kram, 1983, 1985a; and Geiger, 1992); the type of mentoring relationship (Ragins and Cotton, 1998); and gender differences in the mentoring relationship (Noe, 1988; Dreher and Ash, 1990; Oglensky, 1995; and Ragins and Cotton, 1998).

Numerous studies have documented a positive impact of mentoring on protégés, mentors, and organizations. Former protégés are better educated, better paid, less likely to

leave the organization and have a higher level of satisfaction with their work and their career progress (Treasury Board, 1994). Mentoring relationships help young professionals develop technical skills, learn about the politics of the organization, develop competencies and learn how to behave in order to succeed (Hunt and Michael, 1983). Mentors grow and develop professionally and personally from the mentoring experience (Galbraith, 1995). Mentors gain satisfaction by helping less experienced individuals in their development and can rejuvenate themselves by interacting with protégés thus obtaining new ideas, theories, and skills (Levinson et al., 1978; Hunt and Michael, 1983). Mentors also receive confirmation of their self worth and acceptance by passing on their wisdom and their experience to protégés. For organizations, mentoring improves their recruitment efforts, increases communication within the organization, increases productivity and cost effectiveness, speeds up the induction process of new employees, and reduces training costs (Galbraith, 1995).

Mentoring can also have negative outcomes for protégés, mentors, and organizations. For protégés, mentoring relationships that end prematurely or that are not complementary may result in a loss of self-esteem, frustration, blocked opportunities, a sense of betrayal or a loss of career time (Hunt and Michael, 1983). For the mentor, the poor performance of a protégé reflects badly for the mentor who has promoted a protégé. Frustration may also develop if the mentor cannot help the protégé reach their potential. Moreover, envy and resentment may arise if the protégé surpasses the mentor (Hunt and Michael, 1983). For the organization, the negative outcomes of mentoring may include employees who are not satisfied, a decrease in their productivity at work, and higher employee turnover that leads to increased costs to the

organization in terms of recruiting new talent (Galbraith, 1995).

The purpose of this study is to clarify the construct of mentoring by basing this study on real life experiences of people who are familiar with mentoring. Chapter Two of this thesis reviews the literature on mentoring to gain a better understanding of the research in this area. The goal of the literature review section is to identify shortcomings of the research and to suggest the need for the present research. The third chapter outlines the objectives of this thesis. The fourth chapter covers the methodology and the procedures that were used in this study. Chapter Five describes the results found in the four phases of this study. Chapter Six is a discussion of the implications of the results of the research. Chapter Seven outlines the benefits and the limitations of this research.

2 Literature Review

This chapter is an examination of the mentoring literature. It begins with the origins of the term mentor, mentor roles, the functions of mentoring, the types of mentors, mentoring and gender, and mentoring outcomes in order to gain a better understanding of the research that has been done in the area of mentoring. The empirical research is examined summarizing the measurements that have been used and the important findings, and identifying any shortcomings. Finally, suggestions are made for future research.

2.1 Origins of the Term Mentor

There are several origins of the term mentor. In the epic The Odyssey by Homer, Mentor was a wise, faithful teacher and counselor to the son of Odysseus, named Telemachus. Mentor's name is now synonymous to the term loyal advisor (Oglensky, 1995). The origins of the term mentor can also be traced back to the apprentice system of the medieval guilds. In this system, elders trained young men to become craftsmen, thus protecting the brotherhood of the craft and also serving a gatekeeping function (Oglensky, 1995). The familial and loving connotations of the term mentor are influenced by the role that uncles played in primitive cultures in relation to nephews who were nearing adulthood. The uncle's role was to usher his nephew through the ceremonial rites of passage (Oglensky, 1995). There is also a coercive connotation of the term mentor which has origins in the patron landholder system of rural communities. By gathering favors to his clients, the patron developed an intricate web of obligation bringing him deference, allegiance, and various other forms of material and socio-emotional gratuity (Oglensky, 1995).

In the present literature, researchers have attempted to provide a concise definition of the mentoring construct. Several different definitions of mentoring exist, but there are common themes. In terms of relationships, mentoring is said to be a developmental relationship. A developmental relationship is one in which the conscious goal of both parties is to develop the ability and the promotability of the subordinate (Clawson and Kram, 1984). In general, a mentor is a more senior, experienced employee who is a role model, who provides support, direction and feedback to a less experienced employee regarding interpersonal development. A mentor also typically increases the visibility of the protégé to those in the organization who influence career opportunities (Noe, 1988a; Levinson et al., 1978; Kram, 1983; Hunt and Michael, 1983; Harper, 1997).

The common themes of mentoring have led to the development of two perspectives regarding mentoring: a primary view of mentoring as an intense, hierarchical relationship, and a secondary view as encompassing a variety of relationships. The two views of mentoring are important because they are the foundation of the research that has been conducted regarding the mentoring construct. The following section examines these two views of mentoring.

2.2 Mentoring: Two Schools of Thought

In the research literature, there are two schools of thought regarding the concept of mentoring (Oglensky, 1995). In the classical or primary sense of the term, mentor and all of its derivatives are used to define an older, more experienced person who helps a younger person learn how to function in the adult world of work. This relationship is hierarchical in terms of rank, experience, or age.

In an organization, a mentor can be an immediate supervisor, a former boss, or someone within the organization but outside the direct line of authority. A mentor can also be someone outside the organization like a seasoned professional who is in the same field as the protégé. The mentoring relationship is initiated and sustained on an informal basis, therefore it is not institutionalized where formal roles and responsibilities exist. Mentoring is characterized by an intense developmental relationship of a relatively long duration in which protégés receive a range of career and psychosocial help from one senior manager (Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher, 1991; Oglensky, 1995).

In this view, mentoring is seen as a type of social relation that can be differentiated from other types of relationships that provide vocational and developmental support. Shapiro, Haseltine and Rowe (1978), developed a continuum of relationships that make up the 'patron system'. The elements in increasing intensity were: peer pal, guide, sponsor and mentor. These four elements were distinguished from each other on the dimensions of relationship hierarchy and the level of emotional involvement. Hunt and Michael (1983) found that of these four elements, mentoring is the most emotionally charged relationship, and is hierarchical, parental, exclusionary, and elitist. In their work, The Season's of a Man's Life, Levinson et al. (1978) echoed this distinction. Hence, it is understood that the classic view of mentoring contains elements of other types of advisory and support relationships but, mentoring is viewed as qualitatively different and greater than the sum of its parts (Oglensky, 1995).

The secondary perspective views mentoring as an umbrella concept under which a range of relationships that offer career help are classified. From this perspective, the mentoring

relationship may be shorter, less intense, and a less inclusive developmental process as compared to the primary perspective (Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher, 1991). Secondary mentoring focuses on external, career progress oriented functions such as sponsorship, visibility and exposure and not on inner-oriented psychosocial developmental functions (Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher, 1991). According to Kram (1983) it is the substance of the relationship that matters, not the form. Both higher ranking people and peers can be mentors (Kram and Isabella, 1985), therefore the mentoring relationship does not need to be hierarchical. Moreover, the relationship can be formally arranged through mentoring programs set up in organizations, or the mentoring relationship can be arranged informally.

The work of Kram (1983, 1985a) is central to the understanding of mentoring using this view. Kram defined mentoring in terms of the developmental functions that are present in varying degrees, in different types of supportive relationships at work (Oglensky, 1995). Kram (1983) found that there are two general types of functions that a mentor can provide: career functions and psychosocial functions. According to Oglensky (1995) mentoring is said to occur when any of the functions of mentoring are carried out.

In conclusion, the literature demonstrates that there are two conflicting views of the construct of mentoring: a primary view where the mentoring relationship is intense, informal, and hierarchical; and a secondary view where the mentoring relationship is less intense, the relationship can be informal or formal, the mentoring relationship is focused upon external career goals, and mentoring can be provided by superiors or peers.

2.3 Dimensions of the Mentoring Construct

The literature on the roles that mentors provide and the functions of mentoring suggest that the mentoring construct is not clearly defined. In this section the dimensions of the mentoring construct are outlined. A brief overview of the development of the roles of mentors is given in order of chronology, followed by an examination of the functions of mentoring.

2.3.1 Mentor Roles

According to the Canadian Oxford Dictionary, a role is defined as: “a person’s or thing’s characteristic or expected function; the part played or assumed by a person in society, life, etc., influenced by his or her conception of what is appropriate” (p.1250, 1998). In the literature on mentoring roles, there is no consensus regarding what the roles of mentors are and their importance.

Levinson et al. (1978) state that the key role of the mentor is to support the protégé’s lifelong objective. Levinson et al. found that there were five roles that a mentor provides a protégé. A mentor must be a teacher, enhancing the protégé’s skills and intellectual development. A mentor is a sponsor who uses his or her influence to facilitate the protégé’s entry into the organization and the protégé’s advancement. A mentor is a host and guide, welcoming the protégé into a new occupational and social world and acquainting the protégé with the values, customs and cast of characters. A mentor is an exemplar by way of the mentor’s own virtues, achievements and way of living thus setting an example for the protégé to follow. A mentor is also a counselor, who provides moral support in times of stress.

Burke (1984) found that there are fifteen roles of mentoring. The five most common roles of mentoring are that: a mentor should be a positive role model for the protégé; a mentor should build the protégé's self-confidence; a mentor should go to bat for the protégé; a mentor should be a teacher, coach and trainer; and a mentor should use job assignments to develop their protégé.

In their study of employees who had supervisors who were effective in helping them with their careers, Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) identified nine roles that mentors may play: a communicator, a counselor, an appraiser, a coach, a mentor, an advisor, a broker, a referral agent, and an advocate. Geiger (1992) further adapted the roles developed by Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) and found that there are seven roles that are necessary for a mentor to effectively carry out their duties. A mentor must be a communicator promoting a two-way exchange of information with the protégé. An effective communicator listens to the career concerns of the protégé and responds appropriately, establishes an environment for open interaction, schedules uninterrupted time to meet the protégé and acts as a sounding board for ideas and outcomes.

The second role Geiger (1992) identified is that of a counselor. A mentor works with the protégé to identify and understand the career related skills, interests and values of the protégé. An effective counselor helps the protégé evaluate the appropriateness of career options and helps the protégé to plan strategies to achieve mutually agreed upon goals (Geiger, 1992).

As a coach, the mentor helps the protégé clarify performance goals and developmental

needs. An effective coach teaches managerial and technical skills, reinforces effective job performance, recommends specific behaviors that need improvement, clarifies and communicates organizational objectives and goals, and serves as a role model to the protégé by demonstrating successful professional behaviors (Geiger, 1992).

As an advisor, the mentor communicates the formal and informal realities of progression within the organization. An effective advisor recommends opportunities for training, recommends appropriate strategies for career direction, reviews the protégé's developmental plan on a regular basis, and helps the protégé identify career obstacles and take appropriate action to overcome them (Geiger, 1992).

Geiger's (1992) fifth role is that of a broker. An effective broker expands the protégé's network of professional contacts, helps to bring together protégés who might mutually benefit from helping each other, helps link the protégé with appropriate educational and employment opportunities and helps the protégé identify resources required for career progression (Geiger, 1992).

Geiger's (1992) sixth role of a mentor is a referral agent. An effective referral agent identifies resources to help the protégé with specific problems and follows up to ensure that the resources used are effective. The seventh and final role of a mentor is an advocate who intervenes on behalf of the protégé for benefits like promotions or eliminating obstacles (Geiger, 1992).

Kram (1983, 1985a) found that the roles of a mentor could be categorized into career functions and psychosocial functions. The career function roles of mentoring include:

sponsorship, exposure, coaching, protection, and providing challenging assignments. The role of the mentor in sponsorship is to open doors for the protégé. The role of the mentor in protection is to provide support for the protégé and to act as a buffer between the protégé and their environment. The role of the mentor in exposure is to create opportunities for visibility for the protégé. The role of the mentor in challenging the protégé is to provide the protégé with stretch assignments that push the protégé.

Kram's (1983, 1985a) psychosocial functions of mentoring include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. The role of the mentor in role modeling is to demonstrate appropriate behaviors, attitudes and values that the protégé can emulate. The role of the mentor in acceptance and confirmation is to offer support and respect to the protégé. The role of the mentor in counseling is to help the protégé resolve problems through feedback and active listening. Finally, the role of the mentor in friendship is to care and share with the protégé in ways that go beyond the requirements of work. Kram (1985a) found that the greater the number of roles the mentor provided, the more beneficial the relationship will be but, she could not determine whether all roles are equally important.

The numerous roles of mentors in the literature suggests that the dimensions of mentoring are not clearly defined, nor are the importance of the roles of mentoring. This has influenced the research in the area of mentoring functions, because the roles that mentors play are often grouped into mentoring functions.

2.3.2 Functions of Mentoring

In this section the distinction between mentoring roles and functions is discussed and the seminal work of Kram (1983, 1985a) on the functions of mentoring is outlined. The phases in the mentoring relationship are examined in relation to the mentoring functions. Finally, dissension in the literature regarding mentoring functions is discussed.

The Canadian Oxford dictionary defines a function as: “an activity proper to a person or institution; a mode of action or activity by which a thing fulfills its purpose” (p.564). The literature on the dimensions of mentoring demonstrates that the difference between the mentor roles and the functions of mentoring are not clear. This suggests that both the roles of mentors and the functions of mentoring need to be defined clearly. Further research needs to be done in order to determine the relationship between mentor roles and the functions of mentoring. For the purposes of this study a mentor role was used to refer as specific activities while a function of mentoring was used to refer to the broader grouping of roles. This is consistent with Kram (1983) who used the term function to categorize roles in two broad groups as noted above.

According to Kram (1983), the mentor relationship has the potential to enhance both the career development and the psychosocial development of both the protégé and the mentor. In her study of eighteen managers in a public sector organization, Kram (1983) found that mentors provided two types of functions to protégés: career functions, that assist the protégé in learning the ropes of organizational life and in preparing the protégé for career advancement opportunities; and psychosocial functions, that support the protégé in developing a sense of competence, confidence, identity, and effectiveness in the managerial role. Kram (1985a)

suggests that the mentoring relationship is more beneficial for the protégé if the mentor provides both functions of mentoring.

2.3.2.1 Changing Mentor Functions Throughout the Phases of the Mentoring Relationship

Kram (1983) also examined the phases of the mentor relationship in order to highlight the psychological and organizational factors that influence the functions that are provided to protégés and how protégés experienced the relationship at a given time. In general there are four phases of the mentoring relationship: the initiation phase, the cultivation phase, the separation phase and the redefinition phase.

The initiation phase is the period where the mentoring relationship is started. This phase lasts six to twelve months. The cultivation phase is the period where the range of career and psychosocial functions that are provided expand to their maximum. This phase lasts from two to five years. In general, the career functions emerge first as the mentor provides challenging work, coaching, exposure and visibility, protection and sponsorship to the protégé. The career functions that are provided by the mentor depend on the mentor's organizational rank, tenure and experience.

The psychosocial functions emerge after the interpersonal bond between the mentor and the protégé has strengthened. The psychosocial functions include role modeling and acceptance and confirmation. The activities of counseling and friendship emerge after instances of greater intimacy. The psychosocial functions that are provided by the mentor depend upon the degree of trust between the mentor and the protégé, the degree of mutuality between both

parties and the degree of intimacy that exists in the mentoring relationship.

The separation phase of the mentoring relationship occurs after a period of two to five years after the mentoring relationship has been initiated. This period is categorized by significant changes in the functions provided by the relationship and the affective experiences of both the mentor and the protégé. The nature of the relationship is altered by structural changes in the organization's context and by psychological changes in one or both individuals. During this period the parties experience turmoil, anxiety and feelings of loss. The relationship becomes a less central part of their lives at work. This phase is important to both the protégé and the mentor. It is critical to the development of the protégé, because it provides an opportunity for the protégé to demonstrate essential job skills while operating without a mentor. For the mentor this period is an opportunity to demonstrate that he or she was successful in developing managerial talent.

During the redefinition phase of the mentoring relationship there are two possible outcomes: the relationship evolves and a new relationship develops that is significantly different from the past, or the relationship ends. The mentor and the protégé may become friends since the protégé has the ability to function effectively in a new setting without the mentor. The protégé also demonstrates their competence, self-confidence and autonomy. The mentor has the ability to relate to the protégé as a peer. The mentor also has the time to put more energies toward other protégés in order to reflect their competence and generativity.

2.3.3 Dissension regarding the Functions of Mentoring

The seminal work of Kram (1983, 1985a) regarding the career functions of mentoring and the psychosocial functions of mentoring has been questioned by the work of Burke (1984) and the work of Harper (1997). This section outlines the dissension in the literature with regards to what are the components of the functions of mentoring.

Burke (1984) developed a mentorship scale comprised of fifteen items that asked respondents to rate their mentor's different roles. He used a sample of 80 men and women in early career stages. Burke found that there were three dimensions of the mentoring relationship: career development functions, psychosocial functions, and role modeling functions. The role modeling function consisted of the following activities: the mentor representing an advanced level that the protégé strove toward; the mentor being a positive role model for the protégé; and the mentor being a teacher, coach and trainer.

In her M.M.S. thesis, Harper (1997) had twelve items and found four functions of mentoring: career functions, psychosocial functions, enhanced effectiveness, and a better understanding of the organization. Enhanced effectiveness is comprised of the activities of providing coaching, providing developmental opportunities, improving managerial and interpersonal skills and helping the protégé to develop new ways to approach problems. The function of a better understanding of the organization is comprised of the activity of providing the protégé a greater understanding of the organization, how it is organized, the politics of the organization and its power distribution.

In summary, Kram (1983) found two mentoring functions, Burke (1984) found three

mentoring functions and Harper (1997) found four mentoring functions. The current literature on the functions of mentoring suggests that the dimensions of the mentoring construct are not clearly defined. This is an issue that must be resolved in order for research on mentoring to advance.

2.4 Formal versus Informal Mentoring

Formal and informal mentoring are important to the mentoring construct because they affect the positive and negative outcomes of the mentoring relationship. The outcomes of the mentoring relationship determine the degree of success of the mentoring relationship. This section outlines the two types of mentoring relationships: formal mentoring relationships and informal mentoring relationships and the differences between these two mentoring relationships by examining the structure of the relationship, the way the relationship is initiated, and the processes within the relationship.

According to Ragins and Cotton (1998) there are three distinct differences between formal and informal mentoring relationships that may affect the mentor's functions and the career outcomes of the relationship. These differences can be categorized into: the way the relationship is initiated, the structure of the relationship, and the process involved in the relationship.

2.4.1 Relationship Initiation

A key difference between formal and informal mentoring relationships is the way in which they develop (Ragins and Cotton, 1998). Informal mentoring relationships develop spontaneously without external organizational involvement, whereas formal mentoring

relationships develop with assistance and intervention generally in the form of a voluntary assignment or matching of mentors and protégés. The development of informal mentoring relationships is guided by identification, perceived competence, and the level of interpersonal comfort between members of the relationship. Perceived competence influences the selection process in the informal mentoring relationship. The mutual identification process contributes to the high level of intensity in informal relationships because mentors often select protégés who are viewed as younger versions of themselves, and protégés select mentors who they view as role models. Interpersonal comfort is also a factor in developing informal mentoring relationships because mentoring relationships develop partially on the basis of the degree of comfort in communication within the relationship.

Formal mentoring relationships are typically assigned relationships. Variation exists in the method of assignment, but frequently mentoring relationships are assigned by a third party. The implication is that identification, role modeling and interpersonal comfort do not play a primary role in developing formal mentoring relationships. Formal mentoring relationships are also less likely to be founded on mutual perceptions of competence and respect because the matching process is made on the basis of one or a combination of the following factors: the mentor's position in the organization; their areas of expertise; technical competence; or knowledge of the organization. The evaluation of the mentor's competence is usually based on the perception of the program's coordinator and their perceptions may differ from the perceptions of the protégé or the mentor. Formal mentors may perceive protégés as performers who enter the program because they require special or remedial attention.

According to Ragins and Cotton (1998), it is reasonable to expect that the psychosocial functions of role modeling, friendship and counseling may be less well developed in formal mentoring relationships compared to in informal mentoring relationships.

2.4.2 Relationship Structure

Informal mentoring relationships generally last between three to six years. The parties meet when desired and the goals of the relationship evolve over time and adapt to the career and the life stages of the individuals in the relationship. Formal mentoring relationships are usually shorter in duration (Douglas, 1997). The length of formal mentoring relationships are predetermined; 6 months to one year are common durations. The mode, frequency, and location of contact for many formal mentoring relationships are often specified in a relationship contract and the protégé's career goals are specified at the start of the relationship.

Ragins and Cotton (1998) outline three potential outcomes of the different structures. First, informal mentoring relationships have more time than formal mentoring relationships to develop psychosocial functions such as establishing trust, building the protégé's self confidence and helping the protégé develop an identity both professionally and personally. Therefore informal mentoring may have a less immediate effect on career outcomes, but the outcome may be more substantial in the long term.

Second, protégés in formal mentoring relationships may perceive that their mentors spend time with them due to their contractual commitment to the organization and the mentoring program and not due to their mentors' personal commitment to the protégé, or because the mentor believes in the protégé's potential. This may prevent the protégé from becoming close

to the mentor emotionally which may hinder the development of trust in the relationship and the provision of psychosocial functions. Furthermore, because both parties know that the mentoring relationship will end at a specified time, both parties may not personally invest as much in the formal mentoring relationship which may hinder the development of psychosocial functions.

Third, formal mentoring relationships focus on career goals that are short term and are applicable to the protégé's current position in the organization. Informal mentors may be more concerned with the long term career needs of their protégés. These needs may take precedence over the needs of the organization.

2.4.3 Processes in the Relationship

The differences in the initiation and the structure of formal and informal mentoring relationships can result in different processes in the mentoring relationship. The first difference is the motivation for the relationship. According to Ragins and Cotton (1991) formal mentors may be less motivated to be in a mentoring relationship and may not invest as much of their time in the protégé's development because they do not identify with their protégés. Moreover, although formal mentors receive more explicit organizational recognition than informal mentors, they are less likely to receive internal rewards related to their career development stage.

The second difference is communication in the relationship. Formal mentors may lack the communication and coaching skills that are necessary to provide effective mentoring, because formal mentors are self nominated or selected by program coordinators (Kram, 1985b). Informal mentors are selected by protégés based on their ability to coach and to

communicate (Olian, Carrol and Giannantonio, 1988). Even if the formal mentor is perceived as being an excellent coach and communicator by the program director, but the protégé does not share this perception, the mentoring relationship may be less effective (Ragins and Cotton, 1998). Ragins and Cotton (1998) believe that it is reasonable to expect that formal mentors will provide fewer functions related to effective communication, such as coaching, friendship, and counseling.

Third, formal mentoring relationships often match participants from different departments or functional units. Formal mentors from different departments or functional areas may have career paths that are entirely different than the path that the protégé would like to take. Therefore, formal mentors may provide less effective career counseling than informal mentors because they have less in common with their protégés. Informal mentoring relationships evolve based on mutual interest, mutual job functions, or mutual career paths (Ragins and Cotton, 1998).

Finally, formal mentors are often more visible than informal mentors because the relationship is public, and the relationship is typically monitored by a program coordinator (Murray, 1991). Formal mentors may be more self-conscious about engaging in behavior that may be construed as favoritism by others in the organization. In contrast, informal mentors have been found to sponsor their protégés into upper level positions, give their protégés challenging work assignments, and buffer their protégés from adverse forces in the organization (Ragins and Cotton, 1998). Murray (1991) believes that formal mentors may be less likely to actively intervene on behalf of their protégé.

In summary, research on the types of mentoring relationships demonstrates that informal and formal mentoring relationships differ in the way they are initiated, the structure of the relationship and the processes in the relations. These three factors influence the career and psychosocial mentoring functions that are provided in formal and informal mentoring relationships.

2.5 Mentoring Outcomes

This section summarizes the research conducted regarding mentoring outcomes. This section also examines the type of mentoring and mentoring outcomes. The literature on mentoring outcomes is rich. In the literature, one commonly studied mentoring outcome is the number of promotions (Ragins et al., 1998; Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher, 1991; Dreher and Ash, 1990; and Scandura, 1992). The relationship between level of income and mentoring has been examined by Chao (1997), Ragins and Cotton (1998), Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992), Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher (1991), and Dreher and Ash (1990). Chao (1997), Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993), and Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992) analyzed the relationship between organizational socialization and mentoring outcomes. Finally, Chao (1997), Koberg et al. (1994), and Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992) examined the relationship between mentoring outcomes and job satisfaction.

Dreher and Ash (1990), and Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher (1991) found that the presence of a mentor has been associated with increased promotions for individuals who were mentored versus individuals who were not mentored. Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992), Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher (1991), and Dreher and Ash (1990) found that the presence of

a mentor is associated with higher incomes for individuals who were mentored versus individuals who were not mentored. Chao (1997), and Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992) found that the effects of mentoring on organizational socialization endures over an extended period of time and the effects are beneficial to individuals who are mentored. Koberg et al. (1994) found that mentoring has a positive impact on job satisfaction for individuals who are mentored.

Several studies have been conducted regarding mentoring outcomes and their measurement. In their studies of formal and informal mentorships and mentoring functions, Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992) emphasized three outcomes of mentoring: organizational socialization, job satisfaction and salary. The findings were that protégés in informal mentorships perceived more career-related support from their mentors than protégés in formal mentorships. Protégés in informal mentorships reported higher levels of organizational socialization, higher levels of intrinsic job satisfaction, and higher salaries than non mentored individuals in all three outcome variables. However, the difference between protégés in formal mentorships and non mentored individuals was only found for three socialization factors. Finally, there was not a difference found between formal and informal protégés for any of the outcome measures. Chao (1997) conducted a study of mentoring phases and outcomes using the same mentoring outcome variables using informally mentored protégés, formally mentored protégés, and non mentored individuals. Chao found consistent differences between mentored and non mentored individuals with respect to career outcomes, job satisfaction, organizational socialization, and income measures.

In their study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional and

technical positions, Dreher and Ash (1990), analyzed four outcome variables: number of promotions, level of income, level of pay satisfaction, and level of benefit satisfaction. The researchers found that men and women who were mentored received the same number of promotions and reported essentially the same levels of compensation satisfaction. The primary difference between men and women regardless of whether they were mentored or not mentored was annual income. Men reported a higher level of income than women.

Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher (1991) examined the relationship of career mentoring to the number of promotions and the level of total current compensation received. The researchers found that mentoring was related to the promotion rate and total compensation. The researchers also found that career-oriented mentoring has a greater relationship with promotion rate for people from the highest socioeconomic group, members of the upper class and the upper middle class, than for individuals from lower socioeconomic groups. The studies previously mentioned show a positive relationship between people who are mentored and outcomes of mentoring.

2.5.1 Formal and Informal Mentoring and Mentoring Outcomes

Noe (1988a) investigated the influence of the protégé's job and career attitudes, the gender composition of the mentoring dyad, the amount of time spent with the mentor and the quality of the interaction on the psychosocial and career benefits that protégés gain from participation in assigned mentoring relationships. Noe (1988a) found that protégés received beneficial psychosocial outcomes but limited career functions from an assigned mentor. Noe's (1988a) findings are in contrast to what might be expected. Formal mentoring relationships are

of shorter duration and they are formed involuntarily by a third party. These relationships are not based upon the mutual interests, mutual respect, and perceptions of competence that typically exist in an informal relationship, therefore it is often expected that protégés in informal mentoring relationships would receive higher psychosocial outcomes than protégés in formal mentoring relationships because psychosocial outcomes are expected to take longer to develop. Moreover, since formal mentoring relationships are of short duration it is expected that they will focus on career outcomes which can be achieved in a short period of time. Noe (1988a) offers the following explanation for the findings. The mentoring program that was the focus of the study included many of the characteristics that are important for the success of formal mentoring programs. These characteristics included: clearly defined purpose and goals of the program, selection of mentors based on the interpersonal skills and the interest in developing employees, and mentor training.

Three studies have directly investigated the relationship between the type of mentoring relationship and the functions of mentoring. In their study of formal and informal mentoring relationships (Ragins and Cotton, 1998), protégés in informal mentoring relationships reported more psychosocial functions involving friendship, social support, role modeling and acceptance than protégés in formal mentoring relationships. However, no significant differences were found on the parent and counseling functions. Protégés in informal mentoring relationships also reported greater overall satisfaction with their mentors than protégés in formal mentoring relationships and earned more in total income. In contrast to what they expected in the literature, the researchers found that protégés in informal mentoring relationships report more

career development functions than protégés in formal mentoring relationships. One possible explanation for this finding is that the formal mentoring relationship is public, therefore formal mentors may not want to be perceived as engaging in behavior that may be construed as favoritism.

In their study of informal and formal protégés employed at two organizations that were merging, Fagenson-Eland, Marks and Amendola (1997) found that informal protégés reported more psychosocial benefits than formal protégés. However, informal and formal protégés did not significantly differ in career development and role modeling functions. Moreover, protégés in informal mentorships had significantly greater compensation than protégés with a history of formal mentors. A possible explanation for this finding is that the greater intensity in informal mentoring relationships fosters more roles overall. However, there were no significant differences found in the number of promotions when controlling for differences in position tenure, number of career interruptions, occupation, supervisory status of mentors and length of the mentoring relationship.

In their study Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992) found that protégés in informal mentoring relationships receive more career related functions (i.e., sponsoring, coaching, protection, challenging assignments and exposure) than protégés in formal relationships. They also found that longer mentorships were associated with higher scores on mentorship functions. Chao, Walz and Gardner suggest that their results are an indication that further examination of the functions that are central to mentoring must be done.

2.6 Mentoring and Gender Differences

Gender differences in mentoring relationships are important because the outcomes of mentoring differ for men and women who are mentors and protégés. The outcomes of the mentoring relationship determine the degree of success of the mentoring relationship. In addition, the nature of the relationship, such as the function and the roles that mentors provide for protégés, may be different for men and women. This section briefly outlines the benefits of mentoring for women and the barriers that women encounter in pursuing mentoring relationships.

Dreher and Ash (1990) found that women and men are equally likely to have mentors. Moreover, Noe (1988b) found that women who have mentors reported greater job success and job satisfaction than women who did not have a mentor. This is consistent with other findings regarding individuals who are mentored versus individuals who are not mentored. However, a number of barriers to mentoring for women have been identified. Ragins and Cotton (1998) found that women perceived the presence of more barriers than men in gaining a mentor. Nieva and Gutek (1981) found that women are not well integrated into mentoring systems. The reasons were that mentors cannot accept women as protégés, women are not as sensitive as men to organizational realities, and that women hold few upper level positions therefore there are more cross-gender mentoring relationships. Noe (1988b) found that barriers to mentoring for women included:

- lack of access to information networks;
- tokenism;

- stereotypes and attributions;
- socialization practices of men and women;
- norms regarding cross-gender relationships;
- a reliance on an ineffective power base; and
- a lack of female mentors to act as role models for female protégés.

Each factor will be discussed briefly. Lack of access to information networks occurs when there is limited contact with potential mentors for women. According to Noe (1988b) this arises due to a lack of knowledge of how to develop informal networks, a preference for interacting with others of similar status in the organization, or the intentional exclusion of women by male managers (1988b).

Tokenism occurs when an individual enters a job environment where their social category, such as their sex, historically has been disproportionately represented. The result is that women become highly visible in organizations, therefore their performance and socialization experiences are more likely to be monitored by management. This may dissuade potential mentors from developing relationships with female employees. If women are given preferential treatment within the organization, potential mentors may view female employees as threats to their job security and therefore potential mentors may be reluctant to develop a mentoring relationship with women (Noe 1988b).

The negative stereotypes and attitudes towards women's abilities to manage, the beliefs regarding women's job preferences, attributions regarding women's performance, beliefs that women are not interested in advancement opportunities, beliefs that women lack the necessary

skills and abilities, and sex-role stereotypes persist. These factors may dissuade senior managers from developing mentoring relationships with female employees (Noe, 1988b).

Socialization practices encourage females to develop personality traits and behaviors that are contrary to those that many consider to be necessary in management (Noe, 1988b). The socialized roles and the role expectations of managers and peers may have a chilling effect on the career aspirations of women who are isolated from performing and mastering behaviour required for future managerial positions (Noe, 1988b).

According to Noe (1988b) men and women prefer interacting with members of the same sex in the work environment. However, due to the lack of female mentors, the majority of mentors are male managers. The perceptions of peers in cross-gender relationships, and concerns about public image may deter managers from becoming mentors to female employees.

Managers are motivated to develop mentoring relationships with employees who possess technical expertise or expert knowledge that may help the manager or the work unit. According to Noe (1988b), women use more indirect influence strategies which may mask their competence. If female employees fail to stress their expertise, potential mentors may be unaware of the female employee's potential and thus not initiate a mentoring relationship (Noe, 1988b). The above literature suggests that women must work through more barriers in order to develop a mentoring relationship but, women who develop mentoring relationships benefit from the experience.

2.7 Conclusion

The literature on mentoring is substantial, however, there are divergent views in the literature regarding the mentoring construct. The literature on the origins of the term mentor has demonstrated that there are several origins of this term. There are two schools of thought regarding the construct of mentoring: the classical or primary perspective of mentoring where the mentor is an older, more experienced person who helps a younger person learn how to function in the world of work. This relationship is hierarchical in terms of rank, experience, and age. In contrast, in the secondary perspective on mentoring the relationship may be less intense, shorter in duration, and focus on external, career progress oriented functions. In secondary mentoring, the substance of the relationship is of importance not the form. This literature demonstrates a lack of a clear definition regarding the construct of mentoring.

The literature regarding dimensions of the construct of mentoring suggests that further research needs to be conducted. The work on the roles of mentors has demonstrated that while there is a consensus regarding the fact that mentors teach protégés how to become successful, there is a lack of consensus regarding the specific roles that mentors provide their protégés. Furthermore, little work has been done in the area of which roles are central to the construct of mentoring. The work on the functions of mentoring has demonstrated a lack of consensus regarding the broad functions that mentors provide protégés. Kram's (1983) seminal work on the career and the psychosocial functions that mentors provide protégés has been questioned by the findings of Burke (1984), who found a third function of role modeling. Moreover, Harper (1997) found an additional two functions that mentors provide: a better

understanding of the organization; and enhanced effectiveness. Furthermore, the difference between a mentor role and a function of mentoring is not clear in the literature. As previously discussed, for the purposes of the current research a mentor role was used to refer to specific activities, while a function of mentoring was used to refer to the broader grouping of roles. The work on the types of mentoring has highlighted the important differences between informal and formal mentoring relationships in their initiation, formation, development and the structure of the relationship. Researchers have concluded that since formal mentoring is of a shorter duration, fewer benefits may be derived. However, only three studies have been done regarding the type of mentoring and mentoring outcomes, and the results suggest that there is a need for further examination of the functions that are central to the mentoring construct.

The work on mentoring outcomes has demonstrated that there are several factors that have been used in the literature in order to measure the effectiveness of mentoring. The work on mentoring and gender has demonstrated that women who have mentors have reported greater job success and job satisfaction than women who did not have a mentor. However, there are barriers faced by women in obtaining mentoring.

According to Noe (1988b), preliminary studies on mentoring focused on the benefits that protégés gain by participating in mentoring relationships, but the results are unclear because of the lack of agreement in the literature regarding the functions that mentors provide. The oversupply of operationalizations of mentoring suggest that the construct of mentoring needs to be more clearly defined. Research in the area of mentoring is at the point where the construct of mentoring needs to be clearly defined in order for our understanding of the construct to

advance. This suggests that further research that is based upon real life experience needs to be conducted regarding the mentoring construct.

3 Objectives of this study

The absence of a clear definition of the construct of mentoring is demonstrated by the two schools of thought regarding the mentoring construct. The work regarding the specific roles that mentors provide protégés, and the roles that are central to the mentoring construct is inconclusive. The deficiency of mentor roles is further compounded by the lack of clarity regarding the functions of mentoring. Furthermore, the research in the area of the functions of mentoring is inconclusive regarding the dimensions of the construct. The research that has been conducted in the area of informal and formal mentoring relationships and mentoring functions has resulted in findings that conflict with present theories. For research on mentoring to progress, the roles of mentors and the functions of mentoring need to be clearly defined.

This suggests that further research that is based upon real life experience needs to be conducted regarding the mentoring construct. Consequently, the objectives of this study were:

- To clarify the construct of mentoring by using the act frequency approach. The act frequency approach is a grounded perspective that is based on the real life experiences of observers. It is used to identify acts that are central to a particular behavior. By using the act frequency approach in the present study, the aim was to use real life experiences of observers in an attempt to develop a comprehensive understanding of mentoring.
- The second objective was to determine which mentoring behaviors are most important in order to incorporate them in a new scale of mentoring and to explore the dimensionality of the mentoring construct. Two alternative methods

for determining importance were used: act prototypicality scores and correlations with a global measure of mentor effectiveness. This resulted in alternative measures of mentoring. The aim was then to demonstrate convergent validity by correlating the new scales that were developed in this study with outcomes of mentoring. Exploratory classification was used to explore the construct of mentoring.

4 Methodology

The act frequency approach was used to identify mentoring behaviors that were then reviewed to create a grounded measure of mentoring. In this section act frequency approach is overviewed, the act frequency approach is compared to traditional methods and the criticisms of the act frequency approach are discussed. The sample used for this study, the measures and the control variables used for this study are also discussed in this section.

4.1 An Overview of the Act Frequency Procedure

The act frequency approach is a methodology developed by Buss and Craik (1980, 1981, 1983a). It is a method for revealing the natural cognitive categories which we use to classify behaviors. This approach has three phases. The first phase is the nomination of acts that represent a behavioral category. The second phase is the identification of prototypical acts. The third phase is the measurement of act frequencies. The result is a well grounded measure of a behavioral category.

There are two advantages of the act frequency approach for the present study. First, this method uses lay people to nominate acts that represent the domain under study. This results in a measure that more closely reflects people's experiences of the phenomenon (Buss and Craik, 1983b). A grounded lay description of mentoring leads to a better understanding of the construct of mentoring because it is based upon the actual experience of people in the workforce.

Second, the act frequency approach views constructs as categories with membership gradients (Buss and Craik, 1981). There are some acts that are prototypical of the construct

while other acts may still be in the category, but are more peripheral members of the category. The use of prototypicality ratings helps to define the core of the mentoring construct, thus creating a better measure. An examination of the most prototypical acts of mentoring enlarges our understanding of the construct of mentoring and adds to our understanding regarding the roles of mentors and the functions of mentoring.

For the purposes of this study the procedure consisted of three phases of data collection: the act nomination phase, the prototypicality rating phase, and the validation phase. This section describes each phase as it relates to the present study.

Phase I: Act Nomination

Respondents were asked to identify behaviors that exemplify mentoring. Once the responses were received, the act nominations were compiled. Nominations that were overlapping, acts that were redundant, non-act statements such as adjectives, general tendency statements, and statements considered too vague to constitute an observable act were discarded following Buss and Craik (1980, 1981, 1983a). The aim of this phase was to secure a comprehensive list of acts for the behavior of mentoring.

Phase II: Prototypicality Ratings

Phase II involved determining how representative each act is of mentoring. This was accomplished by sending the full list of acts to respondents. Each of the subjects received a questionnaire asking them to rate each act's prototypicality on a 7-point Likert scale. A score of 7 indicated that the act was a very good example of mentoring whereas a score of 1 indicated that the act was a poor example (Dyke, 1990; Buss and Craik, 1980, 1981, 1983a).

Respondents were given the following explanation to differentiate between prototypicality and frequency taken from Buss and Craik (1980):

The purpose of this study is to find out what prototypical acts people have in mind when they talk about mentoring. What I mean by prototypical can be best explained with an example.

Take the word red for example. Close your eyes and imagine a true red. Now imagine an orangish red or a purple red. Although you might still name the orange-red or the purple-red with the term red, they are not as good examples of red as the clear *true* red. In short some reds are *redder* than others.

The acts were then ranked. The ranking was based upon the mean prototypicality score that each act received. The purpose of this ranking was to establish a list of the top mentoring behaviors following Buss and Craik (1981).

Phase III: Validation of the measure

There were two objectives of this phase. The primary objective of this phase was to demonstrate convergent validity by correlating the new scale that was developed with outcomes of mentoring. The second objective was to explore the dimensionality of the mentoring construct.

Once acts that did not receive high prototypicality ratings in phase II of the study were dropped, the remaining acts were used to formulate the Phase III questionnaire. These questionnaires contained a list of mentoring behaviors that were identified as critical in phase II. Respondents were asked whether their mentor or mentors had demonstrated each of the behaviors. Demographic questions were included to enable a discussion of the results based on

gender. In addition, measures of mentoring outcomes were included in the questionnaire in order to establish a link between mentoring and outcomes.

4.2 A Comparison of the Act Frequency Approach and Traditional Methods

Block (1989) claims that the act frequency approach does not have anything new to offer to the area of scale development. In order to point out the benefits of the act frequency approach Dyke (1990) compared the act frequency approach to traditional methods by reviewing the five steps in the measurement construction process. The five steps in the measurement construction process are:

- generating items,
- editing the pool of items,
- judging the adequacy of items as measures of the construct,
- summing items to improve reliability and validity, and
- a sequential revision process.

Block (1989) claims that the generation of items in the act frequency approach is equivalent to the traditional process of item generation. Dyke (1990) contends that they are not equivalent because traditional methods for scale construction offer the researcher little guidance when creating items. The act frequency approach, through the adoption of an empirical process for the creation of measurement items, makes an important contribution to measurement development.

The second step in scale construction is editing the pool of items. In both methods, redundancies are edited. The traditional method researcher edits out redundancies during

selection, while the act frequency approach researcher edits redundancies after generating a large number of items. Dyke (1990) claims that the act frequency approach to item generation and editing is likely to result in a more thorough sampling of the domain than editing items out in the initial selection process.

The third step in scale construction is judging the adequacy of the items as measures of the construct. Block (1989) claims that the traditional evaluation and act frequency approach evaluation are equivalent. Dyke (1990) observes that respondents to traditional scale development tests reflect on only their own behavior, which introduces random variance. Respondents in act frequency approach studies reflect on the behavior of prototypical others which reduces the noise in the data.

The fourth step of scale construction is the summing of items to improve reliability and validity. This procedure is common to both traditional methods and the act frequency approach. According to Dyke (1990) the inclusion of all one hundred acts by Buss and Craik (1980) is not necessary nor reasonable. Dyke (1990) states that summing instances of only the most prototypical behaviors is more valid and it parallels traditional psychometric practice.

The final step of scale construction is the sequential revision process which is unique to traditional methods. This step involves assessing convergent and discriminant validity. According to Dyke (1990), although this step is not part of the act frequency approach as developed by Buss and Craik (1980), act indices also need to be validated in relation to other measures and constructs. Adding this final stage to the act frequency approach removes any potential advantage held by traditional methods.

In summary, traditional scale construction methods and the act frequency approach follow these five steps: item generation, editing, judgements of item adequacy, summation of items and validation involving convergent and discriminant analysis. In the item generation phase the act frequency approach offers an advantage because of the empirical process of domain sampling. The editing phase is more likely to result in a more thorough sampling of the domain than traditional methods. Item summation is equivalent for both approaches when the act frequency approach is restricted to the most prototypical acts. Finally the advantage which traditional methods can offer disappears when act frequency indices are revised according to convergent and discriminant validity analysis.

4.3 Criticisms of the Act Frequency Approach

The act frequency approach has been scrutinized by Block (1989) and Moser (1989). According to Dyke (1990), the criticisms by Block (1989) and Moser (1989) can be divided into three categories: those only applicable to the use of the act frequency approach for personality measurement; those criticisms that are applicable to traditional scales; and criticisms that have the potential to be damaging to the validity of behavioral measures developed using the act frequency approach. As the present study is not measuring a personality trait or contributing to the development of psychometric theory, only the criticisms that have the potential to be damaging to the development of behavioral measures will be examined.

The first criticism of the act frequency approach is its label. Block (1989) claims that the title of the procedure is a misnomer because the approach does not study acts of people. Block (1989) claims that the act frequency approach measures the endorsement of act

statements instead of measuring acts using on-line behavioral observation (Dyke, 1990). In addition, Block (1989) claims that what an act is is not defined, as some of the acts that are nominated by subjects have to be eliminated as they are not act statements. According to Dyke (1990), although the above criticisms of the act frequency approach are true, they do not invalidate the use of the procedure. Instead, they suggest that the act frequency approach is not that dissimilar from traditional approaches because both approaches measure act statement endorsements rather than acts.

Block (1989) also criticized Buss and Craik (1980) for assuming that high prototypicality scores indicated high inter-rater agreement. In examining the data of Buss and Craik (1980), Block (1989) found little evidence of agreement among judges. Both Dyke (1990) and Rosch and Mervis (1975) state that when demonstrating the reliability of internal structures, high reliability in the ratings of each individual judge is not a necessary condition for category coherence. Dyke (1990) states that reliability can be enhanced by using mean ratings, and she provides evidence that mean prototypicality ratings are a reliable indication of category structure.

The third criticism relates to the lack of face validity of many of the act statements. Block (1989) objects to the inclusion of acts that have low prototypicality, because these acts are by definition a poor fit or are not members of the category at all. Although Buss and Craik (1980) used scales composed of all 100 acts that were nominated, conceptually only acts that demonstrate high prototypicality should be included in the measure. To contribute to face validity in this study, only acts that received high prototypicality scores from the judges were

included in the final measure.

Block (1989) also questions how useful indices composed of prototypical acts are in making valid measures. He contends that act statements that are too specific and require multiple conditions to be met are technically useless. This issue is especially problematic when respondents are asked to rate the number of times that they exhibited a specific behavior over a specified period of time. In the current study, each act was constructed as simply as possible in order to limit the number of conditions in each act.

The final criticism of the act frequency approach are the ambitious claims made with regards to the approach (Dyke, 1990, Block, 1989). Buss and Craik (1983c) claim that act indices imply a true zero point and therefore provide ratio measurement. Both Block (1989) and Dyke (1990) find that a true zero point would require the measurement of the entire universe. The second claim by Buss and Craik (1983c) is that the act frequency approach as a measure is not subject to normal validation. Dyke (1990) argued that this claim is arrogant and recommends applying measurement validation procedures to act frequency measures.

4.4 Sample

The sample was drawn from students registered in the Professional Development Programs at Carleton University and their coworkers. Students from the Professional Development Programs, including the Management Development Program for Women, were chosen for this study because they have significant work experience. These students are typically in lower level management positions therefore they should be familiar with the behavior of mentoring. Moreover as employees in lower level management positions who are engaged in

educational upgrading, they are generally thought to be concerned with career advancement.

4.5 Measures

The measures that were used for the third, validation stage of this study are outlined in this section. Several studies have been conducted regarding mentoring outcomes and their measurement. In their studies of formal and informal mentoring and mentoring functions, Chao (1997) and Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992), emphasized three outcomes of mentoring: increased organizational socialization, job satisfaction and salary. In their study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional and technical positions, Dreher and Ash (1990) analyzed four outcome variables: the number of promotions, the level of income, the level of pay satisfaction and the level of benefit satisfaction. Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher (1991) examined the relationship of mentoring to the number of promotions and the level of total current compensation received. In all cases, these outcomes were found to be positively related to mentoring.

There are several similarities among the above studies that should be noted. First, each study allowed respondents to use retrospective accounts of their experiences with mentors in order to reply to questions on the survey. Second, each of the studies accounted for the possibility of respondents having more than one mentor during their careers and asked respondents to draw upon their current or most recent mentoring experience for the purpose of the study. Finally, the samples used for these studies were alumni who had graduated from universities. This implies that respondents do not have to be part of a mentoring program to take part in this type of study.

For the purposes of this study the following outcome measures were analyzed:

- number of promotions,
- salary progression,
- job satisfaction, and
- organizational socialization.

These outcome measures were used because this study focused on cumulative mentoring over the course of a career. The outcome measures chosen are cumulative outcomes that are built over the course of a career.

In other research, the number of promotions has been defined to include multiple indications of status change such as an increase in salary, and significant increases in job responsibility and scope (Whitley, Dougherty and Dreher, 1991; Dreher and Ash, 1990). For the purposes of this study, the number of promotions was measured using the same criteria. Salary progression was defined as the percentage increase in salary plus bonuses and commissions from the start of respondents' careers to the present. Job satisfaction has been defined as the degree to which employees have a positive, affective orientation towards employment by the organization (Higgins, Duxbury and Lee, 1992). The measurement used was a 6 item scale developed by Seashore et al. (1982). This 6 item measure uses a 7-point Likert scale and measures satisfaction with intrinsic rewards and extrinsic rewards. The six items focussed on the job satisfaction that respondents had regarding: the chance to learn new things, the chance to accomplish something worthwhile, the chance to do something that made them feel good about themselves, their pay, their fringe benefits, and their job security.

Organizational socialization has been defined by Chao et al., (1994) as a dimension with six factors regarding the degree of comfort and familiarity with the organization's: history, language, politics, people, organizational goals and values, and performance proficiency. Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992) and Chao (1997) used a 34-item questionnaire as their measurement tool. In their study, Chao et al.(1994) examined the reliability of each socialization dimension. The internal reliability of each dimension was as follows:

- performance proficiency $\alpha = .80$,
- people $\alpha = .84$,
- organization goals and values $\alpha = .83$,
- politics $\alpha = .80$,
- history $\alpha = .84$, and
- language $\alpha = .85$.

The Chao et al. (1994) socialization scale is composed of 6 subscales: history, language, politics, people, organizational goals and values, performance proficiency. The language scale was not included in this study for several reasons. First, there was a concern that some of the items found in this category may have low endorsement rates. For example "I have not mastered the specialized terminology and vocabulary of my trade/profession". Second, this scale was found to be highly correlated with the other scales in Chao et al. (1994). The average correlation of this scale with the other scales developed by Chao et al. (1994) was .49. Finally, by eliminating this scale, it helped to reduce the response burden for respondents.

4.6 Control variables

The choice of each control variable is explained below. For this study, there were six control variables: organizational level, age, duration of any career interruptions, education, the number of mentors who were supervisors, and the average length of the mentoring relationship. Organizational level was included, because the rate of promotion slows down as an individual reaches senior levels of the hierarchy and there are fewer openings. Age was considered important because the rate of promotion slows down as an employee gets older and more established in his or her career (Veiga, 1981). Duration of career interruptions was examined because it can have a detrimental affect on career outcomes (Lyness and Thompson, 1997). Education was included because it may be related to compensation and promotion rates (Ragins and Cotton, 1998). Chao, Walz and Gardner (1992) and Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher (1991) found that both the number of mentors who were supervisors and the average length of the mentoring relationships were related to mentor roles and outcomes and thus these have also been added as control variables.

These variables were examined in the analysis because they may affect the relationship between mentoring and its outcomes. Tests were conducted to determine whether the control variables were related to outcomes, and where necessary, variables were controlled for by creating residualized outcome variables.

5 The Four Phases of the Study

The purpose, the procedures, the analysis and the results for each of the four phases of this study:

- Phase I - Act nomination,
- Phase II - Prototypicality rating,
- Phase III - Measures validation, and
- Phase IV - Exploratory classification

are outlined in this section. Each phase is discussed with separately.

5.1 Phase I - Act Nomination

The purpose, procedures, analysis and results obtained for the act nomination phase of this study are outlined in this section.

5.1.1 Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of phase I was to generate a comprehensive list of acts of mentoring from people who had experience with mentoring. Instructors in professional development courses were initially contacted by e-mail. The purpose of this initial contact was to introduce the researcher and to inform instructors of the purpose of the research. The researcher then contacted the instructors to personally obtain permission to administer questionnaires during class. Once permission was granted, a mutually convenient time was established for questionnaires to be administered.

Primary data for this phase were collected using a four page questionnaire package (Appendix A). The questionnaire package consisted of an informed consent form and the

actual questionnaire. The purpose of the informed consent form was to ensure that respondents understood the purpose of the study, the nature of their involvement, and to ensure that respondents had enough information to determine whether they wanted to participate in this study. The informed consent form was also used by respondents to request the results for this study. The actual questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section asked respondents to think of some mentors they have known and to describe five acts or behaviours that the mentors did that illustrate mentoring. The second section was designed to obtain demographic data to describe the sample. Demographic questions included age, gender, years of work experience, job category and job function.

The class was introduced to the researcher by the instructor and then the class was given a brief explanation of this phase of the study. The questionnaires were then distributed by the researcher, and students were given an opportunity to fill out the questionnaire in class. Once the questionnaire was completed, the respondents handed the questionnaire back to the researcher. Students who were interested in participating in the study but were not willing to fill out the questionnaire in class were given the option of returning their questionnaire by fax.

5.1.2 Phase I Analysis

Phase I employed qualitative analysis to edit the act nominations. The purpose was to remove statements that were redundant, ambiguous and non-act statements. Since judgement was required, the analysis was conducted by two researchers who worked toward consensus.

5.1.3 Phase I Respondents

Seventy-two questionnaires were handed out to students. Forty-nine questionnaires

were received which was a response rate of 68%. Twenty percent of respondents were male, 73% of respondents were female, 7% respondents did not complete the personal information section. To determine whether the small sample reflected differential response rates for men and women or their different representation in the sampling frame, the proportions of men and women in the sample were compared to those for the sampling frame. A total of 85 students were registered in the professional development program. Since one of the larger professional development programs run in the institution is a Management Development Program for Women (MDPW), women were overrepresented in the sampling frame; there were 25% men and 75% women. It was found using a two-tailed probability that the proportion of male and female respondents in the sample was not significantly different from the proportion of males and females in the sampling frame. This implies that the current sample reflects the sampling frame with respect to gender.

The average age of respondents was 40 years and the standard deviation was 8.82. The average number of years of work experience for respondents was 17 years and the standard deviation was 8.60. With regards to job category, 8% of respondents were in senior management or executive level positions, 29% of respondents were in middle management or project manager positions, 14% of respondents were in first level manager or supervisor positions, 27% of respondents were in professional or technical positions, 12% of respondents indicated "other non-managerial" job categories. Four percent of respondents had indicated that they were in more than one category.

With regards to job function, 10% of respondents were in the area of marketing or

sales, 10% of respondents were in the area of human resources management, 12% of respondents were in the area of research and development or engineering, 8% of respondents were in the area of accounting or finance, 8% of respondents were in the area of administration, 2% were in the area of operations, 14% of respondents indicated that they were in more than one category, and 29% of respondents were in the category “other”. The category “other” was composed of fundraising, administration, production, management consulting, information management, program delivery, operations, training, program management, trade union, alternate service delivery, public relations, political analyst, construction, and social services.

5.1.4 Phase I Results

The respondents and the results obtained after analysing the data from phase I, the act nomination phase are outlined in this section. Phase I of the study involved the compilation of mentoring acts and behaviors. Once questionnaires were received, a list of acts was compiled. Two hundred and eighty-five items were nominated by respondents as acts or behaviors that exemplified mentoring. The nominated acts were reviewed and edited by two raters. This was an iterative process of three rounds. In the first round, like items were grouped together into eleven categories based on key words. The categories were: coach, friend, communicator, advocate, counselor, challenges, advisor, role model, broker, referral agent, and other characteristics. Each category had subcategories. For example the category of coach consisted of the subcategories of feedback, motivation, encouragement, guidance, teach, learn, explain, coaching, suggest, and other. In the second round, items in each category were edited to eliminate redundant statements and to eliminate ambiguous statements. For example the

statements “provided me with feedback on a continual basis” and “constant/regular feedback- having regularly scheduled meetings to obtain feedback on how you are proceeding in your job.” were combined to form the statement “provided regular feedback”. Items were also edited between categories to ensure that there was no overlap between items. In the final round, the items were edited from the past tense to the present tense. For example, the statement “my mentor helped increase my profile within the organization” was edited to the statement “your mentor helps increase your profile within the organization”. Once this process was completed there was a list of 99 unique acts.

The 99 nominated acts can be found in Table 1 (in Section 5.2.4). In general, the acts mirror many concepts common to the mentoring literature (e.g. providing feedback and support, assisting in career development, etc.). They are also very positive in orientation. Only three negative items were nominated: “exercises power over you”, “is not interested in what is best for you”, and “is condescending”.

5.2 Phase II - Prototypicality Ratings

The purpose, the procedures, the analysis and the results obtained for the prototypicality ratings of this study are outlined in this section.

5.2.1 Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of phase II was to establish the membership gradients discussed in the methodology chapter. The first step involved the development of the phase II questionnaire instrument that incorporated mentoring acts and behaviors identified in the phase I questionnaire. Primary data for this phase were collected using an eight page questionnaire

package (Appendix B). The questionnaire package consisted of an informed consent form and the actual questionnaire. The informed consent form also was used by respondents to request the results for this study. The actual questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section was designed to determine how prototypical behaviors were of mentoring. The second section was designed to obtain demographic data to describe the sample. Demographic questions included age, gender, years of work experience, job category and job function.

The 99 acts from phase I were used in the phase II questionnaire. In this questionnaire, respondents were asked to judge how prototypical each behaviour is of the category of mentoring where “1” meant that the act fits very poorly with respondents’ idea of mentoring and “7” indicated that the act is a very good example of the idea of mentoring.

Section one of the questionnaire initially consisted of 101 acts due to a word processing error. There were two statements that were repeated in the list of acts: “serves as a sounding board to test ideas” and “is non judgmental”. Twenty-five questionnaires had been administered to respondents before the first error was detected. It was after all the questionnaires had been administered that it was detected that a second statement was twice repeated in the questionnaire. The corrections for these errors will be dealt with in the analysis section.

Questionnaires were distributed in professional development classes. Students were given an opportunity to fill out the questionnaire during class time. Once completed the questionnaire was handed back to the researcher. Students who were interested in participating in the study but were not willing to fill out the questionnaire in class were given the

option of returning their questionnaire by fax.

5.2.2 Phase II Analysis

The focus of the analysis in phase II was to use mean prototypicality scores to determine what the core items of mentoring are and then to test for differences between means by gender. In defining “core” items, Buss and Craik (1981) have traditionally taken the top quartile of acts as ranked by prototypicality scores. However, this practice may result in the exclusion of items with almost identical means to those in the top twenty-five. In this study, means and standard deviations of the acts were examined to determine if there was a natural breakpoint in the means that occurred near the top quartile. In other words, judgement was applied with regards to the inclusion of the acts. Gender analysis was not conducted because, as noted below, there were too few male respondents to conduct a comparison based on gender.

5.2.3 Respondents

Sixty-seven questionnaires were distributed to students. The sample consisted of thirty-nine students therefore the response rate was 58%. Fifteen percent of respondents were male, 85% of respondents were female.

To determine whether the small number of men in the sample reflected differential response rates for men and women or their different representation in the sampling frame, the proportions of men and women in the sample were compared to those for the sampling frame. A total of 86 students were registered in the professional development programs. Since one of the larger professional development programs run in this institution is a Management

Development Program for Women, women were over-represented in the sampling frame.

There were 25% men and 75% women in the classes studied. It was found using two-tailed probability that the proportion of male and female respondents in the sample was not significantly different from the proportion of males and females in the sampling frame. This implies that the sample for this phase reflected the sampling frame with respect to gender.

The average age of respondents was 42 years and the standard deviation was 8.17.

The average number of years of work experience for respondents was 20 years and the standard deviation was 7.64. With regards to job category, 10% of respondents were in senior management or executive level positions, 31% of respondents were in middle management or project manager positions, 21% of respondents were in first level manager or supervisor positions, 23% of respondents were in professional or technical positions, and 15% of respondents indicated "other non-managerial" job categories.

In terms of job function, 5% of respondents were in the area of marketing or sales, 3% of respondents were in the area of manufacturing, 21% of respondents were in the area of human resources management, 10% of respondents were in the area of research and development or engineering, 8% of respondents were in the area of accounting or finance, 13% of respondents were in the area of administration, 2% were in the area of operations, 10% of respondents indicated that they were in more than one category, and 31% of respondents were in the category "other". The category "other" consisted of administration, communications, management and professional consulting, production, planning and reporting, information and knowledge management, policy analysis, project management, public relations and fundraising.

5.2.4 Phase II Results

The respondents and the results obtained after analysing the prototypicality ratings from phase II are outlined in this section. The means and the standard deviations of the prototypicality scores were calculated for all 99 act statements (see Table 1). To correct the word processing error that had led to the inclusion of 2 items twice, the two sets of scores for each statement were averaged and the means and the standard deviations were calculated. The means and standard deviations were used as selection criteria to establish the top acts. While Buss and Craik (1980) recommended including the top 25 acts, the choice of the top 25 acts is arbitrary. In this study, judgement was applied to determine a suitable cutoff. The top 36 acts were chosen. The top 36 acts can be identified by an asterisk, before each item in Table 1. The mean cutoff score was 5.79. The selection of the top 36 acts was based on the judgement of the researcher. The gap between the means of the 36th and 37th items was 0.07 which was the second largest gap in the data. The largest gap in the data below the top 10 acts is at item 60. The difference between item 59 and item 60 was 0.08. However, 59 items was considered too many to include in the questionnaire because it would increase the response burden.

Table 1
99 Unique Acts of Mentoring
n=39

*1. provides constructive feedback	6.69	0.57
*2. always deals with you honestly	6.54	0.76
*3. maintains confidentiality	6.49	1.07
*4. coaches you to develop your job skills	6.44	0.79
*5. models positive ethics and values	6.36	0.84
*6. provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance	6.36	0.87
*7. shares the knowledge that they possess	6.26	0.94
*8. provides advice but lets you make the decision	6.23	0.81
*9. provides regular feedback	6.21	0.77
*10. inspires you to excel	6.15	0.99
*11. develops a relationship of trust with you	6.15	0.99
*12. shares their organization knowledge	6.15	0.84
*13. models personal and professional growth	6.15	0.99
*14. takes time to discuss issues with you	6.13	0.73
*15. encourages new ideas	6.10	0.72
*16. suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem	6.08	0.66
*17. makes him/herself available to you	6.05	0.83
*18. listens to you carefully	6.00	0.92
*19. provides advice on work situations	6.00	1.10
*20. provides encouragement	5.95	1.05
*21. helps you enhance your career goals	5.92	1.40
*22. questions you to help you to see things from another perspective	5.92	1.19

*23. serves as a sounding board to test ideas	5.92	1.41
*24. helps you understand the organization's vision	5.90	1.07
*25. shares their work experience	5.90	0.97
*26. provides support	5.90	0.94
*27. shows you respect	5.87	1.08
*28. acknowledges your accomplishments	5.85	1.09
*29. supports you through failures	5.82	1.00
*30. pushes you to strive for higher goals	5.82	1.07
*31. encourages you to take initiative	5.82	0.94
*32. discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations	5.82	0.94
*33. suggests areas for further training and development	5.79	0.92
*34. steers you to opportunities to expand your experience	5.79	0.89
*35. demonstrates interest in your career development	5.79	0.86
*36. clearly explains their expectations	5.79	1.26
37. demonstrates interest in your work	5.72	0.94
38. helps you put things into perspective	5.72	1.02
39. expects the best from you	5.72	1.21
40. connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific tasks	5.72	1.10
41. encourages you to empower yourself	5.69	1.22
42. helps you to visualize a goal	5.66	1.21
43. is open to other views	5.63	1.24
44. helps you expand your network	5.62	1.39
45. demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behaviour	5.62	0.99

46. praises your successes	5.59	1.19
47. is non judgmental	5.57	1.37
48. helps you identify career opportunities	5.56	1.43
49. encourages you to take risks	5.54	0.94
50. helps you to gain more responsibility	5.51	1.19
51. exposes you to training opportunities	5.51	1.05
52. shows you the ropes	5.51	1.19
53. builds your confidence	5.49	1.05
54. helps you to gain more autonomy	5.49	1.14
55. shares their own experiences	5.46	1.07
56. helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills	5.46	1.27
57. demonstrates patience	5.46	1.19
58. explains issues in detail	5.46	1.47
59. provides advice on career goals	5.44	1.41
60. solicits your input	5.36	1.80
61. allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing	5.33	1.58
62. assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization	5.31	1.34
63. encourages you to present your work to others	5.28	1.07
64. promotes your abilities within the organization	5.26	1.43
65. shares their opinions with you	5.21	1.28
66. communicates their enthusiasm	5.13	1.04
67. is loyal to you	5.13	1.52
68. introduces you to influential others	5.03	1.25
69. helps you maintain a positive attitude	5.03	1.44

70. stays in touch with you on a regular basis	5.00	1.26
71. helps remove barriers to your career development	5.00	1.28
72. helps you to feel comfortable	4.97	1.25
73. encourages you to apply for new positions	4.95	1.62
74. communicates management priorities to you	4.90	1.59
75. encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings	4.87	1.38
76. connects you with contacts who can help with your career	4.85	1.37
77. helps increase your profile within the organization	4.82	1.47
78. learns and grows when working together with you	4.82	1.43
79. seeks your input on decisions	4.79	1.56
80. champions your activities within the organization	4.79	1.71
81. assists in decision making	4.74	1.29
82. suggests solutions to a particular situation	4.72	1.79
83. recommends you to others	4.63	1.67
84. teaches you how to stand up for what you believe	4.59	1.43
85. makes a long term commitment to you	4.54	1.62
86. represents your career interests and aspirations to management	4.49	1.79
87. helps you deal with disappointments	4.46	1.47
88. is always there when you need them	4.44	1.29
89. initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings	4.36	1.80
90. understands you as a person	4.26	1.48
91. does not criticize you	4.13	2.10
92. empathizes with you	4.03	1.50
93. volunteers their views on the politics of the organization	3.82	1.60

94. takes time to discuss work in a relaxed social context	3.77	1.74
95. is a friend	3.36	1.40
96. shares experiences of their personal life	2.95	1.70
97. exercises power over you	1.72	1.00
98. is not interested in what is best for you	1.62	1.11
99. is condescending	1.21	0.81

* Denotes that the item is one of the top 36 acts.

An examination of the prototypicality scores indicates that the behaviors typical of mentoring are all very positive in orientation — the three negative items received the lowest prototypicality scores. Looking at the top 36 items suggests that some of the behaviors most typical of mentoring relate to coaching or teaching, serving as a role model, and providing support. The overlap between the act frequency items and mentoring roles previously identified in the literature is further explored in the subsidiary analysis reported below.

5.2.5 Subsidiary Analysis

In order to compare the items generated by the act frequency approach to the roles identified in previous research on mentoring, an additional questionnaire was required. This section discusses the purpose, the procedures, the analysis and the results obtained for the subsidiary analysis of this study.

5.2.5.1 Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of the subsidiary analysis was to compare the behaviors identified in this study with the roles established by previous researchers. The first step involved the

development of a questionnaire instrument that incorporated mentoring acts and behaviors identified in phase I.

Primary data for the subsidiary analysis was collected using four versions of a nine page questionnaire package (Appendices C to F). The questionnaire package consisted of a definition sheet, an informed consent form, and the actual questionnaire. There were four versions of the questionnaire and corresponding definition sheets: version K, version L, version B, and version LS. The four versions corresponded with four researchers roles: Kram (1983 and 1985a), Levinson et al. (1978), Burke (1984), and Leibowitz and Schlosberg (1981). In the first section of the questionnaire respondents were asked to place each statement about mentoring behavior into one of the roles defined by the researcher for that questionnaire. Ninety-nine acts from phase I were used in the subsidiary analysis questionnaire. The second section was designed to obtain demographic data to describe the sample. Demographic questions included age, gender, years of work experience, job category and job function. Consent forms and questionnaires were distributed to Management Development Program for Women students. Students were given an opportunity to fill out the questionnaire during class time.

5.2.5.2 Analysis

The purpose of the analysis was to establish the overlap between the act frequency items and previously identified mentor roles. The subsidiary analysis employed a mixture of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The number of respondents who placed each item under each role was first tallied. An item was assigned to a particular role when the largest number of respondents placed it in that category. For example, the act frequency item “ encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings” was assigned to Kram’s (1985) exposure role because 6 out 7 respondents placed it in that category. Where the number of respondents placing an item into 2 or more categories was tied, the tie was broken by the researcher’s judgement. The researcher placed the item into the category that the was the most appropriate.

5.2.5.3 Subsidiary Analysis Respondents

Twenty-six questionnaires were handed out to students. Twenty-five questionnaires were received which was a response rate of 96%. Six respondents completed version L, 6 respondents completed version B, 6 respondents completed version L and 7 respondents completed version K. All twenty-five respondents were female, but three respondents did not complete the personal information section. The average age of respondents was 44 years and the standard deviation was 5.03. The average number of years of work experience for respondents was 22 years and the standard deviation was 6.91. With regards to job category 23% of respondents were in the senior management or executive category, 23% of respondents were in middle management or project manager positions, 23% of respondents were in first level manager or supervisor positions, 13% of respondents were in professional or technical

positions, and 18% of respondents indicated “other non-managerial” positions.

With regards to job function, 5% of respondents were in the area of marketing or sales, 9% of respondents were in the area of human resources management, 5% of respondents were in the area of research and development or engineering, 9% of respondents were in the area of accounting and finance, 5% of respondents indicated that they were in more than one category, and 68% of respondents were in the category “other”. The category “other” was composed of public relations, non-profit, information technology, competency testing for professionals, nursing/counseling, service delivery, policy analyst, foreign service, retail, records management, and administration.

5.2.5.4 Subsidiary Analysis Results

The results obtained after analysing the data from the subsidiary analysis are outlined in this section. The complete results for this phase can be found in Appendix G. Tables 2.1 to 2.4 are a summary of the complete results found in Appendix G.

Table 2.1
Act Frequency Items compared to Kram's Roles
n=25

Sponsorship	4	0
Exposure	9	1
Coaching	19	11
Protection	0	0
Role modelling	9	3
Providing challenging assignments	4	1
Acceptance and confirmation	10	5
Counseling	16	7
Friendship	5	0
Acts not included in this framework	23	8

* Items in the top 36.

Table 2.2
Act Frequency Items compared to Levinson et al.'s Roles
n=25

Teacher	21	11
Sponsor	27	5
Host and Guide	8	3
Exemplar	7	3
Counselor	22	10
Acts not included in this framework	13	3

* Items in the top 36.

Table 2.3
Act Frequency Items compared to Burke's Roles
n=25

Role model	16	8
Build self-confidence	12	4
Go to bat for protégé	10	0
Teacher/Coach/Trainer	32	19
Use job assignments to develop protégé	7	1
Acts not included in this framework	22	4

* Items in the top 36.

Table 2.4
Act Frequency Items compared to Leibowitz and Schlosberg's Roles
n=25

Communicator	7	3
Counselor	6	1
Coach	6	1
Advisor	1	0
Broker	1	0
Referral Agent	1	0
Advocate	6	0
Mentor	39	15
Appraiser	6	5
Acts not included in this framework	26	10

* Items in the top 36.

A review of Tables 2.1 through 2.4 show that many of the act frequency items were not included in the typologies developed by previous researchers. On average across the four researchers, there were 21 act frequency items that had not been identified in the previous typologies and 6 core act frequency items (from the top 36) that had not been included in the previous typologies. The typology that is most inclusive of the items nominated by lay people is the earliest one: Levinson et al's (1978) typology.

The roles identified previously in the literature that reflected the largest numbers of core act frequency items were Kram's coaching and counseling roles; Levinson et al's teacher and

counselor roles; Burke's role model and teacher/coach/trainer roles; and Leibowitz and Schlossberg's mentor role. A number of the items that were not included in previous typologies relate to the mentor demonstrating integrity, understanding and empathy for the protégé (see Appendix G for more details). This suggests that lay people's understanding of mentoring are broader than those of previous research.

5.3 Phase III Measure Validation

The purpose, the procedures, the analysis and the results obtained for the measure validation phase of this study are outlined in this section.

5.3.1 Phase III Purpose and Procedures

The purposes of the measure validation phase were: to further establish the roles that are important to the mentoring construct by determining which roles relate to mentor effectiveness; to develop a new scale of mentoring; and to validate the scale by testing to determine if the new instrument relates to existing theory. The phase III questionnaire instrument incorporated the top 36 mentoring acts and behaviors from the phase II questionnaire. This section outlines the procedures followed and the analysis performed in the measure validation phase.

Primary data for this phase were collected using a nine page questionnaire package (Appendix H). The questionnaire package consisted of an informed consent form and the actual questionnaire. The informed consent form was also used by respondents to request the results for this study. The actual questionnaire consisted of four sections.

Section A of the questionnaire asked respondents questions regarding their job

category, functional area, their supervisory role if applicable, the number of years of full-time work experience they had, and whether or not respondents had taken a leave of absence.

Section B asked respondents questions regarding the number of mentors that they had over the course of their career, whether or not these mentors were also their supervisors, and the average length of the mentoring relationships. Respondents were also asked to rate the extent to which their mentors demonstrated the 36 prototypical acts from phase II and to rate the overall effectiveness of their mentor. Section C asked respondents about their level of job satisfaction, the number of promotions that they had had to date, their current salary and their salary when they first started full time work. This section also asked respondents to rate their experience in their organization using the organizational socialization scales described below. Section D asked respondents demographic questions regarding age, gender, and the highest level of education completed.

Questionnaires were distributed in university professional development classes. Students were given an opportunity to fill out the questionnaire during class time. Once completed the questionnaire was handed back to the researcher. Students who were interested in participating in the study but were not willing to fill out the questionnaire in class were given the option of returning their questionnaire by fax. Students were also asked to take two additional questionnaires in envelopes to their workplace to give to their coworkers to fill out and to mail back to the researcher.

5.3.1.1 Measures

The internal reliability of each scale, except salary progression and promotion, was determined to ensure that the scale was consistent and complete. The internal reliabilities of each outcome scale for this study can be found in Table 3 below:

Table 3
Reliabilities for Outcome Measures
n=67

Organization socialization Politics scale	0.68
Organization socialization People scale	0.67
Organization socialization History scale	0.76
Organization socialization Organization Goals&Values scale	0.81
Organization Socialization Performance Proficiency scale	0.59
Job Satisfaction scale	0.85

The job satisfaction scale and the organization socialization - organization goals and values scale were above the .08 alpha level prescribed by Nunnally (1978), however the other four organization socialization scales were below that level. The lower alpha levels in the scales used in this study would suggest that the organization socialization scales are not as reliable in measuring the socialization of an individual into an organization as anticipated. This unreliability may attenuate any correlation between mentoring and these outcomes.

5.3.2 Phase III Analysis

There were two objectives of the analysis in phase III. The first objective was to further establish the roles that are important to the mentoring construct by testing to determine which items discriminate between effective and ineffective mentors in order to establish the roles that are important to the mentoring construct. The second objective was to develop a new scale of mentoring, only those items related to mentor effectiveness were included in the mentoring scale. In addition, an attempt was made to validate the scale by assessing convergent validity. Convergent validity was assessed in this phase by using known mentoring outcome measures and correlating them with the new measures of mentoring developed in this study.

5.3.3 Phase III Respondents

For this phase, a total of 135 questionnaires were distributed to students. Forty-five questionnaires were administered to students and ninety questionnaires were given to the students to give to their coworkers. The sample of respondents consisted of sixty-seven people therefore the response rate was 50%. Twenty-five percent of the respondents were male, 69% of respondents were female, 6% of respondents did not indicate their gender. Tests for differences were not conducted because there were not sufficient male respondents to conduct a comparison based on gender. The percentage of men and women in the final sample compared to the sampling frame could not be tested, because it was not possible to distinguish between respondents who were in professional development classes and respondents who were not in professional development classes and for whom the gender distribution in the

sampling frame was unknown.

The average age of respondents was forty years and the standard deviation was 9.42. The average number of years of work experience for respondents was seventeen years and the standard deviation was 8.97. With regards to job category, 3% of respondents were in senior management or executive level positions, 22% of respondents were in middle management or project manager positions, 28% of respondents were in first level manager or supervisor positions, 36% of respondents were in professional or technical positions, and 11% of respondents indicated "other non-managerial category".

Nine percent of respondents were in the area of marketing or sales, 10% of respondents were in the area of human resources management, 9% of respondents were in the area of research and development or engineering, 10% of respondents were in the area of accounting or finance, 10% of respondents were in the area of administration, 6% of respondents had indicated that they were in more than one category, and 45% of respondents indicated "other". The category "other" consisted of communications, administration, health care, operations, information technology, production, strategic planning, customer service, management, public relations, training, policy analysis, and insurance.

In terms of education, 6% of respondents completed high school, 24% completed some college, 16% had a college diploma, 36% had a university degree, 12% had a post graduate degree, and 6% did not indicate their highest level of education completed.

Forty eight percent of respondents indicated that did not supervise other employees, 52% indicated that they did supervise other employees. With regards to leaves of absence,

55% of respondents indicated that they did not take a leave of absence, 45% of respondents indicated that they did take a leave of absence. The average length of absence was 30 months.

In terms of experience with mentors, 67% of respondents indicated that they had been mentored. The average length of the mentoring relationship was 2 years, the average number of mentors was 2 mentors, and the average number of mentors who were supervisors was 1 mentor.

5.3.4 Phase III Results

This section outlines the results obtained after analysing the data from phase III. This section is broken down into item correlations with mentor effectiveness, the assessment of the new scale of mentoring, and the validation of the new mentoring scale.

5.3.4.1 Item Correlation with Mentor Effectiveness

The first step in the analysis was to correlate each of the 36 statements with the overall mentor effectiveness item to establish the roles that are important to the mentoring construct. Testing was conducted at the .05 and .01 levels of significance to further distinguish between roles that were found to be important. Items with significant correlations were kept. Correction for experiment wise error was not be conducted because this test was deemed too stringent for such exploratory work. The purpose of this step was to be liberal and to capture the greatest amount of variety, with regards to the items. Thirty statements were correlated to mentor effectiveness at the .05 level of significance (see Table 4). The six acts that were not correlated to mentor effectiveness at the .05 level of significance were:

- discussed reasons for the way in which they deal with situations,

- provided both positive and negative feedback on your performance,
- shared their work experience,
- provided advice but let you make the decision,
- suggested areas for further training and development, and
- shared their knowledge of the organization.

Twenty three statements were correlated to mentor effectiveness at the .01 level of significance (see Table 3). The seven acts that were not correlated to mentor effectiveness at the .01 level of significance but, were correlated at the .05 level of significance were:

- clearly explained their expectations,
- coached you to develop your job skills,
- shared the knowledge that they possess,
- served as a sounding board to test ideas,
- helped you to understand the organization's vision,
- inspired you to excel, and
- modeled personal and professional growth.

Table 4
30-item and 23-item scale
n=67

1. Provides constructive feedback	X	X
2. Always deals with you honestly	X	X
3. Maintains confidentiality	X	X
4. Coaches you to develop your job skills	X	
5. Models positive ethics and values	X	X
6. Provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance		
7. Shares the knowledge that they possess	X	
8. Provides advice but lets you make the decision		
9. Provides regular feedback	X	X
10. Inspires you to excel	X	
11. Develops a relationship of trust with you	X	X
12. Shares their organization knowledge		
13. Models personal and professional growth	X	
14. Takes time to discuss issues with you	X	X
15. Encourages new ideas	X	X
16. Suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem	X	X
17. Makes him/herself available to you	X	X
18. Listens to you carefully	X	X
19. Provides advice on work situations	X	X
20. Provides encouragement	X	X
21. Helps you enhance your career goals	X	X

22. Questions you to help you to see things from another perspective	X	X
23. Serves as a sounding board to test ideas	X	
24. Helps you understand the organization's vision	X	
25. Shares their work experience		
26. Provides support	X	X
27. Shows you respect	X	X
28. Acknowledges your accomplishments	X	X
29. Supports you through failures	X	X
30. Pushes you to strive for higher goals	X	X
31. Encourages you to take initiative	X	X
32. Discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations		
33. Suggests areas for further training and development		
34. Steers you to opportunities to expand your experience	X	X
35. Demonstrates interest in your career development	X	X
36. Clearly explains their expectations	X	

The 23 items most strongly correlated with mentor effectiveness seem to cluster around a small number of functions: providing feedback, demonstrating integrity, providing support, and encouraging growth and development. The dimensionality of the mentoring construct was further explored in Phase IV.

5.3.4.2 Assessment of the New Scales of Mentoring

The next step was to create 2 scales from the significant mentoring items. The first scale consisted of the 30 items that were correlated to mentor effectiveness at the .05 level of significance. The second scale consisted of the 23 items that were correlated to mentor effectiveness at the .01 level of significance. Each scale was tested for its internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha. The internal reliability for the 30 item scale was .9776. The internal reliability for the 23 item scale was .9744. Thus there was little loss in reliability in shortening the scale; however the longer scale does provide a broader target for prediction. Thus both scales were employed in subsequent analysis.

5.3.4.3 Validation of the New Mentoring Scales

The third objective of Phase III was to validate the new mentoring scales. Convergent validity would be demonstrated if the new measures were positively correlated with outcomes found in previous research. True validation would require separate samples to be used to develop and to test the measure. In this study, the same sample was used to develop, refine and test the measure, thus this research provides a biased estimate of validity.

The outcomes examined in this research (organizational socialization, salary progression, promotion, and job satisfaction) may also be attributable to other factors such as: organizational level, age, duration of any career interruptions, education, the number of mentors who were supervisors, and the average length of the mentoring relationship which were included in this study as control variables. In order to explore this possibility, the impact of these control variables on the outcomes and the relationship between the new mentoring scales

and outcomes was examined. The analysis is reported below in 3 sections: correlations between the mentoring scales and the original outcome variables, the relationship of the outcomes to the control variables, and correlations between the mentoring scales and the outcome variables residualized for the effects of the control variables.

5.3.4.3.1 Correlations Between Mentoring and the Original Outcome Variables

The two mentoring scales were correlated with 8 outcome variables (see Table 5):

- 5 organization socialization sub scales:
 - politics,
 - people,
 - history,
 - organization goals and values, and
 - performance proficiency;
- salary progression;
- promotion; and
- job satisfaction.

The two mentoring scales were significantly correlated to only two outcome variables: organizational socialization and job satisfaction. Mentoring was correlated with organizational socialization - history, at the .05 level of significance: the correlation for the 30-item scale was .31, and the correlation for the 23-item scale was .33. The two mentoring scales were correlated to job satisfaction, at the .01 level of significance: the correlation for the 30-item scale was .46, and the correlation for the 23-item scale was .45.

Table 5
Mentoring Scales vs Outcome Variables
n=67

Organization Socialization Politics	0.18	0.20
Organization Socialization People	0.18	0.21
Organization Socialization History	0.31*	0.33*
Organization Socialization Org. Goals & Values	0.08	0.10
Organization Socialization Performance Proficiency	0.25	0.27
Salary Progression	0.04	0.05
Promotions	0.14	0.15
Job Satisfaction	0.46**	0.45**

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

5.3.4.3.2 Control variables and Outcomes

The next step was to correlate the outcome variables with the control variables to determine whether the relationship between mentoring and the outcomes was attributable to the other variables. The control variables in this study were: organization level, age, the number of

career interruptions, education, the number of mentors who were supervisors, and the length of the mentor relationship. The first step was to run correlations between the control variables and the outcome variables (see Table 6).

Table 6
Control Variables vs Outcome Variables
n=67

Org. soc. Politics	-0.31**	0.15	0.17	-0.19	0.42**	0.10
Org. soc. People	-0.12	-0.07	0.02	-0.20	0.21	0.17
Org. soc. History	-0.31*	0.17	0.28	-0.01	0.40**	0.10
Org. soc. Goals	-0.20	0.20	0.26	-0.29*	0.15	0.01
Org. soc. Perf. pro.	-0.18	-0.05	-0.08	-0.16	0.22	0.07
Salary Progression	-0.20	0.32*	0.61**	0.08	-0.11	0.08
Job Satisfaction	-0.31*	0.18	0.39*	-0.05	0.25	0.16
Promotions	-0.27*	0.29*	0.34	-0.28*	0.13	0.11

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

In general, organization level had a negative impact on the outcome variables. Age had a positive impact on the outcome variables. Career interruptions had a positive impact on the outcome variables. Education had a negative impact on the outcome variables. Mentors who were supervisors had a positive impact on the outcome variables. Relationship length did not have an impact on the outcome variables.

Where the control variables were significantly correlated with the outcome variables, regression analysis was used to create residualized outcome variables. The control variables related to each outcome variable were regressed on that outcome variable and the unexplained variance in the outcome variable was saved as a residual (see Table 7). This residualized outcome variable represents the variance in the outcome that is not attributable to the control variables and which is, therefore, potentially due to other factors such as mentoring.

Table 7
Residualized Outcome Variables

Salary Progression	Age Number of career interruptions
Job Satisfaction	Organization level Number of career interruptions
Number of promotion	Education Age Organization level
Organization socialization - politics	Number of mentors who were supervisors Organization level
Organization socialization - history	Number of mentors who were supervisors Organization level
Organization socialization - organization goals and values	Education
Organization socialization - people	None

5.3.4.3.3 Correlations Between Mentoring and the Residualized Outcome

Variables

The next step was to correlate each residualized outcome variable with the two mentor scales: the 30-item scale, and the 23-item scale. These correlations are reported in Table 8 and the correlations of the mentoring scales with the unresidualized outcomes are also included for comparison purposes. The correlations showed that not one of the residualized outcome variables was found to be significantly related to the mentor scales at the .01 or the .05 level of significance (see Table 8). This shows that the mentoring scales do not help to explain outcomes once the other important variables are controlled for. Possible explanations relate to limitations of the data set used in this study: a small sample, respondents who may be engaged in educational upgrading because previous mentoring was inadequate and a predominantly female sample who may face other career barriers.

Table 8
Outcome vs Mentor Scales
n=67

Organization Socialization Politics	0.18	0.20
Residualized Organization Socialization Politics	0.12	0.13
Organization Socialization People	0.18	0.21
Organization Socialization History	0.311*	0.334*
Residualized Organization Socialization History	0.27	0.28
Organization Socialization Org. Goals & Values	0.08	0.10
Residualized Organization Socialization Org. Goals & Values	-0.03	0.00
Organization Socialization Performance Proficiency	0.25	0.27
Salary Progression	0.04	0.05

Residualized Salary Progression	0.11	0.12
Promotions	0.14	0.15
Residualized Promotions	0.15	0.15
Job Satisfaction	0.46**	0.45**
Residualized Job Satisfaction	0.07	0.07

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

5.3.5 Phase IV - Exploratory Classification

The third objective of this research was to explore the dimensionality of the mentoring construct. Due to the small sample size in Phase III, factor analysis could not be conducted. As a general rule, ten subjects per variable is required for reliable factor analysis (Nunnally, 1978). The average enrolment in the Professional Development Programs was only one hundred and ten students per term therefore, each respondent was provided with two extra copies of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to distribute the extra questionnaires to their peers at work. This procedure did not increase the sample size enough to conduct factor analysis. Instead, items were classified using a Q-sort technique whereby respondents were asked to put the 36 items into categories that they determined, then an exploratory classification of items was conducted. This section outlines the data collection method used for this analysis and the results obtained.

Data for exploratory classification was collected using a fourth questionnaire (Appendix I). This questionnaire package consisted of an informed consent form, the actual questionnaire and thirty-six cards. Each card contained one of the 36 most prototypical acts of mentoring. Respondents were instructed to separate the cards into categories using their own criteria and return the cards bundled together in these categories. The questionnaire contained instructions for respondents and demographic questions regarding the respondent's age, gender, highest level of education completed, job category, and job function.

5.3.5.1 Respondents

Twelve questionnaires were distributed among employees of a government agency who were attending a workshop on mentoring and career development. Seven employees responded with completed questionnaires which is a response rate of 58%, however two of the seven questionnaires were incomplete. These respondents had not separated the cards into categories, therefore there were only five questionnaires that could be used in the analysis. Twenty percent of respondents were in the under 30 age category. Eighty percent of respondents were in the 40 to 49 age category. In terms of gender, 40% of respondents were male and 60% of respondents were female. Twenty percent of respondents had completed some college or university, 20% of respondents had completed a college diploma, 40% of respondents had completed a university degree, and 20% of respondents had completed a post graduate degree. In terms of job category, 40% of respondents were in the human resources category, 40% of respondents were in the administrative and foreign service category, and 20% were in the administrative support category. In terms of function, 40% of respondents

were in the managerial category, 20% of respondents were in the support staff category, 20% were in the administration category and 20% of respondents did not answer this question. Finally, the average number of years of full time work experience was 14 years.

5.3.5.2 Classification of Items

In order to combine the data, each pair of items was examined to determine how many respondents had paired them together. If four out of the five respondents had place the two items in the same subset then that pair was assigned a pairing value of 80%. Clustering began with those items whose percentage pairing was 80% or greater. Once those items were clustered, then the remaining items were added to clusters where that item's pairing score averaged across those items already in the cluster was the highest. This analysis led to the creation of nine clusters. Each cluster was named based on the characteristics of the items in the cluster. The clusters were then reviewed for face validity by two researchers and the internal reliabilities were examined (see Table 9). Since the internal reliabilities of each cluster exceeded the cutoff of .60 established by Nunnally (1978) for exploratory work, the categories were left unchanged. The nine clusters were: feedback, integrity, openness, professional growth, encouragement, knowledge, support, coach, career and goal attainment.

Table 9
New Clusters of Mentoring Items
n=7

Cluster 1: Feedback	1. Provided constructive feedback. 9. Provided regular feedback. 36. Clearly explained their expectations.	0.81
Cluster 2: Integrity	3. Maintained confidentiality. 11. Developed a relationship of trust with you. 13. Modelled personal and professional growth. 14. Took time to discuss issues with you. 27. Showed you respect. 2. Always dealt with you honestly 5. Modelled positive ethics and values.	0.91
Cluster 3: Openness	18. Listened to you carefully. 15. Encouraged new ideas.	0.83
Cluster 4: Professional growth	6. Provided both positive and negative feedback on your performance. 19. Provided advice on work situations. 34. Steered you to opportunities to expand your experience.	0.78

Cluster 5: Encouragement	20. Provided encouragement. 17. Made him/herself available to you. 31. Encouraged you to take initiative. 8. Provided advice but let you make the decision.	0.85
Cluster 6: Knowledge	22. Questioned you to help you to see things from another perspective. 12. Shared their knowledge of the organization. 16. Suggested alternative ways of looking at the problem. 24. Helped you to understand the organization's vision. 25. Shared their work experience. 33. Suggested areas for further training and development.	0.86
Cluster 7: Support	28. Acknowledged your accomplishments. 10. Inspired you to excel. 26. Provided support. 29. Supported you through failures.	0.89
Cluster 8: Coach	32. Discussed reasons for the way in which they deal with situations. 4. Coached you to develop your jobs skills. 7. Shared the knowledge that they possess.	0.77

Cluster 9: Career and goal attainment	35. Demonstrated interest in your career development. 21. Helped you enhance your career goals. 23. Served as a sounding board to test ideas. 30. Pushed you to strive for higher goals.	0.87
---------------------------------------	---	------

* The numbers in the column “items in cluster” correspond with the prototypicality ranking that the item received in phase II.

The clusters represent the roles of mentoring found in this study. These roles were named using the judgement of the research. The nine new roles are: feedback, integrity, openness, professional growth, encouragement, knowledge, support, coach, and career and goal attainment. These nine roles differ from the functions that have been developed in past research. The feedback, openness, and integrity roles are new and are very specific roles that are viewed as important to junior managers in this study.

5.3.5.3 Relationship of Clusters and Mentor Scales

The clusters were then compared to the list of 30 items and the list of 23 items that were correlated to mentor effectiveness (see Table 10).

Table 10
Cluster vs Mentor Scales

Cluster 1: Feedback	1. Provided constructive feedback	X	X
	9. Provided regular feedback.	X	X
	36. Clearly explained their expectations	X	
Cluster 2: Integrity	3. Maintained confidentiality.	X	X
	11. Developed a relationship of trust with you.	X	X
	13. Modelled personal and professional growth.	X	
	14. Took time to discuss issues with you.	X	X
	27. Showed you respect.	X	X
	2. Always dealt with you honestly	X	X
	5. Modelled positive ethics and values.	X	X
Cluster 3: Openess	18. Listened to you carefully.	X	X
	15. Encouraged new ideas.	X	X
Cluster 4: Professional growth	6. Provided both positive and negative feedback on your performance.		
	19. Provided advice on work situations.	X	X
	34. Steered you to opportunities to expand your experience.	X	X
Cluster 5: Encouragement	20. Provided encouragement.	X	X

	17. made him/herself available to you.	X	X
	31. Encouraged you to take initiative.	X	X
	8. Provided advice but let you make the decision.		
Cluster 6: Knowledge	22. Questioned you to help you to see things from another perspective.	X	X
	12. Shared their knowledge of the organization.		
	16. Suggested alternative ways of looking at the problem.	X	X
	24. Helped you to understand the organization's vision.	X	
	25. Shared their work experience.		
	33. Suggested areas for further training and development.		
Cluster 7: Support	28. Acknowledged your accomplishments.	X	X
	10. Inspired you to excel.	X	
	26. Provided support.	X	X
	29. Supported you through failures.	X	X
Cluster 8: Coach	32. Discussed reasons for the way in which they deal with situations.		
	4. Coached you to develop your jobs skills.	X	
	7. Shared the knowledge that they possess.	X	

Cluster 9: Career and goal attainment	35. Demonstrated interest in your career development.	X	X
	21. Helped you enhance your career goals.	X	X
	23. Served as a sounding board to test ideas.	X	
	30. Pushed you to strive for higher goals.	X	X

Table 10 indicates that the items that are correlated with mentor effectiveness are not equally distributed across all clusters. Cluster 2 - integrity had the most items from the list of items that are most highly related to mentor effectiveness which may suggest that this role is central to the mentoring construct. Cluster 8 - coach did not have any of the 23 items in its category.

5.3.5.4 Correlation of Clusters to Outcomes

Correlation analysis was then conducted between the nine clusters and the outcome variables (see Table 11). Organization socialization - history was found to be significantly correlated to cluster 7 - Support, cluster 8 - Coach and cluster 9 - Career goal attainment at the .05 level of significance. However when residualized organization socialization - history was examined it was found to be significantly correlated to only cluster 8 - Coach at the .05 level of significance. This would suggest that there is an impact of mentoring on organization socialization - history independent of the control variables. Finally, job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated to all nine clusters at the .01 level of significance, however when residualized job satisfaction was examined none of these correlations remained significant.

Cluster 6 - Knowledge was not correlated to organization socialization - history. This finding was surprising since the organization socialization - history scale deals with knowledge about the organization. It is composed of the following items:

- **I know very little about the history behind my work group/department;**
- **I am not familiar with the organization's customs, rituals, ceremonies, and celebrations;**
- **I know the organization's long-held traditions;**
- **I would be a good resource in describing the background of my work group/department and;**
- **I am familiar with the history of my organization.**

Cluster 6 - Knowledge also had factors related to one's knowledge of the organization:

- **shared their knowledge of the organization and;**
- **helped you to understand the organization's vision for example.**

Yet organization socialization - history was correlated to Cluster 7 - Support, Cluster 8 - Coach, and Cluster 9 - Career and goal attainment however, the above mentioned clusters were not correlated to residualized organization socialization - history. So when the control variables are accounted for, the only significant correlation between the new clusters and outcomes is the relationship between coaching and organizational socialization - history. Given the small sample size, these results should be reevaluated with a larger sample.

Table 11
Clusters vs Outcome Variables
n=67

O.S. - Politics	0.123	0.104	0.095	0.166	0.195	0.086	0.239	0.202	0.208
Resid. O.S. - Politics	0.006	0.089	0.072	0.061	0.171	0.066	0.144	0.255	0.143
O.S. - People	0.038	0.131	0.222	0.110	0.250	0.031	0.204	0.100	0.227
O.S. - History	0.277	0.241	0.176	0.289	0.252	0.195	0.349*	0.307*	0.319*
Resid. O.S. - History	0.198	0.229	0.156	0.203	0.230	0.179	0.273	0.345*	0.265
O.S. - Goals & Values	0.008	0.050	0.042	0.031	0.071	-0.030	0.206	0.054	0.059
Resid. O.S. - Goals & Values	-0.160	-0.050	-0.100	0.000	0.010	-0.128	0.072	0.111	-0.061
O.S. - Perf. Pro.	0.291	0.158	0.261	0.175	0.287	0.175	0.260	0.087	0.212
Salary Prog.	-0.067	0.066	0.203	-0.237	0.189	-0.153	0.038	-0.040	0.023
Resid. Salary Prog.	0.334	0.018	0.000	0.175	-0.010	0.092	-0.050	0.361	0.196
Promo.	0.189	0.099	0.163	0.092	0.119	0.087	0.151	0.000	0.188
Resid. Promo.	0.171	0.081	0.119	0.207	0.118	0.083	0.123	0.120	0.184
Job Sat.	0.366*	0.398**	0.410**	0.396**	0.455**	0.400**	0.429**	0.451**	0.487**
Resid. Job Sat.	0.020	0.000	0.192	-0.080	0.103	0.031	0.000	0.329	0.118

**** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)**

***Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)**

5.4 Summary of Results

This section summarizes the results obtained in all four phases of the analysis. In phase I a list of 99 acts of mentoring was generated. Phase II established the membership gradients of the mentoring acts. From this analysis 36 items were found to be central to the mentoring construct. The subsidiary analysis compared the 99 acts established from Phase I and compared them with the roles that have been established by previous researchers. The act frequency approach identified a number of new items not included in previous typologies. In Phase III, two scales of mentoring were created which included items correlated with mentor effectiveness: a 30-item scale and a 23-item scale both scales were highly reliable. To assess the convergent validity of the scales, the two scales were correlated to the outcome variables residualized for the six control variable. The two mentoring scales were correlated to job satisfaction and organization socialization - history. In Phase IV, exploratory classification of the 36 items was conducted and 9 clusters were created: feedback, integrity, openness, professional growth, encouragement, knowledge, support, coach, and career and goal attainment. The highlights of the results of each phase are discussed in the following section.

6 Discussion and Conclusions

6.1 Phase I and Phase II

The discussion in Phases I and II will focus on the acts are central to the mentoring domain. In the literature review section the roles that were important to the mentoring construct were discussed. To compare my findings with the findings of other researchers respondents to the subsidiary analysis were asked to place each act frequency item into 1 of the roles in an earlier typology. The results are summarized in Tables 2.1 to 2.4 in Chapter Five. These tables compared the 99 acts that were nominated in phase II of this study with the different roles that were created by researchers. There were four researchers: Kram (1983, 1985a), Levinson et al. (1978), Burke (1984), and Leibowitz and Schlosberg (1981). Each researcher's roles will be discussed briefly.

There were four roles of interest for Kram's (1983, 1985a) framework: coaching, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and role modelling. These four roles covered 26 out of the 36 items. However, there were 10 core items that did not fit in the framework which would suggest that there are some roles of mentoring that are missing from this framework. Levinson's (1978) framework had five roles of interest: teacher, sponsor, host and guide, exemplar, and counselor. These five roles covered 32 of the 36 core items. This suggests that these roles are central to the construct of mentoring. Burke's (1984) framework had three roles of interest: role model, build self-confidence, and teacher/coach/trainer. These three roles covered 31 out of the 36 core items of mentoring. This suggests that these roles are central to the construct of mentoring. Finally, Leibowitz and Schlosberg's (1981) framework had three

roles of interest: communicator, mentor, and appraiser. These three roles covered 23 of the 36 core items. This suggests that there are some roles of mentoring that are missing from this framework. In conclusion, the roles that are central to the mentoring construct from the perspective of junior managers who have been mentored are that of coach, teacher, counselor, role model/exemplar/mentor, and building self-confidence/acceptance and confirmation. However, from the analysis conducted, it is evident that there are other roles of mentoring identified in the act frequency study that have not been identified previously. These roles relate to integrity, understanding and empathy.

6.2 Phase III

From the analysis that was conducted in Phase III it is evident that there are items that are related to mentor effectiveness. Effective mentors demonstrate the following behaviors:

- Provides constructive feedback,
- Always deals with you honestly,
- Maintains confidentiality,
- Models positive ethics and values,
- Provides regular feedback,
- Develops a relationship of trust with you,
- Takes time to discuss issues with you,
- Encourages new ideas,
- Suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem,
- Makes him/herself available to you,

- Listens to you carefully,
- Provides advice on work situations,
- Provides encouragement,
- Helps enhance your career goals,
- Questions you to help you to see things from another perspective,
- Provides support,
- Shows respect,
- Acknowledges your accomplishments,
- Supports you through failures,
- Pushes you to strive for higher goals,
- Encourages you to take initiative,
- Steers you to opportunities to expand your experience, and
- Demonstrates interest in your career development.

Two scales of mentoring were developed: a 30-item scale and a 23-item scale. These items were chosen based on the correlation of these items with a global measure of mentor effectiveness. The 23-item scale contained the items that were correlated to respondents' perception of mentor effectiveness at the .01 level of significance. There was no loss of reliability when using the 23-item scale instead of the 30-item scale. Finally, both the 30-item scale and the 23-item scale covered the majority of the clusters. However, not all the clusters were well represented. For example, the clusters Coach and Support were not very well represented in the items that are related to mentor effectiveness. Although the 30-item scale

represents a broader target for prediction, the correlations between outcomes and the mentoring scales were not significantly affected by the choice of mentoring scale. The 23-item scale should be used in future research because it is more parsimonious, and therefore has less respondent fatigue.

Both scales were correlated to the outcome of job satisfaction but the scales were not correlated to residualized job satisfaction. Mentoring is a very complex construct as is job satisfaction and it would not be correct to infer that if a mentor were to perform all the behaviors of the mentoring scales developed in this study that the protégé would be satisfied with their job. There are other factors that could affect this relationship.

6.3 Phase IV

Nine roles of mentoring were established: feedback, integrity, openness, professional growth, encouragement, knowledge, support, coach, and career and goal attainment. The cluster Integrity contains the most items that are most highly related to mentor effectiveness which may suggest that this role is central to the mentoring construct. However, the cluster Coach did not contain any of the items that are most highly related to mentor effectiveness. This may suggest that the role coach is not as central to the mentoring construct as suggested in past research and that integrity should be more prominent in future research.

6.3.1 Nine Roles and Roles from past research

In this section the roles developed in this study are compared to the roles of each researcher outlined in the literature review. A brief definition of each of the nine roles is provided below to facilitate the discussion.

Feedback is defined as providing the protégé with work related feedback that is regular and constructive. A mentor provides feedback by clearly explaining what he or she expects from the protégé.

Integrity is defined as modelling personal and professional growth, ethics and values. A mentor demonstrates the role of integrity by showing the protégé respect, dealing with him or her honestly, by developing a relationship of trust with the protégé, maintaining confidentiality and by taking the time to discuss issues with the protégé.

Openness is defined as listening to the protégé carefully and encouraging new ideas from the protégé. **Professional growth** is defined as providing advice to the protégé on work situations, providing the protégé with both positive and negative feedback on his or her performance and steering the protégé to opportunities to expand their experience.

Encouragement is defined as providing encouragement to the protégé by offering advice to the protégé but letting him or her make the final decision and being available to the protégé. **Knowledge** is defined as sharing the knowledge of the organization and the vision of the organization with the protégé. A mentor demonstrates the role of knowledge by sharing their own work experience, questioning the protégé to help him or her see things from another perspective, suggesting alternative ways of looking at the problem, and by suggesting areas for further training and development.

Support is defined as providing support to the protégé by supporting the protégé through his or her failures, acknowledging the protégé's accomplishments and inspiring the protégé to excel.

Coach is defined as coaching the protégé to develop his or her job skills, sharing the knowledge that the mentor possesses, and discussing reasons for the way in which the mentor deals with situations.

Career and goal attainment is defined as serving as a sounding board for the protégé to test ideas, pushing the protégé to strive for higher goals, demonstrating an interest in the protégé's career development, and helping the protégé enhance his or her career goals.

Now that the nine roles have been defined, the nine roles will be compared with the roles developed from past research.

6.3.1.1 Kram

Kram's (1983, 1985a) roles of mentoring are: role modelling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, friendship, sponsorship, protection, exposure, providing challenging assignments, and coaching.

Feedback: Although Kram (1983, 1985a) does not have a role named feedback, the concept of feedback appears to partially fit in the role counseling. Kram defines counseling as providing a sounding board enabling the protégé to explore personal concerns, offering the mentor's personal experience as an alternative perspective, and helping resolve problems through feedback and active listening. The concept of feedback is used to help the protégé to deal with personal delimmas. The role feedback in this study appears to be more work related.

Integrity: Kram does not have a role named integrity but, the role integrity appears to fit in other roles provided by Kram. The idea of modelling behavior and values appears to fit with Kram's role of role modelling where the mentor sets a desirable example that the protégé can

identify with by demonstrating behaviors, attitudes and values that the protégé can emulate.

However the ideas of maintaining confidentiality, showing the protégé respect and taking time to discuss issues with the protégé are not covered in Kram's framework.

Openness: Although Kram does not have a role called openness, the elements of the role openness: listened to you carefully, and encouraging new ideas do appear to partially fit in Kram's roles of counseling and acceptance and confirmation. Kram describes active listening in the context of helping a protégé to explore personal concerns and helping the protégé to resolve personal problems. The second element, encouraging new ideas, appears to fit with Kram's role of acceptance and confirmation.

Professional growth: The element of providing advice on work situations fits with Kram's role of coach where the mentor suggests specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives, for achieving recognition, and for achieving career aspirations. The element of steering you to opportunities to expand your experience appears to fit with Kram's role of providing challenging assignments where the mentor assigns challenging work to enable the protégé to develop specific competencies. However, the element of providing both negative and positive feedback on the protégé's performance does not appear to fit in any of Kram's roles because it deals specifically with the protégé's performance at work.

Encouragement: The element of providing encouragement and offering advice but, letting the protégé make the final decision appears to fit with Kram's role of acceptance and confirmation where the mentor provides support and encouragement to the protégé, thus allowing the protégé to take risks and to try new methods of relating to their work.

Knowledge: The role of knowledge is made up of the elements of the mentor transferring his or her knowledge of the organization, and specific tasks related to the protégé's work. This role partially fits with Kram's role of coaching where the mentor suggests strategies to help the protégé accomplish work objectives.

Support: The role of support encompasses providing the protégé with support when the protégé fails, sharing in the successes of the protégé and inspiring the protégé to excel. This role partially fits with Kram's role of acceptance and confirmation where the mentor provides support to the protégé.

Coach: The role of coach encompasses the mentor sharing their knowledge with the protégé, explaining the reasons why they deal with situations, and developing strategies so that the protégé can develop job skills. This appears to fit with Kram's role of coaching.

Career and Goal attainment: The role of career and goal attainment does not appear to fit with any of Kram's roles. Kram's role of counseling deals more with personal concerns whereas the idea of the mentor being a sounding board to test ideas deals with work concerns.

In summary, eight of the nine roles fit in Kram's framework. The only role that does not fit is career and goal attainment.

6.3.1.2 Levinson

Levinson et al.'s (1978) roles of mentoring are: teacher, sponsor, host and guide, exemplar, and counselor.

Feedback: The role of feedback does not appear to fit into any of the roles in Levinson's (1978) framework.

Integrity: The role of integrity appears to fit into Levinson's role exemplar, where the mentor sets an example for the protégé to follow by way of his or her own virtues, achievements, and way of living.

Openness: The role of openness does not appear to fit into any of Levinson's roles.

Professional growth: The role of professional growth does not appear to fit into any of Levinson's roles.

Encouragement: The role of encouragement does not appear to fit into any of Levinson's roles although it may implicitly fit with Levinson's role of teacher because teachers are said to encourage their students.

Knowledge: The elements of the role of knowledge that deal with passing the organization's knowledge and vision on to the protégé appear to fit with Levinson's role of host and guide where the mentor acquaints the protégé with the organization's values, customs and cast of characters.

Support: The role of support appears to fit with Levinson's role of counselor where the mentor provides moral support to the protégé in times of stress.

Coach: The role of coach appears to partially fit with Levinson's role of teacher where the mentor enhances the protégé's skills.

Career and goal attainment: The role of career and goal attainment does not appear to fit with any of Levinson's roles.

In summary, five of the nine roles do not fit into Levinson's framework. The roles that fit are support, knowledge, integrity, and coach.

6.3.1.3 Burke

Burke's (1984) roles of mentoring are: role model, build the protégé's self-confidence, go to bat for the protégé, use job assignments to develop their protégé, and teacher, coach, and trainer.

Feedback: The role of feedback appears to fit with Burke's (1984) role of teacher, coach, and trainer.

Integrity: The role of integrity appears to partially fit with Burke's role of role model, specifically the elements of modelling both personal and professional growth, and modelling ethics and values from the present study.

Openness: The role of openness appears to fit with Burke's role of teacher because a teacher must encourage new ideas in order for the student to learn.

Professional growth: The role of professional growth does not appear to fit with any of Burke's roles.

Encouragement: The role of encouragement appears to fit with Burke's role of teacher, coach, and trainer because all three must provide encouragement.

Knowledge: The role of knowledge appears to fit with Burke's role of teacher, coach, and trainer.

Support: The role of support appears to fit with Burke's role of building the protégé's self-confidence.

Coach: The role of coach fits with Burke's role of teacher, coach, and trainer.

Career and goal attainment: This role does not appear to fit with any of Burke's roles.

In summary, only two of the nine roles do not fit into Burke's framework: the role of career and goal attainment, and the role of professional growth.

6.3.1.4 Leibowitz and Schlosberg

Leibowitz and Schlosberg's (1981) roles of mentoring are: communicator, counselor, coach, advisor, broker, referral agent, advocate, mentor, and appraiser.

Feedback: The role of feedback appears to fit with Leibowitz and Schlosberg's (1981) role of appraiser.

Integrity: The role of integrity does not appear to fit with into any of Leibowitz and Schlosberg's roles.

Openness: The role of openness appears to partially fit with Leibowitz and Schlosberg's role of communication. In this instance the transfer of information is from the protégé to the mentor.

Professional growth: The role of professional growth appears to fit with Leibowitz and Schlosberg's role of coach.

Encouragement: The role of encouragement appears to fit with Leibowitz and Schlosberg's role of counselor.

Knowledge: The role of knowledge appears to partially fit with Leibowitz and Schlosberg's role of advisor, specifically the mentor suggesting areas for further training and development for the protégé fits the advisor role.

Support: The role of support does not appear to fit any of Leibowitz and Schlosberg's roles.

Coach: The role of coach appears to fit with Leibowitz and Schlosberg's role of coach.

Career and goal attainment: The role of career and goal attainment appears to partially fit

with Leibowitz and Schlosberg's role of appraiser because the mentor helps the protégé to work out a development plan so he or she can develop goals and objectives that relate to his or her current job.

In summary, two of the nine roles do not appear to fit in Leibowitz and Schlosberg's framework: the role of integrity and the role of support.

6.4.1 Conclusions Drawn from this Research

Using the act frequency approach to study mentoring has indicated that many prior typologies of mentor roles and functions overlooked mentoring roles that are important to junior managers. In particular, integrity, understanding and empathy are much more important to how people in organizations view mentoring than has been previously acknowledged. This research also illustrates that it is possible to construct scales that reflect these attributes of effective mentors and that these scales exhibit reasonable reliability. While further work needs to be done to validate the findings from this research, this study has indicated that such efforts are likely to yield broader, more accurate descriptions of mentoring as it is actually practiced in organizations.

6.4.2 Recommendations for Future Research

Although this study was a step in the right direction in clarifying the roles and the functions of mentoring that are important to junior managers who have been mentored, future research in the area of mentoring needs to use larger samples to study how managers from all levels conceptualize mentoring in terms of the roles that mentors perform and the functions of mentoring. This study should also be replicated with a different type of sample to determine

how generalizable the results of this study are. Future research should include people at different levels of management such as middle and senior managers, people who have been mentors, and people working in different sectors. The scale developed in this study should be properly validated by using separate samples to develop, refine and test the measure. Also, factor analysis should also be conducted using a larger sample.

7 Benefits and Limitations of this Study

The benefits and the limitations of this research are outlined in this section.

7.1 Benefits of this Study

There are two benefits of this study. This study is a first step in clarifying the construct of mentoring by determining what behaviors are central to mentoring. By grounding the research in the experience of people in organizations, new mentoring roles were uncovered such as the importance of integrity. This is a step towards a better understanding of the concept of mentoring. It is hoped that academics will have a richer appreciation of what mentoring means to people as a result.

The second benefit of this study is that a grounded measure of mentoring was developed. This new measure reflects actual experiences of mentoring. This new measure should be useful to both academics and to organizations. A better measure will enhance and advance academic research. Organizations can use this study to assess their mentoring or to train mentors.

7.2 Limitations of this Study

There are some limitations to this study. The first two limitations relate to the sample used in this study. The first limitation is the small sample size. In order to perform factor analysis ten respondents are required for each item that is developed. To attempt to overcome this limitation, respondents were asked to distribute extra questionnaires to their peers. Despite these efforts, the sample size was still restricted. Thus a small sample was limiting to this study. The second limitation is that the same sample was used to develop, refine and test the measure.

Ideally separate samples should have been used at each stage, but this was not possible.

The third limitation is the generalizability of this study. The sample used for this study was students enrolled in the Professional Development Programs at Carleton University and their peers. Although this sample represents a cross-section of organizations, the heavy emphasis in the Ottawa area on both the government and high technology sectors, and the fact that the gender of respondents weighted heavily to women may limit the generalizability of these findings to other sectors.

Bibliography

Bhar, J. (1995) *Developing a Measure of Supervisor Support: A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management Studies*. Carleton University. Ottawa.

Block, J. (1989) *Critique of the act frequency approach to personality* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology v56 pp.234-245

Buss, D.M., and K.H. Craik. (1980) *The Frequency Concept of Disposition: Dominance and Prototypically Dominant Acts* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology v47 pp.361-377

Buss, D.M., and K.H. Craik. (1981) *The Act Frequency Analysis of Inter-Personal Dispositions: Aloofness, Gregariousness, Dominance, and Submissiveness* Journal of Personality v49 pp.175-192

Buss, D.M., and K.H. Craik. (1983a) *Acts Dispositions, and Personality* Progress in Experimental Personality Research v13 pp. 241-301

Buss, D.M., and K.H. Craik. (1983b) *The dispositional analysis of everyday conduct* Journal of Personality v51 no.3 September, pp.393-412

Chao, G. T., A.M. O'Leary-Kelly, S. Wolf, H.J. Klein, P.D. Gardner (1994) *Organizational Socialization: Its Content and Consequences* Journal of Applied Psychology v49, no.5, pp.730-743

Chao, G. T. (1997) *Mentoring Phases and Outcomes* Journal of Vocational Behavior v51 pp.15-28

Chao, G.T., A.M. O'Leary-Kelly, S. Wolf, H.J. Klein, P.D. Gardner (1994) *Organizational Socialization: Its Content and Consequences* Journal of Applied Psychology v79, no.5, pp.730-743

Chao, G. T., P. M. Walz, P. D. Gardner (1992) *Formal and Informal Mentorships: A Comparison on Mentoring Functions and contrast with non mentored counterparts* Personnel Psychology v45 pp.620-636

Clawson, J. G., K. E. Kram (1984) *Managing Cross-Gender Mentoring* Business Horizons May-June pp.22-32.

Douglas, C.A. (1997) *Formal Mentoring Programs in Organizations: An Annotated Bibliography* Greenboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership.

Dreher, G. F., R.A. Ash (1990) *A Comparative Study of Mentoring Among Men and Women in Managerial, Professional, and Technical Positions* Journal of Applied Psychology v75, no. 5, pp.539-546

Dyke, L. (1990) *Self Promotion in Organizations* A thesis submitted to the School of Business in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Management). Queen's University, Kingston.

Fagenson, EA. (1988) *The Mentor Advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus nonprotégés* Journal of Organizational Behavior v10 pp.309-320

Fagenson-Eland, E.A., M.A. Marks, K.L. Amendola (1997) *Perceptions of Mentoring Relationships* Journal of Vocational Behavior v51 pp.29-42

Galbraith, M.W., N.H. Cohen (1995) *Mentoring: New Strategies and Challenges* Jossey-Bass Publishers. San Francisco.

Geiger, A.H. (1992) *Measures for Mentors* Training and Development Journal February pp.65-67

Harper, K. (1997) *Evaluating the Outcomes of Formal Mentoring Relationships*: A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management Studies. Carleton University. Ottawa.

Higgins, C., L. Duxbury, and C. Lee (1992) *Balancing Work and family: A Study of Canadian Sector Employees* Ottawa: National Center for Management Research and Development.

Hunt, D. M., C Michael (1983) *Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool* Academy of Management Review v8, no.3, pp.475-485

Koberg, C. S., R.W. Boss, D. Chappell, R.C. Ringer (1994) *Correlates and Consequences of Protégé Mentoring in a Large Hospital* Group and Organizational Management, v19, no.2, pp.219-239

Kram, K.E. (1983) *Phases of the Mentor Relationship* Academy of Management Journal, v26, no.4) pp.608-625

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

Kram, K.E. (1985b) *Improving the Mentoring Process* Training and Development Journal April, pp.40-43

Kram, K.E and L.A Isabella (1985) *Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development* Academy of Management Journal, v28, no. 1, pp.110-132

Leibowitz, Z.B and N.K. Schlossberg (1981) *Training Managers For Their Role In a Career Development System* Training and Development Journal, July, pp.72-79

Levinson, D.J., C.M. Darrow, E.G. Klein, M.H. Levinson, B. McKee (1978) *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. A.A. Knopf New York.

Lyness, K.S. and D.E. Thompson (1997) *Above the Glass Ceiling? A Comparison of Matched Samples of Female and Male Executives* Journal of Applied Psychology v82 pp.359-375

Moser, K. (1989) *The Act-Frequency Approach: A Conceptual Critique* Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin v15 pp.73-83

Murray, M. (1991) *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: How to facilitate an effective mentoring program*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Nieva, V.F. and B.A. Gutek (1981). *Women and Work*. New York: Praeger

Noe, R.A. (1988a). An Investigation of the Determinants of Successful Assigned Mentoring Relationships. Personnel Psychology, 41(3), 457-479

Noe, R.A. (1988b). *Women and Mentoring: A Review and Research Agenda* Academy of Management Review v13, no.1, pp.65-78

Nunnally, J.C. (1978) *Psychometric Theory, 2nd Edition* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Oglensky, B (1995) *Looking for Mr. Goodmentor? A Study of the emotional dynamics and character of mentor-protégé relationships*. A proposal for dissertation research pp.1-37

- Olian, J.D., S.J. Carrol, C.M. Giannantonio (1993) *What do protégés look for in a mentor? Results of three experimental studies* Journal of Vocational Behavior v33 pp.15-37
- Ostroff, C. and S. W. J. Kozlowski (1993) *The role of Mentoring in the Information Gathering Processes of Newcomers during Early Organizational Socialization* Journal of Vocational Behavior v42 pp.170-183
- Ragins, B.R., J. Cotton (1991) *Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor* Academy of Management Journal v34 pp.939-951
- Ragins, B. R., J. Cotton (1998) *Mentor Functions and Outcomes: A Comparison of Men and Women in Formal and Informal Mentoring Relationships* A paper presented at the Academy of Management Meeting pp.1-43 San Diego.
- Rosch, E. and C.B. Mervis (1975) *Family Resemblances: Studies in the Internal Structure of Categories* Cognitive Psychology v7 pp.573-605
- Scandura, T. A. (1992) *Mentorship and Career Mobility: An empirical investigation* Journal of Organizational Behavior v13 pp.169-174
- Seashore, S.E., E.E. Lawler, P. Mirvis and C. Camman (eds.) (1982) *Observing and Measuring Organizational Change: A Guide to Field Practice*. New York: Wiley.
- Shapiro, E.C., F.P. Haseltine and M.P. Rowe (1978) *Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors and the Patron System* Sloan Management Review v19, no.3, pp.51-58
- Stevens, J. (1996) *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences, 3rd edition*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tabachnik B.G and L.S. Fidell (1983) *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Treasury Board Report (1994) *Self-Help Guide to Mentoring*
<http://publiservice.tbs.sct.gc.ca/Pubs_pol/hrpubs/TB_856/WHAT002_e.html>
- Ulrich, D. (1997) *Human Resource Champions: The Next Agenda for Adding Value and Delivering Results*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston.
- Veiga, J.F. (1981) *Plateaued vs. non-plateaued managers: Career patterns, attitudes and path potential* Academy of Management Journal v24 pp.566-578

Whitley, W., T. W. Dougherty, G. F. Dreher (1991) *Relationship of Career Mentoring and Socioeconomic Origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress* Academy of Management Journal v34, no.2, pp.331-351.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953) *Philosophical Investigations*. New York: Macmillan.

Appendix A

A Study of What Mentors Do

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. Therefore you will be asked to describe some of the behaviors that you associate with mentoring.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on the reverse side.

Task Requirements: You will be asked to fill out one questionnaire which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study will in no way affect your standing in this course.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without penalty.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Researcher's Name _____

Researcher's Signature _____

Date _____ (Please turn over)

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include
your name and address or fax below:

What Do Mentors Do?

Think of some mentors that you have known. With these individuals in mind, please describe five (or more) acts or behaviors they did that illustrated mentoring. Other observations and comments are welcome.

[illegible]

(Please turn over)

When I summarize these data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. All information will remain confidential.

1. What is your age? _____ Years
2. What is your gender? (Please circle)
 A Male
 B Female
3. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years
4. Which job category best describes your job?

 ____ Senior Management/Executive
 ____ Middle Management/Project Manager
 ____ First Level Manager/Supervisor
 ____ Professional or Technical Position
 ____ Other Non-managerial Position
5. What functional area best describes your work experience?

 ____ Marketing/Sales
 ____ Manufacturing
 ____ Human Resources
 ____ Purchasing
 ____ Research and Development/Engineering
 ____ Accounting and Finance
 ____ Other (Please describe) _____

Thank you for your participation.

Brian Russell
Carleton University
M.M.S. Program
School of Business, Dunton Tower
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6
Fax: (613) 520-2652

Appendix B

A Study of What Mentors Do

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. You will be asked to judge how prototypical behaviors are of mentoring.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on the reverse side.

Task Requirements: You will be asked to fill out one questionnaire which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study will in no way affect your standing in this course.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without penalty.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Researcher's Name _____

Researcher's Signature _____

Date _____ (Please turn over)

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include
your name and address or fax below:

The purpose of this phase of the study is to find out what prototypical acts people have in mind when they talk about mentoring. What I mean by prototypical can be best explained with an example.

Take the word 'red' for example. Close your eyes and imagine a true red. Now imagine an orangish red or a purple red. Although you might still name the orange-red or the purple-red with the term 'red', they are not as good examples of red as the clear 'true' red. In short, some reds are 'redder' than others.

In this study I am asking you to judge how prototypical behaviors are of the category of mentoring. Please rate each act on a 7-point scale. A "7" means that you feel the act is a very good example of your idea of mentoring; a "1" means you feel the act fits very poorly with your idea of mentoring (or the act is not a member of that category at all). A "4" means that the act fits moderately well. Use the numbers of the 7-point scale to indicate intermediate judgements. Please circle the number which indicates your assessment.

This person...

solicits your input.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you enhance your career goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
provides constructive feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
is a friend.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
communicates their enthusiasm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
provides advice on work situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
explains issues in detail.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
coaches you to develop your job skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you to gain more responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
is not interested in what is best for you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
provides encouragement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
exercises power over you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shows you the ropes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

demonstrates patience.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
teaches you how to stand up for what you believe.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
exposes you to training opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
is always there when you need them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
models positive ethics and values.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
always deals with you honestly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shares experiences of their personal life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
recommends you to others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
clearly explains their expectations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
acknowledges your accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
serves as a sounding board to test ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
praises your successes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
represents your career interests and aspirations to management.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you deal with disappointments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
is condescending.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shares the knowledge that they possess.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
encourages you to take risks.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
takes time to discuss issues with you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you expand your network.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
is open to other views.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
provides advice but lets you make the decision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
learns and grows when working							

together with you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you to feel comfortable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shares their organization knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
builds your confidence.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
maintains confidentiality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
encourages you to apply for new positions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shares their work experience.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you understand the organization's vision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
suggests solutions to a particular situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
does not criticize you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
empathizes with you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
demonstrates interest in your work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
volunteers their views on the politics of the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
champions your activities within the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

is non judgmental.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you identify career opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
makes him/herself available to you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps remove barriers to your career development.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
encourages new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
provides regular feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
expects the best from you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
promotes your abilities within the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
provides advice on career goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
is loyal to you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you to visualize a goal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
introduces you to influential others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shares their opinions with you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
questions you to help you to see things from another perspective.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
takes time to discuss work in a relaxed social context.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you maintain a positive attitude.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
communicates management priorities to you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
understands you as a person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
stays in touch with you on a regular basis.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

encourages you to take initiative.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps increase your profile within the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shares their own experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
encourages you to empower yourself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
models personal and professional growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
pushes you to strive for higher goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
makes a long term commitment to you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
connects you with contacts who can help with your career.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behaviour.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
assists in decision making.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
provides support.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
demonstrates interest in your career development.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you to put things in perspective.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
listens to you carefully.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
inspires you to excel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
suggests areas for further training and development.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
shows you respect.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
is non judgmental.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
develops a relationship of trust with you.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helps you to gain more autonomy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
steers you to opportunities to expand your experience.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
supports you through failures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
encourages you to present your work to others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
seeks your input on decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
serves as a sounding board to test ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

When I summarize these data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. All information will remain confidential.

1. What is your age? _____ Years
2. What is your gender? (Please circle)
A Male
B Female
3. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years
4. Which job category best describes your job?

____ Senior Management/Executive
____ Middle Management/Project Manager
____ First Level Manager/Supervisor
____ Professional or Technical Position
____ Other Non-managerial Position
5. What functional area best describes your work experience?

____ Marketing/Sales
____ Manufacturing
____ Human Resources
____ Purchasing
____ Research and Development/Engineering
____ Accounting and Finance
____ Other (Please describe) _____

Thank you for your participation.

Brian Russell
Carleton University
M.M.S. Program
School of Business, Dunton Tower
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6
Fax: (613) 520-2652

Appendix C

Definitions Version K

Instructions: In this study you will be asked to put statements into categories. Below is a definition of each category that you can refer to during the exercise. On the attached questionnaire place a checkmark in the space provided if you feel that the statement belongs in the category. If you feel that the statement does not belong in any of the categories then check "none of these categories". Remember that each statement can only be placed into one category.

Role modeling: setting a desirable example that the protégé can identify with by demonstrating behaviors, attitudes and values that the protégé can emulate.

Acceptance and confirmation: providing support and encouragement to the protégé enabling the protégé to take risks and to try new ways of relating to their work .

Counseling: providing a sounding board enabling the protégé to explore personal concerns, offering their personal experience as an alternative perspective, and helping resolve problems through feedback and active listening.

Friendship: liking and understanding and enjoyable informal exchanges about work and experiences outside of work.

Sponsorship: actively nominating a protégé for lateral moves and promotions .

Protection: taking credit and blame in controversial situations, as well as intervening in situations where the protégé is ill-equipped to achieve satisfactory resolution.

Exposure: assigning responsibilities that allow the protégé to develop relationships with key figures in the organization who may judge his/her potential for further advancement .

Challenging assignments: assigning challenging work, enabling the protégé to develop specific competencies and to experience a sense of accomplishment in a professional role.

Coaching: suggesting specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives, for achieving recognition, and for achieving career aspirations.

Information on this Study Version K

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. You will be asked to sort statements about mentoring behavior into specific categories.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on this page.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study will in no way affect your standing in this course.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Date _____

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include
your name and address or fax below:

Version K Instructions: In this study you will be asked to put the following statements into categories. Attached is a definition of each category that you can refer to during the exercise. Place a checkmark in the space provided if you feel that the statement belongs in the category. If you feel that the statement does not belong in any of the categories then check “none of these categories”. Remember that each statement can only be placed into one category.

[illegible]

When I summarize these data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. **All information will remain confidential.**

1. What is your age? _____ Years

2. What is your gender? (Please circle)

- A Male
B Female

3. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years

4. Which job category best describes your job?

- ____ Senior Management/Executive
____ Middle Management/Project Manager
____ First Level Manager/Supervisor
____ Professional or Technical Position
____ Other Non-managerial Position

5. What functional area best describes your work experience?

- ____ Marketing/Sales
____ Manufacturing
____ Human Resources
____ Purchasing
____ Research and Development/Engineering
____ Accounting and Finance
____ Other (Please describe) _____

Thank you for your participation.

Brian Russell
Carleton University
M.M.S. Program
School of Business, Dunton Tower
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6
Fax: (613) 520-2652

Appendix D

Definitions Version L

Instructions: In this study you will be asked to put statements into categories. Below is a definition of each category that you can refer to during the exercise. On the attached questionnaire place a checkmark in the space provided if you feel that the statement belongs in the category. If you feel that the statement does not belong in any of the categories then check "none of these categories". Remember that each statement can only be placed into one category.

Teacher: enhancing the protégé's skills and intellectual development.

Sponsor: using his or her influence to facilitate the protégé's entry into the organization and the protégé's advancement.

Host and guide: welcoming the protégé into a new occupational and social world and acquainting the protégé with the values, customs and cast of characters.

Exemplar: setting an example for the protégé to follow by way of the mentor's own virtues, achievements and way of living.

Counselor: providing moral support in times of stress.

Information on this Study Version L

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, and the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. You will be asked to sort statements about mentoring behavior into specific categories.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on this page.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study will in no way affect your standing in this course.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Date _____

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include your name and address or fax below:

Version L Instructions: In this study you will be asked to put the following statements into categories. Attached is a definition of each category that you can refer to during the exercise. Place a checkmark in the space provided if you feel that the statement belongs in the category. If you feel that the statement does not belong in any of the categories then check "none of these categories". Remember that each statement can only be placed into one category.

Acts	teacher	sponsor	host & guide	exemplar	counselor	none of these categories
solicits your input.						
helps you enhance your career goals.						
provides constructive feedback.						
is a friend.						
communicates their enthusiasm.						
provides advice on work situations.						
explains issues in detail.						
coaches you to develop your job skills.						
helps you to gain more responsibility.						
is not interested in what is best for you.						
provides encouragement.						
exercises power over you.						
shows you the ropes.						
demonstrates patience.						
teaches you how to stand up for what you believe.						
exposes you to training opportunities.						

Acts	teacher	sponsor	host & guide	exemplar	counselor	none of these categories
is always there when you need them.						
models positive ethics and values.						
always deals with you honestly.						
shares experiences of their personal life.						
recommends you to others.						
clearly explains their expectations.						
acknowledges your accomplishments.						
serves as a sounding board to test ideas.						
praises your successes.						
helps you deal with disappointments.						
represents you career interests and aspirations to management.						
is condescending.						
shares the knowledge that they possess.						
encourages you to take risks.						
takes time to discuss issues with you.						
helps you expand your network.						
is open to other views.						
provides advice but lets you make the decision.						

Acts	teacher	sponsor	host & guide	exemplar	counselor	none of these categories
learns and grows when working together with you.						
helps you to feel comfortable.						
shares their organization knowledge.						
assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization.						
builds your confidence.						
maintains confidentiality.						
encourages you to apply for new positions.						
shares their work experience.						
helps you understand the organization's vision.						
suggests solutions to a particular situation.						
does not criticize you.						
encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings.						
empathizes with you.						
demonstrates interest in your work.						
connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific tasks.						
volunteers their views on the politics of the organization.						

Acts	teacher	sponsor	host & guide	exemplar	counselor	none of these categories
allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing.						
champions your activities within the organization.						
discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations.						
is non judgmental.						
helps you identify career opportunities.						
makes him/herself available to you.						
helps remove barriers to your career development.						
encourages new ideas.						
provides regular feedback.						
expects the best from you.						
promotes your abilities within the organization.						
provides advice on career goals.						
is loyal to you.						
helps you to visualize a goal.						
introduces you to influential others.						
helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills.						
suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem.						
shares their opinions with you.						
questions you to help you to see things from another perspective.						

Acts	teacher	sponsor	host & guide	exemplar	counselor	none of these categories
takes time to discuss work in a relaxed social context.						
helps you maintain a positive attitude.						
communicates management priorities to you.						
understands you as a person.						
stays in touch with you on a regular basis.						
encourages you to take initiative.						
helps increase your profile within the organization.						
shares their own experiences.						
encourages you to empower yourself.						
models personal and professional growth.						
pushes you to strive for higher goals						
initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings.						
makes a long term commitment to you.						
connects you with contacts who can help with your career.						
demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behavior.						
assists in decision making.						
provides support.						

Acts	teacher	sponsor	host & guide	exemplar	counselor	none of these categories
demonstrates interest in your career development.						
helps you to put things in perspective.						
listens to you carefully.						
inspires you to excel.						
suggests areas for further training and development.						
shows you respect.						
develops a relationship of trust with you.						
provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance.						
helps you to gain more autonomy.						
steers you to opportunities to expand your experience.						
supports you through failures.						
encourages you to present your work to others.						
seeks your input on decisions.						

When I summarize these data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. All information will remain confidential.

1. What is your age? _____ Years

2. What is your gender? (Please circle)

- A Male
- B Female

3. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years

4. Which job category best describes your job?

- ____ Senior Management/Executive
- ____ Middle Management/Project Manager
- ____ First Level Manager/Supervisor
- ____ Professional or Technical Position
- ____ Other Non-managerial Position

5. What functional area best describes your work experience?

- ____ Marketing/Sales
- ____ Manufacturing
- ____ Human Resources
- ____ Purchasing
- ____ Research and Development/Engineering
- ____ Accounting and Finance
- ____ Other (Please describe) _____

Thank you for your participation.

Brian Russell

Carleton University

M.M.S. Program

School of Business, Dunton Tower

Ottawa, Ontario

K1S 5B6

Fax: (613) 520-2652

Appendix E

Definitions Version B

Instructions: In this study you will be asked to put statements into categories. Below is a definition of each category that you can refer to during the exercise. On the attached questionnaire place a checkmark in the space provided if you feel that the statement belongs in the category. If you feel that the statement does not belong in any of the categories then check "none of these categories". Remember that each statement can only be placed into one category.

A mentor should be a positive role model for the protégé.

A mentor should build the protégé's self-confidence.

A mentor should go to bat for the protégé.

A mentor should be a teacher, coach and trainer.

A mentor should use job assignments to develop their protégé.

Information on this Study Version B

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, and the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. You will be asked to sort statements about mentoring behavior into specific categories.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on this page.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study will in no way affect your standing in this course.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Date _____

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include
your name and address or fax below:

Version B Instructions: In this study you will be asked to put the following statements into categories. Attached is a definition of each category that you can refer to during the exercise. Place a checkmark in the space provided if you feel that the statement belongs in the category. If you feel that the statement does not belong in any of the categories then check "none of these categories". Remember that each statement can only be placed into one category.

Acts	role model	build self confidence	go to bat for protégé	teacher / coach / trainer	use job assignments to develop protégé	none of these categories
solicits your input.						
helps you enhance your career goals.						
provides constructive feedback.						
is a friend.						
communicates their enthusiasm.						
provides advice on work situations.						
explains issues in detail.						
coaches you to develop your job skills.						
helps you to gain more responsibility.						
is not interested in what is best for you.						
provides encouragement.						
exercises power over you.						
shows you the ropes.						
demonstrates patience.						
teaches you how to stand up for what you believe.						

Acts	role model	build self confidence	go to bat for protégé	teacher / coach / trainer	use job assignments to develop protégé	none of these categories
exposes you to training opportunities.						
is always there when you need them.						
models positive ethics and values.						
always deals with you honestly.						
shares experiences of their personal life.						
recommends you to others.						
clearly explains their expectations.						
acknowledges your accomplishments.						
serves as a sounding board to test ideas.						
praises your successes.						
represents your career interests and aspirations to management.						
is condescending.						
shares the knowledge that they possess.						
encourages you to take risks.						
takes time to discuss issues with you.						
helps you expand your network.						
is open to other views.						

Acts	role model	build self confidence	go to bat for protégé	teacher / coach / trainer	use job assignments to develop protégé	none of these categories
provides advice but lets you make the decision.						
learns and grows when working together with you.						
helps you to feel comfortable.						
shares their organization knowledge.						
assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization.						
builds your confidence.						
maintains confidentiality.						
encourages you to apply for new positions.						
shares their work experience.						
helps you understand the organization's vision.						
suggests solutions to a particular situation.						
does not criticize you.						
encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings.						
empathizes with you.						
demonstrates interest in your work.						

Acts	role model	build self confidence	go to bat for protégé	teacher / coach / trainer	use job assignments to develop protégé	none of these categories
connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific tasks.						
volunteers their views on the politics of the organization.						
allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing.						
champions your activities within the organization.						
discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations.						
is non judgmental.						
helps you identify career opportunities.						
makes him/herself available to you.						
helps remove barriers to your career development.						
encourages new ideas.						
provides regular feedback.						
expects the best from you.						
promotes your abilities within the organization.						
provides advice on career goals.						
is loyal to you.						

Acts	role model	build self confidence	go to bat for protégé	teacher / coach / trainer	use job assignments to develop protégé	none of these categories
helps you to visualize a goal.						
introduces you to influential others.						
helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills.						
suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem.						
shares their opinions with you.						
questions you to help you to see things from another perspective.						
takes time to discuss work in a relaxed social context.						
helps you maintain a positive attitude.						
understands you as a person.						
communicates management priorities to you.						
stays in touch with you on a regular basis.						
helps increase your profile within the organization.						
shares their own experiences.						
encourages you to empower yourself.						
models personal and professional growth.						

Acts	role model	build self confidence	go to bat for protégé	teacher / coach / trainer	use job assignments to develop protégé	none of these categories
pushes you to strive for higher goals						
initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings.						
makes a long term commitment to you.						
connects you with contacts who can help with your career.						
demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behavior.						
assists in decision making.						
provides support.						
demonstrates interest in your career development.						
helps you to put things in perspective.						
listens to you carefully.						
inspires you to excel.						
suggests areas for further training and development.						
shows you respect.						
develops a relationship of trust with you.						

Acts	role model	build self confidence	go to bat for protégé	teacher / coach / trainer	use job assignments to develop protégé	none of these categories
provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance.						
helps you to gain more autonomy.						
steers you to opportunities to expand your experience.						
supports you through failures.						
encourages you to present your work to others.						
seeks input on decisions.						
helps you deal with disappointments.						
encourages you to take initiative.						

When I summarize these data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. All information will remain confidential.

1. What is your age? _____ Years

2. What is your gender? (Please circle)

- A Male
B Female

3. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years

4. Which job category best describes your job?

- ____ Senior Management/Executive
____ Middle Management/Project Manager
____ First Level Manager/Supervisor
____ Professional or Technical Position
____ Other Non-managerial Position

5. What functional area best describes your work experience?

- ____ Marketing/Sales
____ Manufacturing
____ Human Resources
____ Purchasing
____ Research and Development/Engineering
____ Accounting and Finance
____ Other (Please describe) _____

Thank you for your participation.

Brian Russell
Carleton University
M.M.S. Program
School of Business, Dunton Tower
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6
Fax: (613) 520-2652

Appendix F

Definitions Version LS

Instructions: In this study you will be asked to put statements into categories. Below is a definition of each category that you can refer to during the exercise. On the attached questionnaire place a checkmark in the space provided if you feel that the statement belongs in the category. If you feel that the statement does not belong in any of the categories then check "none of these categories". Remember that each statement can only be placed into one category.

Communicator: promoting a two-way exchange of information with the protégé.

Counselor: helping the protégé clarify goals and identify steps to take in reaching these goals, whether or not they relate to the present organization.

Coach: giving instruction or skills training to enable the protégé to do his/her job more effectively.

Advisor: giving information about career opportunities both within and outside the organization.

Broker: serving as a an agent (go-between) for the protégé and appropriate resources such as people, and institutions for information.

Referral agent: identifying resources to help the protégé with specific problems.

Advocate: intervening on behalf of the protégé for benefits like promotions, and the elimination of obstacles.

Mentor: serving as a sponsor to facilitate the protégé's career growth.

Appraiser: evaluating the protégé 's performance, gives feedback to the protégé, and helping to work out a development plan so the protégé can develop goals and objectives specific to the current job.

Information on this Study Version LS

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, and the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. You will be asked to sort statements about mentoring behavior into specific categories.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on this page.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study will in no way affect your standing in this course.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Date _____

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include
your name and address or fax below:

When I summarize these data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. All information will remain confidential.

1. What is your age? _____ Years

2. What is your gender? (Please circle)

- A Male
B Female

3. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years

4. Which job category best describes your job?

- ____ Senior Management/Executive
____ Middle Management/Project Manager
____ First Level Manager/Supervisor
____ Professional or Technical Position
____ Other Non-managerial Position

5. What functional area best describes your work experience?

- ____ Marketing/Sales
____ Manufacturing
____ Human Resources
____ Purchasing
____ Research and Development/Engineering
____ Accounting and Finance
____ Other (Please describe) _____

Thank you for your participation.

Brian Russell
Carleton University
M.M.S. Program
School of Business, Dunton Tower
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6
Fax: (613) 520-2652

Appendix G

G.1 Kram

<p>sponsorship (career): actively nominating a protégé for lateral moves and promotions</p>	<p>40. Connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific tasks. 80. Champions your activities within the organization. 83. Recommends you to others. 86. Represents your career interests and aspirations to management.</p>
<p>exposure (career): assigning responsibilities that allow the protégé to develop relationships with key figures in the organization who may judge his/her potential for further advancement</p>	<p>*34. Steers you to opportunities to expand your experience. 44. Helps you expand your network 62. Assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization. 63. Encourages you to present your work to others. 64. Promotes your abilities within the organization. 68. Introduces you to influential others. 75. Encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings. 76. Connects you with contacts who can help with your career 77. Helps increase your profile within the organization</p>

<p>coaching (career): suggesting specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives, for achieving recognition, and for achieving career aspirations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *4. Coaches you to develop your job skills. *7. Shares the knowledge that they possess. *10. Inspires you to excel. *14. Takes time to discuss issues with you. *21. Helps you enhance your career goals. *22. Questions you to help you to see things from another perspective. *24. Helps you understand the organization's vision. *30. Pushes you to strive for higher goals. *31. Encourages you to take initiative. *32. Discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations. *33. Suggests areas for further training and development. 41. Encourages you to empower yourself. 42. Helps you to visualize a goal. 48. Helps you identify career opportunities. 49. Encourages you to take risks. 53. Builds your confidence. 54. Helps you to gain more autonomy. 58. Explains issues in detail. 59. Provides advice on career goals.
<p>protection (career): taking credit and blame in controversial situations, as well as intervening in situations where the protégé is ill-equipped to achieve satisfactory resolution</p>	
<p>providing challenging assignments (career): assigning challenging work, enabling the protégé to develop specific competencies and to experience a sense of accomplishment in a professional role</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *36. Clearly explains their expectations. 37. Demonstrates interest in your work. 39. Expects the best from you. 56. Helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills.
<p>role modelling (psychosocial): setting a desirable example that the protégé can identify with demonstrating behaviors, attitudes and values that the protégé can emulate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *5. Models positive ethics and values. *13. Models personal and professional growth. Makes a long term commitment to you. *25. Shares their work experience. 45. Demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behaviour. 55. Shares their own experiences. 61. Allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing. 66. Communicates their enthusiasm. 84. Teaches you how to stand up for what you believe.

<p>acceptance & confirmation (psychosocial): providing support and encouragement to the protégé enabling the protégé to take risks and to try new ways of relating to their work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *15. Encourages new ideas. *26. Provides support. *27. Shows you respect. *28. Acknowledges your accomplishments. *29. Supports you through failures. 43. Is open to other views. 46. Praises your successes. 60. Solicits your input. 79. Seeks your input on decisions. 91. Does not criticize you.
<p>counselling (psychosocial): providing a sounding board enabling the protégé to explore personal concerns, offering their personal experiences an alternative perspective, and helping resolve problems through feedback and active listening</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *1. Provides constructive feedback. *6. Provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance. *8. Provides advice but lets you make the decision. *9. Provides regular feedback. *17. Makes him/herself available to you. *19. Provides advice on work situations. *23. Serves as a sounding board to test ideas. 38. Helps you to put things in perspective. 47. Is non judgmental. 65. Shares their opinions with you. 69. Helps you maintain a positive attitude. 81. Assists in decision making. 82. Suggests solutions to a particular situation. 87. Helps you deal with disappointments. 92. Empathizes with you. 94. Takes time to discuss work in a relaxed social context.
<p>friendship (psychosocial): liking and understanding and enjoyable informal exchanges about work and experiences outside of work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 67. Is loyal to you. 88. Is always there when you need them. 90. Understands you as a person. 95. Is a friend. 96. Shares experiences of their personal life.

acts not included in this framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *2. Always deals with you honestly. *3. Maintains confidentiality. *11. Develops a relationship of trust with you. *12. Shares their organization knowledge. *16. Suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem. *18. Listens to you carefully. *20. Provides encouragement. *35. Demonstrates interest in your career development. 50. Helps you to gain more responsibility. 51. Exposes you to training opportunities. 52. Shows you the ropes 57. Demonstrates patience. 70. Stays in touch with you on a regular basis. 71. Helps remove barriers to your career development. 72. Helps you to feel comfortable. 73. Encourages you to apply for new positions. 74. Communicates management priorities to you. 78. Learns ad grows when working together with you. 89. Initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings. 93. Volunteers their views on the politics of the organization. 97. Exercises power over you. 98. Is not interested in what is best for you. 99. Is condescending.
-------------------------------------	--

* Item is in the top 36.

G.2 Levinson

<p>teacher: enhancing protege's skills & intellectual development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">*1. Provides constructive feedback.*6. Provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance.*7. Shares the knowledge that they possess.*10. Inspires you to excel.*14. Takes time to discuss issues with you.*15. Encourages new ideas.*16. Suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem.*22. Questions you to help you to see things from another perspective.*23. Serves as a sounding board to test ideas.*33. Suggest areas for further training and development.*36. Clearly explains their expectations.39. Expects the best from you.42. Helps you to visualize a goal.49. Encourages you to take risks.51. Exposes you to training opportunities.54. Helps you to gain more autonomy.57. Demonstrates patience.58. Explains issues in detail.60. Solicits your input.78. Learns and grows when working together with you.81. Assists in decision making.
---	---

sponsor: using his/her influence to facilitate the protégé's entry into the organization and the protégé advancement

- *4. Coaches you to develop your job skills.
- *9. Provides regular feedback
- *21. Helps you enhance your career goals.
- *31. Encourages you to take initiative.
- *35. Demonstrates interest in your career development.
- 37. Demonstrates interest in your work.
- 40. Connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific tasks.
- 41. Encourages you to empower yourself.
- 44. Helps you expand your network.
- 46. Praises you successes.
- 50. Helps you to gain more responsibility.
- 51. Helps you identify career opportunities.
- 53. Builds your confidence.
- 56. Helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills.
- 59. Provides advice on career goals.
- 62. Assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization.
- 63. Encourages you to present your work to others.
- 64. Promotes your abilities within the organization.
- 68. Introduces you to influential others.
- 71. Helps remove barriers to your career development.
- 73. Encourages you to apply for new positions.
- 75. Encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings.
- 76. Connects you with contacts who can help with your career.
- 77. Helps increase your profile within the organization.
- 80. Champions your activities within the organization.
- 83. Recommends you to others.
- 86. Represents your career interests and aspirations to management.

<p>host & guide: welcoming the protégé into a new occupational and social world and acquainting the protégé with the values, customs and cast of characters.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *12. Shares their organization knowledge. *24. Helps you understand the organization's vision. *25. Shares their work experience. 72. Helps you to feel comfortable. 74. Communicates management priorities to you. 89. Initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings. 93. Volunteers their views on the politics of the organization. 94. Takes time to discuss work in a relaxed social context.
<p>exemplar: setting an example for the protégé to follow by way of the mentor's own virtues, achievements and way of living</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *5. Models positive ethics and values. *13. Models personal and professional growth. *32. Discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations. 45. Demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behavior. 55. Shares their own experiences. 61. Allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing. 65. Shares their opinions with you
<p>counsellor: providing moral support in times of stress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *2. Always deals with you honestly. *3. Maintains confidentiality. *8. Provides advice but lets you make the decision. *11. Develops a relationship of trust with you. *17. Makes him/herself available to you. *18. Listens to you carefully. *19. Provides advice on work situations. *20. Provides encouragement. *26. Provides support. *29. Supports you through failures. 38. Helps you to put things in perspective. 47. Is non judgmental. 67. Is loyal to you. 69. Helps you maintain a positive attitude. 82. Suggests solutions to a particular situation. 84. Teaches you how to stand up for what you believe. 87. Helps you deal with disappointments. 88. Is always there when you need them. 95. Is a friend. 90. Understands you as a person. 91. Does not criticize you. 92. Empathizes with you.

<p>acts not included in this framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">*27. Shows you respect.*28. Acknowledges your accomplishments.*34. Steers you to opportunities to expand your experience.43. Is open to other views.52. Shows you the ropes.66. Communicates their enthusiasm.70. Stays in touch with you on a regular basis.79. Seeks your input on decisions.85. Makes a long term commitment to you96. Shares experiences of their personal life.97. Exercises power over you.98. Is not interested in what is best for you.99. Is condescending.
--	--

* Item is in the top 36.

G.3 Burke

<p>role model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *2. Always deals with you honestly. *3. Maintains confidentiality. *5. Models positive ethics and values. *10. Inspires you to excel. *11. Develops a relationship of trust with you. *13. Models personal and professional growth. *25. Shares their work experience. *27. Shows you respect. 43. Is open to other views. 45. Demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behavior. 47. Is non judgmental. 55. Shares their own experiences. 61. Allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing. 67. Is loyal to you. 78. Learns and grows when working together with you. 96. Shares experiences of their personal life.
<p>build self-confidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *8. Provides advice but lets you make the decision. *20. Provides encouragement. *28. Acknowledges your accomplishments. *31. Encourages you to take initiative. 41. Encourages you to empower yourself. 46. Praises your successes. 53. Builds your confidence. 60. Solicits your input. 72. Helps you to feel comfortable. 73. Encourages you to apply for new positions. 79. Seeks input on decisions. 84. Teaches you how to stand up for what you believe.

<p>go to bat for protege</p>	<p>40. Connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific tasks.</p> <p>62. Assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization.</p> <p>64. Promotes your abilities within the organization.</p> <p>68. Introduces you to influential others.</p> <p>71. Helps remove barriers to your career development.</p> <p>76. Connects you with contacts who can help with your career.</p> <p>77. Helps increase your profile within the organization.</p> <p>80. Champions your activities within the organization.</p> <p>83. Recommends you to others.</p> <p>86. Represents your career interests and aspirations to management.</p>
------------------------------	--

teacher/coach/trainer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *1. Provides constructive feedback. *4. Coaches you to develop your job skills. *6. Provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance. *7. Shares the knowledge that they possess. *9. Provides regular feedback. *12. Shares their organization knowledge. *14. Takes time to discuss issues with you. *15. Encourages new ideas. *16. Suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem. *19. Provides advice on work situations. *21. Helps you enhance your career goals. *22. Questions you to help you to see things from another perspective. *23. Serves as a sounding board to test ideas. *24. Helps you understand the organization's vision. *26. Provides support. *32. Discusses reasons for the way in which they deal with situations. *33. Suggests areas for further training and development. *35. Demonstrates interest in your career development. *36. Clearly explains their expectations. 38. Helps you to put things in perspective. 39. Expects the best from you. 42. Helps you to visualize a goals. 51. Helps you identify career opportunities. 52. Shows you the ropes 57. Demonstrates patience. 58. Explains issues in detail. 59. Provides advice on career goals. 65. Shares their opinions with you. 70. Stays in touch with you on a regular basis. 74. Communicates management priorities to you. 81. Assists in decision making. 82. Suggests solutions to a particular situation.
use job assignments to develop protege	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *34. Steers you to opportunities to expand your experience. 37. Demonstrates interest in your work. 44. Helps you expand your network. 50. Helps you to gain more responsibility. 56. Helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills. 63. Encourages you to present your work to others. 75. Encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings.

<p>acts not included in this framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *17. Makes him/herself available to you. *18. Listens to you carefully. *29. Supports you through failures. *30. Pushes you to strive for higher goals. 49. Encourages you to take risks. 51. Exposes you to training opportunities. 54. Helps you to gain more autonomy. 66. Communicates their enthusiasm. 69. Helps you maintain a positive attitude. 85. Makes a long term commitment to you. 87. Helps you deal with disappointments. 88. Is always there when you need them. 89. Initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings. 90. Understands you as a person. 91. Does not criticize you. 92. Empathizes with you. 93. Volunteers their views on the politics of the organization. 94. Takes time to discuss work in a relaxed social context. 95. Is a friend. 97. Exercises power over you. 98. Is not interested in what is best for you. 99. Is condescending.
--	---

* Item is in the top 36.

G.4 Leibowitz and Schlosberg

counsellor: helping the protégé clarify goals and identify steps to take in reaching these goals, whether or not they relate to the present organization	*8. Provides advice but lets you make the decision. 38. Helps you to put things into perspective. 42. Helps you to visualize a goal. 57. Demonstrates patience. 59. Provides advice on career goals. 72. Helps you to feel comfortable.
coach: giving instruction or skills training to enable the protégé to do his/her job more effectively	*4. Coaches you to develop your job skills. *7. Shares the knowledge that they possess. 52. Shows you the ropes. 53. Builds your confidence. 58. Explains issues in detail. 66. Communicates their enthusiasm.
advisor: giving information about career opportunities both within and outside the organization	51. Exposes you to training opportunities.
broker: serving as an agent (go-between) for the protégé and appropriate resources such as people and institutions for information	68. Introduces you to influential others.
referral agent: identifying resources to help the protégé with specific problems	40. Connects you with contacts who can provide advice regarding specific task.
advocate: intervening on behalf of the protegee for benefits like promotions, and the elimination of obstacles	62. Assists you with getting exposure both inside and outside of your organization. 64. Promotes your abilities within the organization. 71. Helps remove barriers to your career development. 77. Helps increase your profile within the organization. 83. Recommends you to others. 86. Represents your career interests and aspirations to management.

mentor: serving as a sponsor to facilitate the protégé's career growth

- *5. Models positive ethics and values.
- *10. Inspires you to excel.
- *11. Develops a relationship of trust with you.
- *12. Shares their organization knowledge.
- *13. Models personal and professional growth.
- *17. Makes him/herself available to you.
- *20. Provides encouragement.
- *21. Helps you enhance your career goals.
- *24. Helps you understand the organization's vision.
- *26. Provides support.
- *27. Shows you respect.
- *30. Pushes you to strive for higher goals.
- *31. Encourages you to take initiative.
- *34. Steers you to opportunities to expand your experience.
- 35. Demonstrates interest in your career development.
- 37. Demonstrates interest in your work.
- 41. Encourages you to empower yourself.
- 44. Helps you expand your network.
- 45. Demonstrates their skills and abilities in such a way that you can model their behavior.
- 49. Encourages you to take risks.
- 54. Helps you to gain more autonomy.
- 55. Shares their own experiences.
- 56. Helps create opportunities for you to develop new skills.
- 61. Allows you to shadow them so that you can learn by observing.
- 63. Encourages you to present your work to others.
- 69. Helps you maintain a positive attitude.
- 70. Stays in touch with you on a regular basis.
- 73. Encourages you to apply for new positions.
- 75. Encourages you to increase your visibility by attending meetings.
- 76. Connects you with contact who can help with your career.
- 79. Seeks your input on decisions.
- 80. Champions your activities within the organization.
- 81. Assists in decision making.
- 84. Teaches you how to stand up for what you believe.
- 85. Makes a long term commitment to you.
- 87. Helps you deals with disappointments.
- 89. Initiates meetings if they feel too much time has elapsed between meetings.
- 93. Volunteers their views on the politics of the

<p>appraiser: evaluating the protege's performance, gives feedback to the protégé, and helping to work out a development plan so the protégé can develop goals and objectives specific to their current job</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *1. Provides constructive feedback *6. Provides both positive and negative feedback on your performance. *9. Provides regular feedback. *33. Suggests areas for further training and development. 36. Clearly explains their expectations. 46. Praises your successes.
<p>acts not included in this framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *2. Always deals with you honestly. *3. Maintains confidentiality. *15. Encourages new ideas. *16. Suggests alternative ways of looking at the problem. *19. Provides advice on work situations. *22. Questions you to help you to see things from another perspective. *23. Serves as a sounding board to test ideas. *25. Shares their work experience. *28. Acknowledges your accomplishments. *29. Supports you through failures. 39. Expects the best from you. 47. Is non judgmental. 50. Helps you to gain more responsibility. 51. Exposes you to training opportunities. 67. Is loyal to you. 74. Communicates management priorities to you. 82. Suggests solutions to a particular situation. 88. Is always there when you need them. 90. Understands you as a person. 91. Does not criticize you. 92. Empathizes with you. 95. Is a friend. 96. Shares experiences of their personal life. 97. Exercises power over you. 98. Is not interested in what is best for you. 99. Is condescending.

* Item is in the top 36.

Appendix H

A Study of What Mentors Do

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. You will be asked whether your mentors have demonstrated certain behaviors.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on the second page.

Task Requirements: You will be asked to fill out one questionnaire which will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study will in no way affect your standing in this course.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without penalty.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Researcher's Name _____

Researcher's Signature _____

Date _____

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include
your name and address or fax below:

Section A: Work Background

This section deals with information about your work history. Please circle or fill in the requested information.

1. Which job category best describes your job?

- ☐ Senior Management/Executive
- ☐ Middle Management/Project Manager
- ☐ First Level Manager/Supervisor

- ☐ Professional or Technical Position
- ☐ Other Non-managerial Position

2. What functional area best describes your work experience?

- ☐ Marketing/Sales
- ☐ Manufacturing
- ☐ Human Resources
- ☐ Purchasing
- ☐ Research and Development/Engineering
- ☐ Accounting and Finance
- ☐ Other (Please describe) _____

3. Do you currently supervise the work of others? (Please circle)

- A NO
- B YES

4. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years

5. Have you ever taken a leave of absence from your career? (Please circle)

- A NO
- B YES - Total months of leave _____

Section B: Mentor Experience

This section deals with information regarding mentors that you have had. Please fill in the requested information or circle the most appropriate response for each question.

6. How many mentors have you had over the course of your career? _____ (If you have not had a mentor, please go to Section C on page 4)

7. How many of your mentors were also your supervisors? _____

8. What was the average length of your mentoring relationships?

_____ Years _____ Months

9. Please indicate the extent to which your mentor(s) have demonstrated the following behaviors:

	To a very little extent		Somewhat			To a very great extent	
Provided constructive feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Clearly explained their expectations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Always dealt with you honestly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Steered you to opportunities to expand your experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maintained confidentiality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Discussed reasons for the way in which they deal with situations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Coached you to develop your job skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pushed you to strive for higher goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Modeled positive ethics and values	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supported you through failures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provided both positive and negative feedback on your performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Showed you respect	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shared the knowledge that they possess	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shared their work experience	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	To a very little extent		Somewhat			To a very great extent	
Provided advice but let you make the decision	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Served as a sounding board to test ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provided regular feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helped you to understand the organization's vision	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Inspired you to excel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Suggested areas for further training and development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Developed a relationship of trust with you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Demonstrated interest in your career development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shared their knowledge of the organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Helped you enhance your career goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Modeled personal and professional growth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encouraged you to take initiative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Took time to discuss issues with you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Encouraged new ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Acknowledged your accomplishments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Suggested alternative ways of looking at the problem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provided advice on work situations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Provided support	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Listened to you carefully	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Questioned you to help you to see things from another perspective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Made him/herself available to you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I am usually excluded in social get togethers given by other people in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The goals of my organization are also my goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Within my work group, I would be easily identified as "one of the gang".	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I know the organization's long-held traditions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe that I fit in well with my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I do not always believe in the values set by my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have mastered the required tasks of my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I understand the goals of my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I would be a good resource in describing the background of my work group/department.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have not fully developed the appropriate skills and abilities to successfully perform my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I do not have a good understanding of the politics in my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I understand what all the duties of my job entail.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I would be a good example of an employee who represents my organization's values.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am not always sure what needs to be done in order to get the most desirable work assignments in my area.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I am usually included in informal networks or gatherings of people within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have a good understanding of the motives behind the actions of other people in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am familiar with the history of my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am pretty popular in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I can identify the people in this organization who are most important in getting the work done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I believe most of my coworkers like me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I support the goals that are set by my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the:

	Very Dissatisfied		Neutral		Very Satisfied		
chances you have to learn new things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
chances you have to accomplish something worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
chances you have to do something that makes you feel good about yourself as a person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
amount of pay you get	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
fringe benefits you receive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
amount of job security you have	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. A promotion is defined as involving one or more of the following:

- significant increases in scope of responsibilities
- significant increases in annual salary
- changes in level in the employing company

Please indicate the number of promotions that you have received in your career to date.

_____ Promotions

14. Please indicate your current approximate annual gross salary (including any bonuses).

Gross Annual Salary \$_____,000

15. Please indicate your approximate annual gross salary (including any bonuses) when you first started full-time work.

Gross Annual Salary \$_____,000

Section D : Personal Information:

When I summarize these data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. Please fill in the requested information or circle the most appropriate response for each question. All information will remain confidential.

16. What is your age? _____ Years

17. What is your gender? (Please circle)

- A Male
- B Female

18. Please circle the letter which best describes the highest level of education you have completed.

- A High school
- B Some college / university
- C College diploma
- D University degree
- E Post graduate degree

Thank you for your participation.

Brian Russell

Carleton University

M.M.S. Program

School of Business, Dunton Tower

Ottawa, Ontario

K1S 5B6

Fax: (613) 520-2652

Appendix I

Information on this Study

The purpose of this form is to ensure that you understand the purpose of this study, the nature of your involvement, and to provide you enough information so that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Purpose: This research is being conducted for a Master's thesis in Management Studies in the School of Business at Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine what mentors do by basing the research on the observations of people who have work experience. You will be asked to sort statements about mentoring behavior using your own criteria.

Research Personnel: Brian Russell, 224-3565, is the researcher in this project and Dr. Lorraine Dyke, 520-2600 extension 2389, is his supervisor. They may be contacted at any time. If you would like to receive the results of this study you may e-mail your complete address to brussell@chat.carleton.ca, or leave a message at 224-3565. You may also fill out the "Request for Results" area on this page.

Voluntary Participation: Your choice to participate in this study is voluntary.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study is confidential. Only the researchers associated with this project will have access to the data. To ensure your complete anonymity, the "Request for Results" form will remain separate from the survey upon our receipt of the package.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

I have read the above description of the study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the research.

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____

Date _____

Request for Results

To receive a copy of the results, include
your name and address or fax below:

Instructions:

You will be given 36 cards each containing a unique statement. Please sort these statements by any criteria that you feel is relevant. Once you have finished sorting the cards please put the cards into piles. Use the staplers that have been provided to staple the cards of each pile together and then put all of the sets of stapled cards in the envelope. Remember I am looking for your perceptions so you determine the criteria for the categories. Once you have completed the exercise please complete the section below.

Personal Information:

When I summarize the data, I would like to be able to describe the group of people who responded. Thus, I would appreciate it if you could provide some personal information. Please fill in the requested information or circle the most appropriate response for each question. All information will remain confidential.

1. What is your age?

- A under 30
- B 30 to 39
- C 40 to 49
- D 50 to 59
- E 60 and over

2. What is your gender? (Please circle)

- A Male
- B Female

3. Please circle the letter which best describes the highest level of education you have completed.

- A High school
- B Some college / university
- C College diploma
- D University degree
- E Post graduate degree

4. Please circle the job category under which you are classified

- A Executive (e.g., EX)
- B Administrative & Foreign Service (e.g., AS, CS, PM)
- C Scientific and Professional (e.g., AU, EN, ES)
- D Technical (e.g., EG, GT, SI)
- E Administrative Support (e.g., CR, DA, ST)
- F Operational (e.g., CX, GL, GS)

If you are not sure under which category your job is classified, please write in your job classification group (level is not necessary): _____

5. Which of the following best describes the function that you most often perform

- A Managerial
- B Administrative
- C Research/Scientific
- D Policy Analysis
- E Support Staff
- F Technical
- G Other (Please specify) _____

6. How many years of full-time work experience do you have? _____ Years

Thank you for your participation.

Provided constructive feedback	Clearly explained their expectations
Always dealt with you honestly	Steered you to opportunities to expand your experience
Maintained confidentiality	Discussed reasons for the way in which they deal with situations
Coached you to develop your job skills	Pushed you to strive for higher goals
Modeled positive ethics and values	Supported you through failures
Provided both positive and negative feedback on your performance	Showed you respect

Shared the knowledge that they possess	Shared their work experience
Provided advice but let you make the decision	Served as a sounding board to test ideas
Provided regular feedback	Helped you to understand the organization's vision
Inspired you to excel	Suggested areas for further training and development
Developed a relationship of trust with you	Demonstrated interest in your career development
Shared their knowledge of the organization	Helped you enhance your career goals

Modeled personal and professional growth	Encouraged you to take initiative
Took time to discuss issues with you	Encouraged new ideas
Acknowledged your accomplishments	Suggested alternative ways of looking at the problem
Provided advice on work situations	Provided support
Listened to you carefully	Questioned you to help you to see things from another perspective
Made him/herself available to you	Provided encouragement