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. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

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.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**EVALUATING THE OUTCOMES OF
FORMAL MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS**

by

Kelly Harper, B.Comm.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for a Master of Management Studies

School of Business
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

September 19, 1997

© copyright
1997, Kelly Harper.

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.

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 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.

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.

0-612-27037-8

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

**EVALUATING THE OUTCOMES OF
FORMAL MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS**

submitted by Kelly Harper
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Management Studies

Thesis Supervisor

Director, School of Business

Carleton University
September, 1997

ABSTRACT

This research looked at the positive outcomes of formal mentoring relationships. The research is exploratory in nature, given that no validated measures of some of the constructs exist, so sophisticated modeling techniques were not utilized. Two models were developed to illustrate that the protégé and mentor relationships. In the protégé model, eight variables were examined: the number of previous mentors, level of career planning, career expectations, psychosocial expectations, communication of expectations, relationship intensity, career outcomes, and psychosocial outcomes. Relationship intensity was defined as the degree of contact between mentors and protégés and the help that the mentor provided by performing nine mentor roles identified from the literature. Factor analysis of the expectations and outcomes scales identified four factors: enhanced effectiveness, career benefits, personal growth, and understanding of the organization. Correlations were reported between expectations of enhanced effectiveness, personal growth expectations, and communication of expectations with the roles the mentor performs. A strong correlation was identified between the roles the mentor performs and the positive outcomes the protégé experiences. The mentor model examined six variables: previous mentor experience, career expectations, psychosocial expectations, relationship intensity, career outcomes and psychosocial outcomes. Correlations were identified between mentors' career expectations and the roles they perform.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first and foremost like to thank my supervisor, Professor Lorraine Dyke. Without her guidance, support and never ending patience this thesis would not have been completed. Her tireless spirit and determination sparked a desire in me to carry on when days and nights were long. Lorraine taught me that statistics can indeed be fun and that a belief in yourself breeds determination and perseverance. I would also like to thank my committee members, Professor Wes Webber and Professor Linda Duxbury, for their help and insight.

A very special thank you goes to my family and friends. Without their never ending support and belief in my abilities, I never would have accomplished a task of which I am very proud. As I move on into the next chapter of my life I will look back at my experiences in the Master's of Management Studies program with fondness and gratitude, for the gift of learning is a powerful tool and one that I will cherish and take with me in on the journey ahead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
-------------------------------	----------

2

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 What is a Mentor?	4
2.2 Mentor Roles.....	5
2.3 Benefits of Mentoring	7
2.3 Benefits of Mentoring.....	7
2.4 Prevalence of Mentoring.....	9
2.5 Formal Mentoring Relationships	10
2.5.1 Benefits of Formal Mentoring Programs.....	10
2.5.2 Potential Problems of Formal Mentoring.....	11
2.5.3 Characteristics of Successful Formal Mentoring Programs	14
2.6 Women and Mentoring	16
2.6.1 Benefits for Women	17
2.6.2 Barriers for Women in Obtaining a Mentor	18
2.6.3 Challenges in Managing Cross-Gender Mentor Relationships.....	20
2.7 Summary	21

3

3.0 MODEL	23
3.1 PROTÉGÉ MODEL.....	23
3.1.1 Dependent Variables	25
3.1.1.1 Career Outcomes	26
3.1.1.2 Psychosocial Outcomes.....	27
3.1.2 Explanatory Variables	27
3.1.2.1 Previous Mentor Experience.....	28
3.1.2.2 Career Planning	29
3.1.2.3 Career and Psychosocial Expectations	31
3.1.2.4 Communication of Expectations.....	32
3.1.2.5 Relationship Intensity.....	33
3.1.3 Protégé Model Research Questions	35
3.1.4 Supplementary Research Questions.....	36
3.2 MENTOR MODEL	37
3.2.1 Dependent Variables	37
3.2.1.1 Career Outcomes	40
3.2.1.2 Psychosocial Outcomes.....	40
3.2.2 Explanatory Variables	41
3.2.2.1 Mentor Career Expectations	41
3.2.2.2 Mentor Psychosocial Expectations.....	42
3.2.2.3 Previous Mentor Experience.....	42
3.2.2.4 Average Relationship Intensity.....	43
3.2.3 Mentor Model Research Questions	44

4.0 METHODOLOGY	45
4.1 The Sample	45
4.2 The Questionnaires	46
4.3 Measures	49
4.3.1 Protégé Measures	49
4.3.1.1 Career Outcomes and Psychosocial Outcomes	49
4.3.1.2 Relationship Intensity	52
4.3.1.3 Career and Psychosocial Expectations	56
4.3.1.4 Communication of Expectations	58
4.3.1.5 Previous Mentor Experience	58
4.3.1.6 Career Planning	59
4.3.2 Mentor Measures	60
4.3.2.1 Career Outcomes and Psychosocial Outcomes	60
4.3.2.2 Average Relationship Intensity	62
4.3.2.3 Career Expectations and Psychosocial Expectations	63
4.3.2.4 Previous Mentor Experience	64
4.4 Analysis Techniques for Protégé and Mentor Research Questions	65
4.4.1 Bivariate Correlation	66
4.4.2 Moderated Regression	67
4.5 Analysis of Supplementary Research Questions	68
4.5.1 The <i>t</i> Test	69
4.5.2 Multiple Regression	69

5.0 RESULTS	71
5.1 The Data	71
5.2 Outliers	72
5.3 Assessment of Protégé Model Measures	73
5.3.1 Bivariate Correlation	66
5.3.1 Career Planning	74
5.3.2 Protégé Expectations	74
5.3.3 Relationship Intensity	77
5.3.4 Protégé Outcomes	79
5.4 ASSESSMENT MENTOR MODEL MEASURES	82
5.4.1 Mentor Expectations	82
5.4.2 Mentor Relationship Intensity	83
5.4.3 Mentor Outcomes	85
5.5 ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS	87
5.5.1 Protégé Research Questions	87
5.5.2 Mentor Research Questions	94
5.5.3 Assessment of Supplementary Research Questions	98
5.6 SUMMARY	101

6.0 DISCUSSION	103
6.1 Discussion of the Protégé Model.....	103
6.2 Supplementary Research Questions in the Protégé Study	111
6.3 Discussion of the Mentor Model	115
6.4 IMPLICATIONS	120
6.5 LIMITATIONS	121
6.6 BENEFITS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	125

A

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I - Protégé Measures	131
APPENDIX II - Protégé Questionnaire	135
APPENDIX III - Mentor Measures.....	136
APPENDIX IV - Mentor Questionnaire	139
APPENDIX V - Questionnaire Cover Letter	140
APPENDIX VI - Questionnaire Follow-up Letter	141

F

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 - Protégé Model	24
FIGURE 2 - Mentor Model.....	38
FIGURE 3 - Revised Protégé Model	88
FIGURE 4 - Revised Mentor Model.....	95
FIGURE 5 - Final Protégé Model.....	114
FIGURE 6 - Final Mentor Model.....	119

R

REFERENCES	127
-------------------------	------------

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade organizations have become increasingly aware of the importance of career development processes. As more and more organizations experience difficulties developing talented managers to replace those retiring and reducing high turnover in early stages of career development, the importance of developing mentor relationships has increased. Mentoring can aid organizations with recruitment, merger transitions and the integration of new employees (Zey, 1988).

Informal mentoring has existed since the time of Ancient Greece when Odysseus entrusted the education of his son, Telemachus, to a trusted counselor and friend. This trusted and wise friend, Mentor, reputedly became the counselor, guide, tutor, coach and sponsor for his protégé (Hunt and Michael, 1983). Many corporate presidents report that they too have had mentors and credit having had mentors for some of their success. Reich (1985) reported that 90% of the executives he surveyed stated that a key individual had influenced their career development and that 75-90% gave concrete assistance that produced valued outcomes. Similarly, Dreher and Ash (1990) reported that individuals experiencing extensive mentoring relationships reported receiving more promotions, having higher incomes and being more satisfied with their pay and benefits than those executives with less extensive mentoring relationships.

As a result of the success of informal mentoring, organizations are now initiating formal mentoring relationships where a senior person undertakes to guide a younger person's personal and career development (Johnson, 1980). Unlike informal relationships that evolve naturally, formal mentoring relationships are assigned. Generally the protégé and mentor are separated by two or more management levels and the mentor is outside of the normal reporting relationship. Formal programs also tend to be of shorter duration, less than a year, than informal relationships that may last upwards of five years.

The research in this study was designed to determine if a relationship exists between the positive outcomes that protégés and mentors experience in a formal mentoring program and their previous mentoring experience, the expectations mentors and protégés may have, communication of those expectations, and the intensity of the mentoring relationship with respect to time spent together and roles that the mentor may perform. Of particular interest is the roles that the mentor performs and their relationship with the positive outcomes that protégés may experience. Since little empirical work has been done in the area of formal mentoring relationships, this thesis is exploratory in nature.

Through this research, insight was be gained about the relationship between positive outcomes and the roles that a mentor performs. This knowledge should help organizations in the development of formal mentoring programs and in particular how to better orient participants in the early stages of a program.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers have looked at mentoring from many different perspectives. Some have sought to define what a mentor is (Levinson, 1978; Leibowitz and Schlossberg, 1981; Farren et al., 1984; Burke, 1984; Noe, 1988; Zey, 1988) while others have measured the prevalence of mentoring (Henning and Jardim, 1977; Levinson, 1979; Roche, 1979; Klauss, 1981; Burke, 1984; Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984; Fitt and Newton, 1981; Morrison, White and Van Velsor, 1987; Zey, 1988; Wentling, 1992). The roles that a mentor fulfills has been of special interest in the research (Johnson, 1980; Leibowitz and Schlossberg, 1981; Klauss, 1981; Kram, 1983; Gray, 1986), as have gender issues related to mentoring (Clawson and Kram, 1984; Noe, 1988; Zey, 1988; Burke and McKeen, 1989; Ragins and McFarlin, 1990; Ragins and Cotton, 1991; Wentling, 1992; Scandura and Viator, 1994; Ragins and Scandura, 1994; Vincent and Seymour, 1995). Other researchers have looked more closely at the development of mentoring relationships (Burke and McKeen, 1989; Clawson and Kram, 1984; Klauss, 1981; Kram, 1985; Kram, 1983; Leibowitz and Schlossberg, 1981) and more recently the development of formal mentoring programs within organizations (Zey, 1988; Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984; Klauss, 1981; Phillips-Jones, 1982; Serlen, 1989; Burke and McKeen, 1989; Noe, 1988; Gray, 1986; Keele et. al., 1987).

The following literature review will define what a mentor is, what roles he or she may fulfill and the benefits of having a mentor. The growth of mentoring as a career

development tool will be illustrated in a review of the prevalence of mentoring and formal mentoring programs. Special interest has been given to the benefits, barriers and challenges of cross-gender mentoring as an area of supplementary research for this proposal.

2.1 What is a Mentor?

Webster's dictionary defines a mentor as a trusted counselor or guide. Levinson et. al. (1978) defines mentoring as follows:

The mentor relationship is one of the most complex, and developmentally important, a man can have in early adulthood. The mentor is ordinarily several years older, a person of greater experience and seniority in the world the young man is entering. No word currently in use is adequate to convey the nature of the relationship we have in mind here. Words such as "counselor" or "guru" suggest the most subtle meanings, but they have other connotations that would be misleading. The term "mentor" is generally used in a much narrower sense, to mean teacher, advisor or sponsor. As we use the term, it means all these things and more. (p. 97)

No one definition exists that conveys the multitude of functions that a mentor provides.

A mentor is usually a senior, experienced employee who serves as a role model, provides support, direction and feedback to the younger employee regarding career plans and personal development, and increases the visibility of the protégé to decision-makers in the organization who may influence career opportunities (Noe, 1988). A mentor is a

teacher, advisor, sponsor, coach, broker, referral agent and advocate (Farren et al., 1984; Leibowitz and Schlossberg 1981; Zey, 1988; Burke, 1984).

2.2 Mentor Roles

Levinson et al. (1978) notes six items that a person moving into managerial ranks must learn: the politics of the organization; the culture of the organization, including norms, standards, values, ideology, history and heroes/heroines; what skills and competencies are necessary for success; the paths to advancement; the acceptable methods for gaining visibility; and the typical stumbling blocks. Similarly, Morrison et al. (1987) list six lessons for success: learn the ropes, take control of your career, build confidence, rely on others, go for "the bottom line", and integrate life and work.

In order to help protégés achieve their career goals, mentors should be people developers who want to share their expertise, should know the organization and the people in it, be respected, and have some degree of power or influence within the organization (Gray, 1986). One of the most important things a mentor does is help protégés understand and appreciate an organization's culture and folkways, its customs and values, its patterns of recognition, and its informal decision-making mechanisms (Gray, 1986). Similarly, Johnson (1980) sees a mentor as the person you know who can teach you how the company operates, how to use the information you acquire to plan for your future and how to control your environment. Mentors help you to develop the self confidence to

grow in your position, share their values and ideals and are generally in a position to let those higher up know what a good job you are doing (Johnson, 1980).

In order to identify the roles that a mentor plays, Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) conducted a pilot study based on “critical incident” interviews with employees who had supervisors who were effective in helping them with their careers. The study identified nine roles that supervisors may play:

Communicator: One who promotes a two-way exchange between him/herself and the employee.

Counselor: One who helps the employee to clarify goals and identify steps to take in reaching these goals, whether or not they are related to the present organization.

Appraiser: One who evaluates an employee’s performance, gives feedback to the employee, and helps to work out a development plan so the employee can negotiate the goals and objectives specific to the current job.

Coach: One who gives instruction or skill training to enable an employee to do his/her job more effectively.

Mentor: One who serves as a sponsor to facilitate an employee’s career growth.

Advisor: One who gives information about career opportunities both within and outside the organization.

Broker: One who serves as an agent (go-between) for the employee and appropriate resources, such as people and institutions, for information.

Referral Agent: One who identifies resources to help an employee with specific problems.

Advocate: One who intervenes on behalf of an employee for benefits such as promotions, or the elimination of obstacles.

(Leibowitz and Schlossberg, 1981, p. 73)

Geiger (1992) further adapted these roles as a tool to measure mentoring results at Douglas Aircraft. Protégés used a written form to evaluate mentors on two aspects of

mentoring: the roles the mentor fulfilled best and the effect of the mentor/protégé discussions (Geiger, 1992). The nine roles identified by Leibowitz and Schlossberg were reduced to seven including communicator, counselor, coach, advisor, broker, referral agent and advocate (Geiger, 1992). Following his study of mentoring at Douglas Aircraft, Geiger (1992) concluded that writing role descriptions for mentors is a useful start to the process of planning a mentoring program.

2.3 Benefits of Mentoring

Many functions and benefits have been associated with mentoring. Kram (1983) conducted in-depth interviews with 18 managers in a public-sector organization in order to identify the functions provided by a mentor. Content analysis revealed that mentors provided two types of functions, career and psychosocial (Kram, 1983). The career functions include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and providing challenging assignments. These aspects of the mentoring relationship prepare the protégé for career advancement (Kram, 1983). The psychosocial functions enhance the protégé's sense of competence, identity and work-role effectiveness through role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship (Kram, 1983).

Mentors may also help to integrate individuals into organizations and build a sense of belonging. Mentoring may reduce turnover by incorporating new employees into the culture of the organization and opening lines of communication, thus reducing

uncertainty (Zey, 1988). An example of this function of mentoring is found in formal mentoring programs used to aid in merger transitions. They ensure the continuity of the corporate culture of the parent company while maintaining a sizable portion of the entrenched management of the purchased organization (Zey, 1988). Mentoring enhances the communications between all levels and sectors of the organization (Zey, 1988). Organizations that support mentoring are willing to go that extra mile for their employees and by demonstrating care for their workers they become an attractive organization to work for (Zey, 1988).

Mentoring is also key in developing a sufficient number of talented managers to replace those about to retire and in preparing those individuals for roles of organizational leadership (Burke and McKeen, 1989). At the same time, high levels of managerial contribution from mentors are maintained through middle age and beyond (Burke and McKeen, 1989). Mentoring may affect managerial and organization functions such as the job performance of both the mentor and protégé, early career socialization, and planning for managerial succession (Burke, 1984).

The mentoring process may be important to mentors as well as protégés. Dalton, Thompson and Price (1977) identify mentoring as the third stage in the four stages of professional careers. During this stage the central activity is training and interfacing as individuals become mentors to others. The mentor begins to assume the responsibility of others and is given increased responsibility as they begin to influence, guide, direct and develop other people (Dalton, Thompson and Price, 1977).

2.4 Prevalence of Mentoring

The prevalence of mentoring can be seen in a number of studies. The Levinson et. al. (1978) study of 40 men, from a variety of occupations, found that 70% of the sample had had a mentor and that 30% reported having had more than one. Similarly, Roche (1979) reported that two thirds of the executive men and women surveyed had a mentor or sponsor and one third of those had had two or more. Burke's study (1984) of 80 men and women in early career stages noted that 76% of the sample of professionals had a mentor and that 36% had more than one mentor, the majority of this group having had two.

The research would suggest that successful women are just as likely or more likely than successful men to have had mentors (Henning and Jardim, 1977; Morrison, White and Van Velsor, 1987; Wentling, 1992). Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987) found that 100% of the executive women in their study had mentors compared to only 55% of the executive men studied. Similarly, Henning and Jardim (1977) reported that all of the successful female managers in their study had had male mentors. While successful executive women credit much of their success to having had a mentor, those who had not achieved the same level of success cite lacking help from above and not being able to adapt as critical assets they lacked (Morrison, White and Van Velsor, 1987).

2.5 Formal Mentoring Relationships

Trends such as labor shortages, the changing composition of the work force, the merger explosion, the quest for innovation and the emergence of the cross-cultural corporation are influencing organizations to use programs, such as formal mentoring, to facilitate information sharing and organizational commitment (Zey, 1988). Research on formal mentoring relationships is still in its infancy. Information that exists on formal mentoring programs comes from organizations that have implemented such programs. Companies such as Johnson and Johnson, Bellcore, NCR Corp., AT&T's Bell Laboratories and Merrill Lynch have all adopted formal mentoring programs (Zey, 1988).

2.5.1 Benefits of Formal Mentoring Programs

At Merrill Lynch a formal mentoring program was added to the career development program in order to help generate high level management support and visibility, build bridges between high-level managers and employees, help participants learn about the firm's culture, increase networking, and provide opportunities for talented people developers to be seen (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984). Individuals who participated in the program report having gained a lot from the experience. Mentors gained objective feedback and developed a sense of pride in helping Merrill develop future managers.

Protégés cited the mentoring relationship as one of the most beneficial parts of the entire six month career development program (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984).

Formal mentoring programs are not only found in the private sector but are also occurring in the public sector. A survey by Klauss (1981) of a number of US federal agencies identified three programs which had considerable experience with formal mentoring programs: The Internal Revenue Service (IRS); the Science and Education Administration (SEA) in the Department of Agriculture; and the Fourth Federal Executive Development Program. Klauss interviewed 36 mentors and protégés, 32 of whom were matched pairs (16 sets of mentor- protégé relationships). Interviews across all three programs indicated that in most cases, mentors and protégés were matched by the organization. All programs provided a brief orientation and individuals involved were left to work out their own relationships. The large majority of respondents felt that the experience had been very worthwhile. Results suggested a generally positive commitment to the relationship and to the career counseling function that formed the core of the process (Klauss, 1981).

2.5.2 Potential Problems of Formal Mentoring

Some researchers argue that it is difficult for organizations to force relationships which normally evolve through mutual liking and compatibility. Although researchers support formal mentoring programs, steps must be taken to ensure they are developed with

psychosocial issues in mind (Kram, 1985; Burke and McKeen, 1989). Formal mentoring programs focus primarily on career issues such as improving job performance, developing sufficient talented managers to replace those about to retire, maintaining high levels of managerial contribution, and preparing individuals for roles of organizational leadership (Burke and McKeen, 1989). Given the short time frame of formal programs, there is less focus on psychosocial functions such as role modeling, counseling and friendship. Some problems of formal mentoring programs are the matching process, role definitions and expectations of participants, and hierarchical tensions.

The process of matching mentor and protégé is critical to the success of formal mentoring. When the chemistry in a relationship is not good, the relationship fails to develop fully (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1981). In a survey of 18 participants in the SES Candidate Development Program, sponsored by the Office of Personnel Management for small agencies, Klauss (1981) notes that those who had been heavily involved in selecting their mentors were much more likely to say that they expected to continue the relationship. These respondents also placed greater importance on the mentor's potential contribution to their future careers as compared with those individuals who had no involvement at all in the selection process (Klauss, 1981). While some formal programs limit the autonomy of participants to choose a specific mentor or protégé, many corporations find it advantageous to allow greater participant control (Zey, 1985). When mentors and protégés are allowed autonomy in choosing a program partner, the program is more successful (Zey, 1985).

Expectations and role definitions are also important to the success of formal mentoring. Protégés often have high expectations because of the program's high visibility within the organization and are disappointed with the limited time mentors may have to devote to the relationship (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984). Programs may suffer if participants are not told what the program is set up to accomplish, leading to confusion and false expectations (Zey, 1985). Ambivalence surrounding the expectations and demands of participants may also lead to questions of who should take the initiative on specific activities (Klauss, 1981). While both the mentor and protégé share responsibility for making the relationship work, ultimately it is the protégé who must be prepared to initiate or take the lead in ensuring that the relationship works out successfully (Klauss, 1981).

Another potential problem in formal mentoring involves hierarchical tensions. If the peers, managers and supervisors peripherally involved with the program do not understand the rationale for its existence, they may be less inclined to cooperate with it (Zey, 1985). When mentors are more than one level above the protégé, the direct manager of the protégé may feel left out if they themselves have not been involved in a development program or been given a high-level mentor (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1985). Immediate supervisors may also be reluctant to cooperate with formal mentoring programs when the mentoring relationship allows protégés to bypass the immediate supervisor on a range of issues beyond the intent of the program (Klauss, 1981).

Organizations that do not take careful consideration while developing formal mentoring programs may assign mentors and protégés to relationships that have a low probability of providing developmental functions; the potential to lead people to feeling mismatched or coerced; a high potential for resentment, pessimism, anxiety and confusion with respect to roles and responsibilities; and if skills are lacking, a high probability of being superficial (Burke and McKeen, 1989).

2.5.3 Characteristics of Successful Formal Mentoring Programs

Many researchers agree that participation in any formal mentoring program should be voluntary (Phillips-Jones, 1982; Serlen, 1989; Zey, 1985; Burke and McKeen, 1989; Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984). Critical features for a formal mentoring program include the following: top management support, careful selection of mentors and protégés, an orientation program emphasizing the development of realistic expectations concerning the relationship, clearly stated responsibilities for both mentor and protégé, and established minimums of duration and frequency of contact between mentor and protégé (Klauss, 1981; Noe, 1988, Phillips-Jones, 1982). A monitoring system should be built in to ensure feedback and determine what modifications are needed (Phillips-Jones, 1982; Kram 1985). In addition, the objectives and scope of the project should be defined; individual and organizational circumstances promoting or interfering with effective mentoring should be diagnosed; educational programs should be implemented; and changes should be made in the reward system, task design or other related management

practices to support the mentoring program (Kram, 1985). The recommended minimum duration for a formal mentoring relationship is six months (Phillips-Jones, 1982; Serlen, 1989; Zey, 1985).

An additional success factor when establishing a mentoring relationship is the process of establishing the expectations for the relationship (Stokes, 1994). If expectations are unclear at the outset of the relationship it becomes very difficult to clarify them later on (Stokes, 1994). The discussion of expectations represents a contract of sorts between the mentor and protégé and serves to outline in advance the demands on personal time and energy required of the relationship (Stokes, 1994).

Critical to the success of a formal mentoring relationship is the matching process (Burke and McKeen, 1989). The relationship is most beneficial when both participants like each other, have an understanding of their responsibilities, and have something to offer each other (Burke and McKeen, 1989). Relationships are more likely to work when the protégé has a say in determining who their mentor is (Klauss, 1981; Farren and Gray, 1984; Burke and McKeen, 1989). Mentors should be people developers who want to share their expertise and relate to protégés in a dynamic manner and who know the organization and the people in it (Gray, 1986). They should be respected and have some degree of power or influence. Protégés should be receptive and responsive to the realities that a mentor shares, willing to incorporate these into their value system, and willing to make a creative contribution to the organization (Gray, 1986).

In a formal mentoring program, there is a fine line between too much structure and not enough (Phillips-Jones, 1982; Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984). Mentors should be encouraged to find what works for them and to build their own mentoring style for the formal mentoring relationship (Phillips-Jones, 1982; Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984). Mentors should be rewarded formally and informally for their participation and their visibility within the organization should be increased to highlight the contribution being made (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984; Keele, Buckner and Bushnell, 1987).

2.6 Women and Mentoring

The formal mentoring program being evaluated in this study is unique in design. Each mentor is assigned both a male and female protégé giving rise to questions of the impact of gender on the relationship. Studies have shown that many executive women credit their success to having had a mentor in their career, however, researchers point out that access to mentors is limited for women. The following section outlines the barriers women experience in gaining a mentor, the benefits of mentoring to women and the challenges faced in managing cross-gender mentoring relationships.

2.6.1 Benefits for Women

Many studies have shown that mentoring has aided executive women in achieving success in their careers. A study by Wentling (1992) of 30 executive women in industrial organizations indicated that 90% had been provided mentors in their professional careers. Of the women who had been mentored, 90% indicated that their mentors significantly influenced their career and had they not been provided substantial help, their career progress may have been hindered (Wentling, 1992). Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987) noted that in their study of 76 top executive women, all of the women who had reached the highest levels reported having had help from above. Similarly, Henning and Jardim (1977) reported that all of the successful female managers in their study had a male mentor who performed significant functions in their careers.

In addition to providing help in their career progress, mentoring has been linked to higher salaries for women. In a study of 30 female managers, Fitt and Newton (1981) observed that the 24 women who had reported having had mentors were on average better paid than the six women who had never had such an affiliation.

Having a mentor or affiliations in networks also helps women gain exposure to top management and access to information about organizational politics (Zey, 1988). This exposure and access can help to reduce the bottleneck of women in middle management

(Zey, 1988). Overall, mentor relationships may play a role in the quality of organizational life for women (Burke and McKeen, 1990)

Women who become mentors also gain from the relationship (Vincent and Seymour, 1995). In a study of 649 female executives, Vincent and Seymour (1995) noted that 60% of the respondents had been mentors and 78% of these mentors had been past protégés. From the mentor's perspective, the mentoring role was found to be an important component of career and life stages and having a protégé helped to advance the mentor's career by offering assistance such as helping to finish a project or serving as a sounding board for ideas (Vincent and Seymour, 1995). Mentors also gained real benefits in terms of satisfaction, personal development, peer recognition and advancement (Vincent and Seymour, 1995).

2.6.2 Barriers for Women in Obtaining a Mentor

The fewer women in an organization, the more important a mentor's guidance can be because of the dearth of other senior role models for women (Noe, 1988). Unfortunately, the number of mentoring relationships available to women is not keeping pace with the increasing number of women needing mentors (Noe, 1988).

Ragins and Cotton's (1991) study of 510 executives, in research and development organizations, found that gender was significantly related to perceived barriers to gaining

a mentor. Women were more likely than men to report that access to mentors was restricted, that mentors were unwilling to enter into relationships with them, that others in the organization would disapprove of the relationship and that either a mentor or others in the organization would interpret their approach as sexual (Ragins and Cotton, 1991). Morrison, White and Van Velsor (1987) note that 40% of the senior males who had acted as mentors to female protégés cited Equal Employment Opportunity legislation as important to their willingness to mentor, suggesting that such relationships might not have been formed in the absence of the legislation. Noe (1988) has hypothesized that women may not develop mentorships because of a lack of access to information networks, tokenism, stereotypes and attributions, socialization practices, norms regarding cross-gender relationships, and reliance on an ineffective power base (Noe, 1988).

These barriers to obtaining a mentor are compounded by the lack of female mentors (Noe, 1988). By definition, mentors are typically older, more experienced and had more responsible jobs, and since most senior jobs in administration are currently filled by men, it follows that most mentors at this time are male (Noe, 1988; McKeen and Burke, 1989, Ragins and Scandura, 1994). Ragins and Scandura (1994) did note however, that women were as likely as men to actually be mentors. Their study of 80 male and female executives in a matched sample found slightly more female mentors (n=33) than male mentors (n=30) (Ragins and Scandura, 1994).

Kanter (1977) suggests that since the few senior women face greater demands on their time than their male counterparts, they may have less time available to mentor others. In addition, the small group of potential female mentors is often overloaded with mentoring requests from the relatively larger block of women at lower ranks (Ragins and Cotton, 1993). Ragins and McFarlin's 1990 study of 181 protégés notes that compared to other gender combinations, female protégés with female mentors were more likely to agree with the idea of the mentor serving as a role model. In their study of 841 employees of large national accounting firms, Scandura and Viator (1994) found that female protégés with female mentors reported receiving significantly higher levels of social support compared to female protégés with male mentors. As fewer women are promoted the problem of a lack of role models and female mentors is perpetuated in the organization (Noe, 1988).

2.6.3 Challenges in Managing Cross-Gender Mentor Relationships

Taking an active part in the growth and development of a subordinate can result in growing concern, liking and admiration (Clawson and Kram, 1984). In cross-gender mentoring relationships, the parties must define the boundary between desired levels of intimacy and romantic involvement (McKeen and Burke, 1989). Channeling these feelings into a productive professional relationship without falling into the pitfalls caused by excessive intimacy requires thoughtful management of the relationship (Clawson and Kram, 1984).

Existing literature in the field of cross-gender mentoring does not address a number of issues. Although male mentors may pursue the same activities for their male protégés as for their female protégés, the outcomes of the roles they assume are not clearly known. In addition, little is known about cross-gender mentoring in a formalized mentoring program.

2.7 Summary

From the literature on mentoring we can conclude that mentoring programs may be an effective career development tool that aids young employees in developing managerial and technical skills, gaining insight into the organization, learning new ways to approach problems and increasing self-confidence. Not only may the protégé benefit but the mentor may benefit as well through developing subordinates, gaining the perspective and energetic drive of youth, receiving recognition from others for effective mentoring and developing a sense of pride in giving something back to the organization. The gender of mentors and protégés may add unique challenges to managing formal mentoring relationships. The literature suggests that the success of formal mentoring relationships may depend on careful matching of the mentor and protégé and the development skills the mentor possesses.

Although research exists on what characteristics a mentor should possess and what roles they may assume, little is known about how these affect outcomes of mentoring relationships. Since not all mentors may take on all the roles identified in the literature, it remains unclear what level of role performance is necessary to facilitate positive outcomes critical to mentoring success. The relationship between the roles that a mentor plays and positive outcomes of the mentoring relationship is unknown. The purpose of this exploratory research is to determine if a relationship exists between expectations, mentor roles and the outcomes of mentoring in a formalized mentoring program.

3.0 MODEL

Drawing on the research cited in the previous section, two models were proposed to illustrate that the mentor and protégé relationships are asymmetric and that mentors and protégés may experience different expectations and outcomes in a formal mentoring relationship. The first model is the Protégé Model (Figure 1) and the second is the Mentor Model (Figure 2). It is presumed that the outcomes that a protégé might experience will differ from those of the mentor because each participant has a different motivation for participating in the program. The mentor's outcome may be that participation in the program provided an opportunity to return something back to the organization. Outcomes of the protégé may include increasing their exposure and visibility in the organization and gaining developmental opportunities. Two models were necessary, therefore, to fully represent the formal mentoring relationship.

3.1 PROTÉGÉ MODEL

The proposed Protégé Model (Figure 1) is comprised of eight variables. Career planning and previous mentor experience are independent variables. Relationship intensity, career expectations and psychosocial expectations are operationalized as intervening variables, i.e. variables that emerge as a function of the independent variables and help to explain the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables (Davis and

FIGURE 1 - PROTÉGÉ MODEL

Cosenza, 1993). Communication of expectations is seen as a moderating variable, a variable that has a strong contingent effect on the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity. Career outcomes and psychosocial outcomes are operationalized as dependent variables that measure the effect of the formal mentoring relationship.

Following is a definition of each variable in the protégé model and an explanation of the anticipated relationships. A summary of the research questions is presented following this discussion of each variable.

3.1.1 Dependent Variables

Formal mentoring programs are intended to provide protégés with one or more kinds of mentoring help: advice on career goals and advancement strategies, instruction in social-managerial as well as technical skills, visibility and exposure, counseling about work-related and personal problems, encouragement and actual opportunities to perform the new skills that are acquired (Phillips-Jones, 1982). Kram's 1983 study of 18 developmental relationships identified the mentoring functions that a mentor provides to a protégé. Mentoring outcomes were divided into career outcomes and psychosocial outcomes (Kram, 1983). Career outcomes are those aspects of the relationship that primarily enhance career advancement. They include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments (Kram, 1983). Psychosocial outcomes are those aspects of the relationship that primarily enhance a protégé's sense of

competence, clarity of identity and effectiveness in the managerial role (Kram, 1983). These outcomes include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counselling and friendship (Kram, 1983). While outcomes of a formal mentoring relationship may be positive or negative, this study examined only positive outcomes at the request of the organization. Kram's distinction between the career and psychosocial functions of mentoring has been maintained and extended in this study.

When we say that mentoring serves career functions, we mean that career outcomes are both a potential reason for seeking a mentor and a potential consequence of the mentoring relationship. In this study, the distinction between career and psychosocial functions was used to categorize protégés' expectations of the mentoring relationship, the roles that a mentor plays, and the outcomes experienced by protégés. The dependent variables in the study are outcomes experienced by protégés. Both career and psychosocial outcomes were examined.

3.1.1.1 Career Outcomes

Career outcomes are defined as the outcomes of the formal mentoring relationship that enhance the protégé's career development (Kram, 1983). Career outcomes examined in this study include gaining a better understanding of the organization, expanding the protégé's network of professional contacts, increasing networking opportunities, and gaining more insight and information on career options.

3.1.1.2 Psychosocial Outcomes

Through psychosocial functions such as role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, friendship, and counseling, the young manager is supported in developing a sense of competence, clarity of identity, confidence and effectiveness in the managerial role (Kram, 1983). Psychosocial outcomes in the protégé model are defined as those outcomes of the formal mentoring relationship that enhance protégés' effectiveness in the managerial role (Kram, 1983). Psychosocial outcomes for protégés may include gaining insight and information on how to manage more effectively and receiving objective feedback and encouragement.

3.1.2 Explanatory Variables

The protégé model outlines the variables that may affect the outcomes experienced by the protégé in a formal mentoring relationship. It is presumed that the previous mentor experience of the protégé and career planning of the protégé will give rise to expectations that the protégé may have of the mentoring relationship. If these expectations are communicated to the mentor, the protégé and mentor may adjust the investment they make in the relationship in line with the expectations. The term relationship intensity has been adopted to indicate the degree of investment the relationship represents. It includes an assessment of both the amount of time participants spend together as well as the extent to which various roles, such as communicator, role model and appraiser, are performed

by the mentor. It is presumed the greater the relationship intensity, the more positive outcomes the protégé should experience. Following is a detailed description of the explanatory variables in the protégé model.

3.1.2.1 Previous Mentor Experience

It is hypothesized that if a protégé has limited previous mentor experience, they will have increased career and psychosocial expectations. If protégés have had few previous mentors their expectations of what can be gained in a short amount of time may be exaggerated (Ragins and McFarlin, 1990). Protégés who have had more previous mentors may have more realistic expectations of the potential gains from a mentor relationship given the time constraint of a formalized relationship. Regardless of previous mentor experience being positive or negative, experience alone will give rise to awareness of what can be gained in a mentoring relationship.

Ragins and McFarlin's (1990) study of 181 protégés in three organizations was used to compare perceptions of mentor roles in cross and same gender mentoring relationships. Previous mentor experience was found to have had one of the largest impacts on perceived mentor roles. Compared to protégés with extensive mentoring experience, protégés with fewer relationships were more likely to perceive their mentors as providing career and psychosocial roles (Ragins and McFarlin, 1990). One reason for this was thought to be that protégés with fewer relationships may have a more restricted basis for

evaluating their mentors than protégés with extensive mentoring experience thus resulting in inflated estimations of mentor roles effectiveness (Ragins and McFarlin, 1990). In addition, the first few mentoring relationships may have a powerful impact on the protégé (Ragins and McFarlin, 1990). Another explanation for this finding was that mentoring relationships that are very effective are simply maintained for a longer period of time than less effective relationships so those with fewer mentors may have mentors that are more effective in providing mentorship functions (Ragins and McFarlin, 1990). The independent variable previous mentor experience is defined in this model as the number of previous mentor relationships the protégé has had.

3.1.2.2 Career Planning

Career planning is hypothesized to impact the career and psychosocial expectations protégés have. Career planning is defined in this study as the extent to which a career plan exists, the extent to which protégés have clear career plans, and the ability of the protégé to know how to achieve these goals. Protégés who participate in career planning are expected to have higher career expectations than protégés who do not participate in career planning because they will have a clearer picture of how the relationship can enhance their careers. These expectations should, in turn shape their behavior to obtain career benefits. Protégés who participate in career planning are also expected to have high psychosocial expectations. Protégés with clearly defined career plans may have a

strong need for their mentor to help in increasing their self confidence and improving their managerial and interpersonal skills.

Previous studies have shown a correlation between mentoring and career planning. Roche (1979) found that in a study of male and female executives, career planning was correlated to mentoring and over the years more executives who had had a mentor followed a career plan than those who did not. While correlations do not indicate the direction of causality, it is logical to hypothesize that career planners will seek out mentors.

Noe (1988) found similar results in his study of 139 educators and 43 mentors. Noe hypothesized that individuals who engage in career planning activities are likely to have a greater awareness of their own strengths, weaknesses and interests than will individuals who have not considered their career plans (Noe, 1988). While it was not clear whether career planners and non career planners reported different levels of career benefits, it was noted that protégés who engaged in career planning reported receiving more psychosocial benefits than did protégés with underdeveloped career plans (Noe, 1988). Noe attributed this to the fact that individuals who had already formulated career plans or a strong interest in work, may have had a greater need for their mentors to provide relationships in which they could openly discuss work and career-related anxieties and frustrations, i.e. psychosocial functions (Noe, 1988).

3.1.2.3 Career and Psychosocial Expectations

The expectations that participants have about the formal mentoring relationship are very important to the development of that relationship. Zey (1985) notes that some formal mentoring programs suffer because participants have not been told what the program is actually set up to accomplish which often leads to confusion and false expectations. Some protégés may think that completing the program is an automatic means to a higher position, whereas the program might be formulated merely to sharpen the junior's skills and familiarize him/her with the organization's structure (Zey, 1985).

Expectations that participants have about the formal mentor relationship may be thought of as outcomes that they hope to gain from the mentoring relationship. If outcomes of the mentoring relationship can be categorized as either career or psychosocial, it is logical to hypothesize that the expectations a protégé has can also be categorized in this way. Career expectations are defined as the expectations a protégé may have of realizing career benefits from the formal mentoring relationship. Protégés' career expectations may include increasing their exposure and visibility in the organization, developing new ways to approach problems, and advancement. Psychosocial expectations are defined as the expectations a protégé may have of realizing psychosocial benefits such as an enhanced sense of competence, clarity of identity, and effectiveness in the managerial role.

Specifically, protégés may expect the mentoring experience to provide greater insight into themselves.

3.1.2.4 Communication of Expectations

If participants do not share their expectations it is difficult to shape the relationship to meet the participants needs and desires. As a guiding principle to success in developing formal mentoring relationships, Farren, Gray and Kaye (1984) urge protégés and mentors to share and negotiate their expectations. One potential pitfall of a formal mentor program is that protégés may want and expect more than their mentors can deliver (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984). Protégés need to clarify exactly what they want from the mentor in the first session and the mentor needs to specify candidly what they can and cannot deliver. When this is accomplished they can schedule their sessions to best meet the needs of both parties (Farren, Gray and Kaye, 1984). Zey (1985) also notes that written explanation plus verbal communication of program goals during the initial interview and orientations can prevent later misunderstandings. Communication of expectations may signal to the mentor what roles and behavior may be necessary to achieve positive outcomes. Only if the protégé shares his or her expectations with their mentor can the protégé's expectations shape their mentor's role performance.

For the purpose of this study, communication of expectations is defined as the extent to which protégés and mentors share their expectations with each other. It is the level that

expectations were shared and not the content of those expectations that is within the realm of this study. As a moderating variable, communication of expectations is hypothesized to have a strong contingent effect on the relationship between expectations and the intensity of the mentoring relationship.

3.1.2.5 Relationship Intensity

The type and level of interaction between the mentor and protégé is presumed to determine what outcomes the protégé receives from the formal mentoring relationship. The type of interaction refers to the roles that a mentor may assume in providing career and psychosocial functions to the protégé. The more time that the mentor and protégé spend together the greater the potential for the relationship to develop and for the protégé to experience high levels of outcomes.

The Ragins and McFarlin (1990) study of 181 protégés noted that protégés with longer mentoring relationships were more likely to perceive their mentors as assuming more roles whereas protégés with shorter mentoring relationships perceived their mentor functions as limited to only coaching and exposure. This is in line with Krams' (1983) finding that coaching and exposure are expectations that are met in the initiation phase of the mentoring relationship during the first six months to a year. The more time that a mentor and protégé spend together the greater the opportunity for role development by the mentor and the greater the intensity of the relationship.

The relationship that develops between the mentor and protégé is defined by the roles the mentor assumes. The most prominent effect of mentoring relationships is the impact on a protégé's career. As part of a career development system, Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) identified numerous roles that a supervisor may play. These roles were identified by Leibowitz and Schlossberg in their 1981 pilot study of employees and supervisors. On the basis of pilot interviews, the following nine roles that supervisors may play were identified: communicator, counselor, appraiser, coach, mentor, advisor, broker, referral agent and advocate.

As a tool to measure the success of mentoring at Douglas Aircraft, Geiger (1992) adapted seven roles from the above nine roles. Writing role descriptions for mentors was found to be a useful start to the process of planning a mentoring program with a built-in evaluation (Geiger, 1992). Protégés were asked to evaluate the kind of help received from mentors in the performance of the following mentor roles: communicator, counselor, coach, advisor, broker, referral agent and advocate. Following Kram's differentiation between career and psychosocial functions, the roles identified by Leibowitz and Schlossberg, and further developed by Geiger may be classified as career enhancing or psychosocial. Career enhancing roles would include such as appraiser, coach, and advocate. Psychosocial roles would include roles such as communicator and counselor.

It is hypothesized that the more time that a protégé spends with a mentor the greater the opportunity for role development by the mentor. The more roles that the mentor performs the greater potential for outcomes to be realized. The time that a mentor and protégé spend together combined with the extent to which various roles are developed is the definition of relationship intensity. Relationship intensity is operationalized as an intervening variable.

3.1.3 Protégé Model Research Questions

The model which is represented diagrammatically in Figure 1 is summarized by the following five research questions:

Q1: Does previous mentor experience lower career and psychosocial expectations?

Q2: Is career planning associated with higher career and psychosocial expectations?

Q3: Are higher protégé expectations associated with higher relationship intensity?

Q4: Does communication of expectations moderate the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity?

Q5: Is higher relationship intensity associated with higher positive outcomes?

3.1.4 Supplementary Research Questions

In addition to the research questions outlined above, the opportunity to compare potential differences between same-sex and opposite-sex mentoring relationships exists. From the literature we are aware of the differences men and women experience in obtaining mentors and the potential problems of opposite-sex mentoring relationships. The literature also gives some indication that the strength of the formal mentoring relationship may be enhanced if that relationship is same-sex. This study examined whether or not protégés and mentors of the same-sex are inclined to have a stronger relationship intensity than relationships of the opposite-sex.

The specific roles that the mentor may play were also examined in more detail. If the roles the mentors performs can be categorized as career or psychosocial, it is presumed that career outcomes would be more highly related to mentors' performance of career roles than psychosocial roles. Similarly, it is presumed that psychosocial outcomes are more highly related to mentors' performance of psychosocial roles than career roles.

Following are the supplementary research questions for the protégé model.

SQ1: Is the intensity of the relationship greater in same-sex relationships than in opposite-sex relationships?

SQ2: Are protégés' career outcomes more highly related to mentors' performance of career roles than psychosocial roles?

SQ3: Are protégés' psychosocial outcomes more highly related to mentors' performance of psychosocial roles?

3.2 MENTOR MODEL

The second model proposed, the Mentor Model (Figure 2), is comprised of the following constructs: career outcomes, psychosocial outcomes, average relationship intensity, career expectations, psychosocial expectations and previous mentor experience. Career outcomes and psychosocial outcomes are operationalized as dependent variables, average relationship intensity and career and psychosocial expectations as intervening variables and previous mentor experience is an independent variable. Following are definitions of the variables in the mentor model and their theoretical logic. A summary of the research questions is presented following the discussion of the variables.

3.2.1 Dependent Variables

Kram (1983) notes that not only do protégés gain from the mentoring relationship but the mentor also gains. As a result of providing career and psychosocial functions to young managers, senior managers experience internal satisfaction, gain recognition and respect from other senior managers for contributing to the development of young managerial talent and receive confirmation and support from the young manager who seeks counsel (Kram, 1983). Mentoring provides mentors with the opportunity to develop their interpersonal skills and to stimulate technical updating (Noe, 1988). An experienced mentor may gain technical and psychological support, find internal satisfaction in

FIGURE 2 - MENTOR MODEL

enabling a younger colleague to learn how to navigate in the organizational world, and gain respect from colleagues for successfully developing younger talent for the organization (Kram and Isabella, 1985). Hunt (1992) notes in his study of 26 mentors that when the needs of the mentor are taken into account, mentors themselves may extend their power base, exercise their creativity, bask in the success of their protégés and otherwise improve their own knowledge and skills (Hunt, 1992).

While negative outcomes exist, the scope of this study will focus on the positive outcomes mentors experience from the formal mentoring relationship. As is the case for protégés, outcomes for mentors can be both career-enhancing and psychosocial. While Kram (1983) does not make the distinction between career and psychosocial functions for mentors, both kinds of functions are represented in the outcomes identified by other researchers. Career outcomes could include gaining recognition as a people developer and having an opportunity to keep in touch with issues at different levels of the organization (Burke, 1984; Hunt, 1992; Klauss, 1981; Dench, Hutchinson and Levine, 1993). Psychosocial outcomes for mentors could include having an opportunity to refine coaching skills and having an opportunity to give something back to the organization (Burke, 1984; Hunt, 1992; Klauss, 1981; Dench, Hutchinson and Levine, 1993).

3.2.1.1 Career Outcomes

Following the work of Kram, career outcomes can be defined as those outcomes of the formal mentoring relationship that enhance the mentor's career development. Career outcomes experienced by the mentor may include gaining recognition as a people developer and having an opportunity to keep in touch with issues at different levels of the organization.

3.2.1.2 Psychosocial Outcomes

Psychosocial outcomes for mentors may be defined as those outcomes of the formal mentoring relationship that enhance the mentor's effectiveness in the managerial role (Kram, 1983). Psychosocial outcomes experienced by the mentor may include having an opportunity to return something back to the organization, refine coaching skills, and gain insight into how the senior team is viewed.

3.2.2 Explanatory Variables

The mentor model outlines the variables that are presumed to affect the outcomes experienced by the mentor in a formal mentoring relationship. It is hypothesized that the previous mentor experience of the mentor gives rise to career and psychosocial expectations that the mentor may have about the outcomes of the relationship. These expectations may in turn impact the amount of time the mentor spends with the protégé and the type of roles they demonstrate in the relationship. Expectations may also affect the type of behavior the mentor exhibits and thus the outcomes that may be gained from the formal mentoring relationship

3.2.2.1 Mentor Career Expectations

Mentor expectations are hypothesized to motivate the behavior of mentors. Mentor expectations about the formal mentoring relationship may be thought of as outcomes that are hoped to be gained. However, the expectations that the mentor has about the formal mentoring relationship differ from those developed by the protégé. As with protégés, a distinction between mentor expectations that are career-enhancing and expectations that are psychosocial can be made. Career expectations for the mentor are those that enhance career development and may include learning about other areas of the organization and providing a source of new ideas.

3.2.2.2 Mentor Psychosocial Expectations

Psychosocial expectations for the mentor are those aspects of the relationship that enhance the mentor's sense of competence, clarity of identity and effectiveness in the managerial role (Kram, 1983). Mentors may hold psychosocial expectations such as they expect to gain a sense of pride in seeing the development of employees, have an opportunity to give something back to the organization and experience a personal challenge.

3.2.2.3 Previous Mentor Experience

In a 1979 study by Roche, nearly two thirds of the mentors reported having had a mentor and one-third of them reported having had two or more mentors (Roche, 1979). Executives who had had a mentor earned more money at a younger age, were better educated, more likely to follow a career plan and, in turn, sponsored more protégés than executives who had not had a mentor (Roche, 1979). It is hypothesized that if a mentor has personal experience of being a protégé they may have a clearer understanding of what the protégé hopes to accomplish from the mentoring relationship and what their own expectations may include. If the mentor has also mentored others in the past they may be experienced in the types of roles needed to develop a successful relationship and foster desired outcomes. Mentors with previous mentor experience may also be aware of the commitment and time required to foster such a relationship. Since the majority of

previous mentor experience will have been informal, mentors may be aware of the limitations of a structured formal program with a set duration. Mentors may see participation in a formal program as a poor substitute to an informal relationship that evolves naturally, resulting in lower expectations.

Previous mentor experience is hypothesized to have an indirect effect on the roles that the mentor assumes through the intervening variable of expectations. Previous mentor experience for the mentor is defined as the number of mentor relationships the mentor has personally had in their career combined with the number of protégés they have mentored in the past.

3.2.2.4 Average Relationship Intensity

The relationship that develops between the mentor and protégé is the result of the mentor and protégé spending time together and the roles that the mentor performs. The mentor may perform roles such as communicator, counselor, appraiser, coach, mentor, advisor, broker, referral agent and advocate (Leibowitz and Schlossberg, 1981). The mentor may assume different roles in order to achieve different outcomes and may perform different roles with each protégé.

Average relationship intensity is an intervening variable that can be used as a measure of the quality of the relationship. The relationship intensity is a product of the level of help

that the mentor provided by performing each of the roles and the degree of contact that the protégés and mentors had with each other. The mentors in this study have both a female and male protégé and so the average relationship intensity of the two relationships will be used to test the relationship between relationship intensity and mentor outcomes.

3.2.3 Mentor Model Research Questions

The mentor model shown in Figure 2 is summarized by the following three research questions:

Q1: Does previous mentor experience contribute to lower career and psychosocial expectations for the mentor?

Q2: Are higher mentor expectations associated with higher average relationship intensity?

Q3: Is higher average relationship intensity associated with more positive mentor outcomes?

4.0 METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to determine if a relationship exists between protégé and mentor expectations, the intensity of the relationship and positive outcomes in a formal mentoring relationship. This research examined the proposed research questions by gathering primary data from a survey of participants in a formalized mentoring program at a large financial institution. The questionnaires and proposed measures of the variables identified in the models are discussed in the following section.

4.1 The Sample

A current formal mentoring program at a large Canadian financial institution was identified for this study. Introduction to the program administrator was made by a senior executive of the organization. Through this contact, employees who had participated in the formal mentoring program were identified. Participation in the formal mentoring program was voluntary and participants were required to have a strong commitment to self development. From the pool of volunteers, protégés were selected randomly based on the sorting criteria of equal gender and proportionate functional group representation. Other matching criteria included a two grade level gap and a mentor removed from the direct reporting line. Each mentor was matched with one female and one male protégé. The matching was based on the preferences and objectives identified by the protégé on the questionnaire they submitted when volunteering for the program.

Participants in the formal program are all managerial level employees located in British Columbia, Alberta, Toronto and south western Ontario. All participants who have completed the formal mentoring program to date are included in the sample. The sample size was 170 in which 56 are mentors and 114 are protégés. Of the 56 mentors, 12 are female. Each mentor was assigned both a male and a female protégé, resulting in 57 of the 114 protégés being female and 57 being male.

4.2 The Questionnaires

Primary data was collected by two questionnaires (Appendix II and IV) designed for this research. The questionnaire in Appendix II was administered to the protégés (referred to as advisees in the organization) and the questionnaire in Appendix IV was administered to the mentors (referred to as advisors in the organization). The mentor questionnaire was designed to obtain responses about the mentor relationship with both the mentor's male and female protégés and appropriate modifications have been made to reflect the different expectations and outcomes that mentors and protégés would experience. For example a protégé may hope that their mentor provide coaching and the mentor may hope to refine their own coaching skills. In order to take advantage of the unique opportunity this program affords, questionnaires were marked with an identification number which allowed the researcher to match mentors with their protégés.

The development of the questionnaires was aided by the completion of five personal interviews. The program administrator was interviewed along with two advisors and two advisees who had participated in the formal mentoring program. Both advisors commented that their participation in the formal mentoring program provided an opportunity to give something back to the organization and that the relationships that developed met their expectations. Advisees interviewed indicated that the level of success of the relationship is a combination of the effort put into the process and the presence of realistic expectations.

Insight into how the formal mentoring program was executed within the organization was given by the program administrator along with specific information regarding how participants were selected and how mentors and protégés were matched. The final draft questionnaire was the result of numerous meetings with the program administrator and an outside consultant hired by the organization, taking into consideration their concern for length and questions appropriate to the individuals involved.

Each questionnaire consists of four sections: initial involvement in the program, evaluation of the relationship, overall evaluation of the advisor program and personal information. Section I - Initial Involvement in the Program, relates to expectations participants held prior to involvement in the formal mentoring program. Ideally, expectations would be better if measured prior to participation in the formal program, but a longitudinal study was not possible. Section II - Evaluation of Relationship, relates to

specific roles the mentor may have assumed and the impact participation in the program had on participants. The design of this section for the mentors allows participants to evaluate the relationship they had with their female and male protégés separately. Section III - Overall Evaluation of the Advisor Program, was included at the request of the sponsoring organization. It evaluates what criteria are important in the matching of participants, how well participants feel they were individually matched and what affect the experience has had on their desire to continue mentoring or to mentor in the future. Section IV - Personal Information, includes demographics such as length of employment, current position, age, sex, and education.

The final draft of the questionnaires was approved by a senior executive of the organization and the program administrator prior to being distributed to all those who had participated in the program to date. Although it would have been desirable to pre-test the questionnaires, the program administrator and outside consultant felt it would place an unnecessary burden on the program participants and unnecessarily delay the distribution of the questionnaire to the entire sample. A cover letter, written by the senior executive, endorsing the research introduced the questionnaires to program participants (Appendix V). A follow-up letter from the researcher was sent three weeks following initial distribution of the questionnaire to encourage completion and increase response rate (Appendix VI). A response rate of 91.3% was achieved for protégés and 87.5% for mentors.

4.3 Measures

4.3.1 Protege Measures

Following are the proposed measures for the constructs in the protégé model. A full list of items included in each measure can be found in Appendix I. As noted earlier, Appendix II contains the actual questionnaire used.

4.3.1.1 Career Outcomes and Psychosocial Outcomes

Noe (1988) developed a measure designed to assess the various types of functions provided by mentors and identified by Kram (1983). Noe studied nine development programs that had been administered at nine different sites across the United States which involved 139 protégés and 43 mentors (Noe, 1988). In order to assess the extent to which protégés believed the mentors provided career and psychosocial functions, 32 items were developed on the basis of career and psychosocial functions previously identified by Kram (Noe, 1988). Examination of the eigenvalues indicated that the two factors that emerged explained approximately 82% of the variance in the mentoring function items (Noe, 1988). The 7 item scale to measure career-related functions was found to have an internal consistency of .89. The 14 item scale to measure psychosocial functions had an internal consistency of .92.

A similar set of scales was developed by Scandura and Viator (1994). Their Mentorship survey instrument was one part of a multi-part questionnaire and contained 20 likert type questions. Through factor analysis, three scales emerged which measure social support, career development and role modeling. The social support scale consisted of 5 items and was found to have a Cronbach's alpha of .81. The career development scale with 6 items, had a Cronbach's alpha of .75 and the role modeling scale of 4 items, had a Cronbach's alpha of .70.

Riley and Wrench (1985) developed a stringent criterion of mentoring by developing a Career Support Scale intended to describe the characteristics of a "true" mentoring relationship for their study of 168 female lawyers in Oregon.. The career support scale consisted of four subscales, "Provisions" (15 items), "Emotion" (5 items), "Self-concept" (8 items) and "Resources" (1 item). Each subject was asked to list up to five individuals who were felt to have played a positive role in the development of the subject's career and for each of those individuals, the subject rated each statement in the four subscales. Results indicated that those who had relationships meeting the more stringent criterion perceived themselves as more successful in their careers than those without such relationships (Riley and Wrench, 1985).

For this study, two scales were assembled to measure career and psychosocial outcomes for protégés (Appendix I). The scales described below combine the concepts outlined in the studies above and incorporate the language, culture and scope of the formal mentoring

program at the organization in this study. A more detailed set of scales that more closely resembled those in the literature were originally presented to the organization and later reduced, at their request, to reduce the length of the questionnaire and response burden. Participants in the study rated the items on a five point likert scale where 1 indicates “to a slight extent” and 5 indicates “to a large extent”.

The following 8 item scale was designed to measure career outcomes: “I’ve gained a better understanding of the workings of the organization” (Riley and Wrench, 1985; Geiger, 1992), “My network of professional contacts has expanded and networking opportunities increased” (Burke, 1984; Noe, 1988; Reeve, 1990; Riley and Wrench, 1985; Geiger, 1992), “I have more insight and information on career options” (Riley and Wrench, 1985; Reeve, 1990; Scandura and Viator, 1994), “I gained insight on how to overcome barriers to advancement” (Noe, 1988), “My visibility and exposure within the organization has increased” (Kram, 1983; Noe, 1988; Burke, 1984; Reeve, 1990), “I have gained increased responsibility” (Noe, 1988) “My insight into other areas of the organization has increased”, and “Participation in the program helped me make a positive career move”. The final two items were included in the scale at the request of the organization sponsoring the study. A high total score for these items should indicate a high level of career outcomes.

The 4 item scale to measure psychosocial outcomes includes the following: “My self-esteem and self-confidence has improved” (Burke, 1984; Riley and Wrench, 1985), “I

received objective feedback and encouragement” (Noe, 1988; Reeve, 1990; Riley and Wrench, 1985), “I gained insight and information on managing more effectively” (Riley and Wrench, 1985; Geiger, 1992) and “I’ve taken more control of my career”. The final item was developed by the administrator of the mentoring program and included at the request of the organization in this study. A high total score for these items should indicate a high level of psychosocial outcomes. A factor analysis was conducted to ascertain if separate scales exist that measure career outcomes and psychosocial outcomes and to confirm the individual items applicable to each scale. In order to be confident about the reliability of each scale, Cronbach’s alpha was assessed

4.3.1.2 Relationship Intensity

The relationship that develops between a mentor and protégé is nurtured by the time spent together and type and level of intellectual exchange. Relationship intensity has been defined in this study as a function of the degree of contact that the protégés and mentors had with each other and the help that the mentor provided by performing the nine roles identified in the literature. The roles that a mentor assumes are presumed to be critical in determining the kind of help protégés received from their mentor.

The nine roles identified by Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) and seven roles that were further developed by Geiger (1992) have been modified slightly by name and definition to appropriate language for the organization in this study (see Appendix I). The

following table illustrates the roles, their description and what departures were made from the literature.

MENTOR ROLES

ROLE	DESCRIPTION	DEPARTURE FROM LITERATURE
<i>Appraiser</i>	-gives feedback on the development plan designed around future goals and objectives	-no departure from definition developed by Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) -role omitted by Geiger (1992)
<i>Coach</i>	-gives specific interpersonal feedback and serves as an independent third party to clarify thinking on such items as performance goals and developmental needs	-definition reduced -incorporates part of the definition developed by Geiger (1992)
<i>Counselor</i>	-provides information about career opportunities and options and suggests appropriate strategies	-originally titled advisor by Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) and Geiger (1992) -title changed at request of the sponsoring organization
<i>Broker</i>	-arranges opportunities for me to become more visible and expand my network of professional contacts	-definition reduced -incorporates part of the definition developed by Geiger (1992)
<i>Referral Agent</i>	-identifies resources to pursue for more information and follows up on effectiveness of suggested referrals	-no departure from literature
<i>Communicator</i>	-encourages a two-way exchange of information and acts as a sounding board for ideas and concerns	-no departure from literature
<i>Informant</i>	-helps to interpret and clarify the organization's culture, political structure and vision	-originally titled counselor -title changed to be more consistent with description
<i>Role Model</i>	-serves as a role model in my career development by demonstrating corporate values and successful career behaviors	-originally titled mentor -role omitted by Geiger (1992) -title changed to avoid confusion
<i>Advocate</i>	-represents my concerns on specific issues to higher-level managers	-incorporates part of definition by Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) and Geiger (1992)

The role of advisor has been renamed to counselor as the organization being studied uses the term Advisor to describe their mentors. Counselor is defined as one who provides information about career opportunities and options and suggests appropriate strategies. The original role of counselor was to help to interpret and clarify the organization's culture, political structure and vision. This role was renamed informant. The role of mentor was originally defined by Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981) as one who serves as

a sponsor to facilitate an employee's career growth. This role was omitted by Geiger (1992). In this study the term mentor was replaced with role model as the term mentor is used to describe the individual in this study and not one specific role. Role model is defined as one who demonstrates corporate values and successful career behaviors.

The description of broker and advocate were reduced to incorporate language appropriate to the direction given to participants in the program being studied. The description of referral agent and communicator most closely resemble the descriptions in the original two studies. Appraiser, although omitted by Geiger (1992), appears with the same description developed by Leibowitz and Schlossberg (1981). The final role of coach incorporates part of the definition developed by Geiger(1992).

The nine roles are measured using a five point likert scale to describe the level of help mentors gave protégés. The scale is anchored with "no help" and "significant help". The roles of appraiser, coach, counselor, broker, referral agent and advocate have been classified as career functions. Psychosocial functions include communicator, informant and role model. A factor analysis was performed to determine if the nine roles do indeed reflect these two functions. Both sets of functions were used to calculate relationship intensity.

The second component of the intensity of the mentor relationship is the time spent together. Protégés were asked to indicate the number of direct contacts they had with

their mentor and how long the relationship lasted (Appendix I). Contact between mentor and protégé was measured by the number of face-to-face meetings mentors and protégés shared. The monthly contact was multiplied by the length of the relationship and the result was converted to standard scores. These standard scores were combined with standard scores for the nine roles to calculate relationship intensity using the following formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Where: RI} &= \text{Relationship Intensity} \\ \text{RI} &= Z(\text{total roles}) \times Z(\text{time}) \end{aligned}$$

For the analysis of the supplementary questions, relationship intensity was further disaggregated into submeasures that reflect same-sex and opposite-sex relationships. Using standard scores, the relationship intensity was calculated for career roles and psychosocial roles in same-sex relationships and opposite-sex relationships. It was then possible to compare the relationship intensity, specific to career roles versus psychosocial roles, for same-sex and opposite-sex relationships. Given that there were only 12 female mentors in the sample, the majority of cross-sex relationships are male mentors with female protégés. Although these cross-sex relationships may be different from the cross-sex relationships between a female mentor and male protégé, responses were combined to provide a more powerful test. The relationships were compared using the following formulas:

Where: I = Relationship Intensity, p = psychosocial roles, c = career roles,
s = same-sex relationships, o = opposite-sex relationships, Z = standard score

$I_{ps} = Z(\text{psychosocial roles for same-sex protégés}) \times Z(\text{time same-sex})$

$I_{po} = Z(\text{psychosocial roles for opposite-sex protégés}) \times Z(\text{time opposite-sex})$

$I_{cs} = Z(\text{career roles for same-sex protégés}) \times Z(\text{time same-sex})$

$I_{co} = Z(\text{career roles for opposite-sex protégés}) \times Z(\text{time opposite-sex})$

Relationship Intensity of same-sex relationships = $I_s = I_{ps} + I_{cs}$

Relationship Intensity of opposite-sex relationships = $I_o = I_{po} + I_{co}$

4.3.1.3 Career and Psychosocial Expectations

Most of the literature on mentoring measures the outcomes of mentoring relationships or what type of help protégés received from their mentors. No extant scales of mentoring expectations could be found. Since expectations may be thought of as outcomes that are hoped to be gained, scales of expectations were developed from existing outcome measures. Expectations are divided into those that are career-enhancing and those that are psychosocial.

A set of scales of expectations was developed for this study based on existing scales by Noe (1988) and Scandura and Viator (1994), the conceptual literature on possible outcomes of mentoring relationships and the goals of the organization in the study. Responses were measured on a 5 point likert scale in which 1 indicates “had no expectations” and 5 indicates “had high expectations”. Items complete the statement, “I

expected my participation would...". A factor analysis was conducted to determine if separate scales exist to measure career-enhancing expectations and psychosocial expectations.

Five items form the proposed scale measure career-enhancing expectations and four items measure psychosocial expectations. The five career-enhancing items are the following: "provide coaching" (Kram, 1983; Noe, 1988; Burke, 1984; Scandura and Viator, 1994), "provide developmental opportunities", "increase my exposure and visibility" (Kram, 1983; Noe, 1988; Burke, 1984; Reeve, 1990), "lead to advancement" (Noe, 1988; Burke, 1984; Riley and Wrench, 1985), and "provide greater understanding of the organization" (Riley and Wrench, 1985; Geiger, 1992). The four psychosocial expectation items are the following: "increase my self-confidence" (Burke, 1984; Riley and Wrench, 1985), "improve my managerial and interpersonal skills" (Noe, 1988), "provide greater insight into myself" (Noe, 1988), and "help me develop new ways to approach problems" (Riley and Wrench, 1985). In order to be confident about the reliability of each scale, Cronbach's alpha was assessed for the sum of each scale.

4.3.1.4 Communication of Expectations

Mentors cannot adapt their behavior to address protégé expectations if they are unaware of those expectations. Thus communication of expectations is hypothesized to moderate the effect that expectations have on the intensity of the relationship. If the protégé has shared their expectations with their mentor, the mentor will be more aware of what roles are necessary to satisfy those expectations. Also, if the protégé hopes to accomplish a great deal in a short period of time it may indicate to the mentor that more time should be spent with that protégé than with a protégé who has fewer expectations. Communication of expectations was measured on a five point scale indicating to what degree the protégé and mentor shared their expectations with each other. Responses range from 1 to indicate “no” to 5 to indicate “fully”.

4.3.1.5 Previous Mentor Experience

From the literature we have learned that successful individuals have experienced one or more mentors in their career. While it is unclear whether or not all of these experiences were positive, the experience in and of itself serves to increase awareness of the potential of such relationships. Protégés with previous mentor experience will have a more accurate picture of what can be accomplished and will have fewer career and psychosocial expectations. Respondents in this study were asked to indicate how many previous mentor relationships they have experienced. It is assumed that all of these

relationships will have been informal since formal mentoring programs are relatively new and few organizations have implemented them.

4.3.1.6 Career Planning

The proposed measure for career planning is an adaptation of Gould's (1979) six item career planning scale. Gould measured career planning by inquiring into the extent to which career plans exist, how frequently career plans are changed, how clear the plans are and whether or not a strategy exists for achieving career goals. The 6 item scale was measured on a 6 point likert scale and the coefficient alpha computed for the scale was .80, indicating an acceptable level of internal consistency. A high score on the scale would be indicative of self-initiated career planning activities. The same scale was later used by Noe (1988) to examine the influence of protégé characteristics on the career and psychosocial benefits gained from their mentor relationship. Noe observed a reliability estimate of .89.

Gould's original six item scale was suggested but later reduced to three items at the request of the organization in this study. The organization felt that some of the items in the original scale were repetitious and in favor of conserving space wanted the scale reduced. The three items forming the proposed scale of career planning are: the extent to which a career plan exists, how clear career plans are, and whether or not participants know how to achieve their career goals. Responses are measured on a five point likert

scale in which 1 indicates “strongly disagree” and 5 indicates “strongly agree”. The last item, “my career objectives are not clear”, is scored in reverse. A high mean score would indicate that participants had engaged in a high degree of career planning.

4.3.2 Mentor Measures

The mentor model for the evaluation of formal mentor relationships consists of six variables: two dependent variables, three intervening variables and one independent variable. The dependent variables are career outcomes and psychosocial outcomes. The independent variable is previous mentor experience. The intervening variables are average relationship intensity (for the mentor’s two protégés), career expectations, and psychosocial expectations. Following are the proposed measures for these variables. A full list of items in each measure can be found in Appendix III. Appendix IV contains the actual questionnaire.

4.3.2.1 Career Outcomes and Psychosocial Outcomes

Most of the literature on mentoring focuses on the outcomes of protégés rather than mentors. One study in which the outcomes of mentors were examined was by Hunt (1992) who studied the positive and negative outcomes reported by 26 mentors who had participated in a formal mentoring program. The purpose was to identify outcomes of both a positive and negative nature at the end of the planned one year program, identify

outcomes of both a positive and a negative nature seven years later and identify changes in outcomes between year one and seven. Hunt conducted in-depth interviews to identify the goals and outcomes participants had one year after the program had ended. Hunt used a structured sets of questions that were based on the mentoring literature. Mentors reported their psychosocial and career related outcomes in the form of open-ended questions and although Hunt identified outcomes for mentors, no scales were developed to measure these outcomes.

Although the career and psychosocial categories identified by Kram (1983) were developed to describe outcomes for protégés, mentors may experience similar types of outcomes. Through the performance of mentoring functions, mentors may enhance their own sense of competence, clarity of identify and effectiveness in their own managerial role, resulting in psychosocial outcomes for themselves. For this study, two scales have been developed that incorporate the work of Hunt, additional literature on the benefits of formal mentoring to mentors and the goals of the organization being studied. The goals of the organization in this study included mentors having an opportunity to refine their coaching skills, giving them an opportunity to give something back to the organization and gaining recognition as a people developer. The scales to measure mentor outcomes in this study were limited to a total of five items at the request of the organization in order to reduce the response burden on the mentors. Items are measured on a five point likert scale indicating to what extent each outcome was experienced. A factor analysis was conducted to determine if separate scales exist to measure career and psychosocial

outcomes. Then Cronbach's alpha was calculated to determine the reliability of the individual scales.

The two item scale intended to measure career outcomes for mentors included the following: "I gained recognition as a people developer" and "I had an opportunity to keep in touch with issues at different levels of the organization" (Burke, 1984; Hunt, 1992; Klauss, 1981; Dench, Hutchinson and Levine, 1993) Psychosocial outcomes were measured by three items: "I had an opportunity to refine my coaching skills", "I had a chance to give something back to the organization and "I received good insight into how the senior team is viewed" (Burke, 1984; Hunt, 1992; Klauss 1981; Dench, Hutchinson and Levine, 1993).

4.3.2.2 Average Relationship Intensity

For the purpose of this study, relationship intensity has been defined as the product of the help that the mentor provided by performing the nine mentoring roles and the degree of contact that the protégés and mentors had with each other. Relationship intensity was averaged across each mentor's two protégés. Mentors were asked to what extent they feel they helped their male and female protégés in the performance of the nine roles identified above. Responses were measured using the same five point likert scale as in the protégés study, anchored with "gave no help" and "gave significant help. The intensity of the individual relationship was calculated as the product of standard scores of the roles

assumed by the mentors and how often the mentor and protégé met during the formal mentoring relationship. The length of the relationship and the frequency of meetings that the mentor and protégé had were determined from the protégé's responses (Appendix I) to alleviate response burden on the mentor at the request of the sponsoring organization.

Where: I = Relationship Intensity, AI = Average Relationship Intensity,
 f = female protégés m = male protégés
 p = psychosocial roles, c = career roles, Z = standard score

$I_{fp} = Z(\text{psychosocial roles for female protégés}) \times Z(\text{time same-sex})$
 $I_{mp} = Z(\text{psychosocial roles for male protégés}) \times Z(\text{time opposite-sex})$
 $I_{fc} = Z(\text{career roles for female protégés}) \times Z(\text{time same-sex})$
 $I_{mc} = Z(\text{career roles for male protégés}) \times Z(\text{time opposite-sex})$

Relationship Intensity of female protégé relationships = $I_f = I_{fp} + I_{fc}$
 Relationship Intensity of male protégé relationships = $I_m = I_{mp} + I_{mc}$
 Average Relationship Intensity = $AI = \frac{(I_f + I_m)}{2}$

4.3.2.3 Career Expectations and Psychosocial Expectations

As with protégés, mentor expectations can be thought of as the outcomes that are possible in a formal mentoring relationship. The scales proposed to measure mentor expectations for this study have been constructed through analysis of mentor outcomes in the literature and the goals of the organization being studied. Some of the specific goals of the organization for the mentoring program were that mentors be recognized by others for effective mentoring, mentors experience a sense of pride in seeing employees develop

and that participating in the program would provide an opportunity for the mentors to give something back to the organization.

The two scales were limited to a total of six items at the request of the organization in order to reduce response burden on the mentors. The career-enhancing expectations scale consisted of three items: learning about other areas of the organization, gaining recognition from others for developing others, and a source of new ideas. The psychosocial expectations scale also consisted of three items: a sense of pride in seeing employees develop, personal challenge, and an opportunity to give something back to the organization. The items are scored on a 5 point scale ranging from 1 indicating “had no expectations” to 5 indicating “had high expectations” A factor analysis was conducted to determine if separate scales existed to measure career expectations and psychosocial expectations. Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine the reliability of the scales.

4.3.2.4 Previous Mentor Experience

Mentors' previous mentor experience was hypothesized to decrease the expectations the mentor has about the relationship. Previous mentor experience was measured by the number of reported mentors they have personally had in their career and the number of protégés they have mentored in the past. Standard scores were calculated so that these items could be combined to indicate the level of previous mentor experience.

4.4 Analysis Techniques for Protégé and Mentor Research Questions

Following is a table illustrating the proposed research questions, the variables involved and the type of analysis that was performed. An explanation of each type of analysis follows.

PROTÉGÉ RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question	Variables	Analysis
1. Does previous mentor experience lower career and psychosocial expectations?	Previous Mentor Experience Career Expectations Psychosocial Expectations	Bivariate Correlation
2. Do career planners have higher career and psychosocial expectations?	Career planning Career Expectations Psychosocial Expectations	Bivariate Correlation
3. Are higher protégé expectations associated with higher relationship intensity? and 4. Does communication of expectations moderate the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity?	Career Expectations Psychosocial Expectations Communication of Expectations Relationship Intensity	Moderated Regression (if the moderator is not significant, Bivariate correlation)
5. Is higher relationship intensity associated with higher outcomes?	Relationship Intensity Career Outcomes Psychosocial Outcomes	Bivariate Correlation

MENTOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question	Variables	Analysis
1. Does previous mentor experience contribute to reduced career and psychosocial expectations for the mentor?	Previous Mentor Experience Career Expectations Psychosocial Expectations	Bivariate Correlation
2. Are higher mentor expectations associated with higher average relationship intensity?	Career Expectations Psychosocial Expectations Avg. Relationship Intensity	Bivariate Correlation
3. Is higher average relationship intensity associated with more positive mentor outcomes?	Avg. Relationship Intensity Career Outcomes Psychosocial Outcomes	Bivariate Correlation

4.4.1 Bivariate Correlation

Bivariate correlation assesses the degree of relationship between two continuous variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). Correlation is the measure of the size and direction of relationship between two variables, and squared correlation is the measure of strength of association between them (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). Although it cannot show causality, a high correlation would lead credence to the hypothesized relationships and was used to assess most of the research questions identified above. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, r , is the most frequently used measure of association (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). Pearson r is independent of the scale of measurement and independent of sample size (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). An r value of -1.00 or +1.00 indicates perfect predictability of one score when the other is known (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). A statistically significant correlation would indicate the presence of a

relationship between the two variables. The relationships were examined separately for mentors and protégés in order to afford a greater understanding of the mentoring experience of both participants.

4.4.2 Moderated Regression

As illustrated in the protégé model, communication of expectations was hypothesized to moderate relationship between protégés' expectations and mentors' behavior. Specifically, if protégés' expectations are not communicated to the mentor, the mentor cannot respond to them. Moderated relationships can be analyzed by including interaction terms in a regression model (Cohen and Cohen, 1975). Two variables are said to interact in their accounting for variance when, over and above any additive combination of their separate effects, they have a joint effect (Cohen and Cohen, 1975). The independent variables, expectations and communication of expectations, may interact and have a joint effect on the dependent variable, relationship intensity. Whatever the nature of expectations (E) and communication of expectations (C), the interaction is carried in the EC product. The product can be understood in terms of joint or conditional or nonuniform relationships with the dependent variable, relationship intensity (I) (Cohen and Cohen, 1975). To determine the interaction effects of expectations and communication, each must first be partialled from the dependent variable, relationship intensity (Cohen and Cohen, 1975). Moderated regressions were run separately for each expectations scale. Thus the following regression models were analyzed:

$$RI = \text{fn} (Ec, C, Ec \times C)$$

$$RI = \text{fn} (Ep, C, Ep \times C)$$

Where: RI = Relationship Intensity

Ec = Career Expectations, Ep = Psychosocial expectations

C = Communication of Expectations

If the interaction term is not significant, this would indicate that the effect of expectations on relationship intensity is not moderated by communication of expectations. In this case, simple bivariate correlation of relationship intensity with career expectations and psychosocial expectations would adequately summarize the data.

4.5 Analysis Techniques for Supplementary Research Questions

Following is a table illustrating the supplementary research questions, the variables involved and the types of analysis that was performed. An explanation of each type of analysis follows.

SUPPLEMENTARY PROTÉGÉ RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question	Variables	Analysis
1. Is the intensity of the relationship greater in same-sex relationships than in cross-sex relationships?	Relationship Intensity	<i>t</i> test
2. Are protégés' career outcomes more highly related to mentors' performance of career roles than psychosocial roles?	Career Roles Psychosocial Roles Career Outcomes	Stepwise Multiple Regression
3. Are protégés' psychosocial outcomes more related to mentors' performance of psychosocial roles than career roles?	Psychosocial Roles Career Roles Psychosocial Outcomes	Stepwise Multiple Regression

4.5.1 The t Test

The t test was used to determine if there is a difference in relationship intensity for same-sex versus cross-sex relationships. The t test is an assessment of differences between the means of two independent samples, in this case cross-sex and same-sex relationships. Although some differences may exist between a cross-sex relationship between a male mentor - female protégé and female mentor- male protégé, there may also be commonalities between the two and therefore all cross-sex relationships were combined to increase the sample size.

An F test was first calculated to determine whether the variance between the two groups was equivalent. If there was no significant difference in the variance of the two groups, the groups' variances were pooled in calculating the t test. If the two groups had significantly different variances, a separate variance estimate was used. A significant t -statistic would indicate that relationship intensity does differ between the two groups.

4.5.2 Multiple Regression

Regression analysis facilitates the assessment of the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). Regression was used to build an equation that represents the best prediction, separately,

of career outcomes and psychosocial outcomes from career roles and psychosocial roles. Using stepwise multiple regression, career roles and psychosocial roles were evaluated in terms of what they added to the prediction of career outcomes or psychosocial outcomes. The following two models of stepwise regression were run:

$$CO = \text{fn}(\text{CR}, \text{PR})$$

$$PO = \text{fn}(\text{CR}, \text{PR})$$

Where CO = career outcomes, PO = psychosocial outcomes

CR = career roles, PR = psychosocial roles

4.6 Summary

This section explained the methodology that was used to examine the research questions there were formed in the previous section. It outlined the sample, how the data was gathered, the method of measurement for each variable and the type of data analysis that was performed. The following section will review the results of the data analysis

5.0 RESULTS

The proposed research questions were analyzed from protégé and mentor responses to the questionnaires in Appendix II and IV. The data for protégés and mentors was examined separately. Since this research is exploratory and the models outlined in the previous section were not fully specified, sophisticated modeling techniques were not appropriate. The following sections describes the data, identification of outlier and assessment of the measures. This is followed by the results of the analysis of each research question

5.1 The Data

From the original sample of 170 mentors and protégés who had participated in the formal mentoring program, 152 were still employed by the organization at the time of the questionnaire mailing. These employees all received questionnaires through the organization's inter-office mail. They represented 104 protégés and 48 mentors. Although some pairs of mentors and protégés were no longer available, all current employees who had participated in the formal mentoring program received questionnaires in order to maximize the sample size. Of the 104 protégé questionnaires, 95 were returned for a response rate of 91.3%. Of the 95 questionnaires returned, 50 were male, 44 female and one did not indicate sex. The sampling frame of protégés included 59 males and 45 females. A binomial test was performed to test for differences in proportion and no significant difference was observed. Although each mentor was matched with a

male and female protégé, only 44 (instead of 47) of the 94 responses are cross-sex mentor relationships.

Of the 48 mentor questionnaires sent out, 42 were returned for a response rate of 87.5%. Male mentors accounted for 36 responses and female mentors for 6 responses. The sampling frame of mentors included 10 females and 38 males. The binomial test indicated no significant differences in the two distributions. A total of 73 pairs of mentors and protégés responded out of a possible 88 pairs.

5.2 Outliers

The first step in the data analysis was to check for outliers. Outliers are cases with extreme values on one variable, or a combination of variables, that unduly influence the statistics (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). There are four reasons for the presence of an outlier: incorrect data entry; failure to specify missing value codes in computer language; the outlier is not a member of the population from which the sample is intended; the case is from the intended population but the distribution for the variable in the population has more extreme values than a normal distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983).

In order to identify any outliers, all variables were explored using a stem-and-leaf plot. A stem-and-leaf plot represents each case with a numeric value that corresponds to the actual observed value (Marija Norusis, 1993). A table generating the cases with the five

largest and five smallest values was then generated. Cases in which values exceeded the maximum scale values were examined. Cases with data entry errors were adjusted by reviewing the data entry and original questionnaires. Cases in which the values were greater than 3 standard deviations from the mean were deemed outliers and recoded as missing values. This occurred on two occasions with the same variable, number of face to face meetings protégés reported in one year with their mentor. A mean of 8.67 and standard deviation of 16.30 was reported overall, with two cases reporting 60 and 150 meetings. These cases were deemed to be outliers and replaced with missing values so they would not unduly influence the results. The frequencies of all variables was also reviewed to ensure that missing values themselves were entered correctly. All data entry errors and outliers were corrected and frequencies reviewed for accuracy.

5.3 Assessment of Protégé Model Measures

The following section assesses the measures used in the protégé model. Factor analysis was performed on protégé expectations, the roles used to determine relationship intensity, and protégé outcomes. Principal axis factoring, rather than principal components analysis, was utilized to determine a theoretical solution uncontaminated by unique and error variability (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). Varimax one of three forms of orthogonal rotation, was utilized to enhance interpretability. In order to be confident about the reliability of the resulting scales, and additional scales in the model, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for all multiple item scales.

5.3.1 Career Planning

The scale for career planning consisted of three items (scored from 1 to 5): a career plan existed, protégés knew what to do to reach their career goals and career objectives were not clear (item scored in reverse). Cronbach's alpha for the career planning scale was .83, indicating a high degree of reliability. The original six-item career planning scale developed by Gould (1979), and utilized by Noe (1988), had an internal consistency reliability estimate of .89. Although the original scale was reduced to only three items, there was not a large drop in the consistency of the scale. Conclusions can thus be drawn that participants with a high mean scale score had engaged in a high degree of career planning (Noe, 1988).

5.3.2 Protégé Expectations

A factor analysis was performed on the 9 expectation items to support the existence of the independent variables career expectations and psychosocial expectations. Table 1A illustrates the career and psychosocial expectations identified in the model, with the Cronbach's alpha of the proposed scales. Table 1B illustrates the results of the factor analysis and Table 1C illustrates the adjusted scales to be utilized in the protégé model.

Cronbach's alpha for the proposed career and psychosocial scales (Table 1A) are .61 and .71 respectively. Scales in which alpha values are less than .70 have low reliability which attenuates correlations. In order to improve upon the proposed scales, principal axis factoring was executed (Appendix V).

Table 1A - Proposed Protégé Expectation Scales

PROTÉGÉ EXPECTATIONS	SCALE COMPOSITION	Cronbach's Alpha
Career	a, b, c, d, i	.61
Psychosocial	e, f, g, h	.71

Principal axis factoring resulted in three expectation factors (Table 1B). The Cronbach's alphas for the scales derived from the factor analysis are also displayed in Table 1B. The four items in factor 1 are that participation in the program would provide coaching, developmental opportunities, managerial and interpersonal skills, and help to develop new ways to approach problems. All four items are expectations that could enhance the effectiveness of protégés. The four item scale has an alpha of .73, indicating an acceptable level of consistency. These items have been combined to form the new variable expectations of enhanced effectiveness.

Table 1B - Protégé Expectation Principal Axis Factor Loadings

Protégé Expectations	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
a. coaching	<u>.56</u>	.24	.03
b. developmental opportunities	<u>.57</u>	.35	.04
c. increase exposure and visibility	.07	<u>.64</u>	.13
d. lead to advancement	.13	<u>.77</u>	.22
e. increase self-confidence	.13	.17	<u>.74</u>
f. develop managerial and interpersonal skills	<u>.78</u>	-.03	.18
g. approach to problem solving	<u>.57</u>	-.15	.42
h. insight into myself	.33	.15	<u>.51</u>
I. greater understanding of the organization	.01	.07	<u>.31</u>
Pct. of Variance	28.2	11.0	7.2
Cronbach's Alpha	.73	.70	.54

Two items loaded strongly onto factor 2. These items, increase exposure and visibility and lead to advancement, are items that provide career benefits to the protégé. With strong factor loadings and an alpha of .70, expectations of career benefits is the second expectation variable to be retained.

The third factor resulting from the analysis is comprised of three items; increase self confidence, insight into myself, and greater understanding of the organization. With a low alpha of .54 indicating a low reliability this factor does not provide an acceptable scale. On closer examination of the loadings and individual items, understanding of the organization, does not have a strong loading nor is it closely related to the first two items. When understanding of the organization is removed from factor 3 the alpha of the two remaining items increases to .67. Although the reliability of this scale falls below the .70 cutoff recommended by Nunnally (1978), it is close enough to justify including the scale in the analysis of protégé expectations. The two items, increase self-confidence and

insight into myself concern the protégé's expectations of personal growth. The single item, understanding of the organization, is the final expectations variable. This item was retained as a single item measure to maintain consistency with the results from the factor analysis of protégé outcomes that will be presented later in this section.

It is evident from the analysis that two independent variables, career and psychosocial expectations, were not adequate to describe the type of expectations that protégés may experience prior to participation in a formal mentoring program. Factor analysis of protégé expectations resulted in the creation of four new independent variables summarized in Table 1C.

Table 1C - Revised Protégé Expectations

PROTÉGÉ EXPECTATIONS	SCALE COMPOSITION	Cronbach's Alpha
Enhanced Effectiveness	a, b, f, g	.73
Career Benefits	c, d	.70
Personal Growth	e, h	.67
Understanding of the organization	i	n/a

5.3.3 Relationship Intensity

Relationship intensity was conceptualized as the product of the roles that a mentor performs for their protégé and the time that mentors and protégés spend together. Before relationship intensity can be calculated, the role subscales must first be evaluated. Table 2A illustrates the career and psychosocial roles of relationship intensity, from the protégé model, and the Cronbach's alphas associated with each scale. While the alphas for the

career roles (.89) and psychosocial roles (.68) are acceptable, factor analysis was performed to explore the factor structure of the nine roles. To maintain consistency throughout the model, principal axis factoring, with varimax rotation, was utilized.

Table 2A - Proposed Relationship Intensity Roles

RELATIONSHIP INTENSITY ROLES	SCALE COMPONENTS	Cronbach's Alpha
Career	appraiser, coach, counselor, broker referral agent, advocate	.89
Psychosocial	communicator, informant, role model	.68

Table 2B illustrates the results of the factor analysis on the relationship intensity roles. Two factors were identified by the principal axis factoring, with coach and appraiser loading strongly on both factors. The two factors map identically onto the proposed scales with the exception of the coaching role, which loads more strongly onto factor 2, psychosocial roles. The resulting alphas for the career roles and psychosocial roles, .87 and .76 respectively, indicate that the psychosocial role variable has been enhanced, with the inclusion of the coaching role, with little detriment to career roles. Both scales exhibit an acceptable degree of reliability.

Table 2B - Relationship Intensity Roles' Principal Axis Factor Loadings

Relationship Intensity Roles	Factor 1	Factor 2
Communicator	.14	<u>.69</u>
Informant	.30	<u>.44</u>
Appraiser	<u>.51</u>	.49
Coach	.52	<u>.62</u>
Counselor	<u>.57</u>	.33
Broker	<u>.79</u>	.30
Referral Agent	<u>.86</u>	.22
Advocate	<u>.73</u>	.33
Role Model	.27	<u>.62</u>
Pct. of Variance	48.4	6.8
Cronbach's Alpha	.87	.76

* Cronbach's Alpha for all 9 items .89

5.3.4 Protégé Outcomes

The final scale reviewed is protégé outcomes. Table 3A illustrates the proposed protégé outcome scales. Two scales were introduced for career and psychosocial outcomes with Cronbach's alphas of .88 and .76 respectively. Although these alphas are acceptable, a factor analysis was performed to explore the factor structure and to determine if these scales could be enhanced. Table 3B illustrates the principal axis factoring, with varimax rotation, of the protégé outcomes and the Cronbach's alphas associated with scales constructed for each factor.

Table 3A - Proposed Protégé Outcome Scales

PROTÉGÉ OUTCOMES	SCALE COMPOSITION	Cronbach's Alpha
Career	a, b, c, e, h, j, k, l	.88
Psychosocial	d, f, g, i	.76

Table 3B - Protégé Outcome Principal Axis Factor Loadings

Protégé Outcomes	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
a. better understanding of workings of organization	.32	.25	<u>.51</u>
b. insight into other areas increased	.10	.19	<u>.84</u>
c. network of contacts and opportunities	<u>.54</u>	.28	.48
d. more self esteem and self-confidence	<u>.45</u>	.40	.16
e. insight and info on career options	<u>.47</u>	.46	.19
f. objective feedback and encouragement	.25	<u>.62</u>	.17
g. manage more effectively	.17	<u>.71</u>	.30
h. overcome barriers to advancement	.39	<u>.67</u>	.19
i. more control of my career	<u>.55</u>	.40	.05
j. increased visibility and exposure	<u>.76</u>	.24	.45
k. gained increased responsibility	<u>.71</u>	.31	.27
l. helped make positive career move	<u>.71</u>	.20	.11
Pct. of Variance	46.1	6.1	5.1
Cronbach's Alpha	.88	.79	.68

The principal axis factoring of the protégé outcomes resulted in three factors. Although the alphas for each factor are acceptable, the factors are not consistent with the expectation factors discussed earlier. Factor 1 includes many items beneficial to the protégés careers. One item which does not fit well, and loads strongly on factor 1 and 2, is item “d”, more self esteem and self-confidence. Similarly, item “h”, overcoming barriers to advancement, is clearly a career benefit even though it loads more heavily on factor 2, which seems to represent enhanced effectiveness. In an attempt to link expectations and outcomes and maintain consistency throughout the protégé model, these two items (“d” and “h”) were moved to different scales. The result was the creation of four factors similar to the protégé expectations.

The first scale is protégé career benefits. This scale includes principally the items from factor one with the deletion of “more self esteem” and the addition of “overcoming

barriers to advancement". The second scale, enhanced effectiveness includes "receiving objective feedback and encouragement" and "gaining insight on how to manage more effectively". The third scale includes "gaining a better understanding of the workings of the organization" and "insight into other areas of the organization", items that help the protégé to better understand the organization overall. The final single item measure, "increased self-esteem and self-confidence", concerns the personal growth of protégés.

Table 3C illustrates the Cronbach's alphas for the revised protégé outcomes. Although the alpha of factor two is slightly reduced, the revised factors provide a more rational distribution of the outcome items and are consistent with the protégé expectations identified earlier.

Table 3C - Revised Protégé Outcome Scales

REVISED PROTÉGÉ OUTCOME FACTORS	SCALE COMPOSITION	Cronbach's Alpha
Career Benefits	c, e, h, I, j, k, l	.88
Enhanced Effectiveness	f, g	.72
Understanding of the Organization	a, b	.68
Personal Growth	d	n/a
Note: The alpha reported for "enhanced effectiveness" and "understanding of the organization" is the simple correlation of the two items.		

5.4 ASSESSMENT OF MENTOR MODEL MEASURES

5.4.1 Mentor Expectations

Table 4A illustrates the proposed career expectations and psychosocial expectations scales from the mentor model. The Cronbach's alpha for the scales are .63 and .55, respectively. Since both scales are less than .70, a factor analysis was performed in the hopes of improving the reliability of the scales.

Table 4A - Proposed Mentor Expectation Scales

MENTOR EXPECTATIONS	SCALE COMPOSITION	Cronbach's Alpha
Career	b, c, f	.63
Psychosocial	a, d, e	.55

In order to produce a solution uncontaminated by error variance, principal axis factoring, with varimax rotation, was initially performed on the mentor expectation items. Principal axis factoring attempted to extract two factors, however, in one of the iterations, communality of a variable exceeded 1.0 and the extraction was terminated. Despite further review and consultation with a statistical consultant, there was no way to correct the problem. The problem is a function of the strong correlations in the data and the low number of cases ($n = 42$) in the data set. Upon review of the pattern of correlations, it was suggested that an attempt to run principal components factoring on the items should be made.

Principal components factoring was successful in extracting two factors, illustrated in Table 4B. The first factor consists of five of the six expectations and explains 41.3% of the variance. Factor 2 is a single item factor, sense of pride in seeing the development of others, and explains 19.2% of the variance. Although the factors do not match the proposed model scales, the strength of the factor loadings indicates a strong correlation between all of the items, with the exception of one. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale derived from factor 1 is .74 improving considerably upon the initial alpha of .63. Close examination of the items in each factor suggests factor 1 can be considered the career expectation scale with items such as gaining recognition as a people developer and keeping in touch with issues at different levels of the organization. These items can affect the career of the mentor. Factor 2 is a single item factor, sense of pride in seeing development of others, a psychosocial expectation.

Table 4B -Mentor Expectation Principal Components Factor Loadings

Mentor Expectations	Factor 1	Factor 2
a. sense of pride in seeing development of others	.19	.88
b. learning about other areas of the organization	.75	.24
c. recognition for developing others	.61	.48
d. personal challenge	.66	.11
e. give something back to the organization	.77	.25
f. source of new ideas	.70	.16
Pct. of Variance	41.3	19.2
Cronbach's Alpha	.74	n/a

5.4.2 Mentor Relationship Intensity

The same relationship intensity roles were used in the mentor model and the protégé model. Table 2A illustrates the scale composition and Cronbach alphas for the proposed

career and psychosocial role scales using the protégé data. Since mentors participating in this formal mentoring program were assigned both a female and a male protégé, their questionnaire reflects the possibility that they may have performed different roles for their protégés. As a result, three separate measures are available for assessing the roles reported by the mentors: roles they performed with their female protégé, roles they performed with their male protégé, and the average role performance for male and female protégés. Factor analysis using each of the three measures led to differing results. Factor analysis on the average role performance for male and female protégés is reported below in Table 5B.

Table 5A - Principal Axis Factor Loadings of Mentor Relationship Intensity Roles

Relationship Intensity Roles	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Communicator	<u>.59</u>	.22	.34
Informant	-.05	.26	<u>.63</u>
Appraiser	<u>.93</u>	.26	-.04
Coach	<u>.55</u>	.27	.49
Counselor	.29	<u>.48</u>	.31
Broker	.33	<u>.49</u>	.10
Referral Agent	.21	<u>.52</u>	.29
Advocate	.11	<u>.72</u>	.16
Role Model	.30	.15	<u>.73</u>
Percentage of Variance	39.2	9.5	6.1
Cronbach's Alpha	.80	.73	.68

There are several difficulties with utilizing the results from this factor analysis. First, the number of cases is significantly smaller than that recommended for factor analysis (48 versus 90, i.e. 10 times the number of items). Second, the factor solution is not stable across different measures of the construct. And third, the factor solution is uninterpretable.

Generally when a factor solution is unreliable, it is best to rely on scales derived from the theory. However, in this case, the factor analysis of the protégé data (a much more reliable solution) suggests that the theoretically derived scales could be improved upon by moving one item (coaching) between the two scales. Thus, this solution was the one adopted for subsequent analysis. Although mentors and protégés may see the roles performed differently and the two models are asymmetric, the mentor data does not allow an adequate test of other possible factor solutions so the two factor developed using the protégé data will be employed.

Table 5B - Mentor Relationship Intensity Roles

MENTOR RELATIONSHIP INTENSITY ROLES	SCALE COMPONENTS	Cronbach's Alpha
Career	appraiser, counselor, broker, referral agent, advocate	.76
Psychosocial	communicator, informant, coach, role model	.80
Total Roles		.83

5.4.3 Mentor Outcomes

The final mentor scale is mentor outcomes. Table 6A illustrates the proposed mentor career and psychosocial outcomes scales. It is evident from the low alphas that these scales are not reliable. In order to improve upon this, principal axis factor analysis, with varimax rotation, was performed on the items. Table 6B illustrates the factor loadings of the mentor outcomes.

Table 6A - Proposed Mentor Outcome Scales

MENTOR OUTCOMES	SCALE COMPOSITION	Cronbach's Alpha
Career	c, d	.55
Psychosocial	a, b, e	.71

Table 6B - Mentor Outcome Principal Axis Factoring Loadings

Mentor Outcomes	Factor 1
a. refine coaching skills	.55
b. give something back to the organization	.68
c. gain recognition as people developer	.53
d. keep in touch with different issues	.70
e. insight into how senior team is viewed	.80
Pct. of Variance	43.7
Cronbach's Alpha	.78

The distinction between career and psychosocial outcomes was originally developed for protégés and although an attempt was made to develop outcomes for mentors that reflected the same categories, only one factor emerged in the factor analysis. While a separate factor for career and psychosocial outcomes would be preferred to maintain consistency throughout the models, these categories may not be valid for mentors. The alpha of .79 for mentor outcomes does provide greater reliability than the separate scales developed for the model. In place of career and psychosocial outcomes for mentors, the single scale will be labeled “positive outcomes” in the revised mentor model.

5.5 ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

5.5.1 Protégé Research Questions

The following section describes the analysis of the research questions for the protégé model. Through the assessment of the measures in the protégé model, in the previous section, it was discovered that the variables identified in the original model were not adequate to describe the protégé-mentor relationships. Figure 3 illustrates the revised protégé model that includes the new variables identified. Following is a table of the adjusted questions that reflect the changes to the protégé model and the emerging variables.

Revised Protégé Research Questions

Research Questions	Variables
1. Does previous mentor experience lower expectations of enhanced effectiveness, career benefits, personal growth and understanding of the organization?	Previous Mentor Experience Enhanced Effectiveness Expectations Career Benefit Expectations Personal Growth Expectations Understanding of the Organization Expectations
2. Is career planning associated with higher expectations?	Career Planning Enhanced Effectiveness Expectations Career Benefit Expectations Personal Growth Expectations Understanding of the Organization Expectations
3. Are higher protégé expectations associated with higher relationship intensity? And 4. Does communication of expectations moderate the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity?	Enhanced Effectiveness Expectations Career Benefit Expectations Personal Growth Expectations Understanding of the Organization Expectations Communication of Expectations Relationship Intensity
5. Is higher relationship intensity associated with higher outcomes?	Relationship Intensity Outcome Measures

FIGURE 3 - REVISED PROTÉGÉ MODEL

Does previous mentor experience lower expectations of enhanced effectiveness, career benefits, personal growth and understanding of the organization?

Bivariate correlation was used to assess the relationship between previous mentor experience and expectations. From the following table (Table 7) of correlation coefficients it is evident that no significant relationship exists between previous mentor experience and expectations. The data was checked to ensure that there was no range restriction that might limit the correlations -- all variables had good variance and range.

Table 7 - Correlation of Protégé Previous Mentor Experience and Protégé Expectations

Variable	Enhanced Effectiveness Expectations	Career Benefits Expectations	Personal Growth Expectations	Understanding of the Organization Expectations
Z Mentors	.0976 p = .372	.1554 p = .141	.1393 p = .190	.1249 p = .236

Is career planning associated with higher expectations?

Table 8 illustrates the bivariate analysis of the relationship between career planning and protégé expectations. Career planning has a significant negative correlation with enhanced effectiveness expectations and no correlation with the remaining three expectation factors. Respondents who engaged in a lot of career planning had low expectations with respect to enhancing their effectiveness as a result of their participation in the formal mentoring program.

Table 8 - Correlation of Protégé Career Planning with Protégé Expectations

Variable	Enhanced Effectiveness Expectations	Career Benefits Expectations	Personal Growth Expectations	Understanding of the Organization Expectations
Career Planners	-.2176 p = .041	-.0615 p = .556	-.0865 p = .410	-.1170 p = .259

Are higher protégé expectations associated with higher relationship intensity?

The first step in assessing the relationship between protégé expectations and relationship intensity was to calculate relationship intensity. Relationship intensity is the product of the standard scores on roles that the mentor performs and time (number of meetings x duration of relationship). Table 9 illustrates the bivariate correlations between relationship intensity and expectations. From the analysis we can see that there is no correlation between any of the four expectations and relationship intensity. To explore whether expectations affected aspects of relationship intensity, relationship intensity was disaggregated into role performance and time. Table 9 includes the correlation coefficients between protégé expectations, total roles that the mentor performed and the relationship time.

Table 9 - Correlation of Relationship Intensity, Total Roles, Relationship Time and Protégé Expectations

Variable	Enhanced Effectiveness Expectations	Career Benefits Expectations	Personal Growth Expectations	Understanding of the Organization Expectations
Relationship Intensity	-.0341 p = .768	.0082 p = .942	-.1216 p = .282	.0819 p = .467
Total Roles	.3099 p = .005	.0500 p = .651	.2702 p = .013	.0486 p = .660
RelTime	-.0834 p = .451	-.0935 p = .383	-.2125 p = .047	-.0431 p = .687

From analysis of the disaggregated items of relationship intensity it is evident that some relationships exist between protégé expectations and the roles that mentors perform as well as the time that mentors and protégés spend together. The expectations the protégé has about their personal growth and enhanced effectiveness are moderately correlated with the roles that a mentor performs. Personal growth expectations are also negatively correlated with the time that the mentor and protégé spend together. So while expectations are related to role performance and time spent together, combining these latter two variables into relationship intensity masks significant relationships. Subsequent analyses will include role performance and time spent together as well as the composite variable, relationship intensity.

Does communication of expectations moderate the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity?

Since the combined variable of relationship intensity was shown above to mask significant relationships between expectations and different aspects of the mentor-protégé relationship, it was not used in this analysis. Instead, the analysis focused on total roles. Total roles was chosen as the focus because there were more significant relationships between expectations and total roles than between expectations and time spent together. Also, as indicated in the next section, there were more significant relationships between outcome variables and total roles than between outcomes and time. Therefore total roles was chosen as the dependent variable to explore the effect of communication of expectations.

Four separate moderated regressions were run to assess the impact of communication of expectations. In each regression, the dependent variable was total role performance and the independent variables were: one of the four expectation scales, communication of expectations, and the cross-product of the expectations scale and communication of expectations. The analysis was performed using stepwise regression with the simple main effects entered first, followed by the interaction (i.e. cross-product). In each case, the cross-product did not enter the equation. This indicates that communication of expectations does not moderate the relationship between expectations and the roles performed. The simple main effects for communication of expectations was found to be significant in all of the four equations, as displayed in Table 10, for how it is measured here.

Table 10 - Simple Main Effects for Communication of Expectations

Expectation Variable	Beta (Signif.) Expectation Variables	Beta (Signif.) Communication of Expectations	Beta (Signif.) Interaction Term	Adjusted R2 (Signif. of Equation)
Enhanced Effectiveness	.1911 (.0746)	.3773 (.0006)	not in equation	.204 (.0001)
Career Benefits	.0119 (.9064)	.4333 (.0000)	not in equation	.169 (.0002)
Personal Growth	.1946 (.0558)	.3969 (.0002)	not in equation	.205 (.0000)
Understanding of the Organization	.0522 (.6031)	.4345 (.0000)	not in equation	.171 (.0002)

Is higher relationship intensity associated with higher outcomes?

The final research question for the protégé model assesses the relationship between relationship intensity and outcomes. Correlations were calculated between outcomes and relationship intensity, total roles, and time spent together. Table 11 includes the correlation coefficients between the variables. The analysis of outcomes with relationship intensity mirrors the previous finding that relationship intensity masks significant relationships. When disaggregated there are high correlations between the total roles that the mentor performs and each of the four outcomes a protégé experiences. Time spent together is only marginally related to one outcome: career benefits. Thus can be concluded that time overall is not that significant in explaining protégé outcomes.

Table 11 - Correlation of Relationship Intensity, Total Roles, and Time Spent Together with Protégé Outcomes

Variable	Enhanced Effectiveness Outcomes	Career Benefits Outcomes	Personal Growth Outcomes	Understanding of the Organization Outcomes
Relationship Intensity	.0486 p = .681	.0945 p = .404	.1157 p = .304	.1072 p = .344
Total Roles	.7493 p = .000	.6849 p = .000	.6613 p = .000	.5112 p = .000
ZRelTime	.1779 p = .110	.2008 p = .061	.1243 p = .243	.1469 p = .172

5.5.2 Mentor Research Questions

The following section describes the analysis of the research questions for the mentor model. Through the assessment of the measures in the previous section, the variable psychosocial outcomes was eliminated from the original model. The factor analysis of the mentor outcomes illustrated that only one variable existed for mentor outcomes, positive outcomes. Figure 4 illustrates the revised mentor model. Following is a table of the adjusted mentor research questions that reflect the change to the model.

Revised Mentor Research Questions

Research Question	Variables
1. Does previous mentor experience contribute to reduced career and psychosocial expectations for the mentor?	Previous Mentor Experience Career Expectations Psychosocial Expectations
2. Are higher mentor expectations associated with higher average relationship intensity?	Career Expectations Psychosocial Expectations Average Relationship Intensity
3. Is higher average relationship intensity associated with more positive outcomes?	Average Relationship Intensity Positive Outcomes

Does previous mentor experience contribute to reduced career and psychosocial expectations for the mentor?

Bivariate correlation was used to assess the relationship between the previous mentor experience of the mentor and mentor expectations. From Table 12 it is evident that no correlation exists between the previous mentor experience of the mentor and mentor career and psychosocial expectations.

Table 12 - Correlation of Mentor Previous Mentor Experience and Mentor Expectations

Variable	Career Benefit Expectations	Psychosocial Expectations
Zmentors	.1533 p = .402	-.0388 p = .836

FIGURE 4 - REVISED MENTOR MODEL

Are higher mentor expectations associated with higher average relationship intensity?

In order to assess the relationship between mentor expectations and average relationship intensity, average relationship intensity was first calculated. Standard scores were calculated for total roles for male and female protégés. These scores were combined with the time that mentors and protégés spent together and the duration of the relationship, reported by the protégés. The average relationship intensity was calculated by averaging the relationship intensity of female protégé relationships and male protégé relationships.

Bivariate correlation was used to assess the relationship between mentor expectations and average relationship intensity. Table 13 illustrates that no correlation exists between expectations and average relationship intensity. Similar to the protégé data, average relationship intensity was disaggregated in an attempt to determine if a correlation exists between the average roles the mentor performed, duration of the relationship and mentor expectations. One correlation was indeed found to exist between the average roles that the mentor performs and their career expectations. Mentors with higher career expectations performed more roles (see Table 13). Similar to the protégé model, average relationship intensity will be disaggregated to ensure that significant relationships are not hidden.

Table 13 - Correlation of Mentor Expectations, Average Relationship Intensity, Average Roles and Duration of Relationship

Variable	Career Benefit Expectations	Psychosocial Expectations
Average Relationship Intensity	.0140 p = .956	.1314 p = .603
Average Roles	.3431 p = .041	.1650 p = .343
RelTime	-.0106 p = .947	-.1841 p = .255

Is higher average relationship intensity associated with more positive outcomes?

Bivariate correlation was used to assess the association between average relationship intensity and positive outcomes. The average relationship intensity, previously calculated, was found to have no correlation with higher career outcomes (Table 14). Similar to the previous question, average relationship intensity was disaggregated to determine if the average roles that the mentor performed or the time that the mentor spent with their protégé were associated with more positive career moves. Neither the roles nor the time are correlated with outcomes.

Table 14 - Correlation of Average Relationship Intensity, Average Roles and Duration of Relationship with Mentor Outcomes

Variable	Mentor Outcomes
Average Relationship Intensity	.0204 p = .936
Average Roles	.1784 p = .305
ZRelTime	.0338 p = .836

5.5.3 Assessment of Supplementary Research Questions

The following section reviews the analysis of the supplementary research questions. The questions have been modified to reflect the changes to the protégé model. Following is a table illustrating each supplementary question and the variables involved.

Revised Supplementary Research Questions

Research Questions	Variables
1. Is the intensity of the relationship greater in same-sex relationships than in cross-sex relationships?	Relationship Intensity Total Roles Relationship Time
2. Are protégés' career benefit outcomes more highly related to mentors' performance of career roles rather than psychosocial roles?	Career Roles Psychosocial Roles Career Benefit Outcomes
3. Are protégés' enhanced effectiveness outcomes more related to mentors' performance of psychosocial roles than career roles?	Psychosocial Roles Career Roles Enhanced effectiveness Outcomes

Is the intensity of the relationship greater in same-sex relationships than in cross-sex relationships?

The *t* test was used to determine if there was a difference in relationship intensity for same-sex versus cross-sex relationships. The *t* test is an assessment of differences between the means of two independent samples, in this case cross-sex and same-sex mentor relationships. Table 16 below illustrates both an *F* test for equality of variance and the *t* test for equality of means. The tests have been completed on the relationship intensity for same-sex and cross-sex relationships. In addition, relationship intensity has been disaggregated into total roles and the standard score of time spent together.

Table 15 - *t* Test of Same-Sex vs. Cross-Sex Relationships

Variable	<i>t</i> test 2-Tail Sig.	Same-Sex Mean	Cross-Sex Mean
Relationship Intensity	2.13 p = .036	5.03	-7.22
Total Roles	.77 p = .443	30.02	28.80
RelTime	1.67 p = .099	80.76	61.27

From the results above, the *t* test indicates that there is a significant difference in the relationship intensity between cross-sex and same-sex mentor relationships. Same-sex relationships are, on average more intense than cross-sex relationships. The difference between same-sex and cross-sex relationships was marginal for time ($p = .099$) and non-significant for roles ($p = .433$). However, the two differences are both in the same direction and so when they are combined to form relationship intensity the difference is significant ($p = .036$).

It should be noted that since there are relatively few female mentors in the sample (10), most of the cross-sex relationships reported in this test are male mentors with female protégés. Although cross-sex relationships may share important elements regardless of which gender the mentor is, it is also possible that male mentors develop different dynamics with their female protégés than do female mentors with male protégés. Given the skewed distribution of male and female mentors, the findings for cross-sex relationships are more reflective of the male mentor-female protégé relationship.

Are protégés' career benefit outcomes more highly related to mentors' performance of career roles rather than psychosocial roles?

Are protégés' enhanced effectiveness outcomes more related to mentors' performance of psychosocial roles rather than career roles?

Step-wise multiple regression was used to assess the relationships between outcomes and the roles that a mentor plays. The independent variables, career roles and psychosocial roles were evaluated in terms of what they add to the prediction of career benefit outcomes and enhanced effectiveness outcomes. Table 17A illustrates the results of the regression analysis. In addition, regression analysis was utilized to determine which specific roles contribute to the prediction of career benefit outcomes and enhanced effectiveness outcomes. Table 17B illustrates the roles that were identified in the step-wise regression.

Table 16 A- Stepwise Regression Analysis of Career Benefit Outcomes and Enhanced Effectiveness Outcomes with Mentors Scales

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable (in stepwise order)	Adjusted R Square (% of Variance)	F Sig. Of F	T Sig T
Career Benefit Outcomes	Career Roles	54.01	90.462 .0000	9.511 .0000
	Psychosocial Roles	56.03	49.429 .0000	2.086 .0404
Enhanced Effectiveness Outcomes	Psychosocial Roles	63.01	140.657 .0000	11.860 .0000
	Career Roles	did not enter equation	n/a	n/a

Table 16 B- Stepwise Regression Analysis of Career Benefit Outcomes and Enhanced Effectiveness Outcomes with Individual Mentors Roles

Career Benefit Outcomes			Statistics for Each Step		Statistics From the Final Equation	
Step	Role	Type of Role	Total Variance Explained	Signif. Of R2 Change	Beta	Signif.
1	Broker	Career	43.34	.0000	.391	.0000
2	Communicator	Psychosocial	52.73	.0002	.249	.0032
3	Counselor	Career	58.07	.0019	.211	.0163
4	Appraiser	Career	60.24	.0287	.200	.0287

Enhanced Effectiveness Outcomes			Statistics for Each Step		Statistics From the Final Equation	
Step	Role	Type of Role	Total Variance Explained	Signif. Of R2 Change	Beta	Signif.
1	Coach	Psychosocial	45.26	.4593	.379	.0000
2	Role Model	Psychosocial	57.97	.1307	.345	.0000
3	Communicator	Psychosocial	61.63	.0404	.253	.0043

From the results of the regression analysis we note that career roles contribute 54% of the variance in explaining career outcomes. Although psychosocial roles are also part of the regression equation, they contribute only an additional 2%. The regression analysis of the enhanced effectiveness outcomes indicates that psychosocial roles explains 56% of the variance and career roles do not add significantly to the predictive power of the regression equation. On further analysis, 60% of the variance in career benefit outcomes can be explained by four roles, three of which are career roles. A total of 62% of the variance in enhanced effectiveness outcomes can be explained by three roles, all of which are psychosocial roles. Thus career outcomes do seem to be more highly related to career roles while psychosocial roles contribute primarily to psychosocial outcomes.

5.6 SUMMARY

The purpose of this analysis was to answer the research questions posed in the previous section. Correlations were reported between protégé expectations of enhanced effectiveness, personal growth expectations, and communication of expectations with the

roles the mentor performs. A strong correlation was identified between the roles the mentor performs and the positive outcomes the protégé experienced. In the supplementary research, same-sex relationships were found to have a strong relationship intensity than cross-sex relationships. From the same data, strong links were identified between career benefit outcomes and the performance of career benefit roles by the mentor and between enhanced effectiveness outcomes and the performance of psychosocial roles. In the mentor data, correlations between mentor career expectations and the roles they performed were also identified. The following chapter will discuss these and other results in more detail.

6.0 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an interpretation of the results previously presented. First, a review of the results in terms of the research questions will be presented. Two new models developed from the insights gained from the results and their application to mentoring will also be discussed. Finally the implications and limitations of the research will be addressed and future research directions will be presented.

6.1 Discussion of the Protégé Model

The following section summarizes the protégé model research question and supplementary questions. Each question is presented in a table with the results discussed in the previous section, followed by discussion of those results.

Research Question	Results
1. Does previous mentor experience lower expectations of: enhanced effectiveness, career benefits, personal growth and understanding of the organization?	Previous mentor experience does not lower expectations.

From the data analysis in this study, previous mentor experience was found to have no effect on the protégés' expectations. One explanation for the absence of any correlation is the extensive orientation that protégés and mentors received prior to participation in the formal mentoring program. The Program Administrator conducted day-long orientation

sessions with participants, outlining the goals of the program and what participants could expect to gain. Participants also had an opportunity to discuss their expectations with each other prior to the beginning of the relationship. This may have encouraged protégés to separate past experience from the current formal mentoring program. Since the majority of previous experience would have been informal given the rarity of formal mentoring, it is conceivable that previous experience was not seen as relevant to this relationship. It may have also been a long time since their previous mentor experience and so recall would have been a problem.

A second possible explanation for the absence of any correlation is the limited previous mentor experience reported. Over 50% of protégés had no previous mentor experience from which to draw expectations.

Research Question	Results
2. Is career planning associated with higher expectations?	Career planning is negatively correlated with expectations of enhanced effectiveness, while no correlation exists with the remaining three expectations.

One possible explanation for the above findings may be that the scale used to measure career planning was a reduced version of that used in previous research. The scale originally developed by Gould (1979) and used by Noe (1988) contained six measures and, at the request of the organization in this study, the scale was reduced. Given the acceptable level of reliability of the reduced scale, ($\alpha = .83$) it is unlikely however that this contributed to the finding that there was no correlation between career planning and

three of the four expectations. It is also possible that the revised scale captured a slightly different connotation of career planning, however the items chosen do seem to focus quite clearly on the notion of career planning. The items in the scale measure the protégés' existence of career goals, the existence of a career plan and whether or not career goals are clear. One connotation of career planning that participants may have drawn is that career planning is a specific activity mutually exclusive of mentoring. Protégés were told not to expect a promotion as a result of their participation in the program. Given that expectations about career benefits were the lowest of the four factors, protégés may see career planning as a personal activity or one conducted with their immediate supervisor, whereas participation in a formal mentoring program provides a broader knowledge base and exposure within the organization.

Results indicate that there is a negative correlation between career planning and expectations of enhanced effectiveness. Although there was no correlation between career planning and expectation of career benefits, those participants who engaged in career planning may be confident about their abilities and do not see any need for enhanced managerial effectiveness.

Research Questions	Results
3. Are higher protégé expectations associated with higher relationship intensity? And, 4. Does communication of expectations moderate the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity?	Higher protégé expectations are not correlated with relationship intensity. Expectations of enhanced effectiveness and personal growth are positively associated with the total roles that a mentor plays. Expectations of personal growth are negatively correlated with the time mentors and protégés spend together. Communication of expectations does not moderate the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity or its elements. Communication of expectations is positively associated with the total roles the mentor plays.

Relationship intensity was a variable developed in this study to assess the quality of the mentoring relationship. It was hypothesized that the quality of the relationship and thus its impact on participants would be a joint function of the roles performed and the time spent together. Some model variables were significantly related to relationship intensity while others were not related to relationship intensity but to its component parts. Therefore all research questions related to relationship intensity were addressed by examining relationship intensity and its separate components.

Results of this study indicate that a positive relationship exists between protégés' expectations of enhanced effectiveness and personal growth and the roles that a mentor performs. Expectations of personal growth were also negatively correlated with the time that a mentor and protégé spend together. One explanation for this finding may be that expectations about personal growth are less specific than the other expectations identified in this study. If a protégé wants to develop their career, enhance their effectiveness or

learn more about the organization, their mentor can suggest specific goals and methods to accomplish this. A protégé can develop their career by joining a professional association or volunteering to participate in a task force or training seminar. A protégé can enhance their effectiveness by taking a course or attending a seminar. To increase their understanding of the organization, a protégé can ask for a transfer to another area of the organization or read departmental reports. If a mentor wants to help a protégé grow personally, the suggestions are not so obvious. In order to help their protégé grow personally the mentor may choose to engage in a variety of roles but, lacking specific objectives, seek out fewer meetings thus spending less time with their protégé. Protégés may have also found that the more time they spent with their mentor, the less they liked each other.

There was no relationship between career benefit expectations and relationship intensity or its components. One possible reason for this was that mentors were not aware of their protégés career benefit expectations, however, communication of expectations was found to be positively associated with the roles performed by the mentor and therefore many mentors did know of protégés expectations. A second possible explanation was that the mentor did not perform any career roles for their protégé, regardless of their expectations. There is however significant variance on the different roles performed, disputing this explanation..

The final explanation for the finding that career benefit expectations are not associated with relationship intensity may lie in the goals of the program. The organization in this study was very specific that participation in the program did not guarantee career moves. Since mentors knew that protégés were not to expect career moves, they would not feel compelled to try to provide them. Mentors who felt it was important to try to enhance protégés' careers would probably still try to do so while those who had other priorities would feel free to ignore any such pressures from their protégés. The mentors therefore may have responded to their own expectations about the importance of career benefits rather than to protégés' assumptions. In this case, mentor behavior would have varied but not in response to protégés' expectations.

Expectations about understanding the organization was also found to have no correlation with relationship intensity or its components. One of the matching criteria for the program in this study was that participants be from different functional areas of the organization. Given that participants knew their matches would be cross-functional they may all have expected to learn something about the organization. But there was no range restriction in expectations about understanding the organization, and expectations were not uniformly high, so this explanation is not supported.

Mentors may have responded to the policy of cross-functional matches in two ways. The first possible response would be the assumption that cross-functional matching took care of the need to help protégés learn more about the organization. The second response may

be that cross-functional matches sensitized the mentor to helping protégés learn more about the organization. If all mentors interpreted the policy in one way or the other, there would be little variance in mentor behavior. Since there is variance in mentor behavior, mentors adopted different interpretations and the absence of any correlation has to do with mentors' varied interpretation of the policy rather than protégés' expectations.

Communication of expectations was hypothesized to have a moderating effect on the relationship between expectations and relationship intensity. If protégés do not communicate their expectations to their mentor, how can the mentor develop roles that will help the protégé? From the analysis however it was determined that the relationship between expectations and the roles that the mentor plays was not moderated by communication of expectations, nor was time or relationship intensity.

Although communication of expectations was not a moderating variable, communication of expectations was found to be positively correlated with total roles although not with the time the mentor and protégé spent together or with relationship intensity. When participants shared their expectations fully, mentors performed more roles. Mentors seemed to respond to the act of discussing expectations rather than the content of those discussions. Although it is not possible to determine what specific expectations were communicated, the existence of a relationship between the roles performed and communication of expectations highlights the importance of communication.

Research Question	Results
5. Is higher relationship intensity associated with positive outcomes?	Relationship intensity is not associated with positive outcomes. All four outcomes are positively associated with the roles that the mentor plays. Career benefit outcomes are positively associated with the time the mentor and protégé spent together.

Relationship intensity was not associated with positive outcomes. As previously described, the composite measure relationship intensity was found to mask the effects of time and role performance and was therefore disaggregated. All four outcomes were found to be positively associated with the roles the mentor plays.

This result is an important addition to the knowledge of mentoring relationships. The nine roles defined in the research were previously untested and the findings in this study indicate that performance of these roles plays a significant part in the positive outcomes a protégé experiences.

Career benefit outcomes were the only outcomes found to be associated with the time mentors and protégés spent together. Career benefit outcomes had the highest individual mean average per item, perhaps indicating that this was the focus of the relationship and therefore the greatest amount of time was associated with achieving these outcomes versus the other three remaining outcomes.

6.2 Supplementary Research Questions in the Protégé Study

Research Question	Results
1. Is the intensity of the relationship greater in same-sex relationships than in cross-sex relationships?	Relationship intensity is greater in same-sex relationships. No significant difference exists between same-sex and cross-sex relationships with respect to the roles the mentor plays or time.

The supplementary research indicated that there was a difference between same-sex and cross-sex mentor relationships with respect to the intensity of the relationship, when all cross-sex relationships were taken into account. Although relationship intensity as a composite variable was found to mask the effect of roles and time in other analysis, in this case, the multiplication of the two amplified effects. The difference between same-sex and cross-sex relationships was marginal for time ($p = .099$) and non-significant for roles ($p = .443$). However, the two differences are both in the same direction and so when they are combined to form relationship intensity the difference is significant ($p = .036$). Same-sex mentor relationships have a higher relationship intensity than cross-sex mentor relationships. This may be attributed to the fact that the majority of same-sex relationships were between men given that only 6 female mentors were in the sample. It is possible that protégés and mentors of the same-sex felt more comfortable spending time together and interacting in more ways. Given that only a small sample of female mentors with male protégés were included in the sample, conclusions about the intensity of the relationship, with respect to the problems identified in the literature, can not be drawn.

Research Question	Results
2. Are protégés' career benefit outcomes more highly related to mentors' performance of career roles rather than psychosocial roles?	Protégés' career benefit outcomes are more highly associated with mentors' performance of career roles.

The second supplementary question examined if protégés' career benefits were more highly related to mentors' performance of career roles than performance of psychosocial roles. The research clearly indicated that career roles had greater influence over career benefits than psychosocial roles did over career benefits, and that three out of four roles that influenced career benefits were career type roles. Although the nine mentor roles utilized in this study had not been previously tested, it is clear from the results in this study that some roles have distinct career functions.

Research Question	Results
3. Are protégés' enhanced effectiveness outcomes more related to mentors' performance of psychosocial roles than career roles?	Protégés enhanced effectiveness outcomes are more highly associated with mentors' performance of psychosocial roles.

The final supplementary question examined if protégés' enhanced effectiveness outcomes were more highly related to mentors' performance of psychosocial roles than career roles. The relationship between psychosocial roles and enhanced effectiveness outcomes was clearly evident. This was supported by the finding that psychosocial roles as a group influenced enhanced effectiveness outcomes and the three roles that influenced enhanced effectiveness outcomes the most were psychosocial in nature. While these findings support the earlier work of Kram (1988) they also give rise to questions about whether or

not career and psychosocial functions are the only functions that mentoring provides. The results of this study indicate that mentoring may provide other functions that pertain to the protégés' personal growth and understanding of their organization.

Based on the results of the protégé analysis, the protégé model has been modified to reflect these changes. Figure 5 illustrates the formal mentoring relationship for protégés.

FIGURE 5 - FINAL PROTÉGÉ MODEL

6.3 Discussion of the Mentor Model

The following section summarizes the mentor research questions and the results discussed in the previous section. A possible explanation for the small number of significant findings in the mentor data is the lower power of the test for this sample size ($n=44$). For correlational analysis, Cohen (1988) defines a small effect size as $r = .10$, a medium effect size as $r = .30$ and a large effect size as $r = .50$. The power of the test to detect a large effect size in the mentor data is 94%, a medium effect size is 52% and a small effect size is 10% (Cohen, 1988). Clearly this sample is not large enough to detect subtle effects.

Research Question	Results
1. Does previous mentor experience contribute to reduced career and psychosocial expectations for the mentor?	There was no association between previous mentor experience and career and psychosocial expectations for the mentor.

Roche (1979) found that nearly two thirds of mentors reported having had a mentor and one-third of them had two or more mentors. Since it was assumed that the previous experience of mentors evolved through informal mentoring relationships, it was hypothesized that mentors with previous mentoring experience would have lower expectations of a formal mentoring program given the limitations of time and structure. There was no association between previous mentor experience and expectations of the mentor. Although mentors had expectations about participation in the program, they were independent of their previous experience as a mentor or protégé.

One possible explanation for this finding may be the detailed orientation the mentors received prior to participation in the formal mentoring program. The goals and objectives of the program were clearly stated for all participants, and while mentors had expectations about participation in the program, they seem to have been able to separate past experience and concentrate on the current relationship. In addition, given the uniqueness of formal mentoring programs, the majority of previous mentor experience would have been informal and the mentors may have been able to distinguish expectations of the current formal relationship from previous informal experience.

Research Question	Results
2. Are higher mentor expectations associated with higher average relationship intensity?	Mentor expectations are not associated with relationship intensity or the time mentors and protégé spend together. Mentor career benefit expectations are associated with the average roles the mentor performs.

The second mentor research question involved the mentors' expectations and the average relationship intensity of the relationships. As with the protégé data, relationship intensity, as a product of the roles the mentor performed and time the mentor and protégé spent together, was found to mask the relationship between mentor expectations and role performance. Specifically, expectations of higher mentor career benefits were associated with higher average role performance. Career benefit expectations for the mentor included learning about other areas of the organization, gaining recognition for developing others, tapping a source of new ideas, giving something back to the

organization, and facing a personal challenge. These expectations are correlated with the roles the mentor performs, specifically the roles of counselor, role model and informant. By performing these roles for the protégé, the mentor also gains knowledge and understanding. So recognizing potential opportunities for themselves enhances the likelihood of mentors investing in the relationship.

Research Question	Results
3. Is higher average relationship intensity associated with more positive outcomes?	Relationship intensity is not associated with more positive outcomes, nor is time or the roles performed.

The final mentor research question assessed the association between relationship intensity and positive outcomes for the mentors. Relationship intensity was found to have no association with positive outcomes, nor did the roles the mentor performed or the time the mentor and protégé spent together. These results may be attributed to the limited scale utilized to measure mentor outcomes . Specifically the scale was limited to only positive outcomes. It is possible that mentors may have experienced negative outcomes associated with the roles they performed, but there was no measurement of negative outcomes. In addition, the literature provides significantly less guidance on the likely outcomes experienced by mentors compared to protégés. Therefore, there may be mentor outcomes that have yet to be articulated.

Although the mentor data did not provide a strong test of the proposed model, the results of the mentor data analysis confirm a portion of the original model. Figure 6 illustrates the modified model of the formal mentoring relationship for mentors.

FIGURE 6 - FINAL MENTOR MODEL

6.4 IMPLICATIONS

As a result of this research, there are potential implications for protégés and mentors participating in a formal mentoring program and for organizations developing formal mentoring programs. For the protégé, it is important that they share their expectations about the formal mentoring relationship. These expectations may shape the roles the mentor performs and thus the outcomes the protégé experiences. The roles that are performed are the key in providing positive outcomes. For instance, a desire for career benefit outcomes can be achieved through the performance of career roles. Through communication of expectations, participants can prioritize their goals and make the most of the limited time the program allows.

For mentors, the key implication is the impact that the roles performed has on outcomes. Education and orientation about the nine mentor roles and the outcomes they provide protégés will help to guide mentors through the mentoring process. Given that the time of formal mentoring programs is limited and the time a mentor has to devote to the program may also be limited, orientation may help mentors to identify the needs of their protégé and what roles should be performed to meet those needs.

The implications for organizations developing formal mentoring programs appear to be in the orientation of participants. Through education and awareness participants would have a clear understanding of the outcomes that can be expected and the tools that should be

utilized to achieve those outcomes. A secondary issue to consider may be the type of mentoring relationships assigned, cross-sex versus same-sex. The research in this study indicates that same-sex mentoring relationships are more intense (although relatively few female mentor-male protégé relationships were studied).

6.5 LIMITATIONS

As with any research, there exist some limitations that must be acknowledged and kept in mind as the results are interpreted. The first limitation is the small sample size. To minimize this limitation, a cover letter was sent with the questionnaires outlining the purpose and benefits of the research and ensuring participants that confidentiality would be maintained. A letter of introduction from a senior executive of the organization was also included lending support and increasing the credibility of the research. A follow-up letter was sent out three weeks after the initial distribution of the questionnaire to further enhance response rate.

Although a high response rate was achieved, the small sample frame, of the mentors in particular, reduced the chances of finding significant results in some areas of the proposed models, as indicated by the power analysis described earlier. In addition, the small sample size of female mentors makes it difficult to draw conclusions about cross gender differences. Although some similarities between cross-sex relationships may

exist, there may be fundamental differences between a male and female mentor that makes it difficult to combine these two sets of relationships.

Another limitation are the measures themselves. The lack of some findings may be due to the measures themselves and not the absence of any relationship. An overall limitation to the measures is the absence of any negative items. At the request of the organization in this study, negative items were not included in any scales. This may have contributed to the lack of findings in some areas and would be an area to expand on in future research. Along the same lines, a measure of the quality of the relationship would also have been beneficial in measuring the outcomes.

With respect to specific measures, the protégé measure of previous mentor experience may have been enhanced with the inclusion of formal versus informal experience. The experiences of a formal mentoring relationship may differ from an informal mentoring relationship given that informal relationships last upwards of five years and evolve naturally where as formal mentoring relationships are structured with much shorter duration, usually one year. For the mentors, combining experience as a protégé and as a mentor into previous mentor experience may have masked some relationships. The experiences are fundamentally different and as a result may have had varying affects on the current relationship.

The measure of expectations has limitations that are twofold. The first limitation is that of recall. Participants in the formal mentoring program were from four regional areas and each area participated in the program at a different time. Thus, the recall of expectations, was much greater for the initial group of participants than for the final group of participants. Second, as previously mentioned, a more accurate measure of expectations would have been prior to the participation in the program. Since a longitudinal study was not possible, the measure itself may be the reason for the lack of findings rather than the variable itself.

The measure of communication of expectations also has some limitations. Although communication of expectations was found to be correlated with the roles the mentor performed, it is impossible to know what was communicated specifically. A more sophisticated measure of communication of expectations, identifying specific expectations, is necessary if conclusions are to be drawn about the impact of expectations on roles performed.

Some of these limitations may have been avoided if the questionnaires had been pre-tested. In the interests of reducing response burden, on the mentors particularly, and timely execution of the questionnaires, the organization in this study did not wish to conduct a pre-test. As a result the questionnaire was developed with limited access to participants in the program, two mentors and two protégés, as well as the program

administrator. Greater development of some of the measures may have provided stronger findings and thus greater generalizability.

Another limitation lies in the overall generalizability of the results. Since only one mentor program was selected it may not be possible to generalize the results of this study to other formal mentoring programs. However, this program shared many design elements with other formal mentoring programs as described by Phillips-Jones (1982), Stokes (1994), Burke and McKeen (1989), Klauss (1981) and Zey (1985). Therefore, it is likely that similar dynamics may be observed in other formal mentoring programs. Generalizing the results of this study of formal mentoring relationships to informal mentoring relationships may, however, be problematic. Relationships that evolve naturally and without formal identification of goals and objectives, are likely to be different in important ways. These results may, however, suggest fruitful lines of inquiry for the study of informal relationships as well.

There are also methodological limitations, particularly with factor analysis. Factor analysis results in an infinite number of mathematically identical solutions (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). Thus in the absence of strong theory, the results of factor analysis may be difficult to interpret. Since there has been relatively little theoretical or empirical work in several areas of the model used in this research, conclusions drawn from the factor analysis should be regarded as tentative.

An additional constraint to the type of conclusions that can be made is socially desirable responding. It is possible that participants' perceptions of outcomes were affected by their loyalty or respect for other individuals involved in the program or for the organization. Participants may have answered what was expected resulting in biased results. In an effort to minimize the effects of this limitation, questionnaires were returned directly to the researcher. Similarly, although no exogenous variables were anticipated or identified during the gathering of data, their existence is still a possibility and should be acknowledge when conclusions are drawn from this analysis.

6.6 BENEFITS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This research has added insight into what type of outcomes mentors and protégés experience in a formal mentoring relationship. Through analysis of the models developed, organizations may better orient their employees on how the roles that the mentor performs can affect the outcomes participants' experience. Through analysis of the individual roles and their effect on outcomes, organizations may use the information to better train their mentors on the mentoring roles that have been identified. This information may also be useful for organizations in the customization of formal mentoring programs to produce career or enhanced effectiveness outcomes as desired.

The first suggestion for further research is to replicate the aspects of this study that identified the four expectation and outcome factors. All previous mentoring research to

date has focused on the career and psychosocial functions developed by Kram (1988) and this research indicates that there may be additional functions that have been overlooked in the past.

It would also be interesting to expand this study to include expectations and outcomes that are both positive and negative in nature. The literature indicates that many problems exist in mentoring relationships, particularly cross-sex mentoring relationships, and the opportunity to investigate negative aspects of the relationship would be beneficial. The difficulty will be, of course, convincing an organization to let researchers examine the possible negative consequences of these programs.

REFERENCES

- Burke, R.J. and McKeen, C.A. (1989) Developing Formal Mentoring Programs in Organizations. Business Quarterly, Winter, 76-79.
- Burke, R.J. (1984) Mentors in Organizations. Group and Organization Studies, 9(3), 353-372.
- Burke, R.J. and McKeen, C.A. (1990) Mentoring in Organizations: Implications for Women. Journal of Business Ethics, 9, 317-332.
- Clawson, J.G. and Kram, K.E. (1984) Managing Cross-Gender Mentoring. Business Horizons, May-June, 22-32.
- Clawson, J.G. (1988) Chemistry, Contingency Theory and Interpersonal Learning--A Theory of Developmental Relationships in Organizations. Mentoring: Aid to Excellence in Education, the Family and the Community, 2, 102-112.
- Cohen, J. (1988) Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cohen, J. and Cohen, P. (1983) Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Dalton, G.W., Thompson, P.H., and Price, R.L. (1977) The Four Stages of Professional Careers-A New Look at Performance by Professionals. Organization Dynamics, Summer, 19-42.
- Dench, S.J., Hutchinson, J.E. and Levine, K.B. (1993) Mentoring: Building An Effective Relationship. Vancouver: JKS Mentoring.
- Dillman, D.A. (1978) Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dreher, G.F. and Ash, R.A. (1990) A Comparative Study of Mentoring Among Men and Women in Managerial, Professional and Technical Positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75(5), 539-546.
- Farren, C., Gray, J.D. and Kaye, B. (1984) Mentoring: A Boon to Career Development. Personnel, November-December, 20-24.
- Fitt, L.W. and Newton, D.A. (1981) When the mentor is a man and the protégé a woman. Harvard Business Review, March-April, 56-60.
- Gage. (1983) Gage Canadian Dictionary. Toronto: Gage.

- Geiger, A.H. (1992) Measures for Mentors. Training and Development Journal, February, 65-67.
- Gould, S. (1979) Characteristics of career planners in upwardly mobile occupations. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 539-550.
- Gray, W.A. (1986) Formalized Mentoring. Canadian Public Administration, 29(4), 636-638.
- Henning, M. and Jardim, A. (1977) The Managerial Woman. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Hunt, D.M. and Michael, C. (1983) Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool. Academy of Management Review, 8(3), 475-485.
- Johnson, M.C. (1980) Mentors - The Key To Development and Growth. Training and Development Journal, July, 55-57.
- Keele, R.L., Buckner, K. and Bushnell, S.J. (1987) Formal Mentoring Programs Are No Panacea. Management Review, February, 67-68.
- Klauss, R. (1981) Formalized Mentor Relationships for Management and Executive Development Programs in the Federal Government. Public Administration Review, July-August, 489-496.
- Kram, K.E. (1985) Improving the Mentoring Process. Training and Development Journal, April, 40-43.
- Kram, K.E. and Isabella L.A. (1985) Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development. Academy of Management Journal, 28(1), 110-132.
- Kram, K.E. (1983) Phases of the Mentor Relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 608-625.
- Leibowitz, Z.B. and Schlossberg, N.K. (1981). Training Managers For Their Role In a Career Development System. Training and Development Journal, July, 72-79.
- Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.M., Klein, E.G., Levinson, M.H. and McKee, B. (1978) The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: A.A. Knopf.
- Morrison, A.M., White, R.P. and Van Velsor, E. (1987) Breaking the Glass Ceiling. Boston: Addison-Wesley.

- Noe, R.A. (1988) Women and Mentoring: A Review and Research Agenda. Academy of Management Review, 13(1), 65-78.
- Noe, R.A. (1988) An Investigation of the Determinants of Successful Assigned Mentoring Relationships. Personnel Psychology, 41(3), 457-479.
- Norusis, M.J. (1993) SPSS for Windows Base System User's Guide. Release 6.0. SPSS Inc.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978) Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Nunnally Jr., J.C. (1959) Tests and Measurements: Assessment and Prediction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Phillips-Jones, L. (1982) Establishing a Formalized Mentoring Program. Training and Development Journal, February, 39-42.
- Ragins, B.R. and Cotton, J.L. (1991) Easier Said Than Done: Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers to Gaining a Mentor. Academy of Management Journal, 34(4), 939-951.
- Ragins, B.R. and Cotton, J.L. (1993) Wanted: Mentors for Women. Personnel Journal, April, 20.
- Ragins, B.R. and McFarlin, D.B. (1990) Perceptions of Mentor Roles in Cross-Gender Mentoring Relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37, 321-339.
- Ragins, B.R. and Scandura, T.A. (1994) Gender Differences in Expected Outcomes in Mentoring Relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 37(4), 957-971.
- Reeve, C.S. (1990) Mentoring Relationships in High Technology Firms. Kingston: Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University.
- Reich, M.H. (1985) Executive Views from Both Sides of Mentoring. Personnel, March, 42-46.
- Riley, S. and Wrench, D. (1985) Mentoring Among Women Lawyers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 15(4), 374-386.
- Roche, G.R. (1979) Much ado about mentors. Harvard Business Review, January-February, 14-28.
- Scandura, T.A. and Viator, R.E. (1994) Mentoring in Public Accounting Firms: An Analysis of Mentor-Protégé Relationships, Mentorship Functions, and Protégé Turnover Intentions. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 19(8), 717-734.

Serlen, B. (1989) How Mentoring Programs Work. Journal of Career Planning and Employment, Winter, 54-56.

Stokes Jr., S.L. (1994) Networking with a Human Face. Information Systems Management, 11(3), 34-40.

Tabachnick, B. and Fidell, L. (1983) Using Multivariate Statistics, 2nd Edition. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.

Vincent, A. and Seymour, J. (1995) Profile of Women Mentors: A National Survey. SAM Advanced Management Journal, Spring, 4-11.

Wentling, R.M. (1992) Women in Middle Management: Their Career Development and Aspirations. Business Horizons, January-February, 47-54.

Zey, M.G. (1985) Mentor Programs: Making the Right Moves. Personnel Journal, February, 53-57.

Zey, M.G. (1988) A Mentor For All. Personnel Journal, January, 46-51.

APPENDIX I - PROTÉGÉ OUTCOMES MEASURE

Read the following statements and indicate on the scale provided the extent to which they describe the outcomes of your relationship with your Advisor.

<u>Slight</u>	<u>Large</u>
<u>Extent</u>	<u>Extent</u>

Career Items:

I've gained a better understanding of the workings of the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
My insight into other areas of the organization has increased.	1	2	3	4	5
My network of professional contacts has expanded and networking opportunities have increased.	1	2	3	4	5
I have more insight and information on career options.	1	2	3	4	5
I gained insight on how to overcome barriers to advancement	1	2	3	4	5
My visibility and exposure within the Organization has increased.	1	2	3	4	5
I have gained increased responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
Participation in the Program helped me make a positive career move.	1	2	3	4	5

Psychosocial Items:

My self-esteem and self-confidence has improved.	1	2	3	4	5
I received objective feedback and encouragement.	1	2	3	4	5
I gained insight and information on managing more effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
I've taken more control of my career.	1	2	3	4	5

RELATIONSHIP INTENSITY MEASURE

Following is a list of various roles your Advisor may have assumed during your participation in the Advisor Program. Please read the following statements and indicate to what extent each is accurate in describing the kind of help you received from your Advisor.

No Help Modest Significant

Career Roles:

Appraiser: "My Advisor would give feedback on the development plan designed around my future goals and objectives."	1	2	3	4	5
Coach: "My Advisor gave specific interpersonal feedback and served as an independent third party to clarify my thinking on such items as performance goals and developmental needs."	1	2	3	4	5
Counselor: "My Advisor provided information about career opportunities and options and suggested appropriate strategies."	1	2	3	4	5
Broker: "My Advisor arranged opportunities for me to become more visible and expand my network of professional contacts."	1	2	3	4	5
Referral Agent: "My Advisor identified resources to pursue for more information and followed up on effectiveness of suggested referrals."	1	2	3	4	5
Advocate: "My Advisor represented my concerns on specific issues to higher-level managers."	1	2	3	4	5

Psychosocial Roles:

Communicator: "My Advisor encouraged a two-way exchange of information and acted as a sounding board for my ideas and concerns"	1	2	3	4	5
Informant: "My Advisor helped to interpret and clarify the organization's culture, political structure and vision."	1	2	3	4	5
Role Model: "My Advisor served as a role model in my career development by demonstrating corporate values and successful career behaviors."	1	2	3	4	5

How frequently would you communicate with your Advisor?

Face-to Face - _____ times/month OR _____ times/year

What was the actual duration of your formal Advisor Relationship? _____ months

CAREER PLANNING MEASURE

Following is a list of questions that relate to career objectives and goals. Please indicate on the scale provided the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Strongly <u>Disagree</u>			Strongly <u>Agree</u>	
I have a plan for my career.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what I have to do to reach my career goals.	1	2	3	4	5
My career objectives are not clear	1	2	3	4	5

PREVIOUS MENTOR EXPERIENCE MEASURE

How many mentor relationships have you had prior to your participation in the Advisor Program? _____

APPENDIX II - PROTÉGÉ QUESTIONNAIRE

EXECUTIVE ADVISOR PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

ADVISEE EVALUATION

SECTION I - INITIAL INVOLVEMENT IN ADVISOR PROGRAM

1. Please indicate to what extent you held the following expectations prior to your participation in the Program.

	<u>Had No</u> <u>Expectations</u>			<u>Had High</u> <u>Expectations</u>	
I expected my participation would:					
a. provide coaching	1	2	3	4	5
b. provide developmental opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
c. increase my exposure and visibility	1	2	3	4	5
d. lead to advancement	1	2	3	4	5
e. increase my self confidence	1	2	3	4	5
f. improve my managerial and interpersonal skills	1	2	3	4	5
g. help me develop new ways to approach problems	1	2	3	4	5
h. provide greater insight into myself	1	2	3	4	5
i. provide greater understanding of the Organization	1	2	3	4	5
Other expectations (please specify)					

	<u>No</u>		<u>Partially</u>		<u>Fully</u>
2. Did you and your Advisor share your expectations with each other?	1	2	3	4	5

3. Were your expectations met overall?	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

4. How many mentor relationships have you had prior to your participation in the Advisor Program? _____

5. How was the relationship with your Advisor different from previous relationships?

6. Following is a list of questions that relate to career objectives and goals. Please indicate on the scale provided the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. Strongly Strongly

	<u>Disagree</u>			<u>Agree</u>	
I have a plan for my career.	1	2	3	4	5
I know what I have to do to reach my career goals.	1	2	3	4	5
My career objectives are not clear	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION II - ADVISEE EVALUATION OF ADVISOR RELATIONSHIP

7. Following is a list of various roles your Advisor may have assumed during your participation in the Advisor Program. Please read the following statements and indicate to what extent each is accurate in describing the kind of help you received from your Advisor.

	<u>No Help</u>		<u>Modest</u>		<u>Significant</u>
Communicator: "My Advisor encouraged a two-way exchange of information and acted as a sounding board for my ideas and concerns"	1	2	3	4	5
Informant: "My Advisor helped to interpret and clarify the organization's culture, political structure and vision."	1	2	3	4	5
Appraiser: "My Advisor would give feedback on the development plan designed around my future goals and objectives."	1	2	3	4	5
Coach: "My Advisor gave specific interpersonal feedback and served as an independent third party to clarify my thinking on such items as performance goals and developmental needs."	1	2	3	4	5
Counselor: "My Advisor provided information about career opportunities and options and suggested appropriate strategies."	1	2	3	4	5
Broker: "My Advisor arranged opportunities for me to become more visible and expand my network of professional contacts."	1	2	3	4	5
Referral Agent: "My Advisor identified resources to pursue for more information and followed up on effectiveness of suggested referrals."	1	2	3	4	5
Advocate: "My Advisor represented my concerns on specific issues to higher-level managers."	1	2	3	4	5
Role Model: "My Advisor served as a role model in my career development by demonstrating corporate values and successful career behaviors."	1	2	3	4	5
Other roles. (please specify)					

8. How frequently would you communicate with your Advisor?

Face-to Face - _____ times/month OR _____ times/year

Other Means - _____ times/month OR _____ times/year

9. Who initiated most of your meetings? Myself My Advisor

10. Was there a new agenda set prior to each meeting? Yes No

11. If Yes, who would generally set the agenda? Myself My Advisor

12. What was the actual duration of your formal Advisor Relationship? _____ months

13. Read the following statements and indicate on the scale provided the extent to which they describe the outcomes of your relationship with your Advisor.

	<u>Slight</u> <u>Extent</u>			<u>Large</u> <u>Extent</u>	
a. I've gained a better understanding of the workings of the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
b. My insight into other areas of the organization has increased.	1	2	3	4	5
c. My network of professional contacts has expanded and networking opportunities have increased.	1	2	3	4	5
d. My self-esteem and self-confidence has improved.	1	2	3	4	5
e. I have more insight and information on career options.	1	2	3	4	5
f. I received objective feedback and encouragement.	1	2	3	4	5
g. I gained insight and information on managing more effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
h. I gained insight on how to overcome barriers to advancement	1	2	3	4	5
i. I've taken more control of my career.	1	2	3	4	5
j. My visibility and exposure within the organization has increased	1	2	3	4	5
k. I have gained increased responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
l. Participation in the Program helped me make a positive career move.	1	2	3	4	5

Other Areas (please specify)

14. How useful were the self assessment materials and skills strategy guide as development tools?

<u>Not</u> <u>Helpful</u>					<u>Very</u> <u>Helpful</u>
1	2	3	4	5	

SECTION III - OVERALL EVALUATION OF ADVISOR PROGRAM

15. Following is a list of criteria for Program participation. Please indicate the importance of each element with respect to the development of an effective relationship between Advisor and Advisee.

	<u>Not</u> <u>Important</u>		<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>		<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>
a. Advisor knowledge of the Organization	1	2	3	4	5
b. Advisor commitment to the program	1	2	3	4	5
c. Broad multifunctional experience of Advisor	1	2	3	4	5
d. Geographic proximity between those matched	1	2	3	4	5
e. Advisee commitment to concept of self development	1	2	3	4	5
f. Voluntary open participation	1	2	3	4	5

Others (please specify)

16. How well do you feel you were matched to your Advisor? Poorly Very Well
1 2 3 4 5
17. Do you still have a relationship with your Advisor outside of the formal Advisor program? Yes No
18. How would you characterize this relationship? Advisor-Advisee relationship
Peer-like relationship
Lasting friendship
Other _____
19. Would you recommend participation in the program to others? Yes No
20. Overall, how valuable do you think the Advisor Program is to the Organization? Not Valuable Very Valuable
1 2 3 4 5
21. How do you feel the current Advisor Program can be improved?

SECTION IV - PERSONAL INFORMATION

22. Are you: Male Female
23. The Gender of my Advisor: Male Female
24. How long have you been with the Organization? _____ years
25. What is your current position with the Organization? _____, Level _____
26. How long have you been in this position? _____ years _____ months
27. What was your position when you participated in the Organization's Advisor Program?
_____, Level _____
28. How long did you/have you held that position? _____ years _____ months

APPENDIX III - MENTOR OUTCOME MEASURES

Read the following statements and indicate on the scale provided the extent to which they describe the outcomes of your participation in the Advisor Program.

Slight Extent	Large Extent
------------------	-----------------

Career Items

I gained recognition as a people developer.

1 2 3 4 5

I had an opportunity to keep in touch with issues at different levels of the organization.

1 2 3 4 5

Psychosocial Items:

I had an opportunity to refine my coaching skills.

1 2 3 4 5

I had a chance to give something back to the Organization.

1 2 3 4 5

I received good insight into how the senior team is viewed.

1 2 3 4 5

AVERAGE RELATIONSHIP INTENSITY MEASURES

Following is a list of various roles you may have assumed as Advisor during your participation in the Advisor Program. Please read the following statements and indicate on the scale provided to what extent each is accurate in describing the kind of help you offered your Advisees.

No Help Modest Significant
1 2 3 4 5

No Help Modest Significant
1 2 3 4 5

Female Advisee

Male Advisee

Career Roles:

1 2 3 4 5

Appraiser: "I would give feedback on his/her development plan designed around future goals and objectives."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Coach: "I gave specific interpersonal feedback and served as an independent third party to clarify his/her thinking on such items as performance goals and developmental needs."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Counselor: "I provided information about career opportunities and options and suggested appropriate strategies."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Broker: "I arranged opportunities for my Advisee to become more visible and expand his/her network of professional contacts."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Referral Agent: "I identified resources to pursue for more information and followed up on effectiveness of suggested referrals."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Advocate: "I represented my Advisees concerns on specific issues to high-level managers."

1 2 3 4 5

Psychosocial Roles:

1 2 3 4 5

Communicator: "I encouraged a two-way exchange of information and acted as a sounding board for his/her ideas and concerns"

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Informant: "I helped to interpret and clarify the organization's culture, political structure and vision."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Role Model: "I served as a role model in Advisees' career development by demonstrating corporate values and successful career behavior."

1 2 3 4 5

MENTOR EXPECTATIONS MEASURES

Please indicate to what extent you held the following expectations prior to your participation in the Program.

No High
Expectations Expectations

I expected participation would provide:

Career Items:

learning about other areas of the Organization	1	2	3	4	5
recognition from others for developing others	1	2	3	4	5
a source of new ideas	1	2	3	4	5

Psychosocial Items:

a sense of pride in seeing employees develop	1	2	3	4	5
personal challenge	1	2	3	4	5
an opportunity to give something back to the Organization	1	2	3	4	5

MENTOR PREVIOUS MENTORING EXPERIENCE MEASURE

How many mentors have you had in your personal career? _____

How many others have you mentored?

APPENDIX IV - MENTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

EXECUTIVE ADVISOR PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

ADVISOR EVALUATION

SECTION I - INITIAL INVOLVEMENT IN ADVISOR PROGRAM

1. Please indicate to what extent you held the following expectations prior to your participation in the Program.

	<u>No</u>		<u>High</u>		
	<u>Expectations</u>		<u>Expectations</u>		
I expected participation would provide:					
a. a sense of pride in seeing employees develop	1	2	3	4	5
b. learning about other areas of the Organization	1	2	3	4	5
c. recognition from others for developing others	1	2	3	4	5
d. personal challenge	1	2	3	4	5
e. an opportunity to give something back to the Organization	1	2	3	4	5
f. a source of new ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Other _____					

SECTION II: ADVISOR EVALUATION OF ADVISEE RELATIONSHIP

The following section asks you to describe your relationship with your Advisees. Each question allows you to answer separately for each Advisee.

Female Advisee

No Partially Fully

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

2. Did you and your Advisee share your expectations with each other?

3. Were your expectations met overall?

4. Do you feel you were effectively utilized as a developmental mentor?

Poorly Well

1 2 3 4 5

5. How well do you feel you were matched with your Advisee?

Male Advisee

No Partially Fully

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Poorly Well

1 2 3 4 5

6. Following is a list of various roles you may have assumed as Advisor during your participation in the Advisor Program. Please read the following statements and indicate on the scale provided to what extent each is accurate in describing the kind of help you offered your Advisees.

No Help Modest Significant

1 2 3 4 5

No Help Modest Significant

1 2 3 4 5

Female Advisee

Male Advisee

1 2 3 4 5

Communicator: "I encouraged a two-way exchange of information and acted as a sounding board for his/her ideas and concerns"

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Informant: "I helped to interpret and clarify the organization's culture, political structure and vision."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Appraiser: "I would give feedback on his/her development plan designed around future goals and objectives."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Coach: "I gave specific interpersonal feedback and served as an independent third party to clarify his/her thinking on such items as performance goals and developmental needs."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Counselor: "I provided information about career opportunities and options and suggested appropriate strategies."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Broker: "I arranged opportunities for my Advisee to become more visible and expand his/her network of professional contacts."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Referral Agent: "I identified resources to pursue for more information and followed up on effectiveness of suggested referrals."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Advocate: "I represented my Advisees concerns on specific issues to high-level managers."

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Role Model: "I served as a role model in Advisees' career development by demonstrating corporate values and successful career behavior."

1 2 3 4 5

Other roles. (please specify)

Female Advisee**Male Advisee**

		7. Do you still have a relationship with your Advisee ?		
No	Yes		No	Yes
		8. How would you characterize this relationship?		
		Advisor-Advisee		
		Peer-like		
		Lasting Friendship		
		Other		
_____			_____	
_____			_____	

SECTION III - OVERALL EVALUATION OF ADVISOR PROGRAM

9. Following is a list of criteria for Program participation. Please indicate the importance of each element with respect to the development of an effective relationship between Advisor and Advisee.

	Not Important		Somewhat Important		Very Important
a. Advisor knowledge of the Organization	1	2	3	4	5
b. Advisor commitment to program	1	2	3	4	5
c. Broad multifunctional experience of Advisor	1	2	3	4	5
d. Geographic proximity between those matched	1	2	3	4	5
e. Advisee commitment to self development	1	2	3	4	5
f. Voluntary open participation	1	2	3	4	5
Others (please specify)					

10. Read the following statements and indicate on the scale provided the extent to which they describe the outcomes of your participation in the Advisor Program.

		Slight Extent			Large Extent
a. I had an opportunity to refine my coaching skills.	1	2	3	4	5
b. I had a chance to give something back to the Organization.	1	2	3	4	5
c. I gained recognition as a people developer.	1	2	3	4	5
d. I had an opportunity to keep in touch with issues at different levels of the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
e. I received good insight into how the senior team is viewed.	1	2	3	4	5
Others (please specify)					

11. Would you recommend participation in the program to others? Yes No

12. Overall, how valuable do you think the
Advisor Program is to the Organization?

<u>Not Valuable</u>					<u>Very Valuable</u>
1	2	3	4	5	

13 How do you feel the current Advisor Program can be improved?

SECTION IV - PERSONAL INFORMATION

14. How long have you been with by the Organization? _____ years

15. Are you: Male Female

16 How many mentors have you had in your personal career? _____

17. How many others have you mentored? _____

Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX V - QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

Dear Executive Advisor Program Participant,

We are writing to ask for your help in conducting an evaluation of the Executive Advisor Program. This input, in conjunction with information collected in our initial survey, will enable us to assess the program from both the short and long term perspective. All pilot participants of Toronto and British Columbia, as well as all recent participants in Albert and South Western Ontario, are being asked for their feedback.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. We encourage you to be candid. All responses will be held in confidence and reported in summary form.

We greatly appreciate your participation in this survey and look forward to sharing with you the summary of our findings. Should you have any questions please feel free to call the Program Manager at ###-###-####.

Sincerely,

Vice President
Employee Programs &
Workplace Equality

APPENDIX VI- THREE WEEK FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Executive Advisor Program Participant,

Three weeks ago a questionnaire seeking your opinions about the Executive Advisor Program was mailed to you.

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If you have not yet had the opportunity to do so please complete it as soon as possible. Your input is extremely important in assessing the program.

If by some chance you did not received the questionnaires, or it got misplaced, a new questionnaire has been enclosed. If you have any questions please call the program administrator at ###-###-####.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Program Administrator

© 1993, Applied Image, Inc., All Rights Reserved