

# Essential Formal Mentor Characteristics and Functions in Governmental and Non-Governmental Organizations from the Program Administrator's and the Mentor's Perspective

*Wanda J. Smith*

*Jerusalem T. Howard*

*K. Vernard Harrington*

**This study examines (from the formal mentor's perspective) who mentors are (essential traits) as well as what mentors do (essential functions) in four types of organizations (i.e., academic, business, military-armed forces, and military-academic organizations). We found that industry context and gender do significantly influence perceptions of the ideal formal mentor characteristics. Results also indicate formal mentors place more importance on mentor traits (compared to mentor behaviors). Implications for this research include considering revision of the criteria used for the selection of formal mentors.**

**R**ecognizing the personal and organizational benefits associated with informal mentoring relationships,<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8</sup> over one-third of the major corporations in the United States as well as all branches of the United States armed forces have established formal mentoring programs.<sup>9,10</sup> At the same time, researchers comparing the outcomes of formal and informal mentoring relationships have consistently learned that formal mentoring relationships (also known as formal mentorships) may not be particularly beneficial to the protégé, the mentor, or the organization.<sup>11,12,13</sup> For example, when comparing the experiences of 1,162 formal and informal protégés across three occupations (i.e., journalist, social workers, and engineers), Ragins and Cotton<sup>14</sup> found that formal mentors provide lower levels of career development functions, including less coaching, lower protégés exposure or visibility, and fewer

challenging assignments. These researchers also found that formal mentors are less likely to engage in psychosocial activities such as role modeling, providing friendship, counseling, and facilitating social interactions. One common explanation for these findings has been the nature of the formal mentoring relationship.

### **The Nature of Formal Mentoring Relationships**

Few would argue that there are distinct differences in formal and informal mentoring relationships. One major difference lies in the initiation of the mentor/protégé relationship.<sup>15</sup> Informal mentorships are spontaneous and unstructured relationships with minimal organizational involvement. Informal protégés generally have proven they possess the ‘right stuff’ and are worthy of the attention that they are given by their informal mentors.<sup>16</sup> In contrast, formal mentoring programs are officially recognized, sanctioned, and managed by the sponsoring organization.<sup>17</sup>

Typically, when developing a formal mentoring program, organizations (both governmental and non-governmental) adopt an official policy to decide who is to be mentored and who will serve as mentors. Potential mentors and protégés frequently complete and submit application forms.<sup>18</sup> A third party (generally an HR representative) pairs or facilitates the pairing of the formal mentors and their protégés. The criteria for selecting protégés are often related to membership in a target group (e.g., graduate trainees, EEO protected group, new employees, etc.). The selection criterion of mentors, on the other hand, varies from being based on organizational positions the potential mentor occupies to the potential mentors being ‘intuitively’ considered a good mentor.<sup>19</sup>

Although many studies have focused on topics such as preconditions for successful program implementation<sup>20,21</sup> and the ‘mechanics’ of formal mentoring programs,<sup>22,23,24</sup> little is known about which mentor characteristics (i.e., traits or behaviors) are perceived as most important from the mentor’s or program administrator’s perspective. This situation has resulted in formal mentoring program practitioners selecting formal mentors without the benefit or guidance of empirical research. Given these stakeholders’ critical role in the initiation and maintenance of the formal mentoring relationship and the considerable costs (both tangible and intangible) associated with dissatisfying or dysfunctional mentorships, an empirical investigation of their perspective is warranted.<sup>25</sup>

### **Research Objectives**

In this study, we take a step towards identifying essential formal mentor characteristics from the formal mentor’s perspective. Our initial research objective is to shed light on the tangled web of operationalizations of formal mentor characteristics by systematically capturing (using the Delphi technique) formal mentoring practitioners (i.e., formal mentoring program administrators and experts) descriptions of essential mentor functions and traits. Specifically, this initial phase of the study examines, from the practitioners’ perspective — *who formal mentors are* (i.e., mentor traits) as well as *what formal mentors do* (i.e., mentor functions). The ultimate objective of this phase of the research is to explore the extent to which the mentor model generated by practitioners parallels Kram’s mentor roles.<sup>26</sup>

The second phase of this study explores the nature and the relative importance of mentor traits and functions as perceived by formal mentors. There is little research on the essential nature of mentor traits and virtually no research using the formal mentors' perspective.<sup>27,28,29</sup> Further investigation is also warranted regarding the relative importance of mentor behaviors. Doing so may shed light on the tendency of formal mentors to provide fewer or lower levels of these functions.

The final phase of this study investigates the impact of industry context (i.e., academic, business, military, or military/academic) on formal mentor perceptions of essential mentor traits and functions. Opportunities presented to officers by the military are increasingly being viewed as equal to, if not greater than those in the corporate arena.<sup>30</sup> Recent university graduates of color (a highly sought after pool of candidates in corporate America) are seizing these opportunities at surprising rates. To boost minority junior officers' military career advancement and to increase retention, each of the United States armed forces support and sponsor a variety of formal mentoring programs. The success of these targeted formal programs as well as programs including junior officers from the majority population depends, in part, on the selection of the "right" formal mentor.<sup>31</sup> This study seeks to determine if there are unique mentor characteristics that can be used to guide the military's selection process.

Before discussing government and non-government practitioners' perceptions of essential mentor characteristics and their relative importance, we will present a brief overview of the formal mentoring literature.

## **Literature Review**

### **Mentoring Defined**

Mentoring has been defined as an interpersonal relationship in which a senior or more experienced person helps a junior or inexperienced person to succeed in the organization.<sup>32</sup> Many have extended the mentoring concept to other forms of "helping" relationships, particularly peer relationships.<sup>33</sup> However, the essence of mentoring considered in this study is that significant differences (particularly in status, experience, tenure, etc.) exist between the mentor and the person being mentored (referred to as a protégé or mentee). Thus, for the purposes of the present study, the term "mentor" refers to a more senior person who takes an interest in sponsorship of the career of a more junior person.<sup>34</sup>

### **Research on Mentor Traits (Characteristics)**

Because not all mentors are effective,<sup>35,36,37</sup> organizational researchers and managers have become interested in examining the influence of a mentor's traits on the quality of mentoring relationships.<sup>38,39</sup> Most of the research responding to this call has examined demographic characteristics as possible predictors. Researchers have consistently found that the demographic characteristics of both mentor and protégé (i.e., age, gender, rank, experience, and race) can affect perceptions of the mentoring relationship as well as its outcomes.<sup>40,41,42,43,44</sup>

Further empirical investigations into the nature and impact of mentor traits include: flexibility,<sup>45</sup> competence,<sup>46</sup> mentor personality,<sup>47,48</sup> and power.<sup>49</sup> Darwin extended this list of mentor traits to include authenticity, nurturance, approachability, inspiration, and conscientiousness.<sup>50</sup> The methodology used in most of this research has been to ask protégés to identify traits of a good mentor or to describe their mentor.<sup>51</sup> No study was found asking formal mentors to identify essential formal mentor traits. In addition, no previous research was discovered identifying essential traits of military mentors.

Other researchers have developed theoretical models of essential mentor characteristics. Based on leadership literature emphasizing character and other leader traits, Wilson suggests a 'principled mentor' may increase the chances of positive mentoring outcomes.<sup>52</sup> He describes a principled mentor as one who has formed the values of integrity, courage, and care within their character. Wilson's first mentor character trait, integrity, is seen as contributing to success in business and has been called by others an essential executive quality, and an indispensable ingredient for leadership.<sup>53</sup> Caring, in contrast, involves being able to put yourself in the place of others — empathy. Some philosophers see this character trait as a manifestation of the 'Golden Rule': treat others as you would like to be treated. Another, and more recent, interpretation of the caring trait is that it can be equated with the virtue of sensitivity. One writer advocates that teamwork and personal relationships (such as mentorships) built upon caring can assist the firm in socializing new members while garnering greater commitment, and ultimately being more competitive.<sup>54</sup>

On the basis of the theory and research reviewed above, we hypothesized that formal mentors will value respectability traits more highly than sensitivity and wisdom — the latter being the least important.

*H1a: When comparing the importance of mentor traits, formal mentors will rank respectability traits (e.g., honesty, integrity, high morals) as most important.*

*H1b: When comparing the importance of mentor traits, formal mentors will rank mentor wisdom (e.g., organizational savvy and professional competence) as least important.*

## **Research on Mentor Behaviors (Functions)**

Kram's<sup>55</sup> 1983 study employing qualitative interviews with both mentors and protégés has generated the most commonly cited and validated classification of mentor functions: career development and psychosocial.<sup>56,57,58</sup> Kram suggested that mentors perform five specific career development functions — exposure, protection, coaching, sponsorship, and challenging assignments.<sup>59</sup> The general goal of these functions is to help protégés progress in their careers. In contrast, the psychosocial category describes the psychological support provided by the mentor, which enhances the protégés' self-efficacy, personal development, identity, and work-role effectiveness. Kram posited that the four psychosocial functions of a mentor are counseling, friendship,

role modeling, and acceptance/confirmation. Unlike the career development functions, psychosocial behaviors can be carried out for the protégé by a variety of individuals within the organization.<sup>60</sup>

A large body of informal mentoring research using a variety of methods has supported and/or expanded Kram's two-function model.<sup>61,62</sup> Less research has been conducted in the context of formal mentoring relationships. The research that does exist suggests that formal mentors provide fewer or lower levels of these functions than informal mentors.<sup>63,64,65,66</sup>

The most common methodology used in studies examining formal mentoring has been to survey formal and informal protégés and/or mentors. The three instruments administered in these limited number of studies were designed to measure Kram's broad categories of mentoring functions.<sup>67</sup> The total number of items for each of these instruments range in number from 18 to 33.<sup>68,69</sup> The latter scale measured two additional psychosocial functions (i.e., parent and social interactions). These additional roles may have emerged given the unique context of cross-gender mentorships. For example, as theorized by Kram and tested by Ragins and Cotton, protégés in cross-gender relationships may seek to avoid sexual issues by avoiding informal (away from the workplace) socializing or by viewing their mentor as a parental figure.<sup>70</sup> No scale was found specifically designed to assess the formal mentoring program administrator and experts' perspective or the formal mentor's perspective of formal mentoring programs.

On the basis of these theories and findings, we suggest that the measurement of formal mentoring needs to be thought about afresh for two reasons. First, formal mentoring program administrators generally match or facilitate the pairing of formal mentors and protégés. While many formal mentoring programs provide specific selection guidelines (e.g., rank, gender, race), the subjective criteria program administrators use to match mentors and protégés has not been systematically captured in the literature. The second reason why the measurement of formal mentor functions should be reexamined is that today's formal mentors may have distinct expectations about their role as mentors given the current emphasis to become a mentor and the rewards for being a formal mentor.<sup>71</sup>

According to Kram and others, formal mentors can become anxious (given the visibility of the relationship) and confused about their new responsibilities as a mentor even when the formal mentor and protégé like each other and want to build a mentorship. Many formal mentors cope with this confusion by developing idealized models of what they should do as a mentor.<sup>72,73</sup> Since formal mentors often use their experiences as protégés as the basis of these idealized models of mentor behaviors,<sup>74</sup> we anticipate that formal mentors who had experienced less rich formal mentorships will continue the established norm of less rich formal mentor behaviors. Whether Kram's operationalization of mentor behaviors applies equally to or is valued by formal mentors and administrators are questions that should be addressed. We anticipate that there will be differences, especially across industry contexts. Before presenting hypotheses regarding mentor functions, we turn to a discussion of mentor functions across industry contexts.

## **Mentor Functions across Industry Contexts**

Merriam states that “mentoring appears to mean one thing to developmental psychologists, another thing to business people, and a third thing to those in academic settings.”<sup>75</sup> Other scholars have suggested that what mentors do may depend on the industry context.<sup>76</sup> Ragins<sup>77</sup> and Ibarra<sup>78</sup> noted that under some circumstances mentors providing developmental functions might generate sufficient career advantages for the protégés, whereas in other circumstances psychosocial mentor may be as, if not more, important. For example, new recruits in a politically charged business context would most likely value developmental connections more than psychosocial support. On the other hand, a new faculty member in an academic context may value psychosocial support more than career enhancing support.

Surprisingly, few studies have systematically and theoretically explored the importance of contextually driven formal mentor functions. In this study, it is proposed that industry contexts (i.e., academic, business, military, and military-academic) may necessitate customized approaches to formal mentoring as well as unique valued mentor behaviors. This level of analysis has been advised to minimize idiosyncratic characteristics of organizations.<sup>79</sup>

Related research also supports using industry context as a predictor. For example, Simerly and Hunt found that industry context has a strong impact on organizational receptivity to women’s issues.<sup>80</sup> Their results indicate that despite years of Affirmative Action programs, mentoring programs and other efforts to advance the station of women, there remains a marked difference across industries in the ability of women to advance.

A review of the literature examining mentor functions in four industry contexts (academic, military, business, and military-academic) is followed by a comparative analysis of the research similarities and differences among these contexts.

**Academic Context.** Formal, academic mentor programs are geared to help students succeed.<sup>81,82</sup> Academic mentors tend to carry out a blend of psychosocial and career-related functions.<sup>83</sup> Psychosocial functions “enable a protégé to clarify a sense of identity and develop a greater sense of competence and self-worth.”<sup>84</sup> Vocational (career-related) functions focus more on the protégé’s occupational development.<sup>85,86</sup> Common psychosocial examples found in the academic literature include role modeling, encouraging, counseling, and befriending.<sup>87,88</sup> Examples of vocational functions include: educating, consulting, sponsoring, and protecting.<sup>89,90,91</sup>

For the most part, academic theorists have identified these mentor functions without support of a quantitatively derived methodology. One exception is Schockett and Haring-Hidore, who did engage in a factor analysis to achieve their categorizations.<sup>92</sup>

**Business Context.** As noted earlier in this literature review, Kram’s career functions are: sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, and protection.<sup>93</sup> These functions are similar to Zey’s mentor roles: (1) teaching, (2) organizational interventions, and (3) sponsoring.<sup>94</sup> The teaching function involves: teaching the job, drawing the organizational road map, and giving career guidance. A mentor’s organizational intervention involves: protection, marketing, and access to resources.

The major difference between Zey's and Kram's models of mentor roles involves the psychosocial functions. Kram includes role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship as important psychosocial functions. Zey's contention, in contrast, is that psychological counseling/personal support centers on helping through counseling. Although there is some disparity between these two, one can readily expand the list of mentor functions to include: role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. It is interesting to note that other authors have identified similar functions, but have termed them differently. Is this difference evidence of idiosyncratic characteristics of organizations? This question is beyond the scope of this paper, but warrants further study.

**Military Context.** Most literature about mentors in the military has centered on regulations establishing mentor programs and has been anecdotal in nature.<sup>95,96,97,98,99,100</sup> One exception, a survey of retired navy admirals, explored the frequency, duration, nature, and significance of mentor relationships in their careers.<sup>101</sup> This study's results indicate that 68 percent of the respondents had three or more mentors during their careers. The relationships, for the most part, were informal in nature with military officers who were older and in the respondents' chain of command.

The dearth of research on military mentors has resulted in practitioners' using leadership traits as substitutes of desired mentor traits. For example, military doctrine has established certain competencies for its leaders. Four required leadership competencies are: communication skills, supervision, teaching and counseling, and professional ethics.<sup>102</sup> The first three competencies parallel the mentor functions examined in the business and education literature.<sup>103,104,105,106,107</sup> However, the fourth function, professional ethics, does not often appear in the business context of mentoring.

While some scholars<sup>108,109</sup> have found empirical distinction between leadership and mentoring, others have found a positive relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and mentoring functions.<sup>110</sup> In addition, prior leadership research<sup>111,112</sup> has identified similar and overlapping characteristics between mentoring and transformational leadership behaviors. In this study, TRADOC's widely referenced leadership competencies will be used as one index of military mentor functions and traits.<sup>113</sup>

**Military-Academic Context.** This unique industry context consists of military (i.e., Army, Navy, and Air Force) personnel stationed at academic institutions. The central groups in this industry context are: (1) active duty student personnel (whose mission is to complete their graduate degree in the time allotted) and (2) active duty 'support' personnel (whose mission is to facilitate the undergraduate education of a given university's corps of cadets). Examples of formal mentors for these personnel include the senior (highest ranking) student liaison officer, a professor of military science, or the university corps commandant.

No research was found examining mentoring relationships in this context. Nevertheless, we anticipate higher formal mentor expectations from this group of individuals given the nature of the selection process. Personnel who are selected for these tours of duty and find themselves in the role of a formal mentor are members of



an elite group. Qualification requirements for these tours include evidence of commitment as well as prior performance excellence (education and leadership). Since the protégés are isolated, in many cases, from the traditional military culture and are seeking to adapt to the academic culture, military-academic formal mentors fulfill a wide range of roles for their protégés, especially when protégés seek to manage cultural conflict and role ambiguity.

On the basis of the theory and research above, we propose the following hypotheses relating to mentor functions and traits across industry contexts:

*H2: The relative importance ranking of the various mentor functions will vary across industry context.*

*H3: Formal mentors will rank psychosocial functions as more essential than career functions.*

Research in the area of industry context presents the following additional hypothesis related to mentor traits:

*H4: The relative importance ranking of the various mentor traits will vary across industry context.*

As previously reported, researchers have, somewhat consistently, found that formal mentors are less likely to engage in psychosocial activities.<sup>114</sup> Explanations for these findings have largely centered around two issues: the nature of the relationship and the impact of organizational systems. First, scholars have posited that formal mentoring relationships, compared to informal relationships, are less rich given the nature of the formal mentoring relationship (e.g., its formality, visibility, short-term length and focus as well as its origins — initiation by a third party rather than mutual attraction).<sup>115,116,117</sup> Second, researchers have suggested that organizational systems (e.g., environment, size, technology, culture, personnel, reward systems, structures, and other factors) facilitate or support the formal mentor's efforts and motivation to support the protégé. For example, Aryee, Chay, and Chew found that an organizational reward system emphasizing employee development was positively related to motivation to mentor.<sup>118</sup>

Recent trends in organizations (government and non-governmental) include developing reward systems (e.g., performance appraisals, mentoring evaluations schemes & structured coaching opportunities) as well as support systems (e.g., training & global registers of mentor networks) to minimize the likelihood of dysfunctional mentoring relationships.<sup>119</sup> We believe this 'positive mentoring' atmosphere can send a strong message of mentoring expectations.

In light of the above research, we hypothesize that:

*H5: Formal mentors will rank mentor traits as more essential than mentor functions.*



## Methods

### **Development of the Survey Instrument**

Development of the survey began with obtaining information from a panel of experts regarding ideal mentor characteristics. Because obtaining the desired information required consensus among experts, the Delphi technique was selected as the most appropriate technique.<sup>120,121</sup> Since the literature has a paucity of empirically derived mentor traits and functions, a first step in determining essential traits and functions was to have experts develop an initial list of items. In this study, the Delphi Technique was used to identify essential mentor traits and functions because it is a good starting point when there is an “absence of a body of theoretical knowledge.”<sup>122</sup>

To generate an initial list of mentor characteristics, a nine-member Delphi panel consisting of mentoring program administrators and experts from the academic, business, and military industry contexts were asked to: (1) individually list the characteristics they believed a mentor should possess, (2) force rank the characteristics, (3) review the force rankings of characteristics, and (4) negotiate a final list of characteristics.<sup>123</sup> The highest number of traits provided by a panel member was 19, while five was the lowest number of traits provided. The total number of characteristics identified in the first round was 88. These 88 characteristics were consolidated into one alphabetical list so as not to create an appearance of priority or hierarchy. All responses were included as written. Even attributes that seemed redundant were included. For example, responses such as “honesty” and “honest” were both listed. The list was returned to the Delphi panel members who were asked to rate each item using a Likert-type scale from one (not important) to five (essential). All nine panel members returned their rankings of characteristics.

Using a weighted scale, a number was calculated for each characteristic. For the item “cooperation,” for example, one panel member ranked it a “2,” four panel members ranked it a “3,” three panel members ranked it a “4” and one panel member ranked it a “5”. Multiplying  $1 \times 2$ ,  $4 \times 3$ ,  $3 \times 4$ , and  $1 \times 5$  and then taking the sum of all the products calculated the total score for this item. The score for this item was 31. The “honesty” item had the highest score of 39 while “rewarded by someone else’s success” had the lowest score of 17. A complete listing of items and scores can be found in **Appendix A**.

Unfortunately, this procedure did not create enough of a distinction among the traits. Therefore, the following method was used to discriminate among the traits. The score of each trait was determined by counting only the number of “4” and “5” given for each trait. Only those traits with six or more “4s” and “5s” were included in the final survey. The rationale for selecting traits that had a score of six or greater was that those characteristics that scored “4s” and “5s” were seen as more important than those traits with fewer “4s” or “5s” since it provided a truer indication of the priority panel members assigned to each trait. Initially, 44 traits had a score of six or greater (see **Appendix B**). Next, similar traits were consolidated. For example, the traits “honesty” and “honesty with integrity” became just “honesty” on the survey. After eliminating six duplicate or redundant traits, the final number of items for the survey was 38 (see **Appendix C**). These characteristics were then returned to the Delphi panel members for their final approval. All panel members indicated that the list

contained the characteristics of an ideal mentor. We (the researchers) then determined which of the characteristics comprised mentor traits, and which comprised mentor functions. These categories are also given in **Appendix C**.

### **Survey Pilot Study**

Using the 38 characteristics developed by the Delphi Panel, a pilot instrument was developed and administered to 11 doctoral students in a graduate-level class studying dissertation research methodologies. Based on the feedback from the pilot, directions and anchors explaining the Likert-type scale were improved. The Likert-type scale was explained so that respondents knew that “1” corresponded to “not important” while “5” corresponded to “essential.” Also included in the revised survey were classifications distinguishing between mentor traits and functions. The final survey contained questions regarding: 14 mentor traits, 19 internal mentor functions, five external mentor functions, six demographic variables, and one open-ended question. The demographic information collected included: gender, ethnic background, mentor context, number of years as a mentor, mentor program size, and mentor/protégé ratio.

### **Procedure**

Data collection procedures involved mailings, follow-up mailings and telephone calls. The mailing included a cover letter from the program coordinator, a survey, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Of the 741 surveys distributed to formal mentors, 355 were returned (a 47 percent rate of return).

## **Analysis and Results**

### **Demographics**

Of the participants reporting gender, 253 were males, 99 were females (three did not report gender). The race/ethnicity breakdown was as follows: 70 African Americans, 259 Caucasians, and 22 from miscellaneous/other groups (four did not report race/ethnicity). Sixty-eight participants came from the academic industry context, 102 from business, 101 from military-armed forces, and 70 from military-academic (14 did not report industry context). Demographics of the sample relating to their organization’s mentor programs are given in **Table 1**.

### **Factor Analysis**

The first step of data analysis was to develop scales for the essential mentor characteristics. This was done via factor analysis. Two separate analyses were performed, one for mentor traits, and one for mentor functions. The 17 characteristics identified a-priori as mentor traits created a three-factor solution, with 12 items loading having primary loadings and five items cross-loading. The cross-loaded items were eliminated from further analysis. The first factor (identified as mentor respectability traits), explained 22.1 percent of the variance. The second factor (mentor wisdom traits), explained 13.5 percent of the variance. The third factor (mentor sensitivity traits), explained an additional 7.5 percent of the variance. The mentor traits items and their factor loadings are given in **Table 2**.

**Table 1. Characteristics of Respondent's Organizational Mentor Programs**

| <b>Size of organizational mentor program</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 – 5 mentor/protégée pairs                  | 158 |
| 6 – 15 mentor/protégée pairs                 | 68  |
| 16 – 25 mentor/protégée pairs                | 26  |
| More than 25 mentor/protégée pairs           | 84  |
| No report                                    | 19  |
| <b>Number of years as a mentor</b>           |     |
| Less than 1 year                             | 52  |
| 1 – 3 years                                  | 102 |
| 4 – 6 years                                  | 75  |
| 7 – 9 years                                  | 32  |
| 10 or more years                             | 89  |
| No report                                    | 5   |
| <b>Current number of protégés</b>            |     |
| 0 protégés                                   | 51  |
| 1 – 2 protégés                               | 127 |
| 3 – 4 protégés                               | 64  |
| 5 or more protégés                           | 106 |
| No report                                    | 7   |

**Table 2. Mentor Traits Factor Matrix**

|   | <b>Respectability</b> | <b>Wisdom</b> | <b>Sensitivity</b> |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 4. Honesty                                | .885                  |               |                    |
| 25. Integrity                             | .879                  |               |                    |
| 24. High moral & ethical standards        | .780                  |               |                    |
| 12. Bearing/personal presence             | .459                  |               |                    |
| 5. Organizational savvy                   |                       | .807          |                    |
| 31. Professional competent                |                       | .793          |                    |
| 9. Understands organization's core values |                       | .725          |                    |
| 1. Ability to teach                       |                       | .461          |                    |
| 3. Empathy                                |                       |               | .816               |
| 15. Compassion/understanding              |                       |               | .782               |
| 23. Genuine                               |                       |               | .589               |
| 17. Confidentiality                       |                       |               | .584               |

The 21 characteristics identified a-priori as mentor traits created a three-factor solution, with 12 items loading having primary loadings and six items cross-loading. The cross loaded items were eliminated from further analysis. The first factor (identified as mentor trainer functions), explained 20.7 percent of the variance. The second factor (mentor supporter functions), explained 12.8 percent of the variance. The third factor (mentor activist functions), explained 8.3 percent of the variance. The mentor functions items and their factor loadings are given in **Table 3**. As a check, when all 38 items were included in a single analysis, no factor solution converged after 25 iterations.

**Table 3. Mentor Functions Factor Matrix**

|  | Trainer | Supporter | Activist |
|--|---------|-----------|----------|
| 13. Broadens protégé's professional experience                   | .643    | .000      | .000     |
| 33. Serves as a role model for protégé                           | .614    |           |          |
| 2. Coaches protégé   | .580    |           |          |
| 27. Offers introduction to<br>academe/corporate/military culture | .575    |           |          |
| 32. Provides cross functional information                        | .467    |           |          |
| 7. Provides vision for protégé                                   | .442    |           |          |
| 8. Fosters teamwork with protégé                                 |         | .716      |          |
| 11. Accepts protégé  |         | .692      |          |
| 18. Develops cooperation with protégé                            |         | .685      |          |
| 6. Provides support for protégé                                  |         | .660      |          |
| 26. Intervenes on protégé's behalf                               |         |           | .647     |
| 21. Provides exposure for protégé                                |         |           | .603     |
| 30. Demonstrates networking ability for protégé                  |         |           | .582     |
| 35. Sponsors protégé   |         |           | .560     |
| 20. Disciplines protégé when appropriate                         |         |           | .510     |

The items loading on these factors were then made into scales to be used during hypothesis testing. When there were missing items, cases were excluded list wise. Alpha coefficients and correlations of these scales are given in **Table 4**.

### **Hypothesis Testing**

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and T-tests and were used for hypothesis testing. Hypothesis testing began by running the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedure. The MANOVA's revealed significant differences in rankings about mentor traits ( $F(1,239) = 2.71, p < .03$ ), and significant differences in rankings of mentor functions, ( $F(1,244) = 3.16, p < .02$ ). The significance of these MANOVA's justified the testing of the individual hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1a (When comparing the importance of mentor traits, formal mentors will rank respectability traits [e.g., honesty, integrity, high morals] as most important) and Hypothesis 1b (When comparing the importance of mentor traits, formal mentors will rank mentor wisdom [e.g., organizational savvy & professional competence] as least important) were tested using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Both hypotheses were supported. In both cases, the paired comparisons performed between the three traits yielded significant differences ( $p < .01$ ). T-Test results for Hypotheses 1a & 1b are given in **Table 5**.

Hypothesis 2 (The relative importance ranking of the three mentor functions will vary across industry context) was not supported ( $F(3,228) = 1.00, n.s.$ ).

Hypothesis 3 (Formal mentors will rank psychosocial functions as more essential characteristics than career functions) was supported ( $t = 6.04, p < .001, n = 238$ , Mean *Psychosocial* = 4.19, Mean *Career* = 3.99).

Hypothesis 4 (The relative importance ranking of the three mentor traits will vary across industry context) achieved partial support  $F(3,240) = 2.47, p = .06$ . Mean comparisons are given in **Table 6**.

**Table 4. Correlations and Reliabilities**

| Scale                    | n   | $\alpha$ | 1    | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     |
|--------------------------|-----|----------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Respectability Traits | 333 | .80      | 1.00 | .30** | .37** | .41** | .31** | .20** | .35** |
| 2. Wisdom Traits         | 334 | .71      |      | 1.00  | .22** | .55** | .39** | .49** | .61** |
| 3. Sensitivity Traits    | 336 | .72      |      |       | 1.00  | .35** | .53** | .27** | .37** |
| 4. Training Functions    | 243 | .70      |      |       |       | 1.00  | .52** | .48** | .85** |
| 5. Supportive Functions  | 245 | .78      |      |       |       |       | 1.00  | .43** | .55** |
| 6. Activist Functions    | 240 | .68      |      |       |       |       |       | 1.00  | .87** |
| 7. Career Functions      | 240 | .76      |      |       |       |       |       |       | 1.00  |

\*\* $p < .01$

**Table 5. T-Test Results, Hypotheses 2a and 2b**

|                       | Mean | <i>t</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
|-----------------------|------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Mentor Respectability | 4.57 | 10.158   | 344       | .000     |
| Mentor Wisdom         | 4.24 |          |           |          |
| Mentor Sensitivity    | 4.34 | 2.806    | 347       | .005     |
| Mentor Wisdom         | 4.24 |          |           |          |
| Mentor Respectability | 4.57 | 7.599    | 342       | .000     |
| Mentor Sensitivity    | 4.34 |          |           |          |

**Table 6. Hypothesis 5 Mean Comparisons**

| Condition                        | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Academic                         | 45       | 4.29        |
| Business                         | 75       | 4.33        |
| Military — Armed Forces          | 61       | 4.34        |
| Military — Academic <sup>a</sup> | 60       | 4.47        |

<sup>a</sup>Significantly different from all other conditions at .06 level.

To test Hypothesis 5 (Formal mentors (FM) will rank mentor traits as more essential characteristics than mentor functions) the 12 mentor traits items and the 15 mentor functions items were used to create a mentor traits and mentor functions scale, respectively. After these scales were created, the hypothesis was tested using a *t*-test. The hypothesis was supported ( $t = 6.04, p < .001, n = 234$ ). The formal mentors in this study believed mentor traits (Mean *Mentor Traits* = 4.37) were more important than the functions of a mentor (Mean *Mentor Functions* = 4.03).

## Discussion

The results of the Delphi panel provide a tentative model of the essential characteristics of a formal mentor in the minds of formal mentoring program administrators and experts. The major contribution of the Delphi panel was its identification of 17 formal

mentor traits. This list of mentor traits could be a useful assessment tool for the developers of government and non-government formal mentoring programs.

Also generated from the Delphi panel's responses was a list of 21 formal mentor functions (see **Appendix C** for a listing of mentor traits and functions). Our comparison of this list in **Table 7** with several previous studies<sup>124,125,126,127,128,129,130</sup> revealed two observations. First, several mentor functions were identified by our Delphi panel that did not appear in any of the previous studies. Providing vision and disciplining the protégé were unique career functions produced by the Delphi panel, while fostering teamwork with protégé, and developing cooperation with the protégé were unique psychosocial functions. Each of these distinct functions is commonly found in the military culture.

The factor analysis results of the Delphi panel's perceptions yield three underlying mentor behavior factors: trainer (e.g., provides vision, coaches, and models), activist (e.g., intervenes and sponsors), and support (accepts and supports). The first two factors correspond to Kram's career functions while the latter parallels Kram's psychosocial function. Interestingly, role modeling, which was a psychosocial function in both the academic and business contexts, loaded on one of the career functions (i.e., trainer) in the present study. A more fine-grain analysis of the differences among the Delphi panel members' perceptions was beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, these results suggest that formal mentorship models based on Kram's model may not generalize to the military context.

The limited theory and research on mentor traits has consistently identified two core traits: integrity and empathy.<sup>131,132,133</sup> Our survey results also indicate the importance of these traits in that they loaded on two factors (respectability and sensitivity). Specifically, we found that the respectability subscale (i.e., honesty, integrity, high moral standards) was rated as most important, followed by the sensitivity subscale (i.e., empathy, compassion, genuine). It has been argued that individuals with a sensitive (or empathic) disposition will provide more mentoring, especially psychosocial support under certain conditions.<sup>134</sup>

Wisdom, as predicted, was of least importance when compare to the respectability and sensitivity subscales. However, an important point to underscore is that our research also revealed the importance of mentor wisdom (i.e., professional competence, organizational savvy, and an understanding of the organization's core values) earning an average importance ranking of 4.20 out of 5. Mentors' wisdom is particularly important for protégés skill development and organizational learning. With this wisdom, a formal mentor may also enhance the protégés' organizational learning, especially tacit knowledge within the organization's culture.<sup>135</sup>

Next, our research indicates that rankings of mentor traits are influenced by industry context. Military personnel, both traditional and academic mentors, ranked respectability and wisdom as more important when compared to mentors in the business and academic contexts. In contrast, the traditional armed forces personnel rated the sensitivity subscale as least important. These results are consistent with anecdotal evidence describing the military culture — reflected in common recruitment: "An army of one," "We're looking for a few good men" seem to be supported by our data.

**Table 7. Comparison Across Organizational Contexts Summary**

|                        | Academic Context  | Business Context  | Military Context   | TRA  | Present Study   |
|------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| Career Functions       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consulting<sup>B,L,T</sup></li> <li>• Educating<sup>B,L,T</sup></li> <li>• Protecting<sup>B,L,T</sup></li> <li>• Sponsoring<sup>B,L,T</sup></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advising<sup>w</sup></li> <li>• Challenging<sup>w</sup></li> <li>• Coaching<sup>k</sup></li> <li>• Exposure &amp; Visibility<sup>k,w</sup></li> <li>• Organizational Interventions<sup>z</sup></li> <li>• Protecting<sup>k,w</sup></li> <li>• Sponsorship<sup>k,w,z</sup></li> <li>• Teaching<sup>z</sup></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication skills</li> <li>• Professional ethics</li> <li>• Supervision</li> <li>• Teaching</li> </ul> |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadens protégés professional experience</li> <li>• Serves as a <i>role model for protégé</i></li> <li>• Coaches protégé</li> <li>• Introduces protégé to culture</li> <li>• Provides cross functional information</li> <li>• <b>Provides vision</b></li> <li>• Intervenes</li> <li>• Provides exposure</li> <li>• Demonstrates networking</li> <li>• Sponsors protégée</li> <li>• <b>Disciplines protégé</b></li> <li>• <b>Fosters teamwork with protégé</b></li> <li>• Accepts protégé</li> <li>• <b>Develops cooperation with protégé</b></li> <li>• Provides support for protégé</li> </ul> |
| Psychosocial Functions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Befriending<sup>L,T</sup></li> <li>• Counseling<sup>L,T</sup></li> <li>• Encouraging<sup>L,T</sup></li> <li>• Role modeling<sup>L,T</sup></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance &amp; confirmation<sup>k</sup></li> <li>• Befriending<sup>w</sup></li> <li>• Counseling<sup>k,w,z</sup></li> <li>• Encouraging<sup>w</sup></li> <li>• Friendship<sup>k</sup></li> <li>• Role modeling<sup>k</sup></li> </ul>  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counseling</li> </ul> |   |

Sources: Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, (1981),<sup>b</sup> Kram (1985),<sup>k</sup> Leon (1993),<sup>l</sup> Taylor (1997),<sup>t</sup> TRADOC (1990),<sup>tra</sup> Williams & Kilbourne (1985),<sup>w</sup> Zey (1995)<sup>z</sup>

**Boldface** indicates functions unique to the present study

*italics* indicates factor loaded on a different function in the present study than in other studies



Consistent with our predictions, our academic-military mentors (compared to other industry contexts) reported higher expectations of all three formal mentor's traits. These findings are not surprising given the elite nature of this group. Surprisingly, no differences in the rankings of traits were found between the academic and business contexts.

Finally, the survey results provide evidence that psychosocial behaviors were significantly more important to formal mentors than career functions. There are several conditions that may have influenced these findings. First, formal mentors may have responded with socially desirable responses. For example, formal mentors have been bombarded with the increasingly popular message that psychosocial activities, combined with career enhancing activities, provide the most beneficial mentoring relationship. Awareness of this message may have influence formal mentors' rankings. Second, as previously noted, formal mentors often base their ideal mentor models on their experiences as protégés. If this experience lacked psychosocial support, the mentor may value it more as a way of correcting past wrongs. Finally, our findings reflect what the formal mentor's desire (value) while past research examining mentor behaviors actually performed. The gap between what formal mentors value and what they do may be accounted for by the obstacles (e.g., a lack of time, poor personality fit, limited resources, etc.) they encounter when seeking to realize their dreams of being the ideal psychosocial mentor.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

This study is not without limitations. While the Delphi technique proved to be valuable in developing a list of essential mentor characteristics, the scales developed from this systematic approach were not without fault. To begin with, as reported in **Table 3**, the scales correlated with each other in a highly significant manner. This multicollinearity proved problematic when interpreting the analyses. In addition, the alpha coefficients for several of the scales were somewhat low. According to Peterson's meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alphas, a coefficient of .70 is average for value and belief constructs.<sup>136</sup> The magnitudes of the alpha coefficients within the present study fall within the range reported by Peterson. The scales were used for analysis on the strength of a-priori classifications (content validation) and the factor analyses.

While using data across different industry contexts improves the robustness of our findings, missing data from the participants was also a problem. While 355 surveys were returned, fewer were included in each analysis due to missing items. It was felt that mean substitution was not the appropriate solution to this problem (due to several surveys with large percentages of missing items), thus, listwise exclusion was used. This decision did lessen the sample size considerably in some analyses.

Although there is some concern about the use of survey data, for this study, it was the only feasible means of collecting data. Future research should investigate matched mentor and protégé responses to calibrate expectations of each member using a variety of data collection methods. Future work should also go beyond the measurement of desired traits and link mentor traits to the quality of the mentoring functions served as well as outcomes. Finally, using a relational demographic approach

to study the impact of essential mentor traits would provide further understanding, especially when seeking to untangle the complexity of cross-cultural mentorships.

## **Conclusion**

This study is exploratory in nature and an initial step towards systematically capturing and reconciling the role expectations of each stakeholder in formal mentoring programs: mentor, protégé, administrator, and the organization. Research has shown that a similar match in terms of belief structures, values, and expectations optimizes organizational learning as well as speeding the development of the relationship.<sup>137</sup> The failure or success of formal mentor relationships maybe a direct consequence of matching administrator, mentor and protégés expectations. To minimize confusion and potential dissatisfaction, we recommend training and clear contracting for all of the above stakeholders.<sup>138</sup>

With the estimated 70 percent of Fortune 1000 firms engaged in some form of formal mentoring programs,<sup>139</sup> and the considerable time, effort, and cost of developing these programs,<sup>140</sup> the issue of ideal mentor characteristics and functions is both timely and critical to the success of these programs.

## **Appendix A: Listing of Scores of Mentor Characteristics**

| <b>Characteristic</b>  | <b>Score</b> |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Honesty   | 39           |
| 2. Honesty w/integrity   | 38           |
| 3. Walk the Talk (Set the example)                                     | 37           |
| 4. Integrity   | 37           |
| 5. Good listener   | 36           |
| 6. Confidentiality   | 36           |
| 7. Coach   | 35           |
| 8. Trust   | 35           |
| 9. High moral & ethical standards                                      | 35           |
| 10. Empathy  | 34           |
| 11. Strategic vision   | 34           |
| 12. Understands company's core values                                  | 34           |
| 13. Dependability  | 34           |
| 14. Compassion/understanding   | 33           |
| 15. Organizational savvy (ability to understand how the company works) | 33           |
| 16. Personal commitment  | 33           |
| 17. Genuine  | 33           |
| 18. Concern for effectiveness  | 33           |
| 19. Knowledge  | 32           |
| 20. Loyalty  | 32           |
| 21. Decisiveness   | 32           |
| 22. Provides support   | 31           |
| 23. Provides vision and widens horizons                                | 31           |
| 24. Willingness to share time  | 31           |
| 25. Willingness to take time   | 31           |
| 26. Follow up  | 31           |
| 27. Teamwork   | 31           |
| 28. Willingness to share   | 31           |
| 29. Willingness to spend time with protégé                             | 31           |
| 30. Cooperation  | 31           |
| 31. Belief in you  | 31           |
| 32. Broaden experience   | 31           |
| 33. Good human interaction   | 31           |
| 34. Good reputation/credibility/willingness to identify opportunities  | 31           |
| 35. Stable/sincere   | 31           |
| 36. Experience   | 31           |
| 37. Judgment   | 31           |
| 38. Role model   | 31           |
| 39. Challenges   | 31           |
| 40. High personnel & professional standards (conduct & appearance)     | 31           |
| 41. Ability to teach   | 30           |
| 42. Gives advice & counsel   | 30           |
| 43. Acceptance & confirmation  | 30           |

| <b>Characteristic</b>   | <b>Score</b> |
|---|--------------|
| 44. Effective communicator  | 30           |
| 45. Fair  | 30           |
| 46. Motivates   | 30           |
| 47. Professional competence   | 30           |
| 48. Provide cross functional information                                  | 30           |
| 49. Provide guidance on personnel & policy                                | 30           |
| 50. Honesty & bluntness   | 30           |
| 51. Counselor /helps setting priorities                                   | 29           |
| 52. Providing vision  | 29           |
| 53. Teacher   | 29           |
| 54. Confidant   | 29           |
| 55. Counselor   | 29           |
| 56. Good communication skills   | 29           |
| 57. Good sense of humor   | 29           |
| 58. Political savvy/well connected to organization                        | 29           |
| 59. Resource for valuable information                                     | 29           |
| 60. Share credit  | 29           |
| 61. Transfer skills, leadership, technology                               | 29           |
| 62. Validation/sharing of dream   | 29           |
| 63. Innovative/forward thinking   | 29           |
| 64. Acceptance (of mistakes)  | 28           |
| 65. Provides challenge  | 28           |
| 66. Exposure & visibility   | 27           |
| 67. Discipline  | 27           |
| 68. Respectful  | 27           |
| 69. Unselfish   | 27           |
| 70. Bearing   | 26           |
| 71. Networking ability  | 26           |
| 72. Political skills  | 26           |
| 73. Willingness to lend credibility/willingness to identify opportunities | 25           |
| 74. Good technical skills   | 24           |
| 75. Intervener  | 24           |
| 76. Tact  | 24           |
| 77. Skills desired by organization  | 24           |
| 78. Be complementary  | 23           |
| 79. Introduction to academic/corporate/military culture                   | 23           |
| 80. High rank in organization   | 23           |
| 81. No "falling star" Viewed as successful                                | 23           |
| 82. Sponsor   | 23           |
| 83. Career planning   | 22           |
| 84. Friend  | 21           |
| 85. Tell protégé everything   | 21           |
| 86. Corrector   | 21           |
| 87. Terminator  | 18           |
| 88. Rewarded by someone else's success                                    | 17           |

## Appendix B: Mentor Characteristics Scoring “4s” and “5s”

|  | 4 | 5 | Total (4& 5) |
|--|---|---|--------------|
| 1. Ability to teach  | 5 | 2 | 7            |
| 2. Coach   | 4 | 3 | 7            |
| 3. Empathy   | 4 | 3 | 7            |
| 4. Honesty   | 1 | 6 | 7            |
| 5. Honesty w/integrity   | 2 | 5 | 7            |
| 6. Organizational savvy<br>(ability to understand how the company works) | 5 | 2 | 7            |
| 7. Provides support  | 4 | 3 | 7            |
| 8. Provides vision and widens horizons                                   | 4 | 3 | 7            |
| 9. Strategic vision  | 5 | 2 | 7            |
| 10. Teamwork   | 4 | 3 | 7            |
| 11. Understands company’s core values                                    | 5 | 2 | 7            |
| 12. Willingness to share time  | 4 | 3 | 7            |
| 13. Willingness to take time   | 4 | 3 | 7            |
| 14. Acceptance & confirmation  | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 15. Bearing/personal presence  | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 16. Broaden experience   | 5 | 1 | 6            |
| 17. Challenges   | 5 | 1 | 6            |
| 18. Compassion/understanding   | 2 | 4 | 6            |
| 19. Concern for effectiveness  | 5 | 1 | 6            |
| 20. Confidentiality  | 1 | 5 | 6            |
| 21. Cooperation  | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 22. Dependability  | 2 | 4 | 6            |
| 23. Discipline   | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 24. Exposure & visibility  | 3 | 3 | 6            |
| 25. Follow up  | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 26. Genuine  | 2 | 4 | 6            |
| 27. High moral & ethical standards                                       | 2 | 4 | 6            |
| 28. Integrity  | 1 | 5 | 6            |
| 29. Intervener   | 5 | 1 | 6            |
| 30. Intro. To academe/corporate culture                                  | 2 | 4 | 6            |
| 31. Knowledge  | 5 | 1 | 6            |
| 32. Motivates  | 6 | 0 | 6            |
| 33. Networking ability   | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 34. Professional competence  | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 35. Provide cross functional information                                 | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 36. Provides challenge   | 3 | 3 | 6            |
| 37. Providing vision   | 3 | 3 | 6            |
| 38. Role model   | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 39. Share credit   | 4 | 2 | 6            |
| 40. Sponsor  | 3 | 3 | 6            |
| 41. Teacher  | 3 | 3 | 6            |
| 42. Transfer skills, leadership, technology                              | 5 | 1 | 6            |

## **Appendix C: Final 38 Mentor Traits and Functions as Determined by Delphi Technique**

| <b>Item</b>   | <b>Type</b> |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Ability to teach   | Trait       |
| 2. Coach  | Function    |
| 3. Empathy  | Trait       |
| 4. Honesty  | Trait       |
| 5. Organizational savvy (ability to understand how company works) | Trait       |
| 6. Provides support   | Function    |
| 7. Provides vision and widens horizons                            | Function    |
| 8. Teamwork   | Function    |
| 9. Understands company's core values                              | Trait       |
| 10. Willingness to share time                                     | Trait       |
| 11. Acceptance  | Function    |
| 12. Bearing/personal presence                                     | Trait       |
| 13. Broaden experience  | Function    |
| 14. Challenges  | Function    |
| 15. Compassion/understanding                                      | Trait       |
| 16. Concern for effectiveness                                     | Trait       |
| 17. Confidentiality   | Trait       |
| 18. Cooperation   | Function    |
| 19. Dependability   | Trait       |
| 20. Discipline  | Function    |
| 21. Exposure & visibility   | Function    |
| 22. Follow up   | Function    |
| 23. Genuine   | Trait       |
| 24. High moral & ethical standards                                | Trait       |
| 25. Integrity   | Trait       |
| 26. Intervener  | Function    |
| 27. Introduction to military/academic/corporate culture           | Function    |
| 28. Knowledge   | Trait       |
| 29. Motivates   | Function    |
| 30. Networking ability  | Function    |
| 31. Professional competence                                       | Trait       |
| 32. Provide cross-functional information                          | Function    |
| 33. Role model  | Function    |
| 34. Share credit  | Function    |
| 35. Sponsor   | Function    |
| 36. Teacher   | Function    |
| 37. Transfer skills, leadership, and technology                   | Function    |
| 38. Trust   | Trait       |

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Chao, G., Waltz, P., & Gardner, P. 1992. Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, 45: 619-636.
- <sup>2</sup> Colarelli, S.M., & Stumph, S.A. 1990. Compatibility and conflict among outcomes of organizational entry strategies: Mechanistic and social systems perspectives. *Behavioral Science*, 35(1): 1.
- <sup>3</sup> Dreher, G.F., & Ash, R.A. 1990. A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 529-546.
- <sup>4</sup> Fagenson, E.A. 1989. The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10: 309-320.
- <sup>5</sup> Ragins B.R., & Scandura, T.A. 1999. Burden or blessing? Expected costs and benefits of being a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20: 493-507.
- <sup>6</sup> Scandura, T.A. 1992. Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 169-174.
- <sup>7</sup> Scandura, T.A., & Schriesheim, C.A. 1994. Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complimentary constructs in leadership research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 1588-1602.
- <sup>8</sup> Schein. E.H. 1978. *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- <sup>9</sup> Nemanick, R. C. 2000. Comparing formal and informal mentors: does type make a difference? *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3). 136-138.
- <sup>10</sup> Boyd, C.E. 2000. Supportive parents often boost military career advancement. *The Black Collegian*, Second Semester Super Issue: 111-115.
- <sup>11</sup> Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992
- <sup>12</sup> Ragins & Cotton, 1999
- <sup>13</sup> Siebert, S. 1999. The effectiveness of facilitated mentoring: A longitudinal quasi-experiment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54: 483-502.
- <sup>14</sup> Ragins & Cotton 1999
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>16</sup> Chao, Waltz, & Gardner, 1992
- <sup>17</sup> Russell, J.E.A., & Adams, D.M. 1997. The changing nature of mentoring in organizations: An introduction to the special issue on mentoring in organizations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51: 1-14.
- <sup>18</sup> Gaskill, R.L. 1993. A conceptual framework for the development, implementation and evaluation of formal mentoring programs. *Journal of Career Development*, 20: 147-160.
- <sup>19</sup> Gibb, S. 1999. The usefulness of theory: A case study in evaluating formal mentoring schemes. *Human Relations*, 52: 1055-1075.
- <sup>20</sup> Gibb, 1999
- <sup>21</sup> Seibert, 1999
- <sup>22</sup> MacLennan, N. 1995. *Coaching and mentoring*. Aldershot: Gower.
- <sup>23</sup> Hamilton, R. 1994. Mentoring. *Education & Training*, 36(5): 32-39.
- <sup>24</sup> Noe, R.A. 1988. An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 41: 457-479.



- <sup>25</sup> Scandura, 1998
- <sup>26</sup> Kram, 1985
- <sup>27</sup> Kilbourne, L., & Williams, S.D. 1996. Identifying good mentors: Mentor characteristics that predict mentoring outcomes. Proceedings of the Southwest Academy of Management Annual Meeting; San Antonio, TX: 148-152.
- <sup>28</sup> Darwin, A.M. 1999. Characteristics ascribed to mentors by their protégés (workplace learning). Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- <sup>29</sup> Wilson, P.F. 1999. Principled Mentoring: Identifying core values for the practice of mentoring (spiritual direction). Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, George Fox University, Newberg, OR.
- <sup>30</sup> Boyd, 2000
- <sup>31</sup> Huwe, J.M. 1999. Mentor experiences among navy flag officers: A survey of retired navy admirals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Fox University, Newberg, OR.
- <sup>32</sup> Clutterbuck, D. 1992. *Mentoring*. London: IPM.
- <sup>33</sup> Kram, K.E. & Isabella, L.A. 1985. Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28: 110-132.
- <sup>34</sup> Scandura, 1998
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>36</sup> Ragins, B.R., & Scandura, T.A. 1997. The way we were: Gender and the termination of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 945-953.
- <sup>37</sup> Kram, 1985
- <sup>38</sup> Wilson, 1999
- <sup>39</sup> Noe, 1988
- <sup>40</sup> Mullen, E.J. 1999. The mentoring information exchange: When do mentors seek information from their protégés? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20: 233-243.
- <sup>41</sup> Turban, D. B. & Dougherty, T.W. 1994. Role of protégé personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37: 688-702.
- <sup>42</sup> Thomas, D.A. 1993. Racial dynamics in cross-race developmental relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 169-194.
- <sup>43</sup> Murray, M. 1991. *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- <sup>44</sup> Ragins, B.R., & McFarlin, D. 1990. Perception of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37: 321-339.
- <sup>45</sup> Weinstein, M.J. 1998. What makes a good mentor? The role of mentor flexibility in mentor functions and protégé outcomes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- <sup>46</sup> Mullen, 1999
- <sup>47</sup> Rose, G.L. 1999. What do doctoral students want in a mentor. Development of the ideal mentor scale. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- <sup>48</sup> Barr, M.J. 1998. Mentoring relationships: A study of informal/formal mentoring, psychological type of mentors, and mentor/protégé type combinations. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale, FL.

- <sup>49</sup> Feinstein, S. 1987. Women and minority workers in business find a mentor can be a rare commodity. *Wall Street Journal*, November 10th: p. 39.
- <sup>50</sup> Darwin, 1999
- <sup>51</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>52</sup> Wilson, 1999
- <sup>53</sup> Horton, T. 1996. Leadership — selecting the best for the top. *Management Review*, 85: 20-23.
- <sup>54</sup> Liedtka, J. M. 1996. Collaborating across lines of business for competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Executive*, 10(2): 20-48
- <sup>55</sup> Kram, K.E. 1983. Phases of the mentoring relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26: 608-625.
- <sup>56</sup> Ragins & McFarlin, 1990
- <sup>57</sup> Scandura, 1992
- <sup>58</sup> Tepper, L., Shaffer, B.C., & Tepper, B.J. 1996. Latent structure of mentoring function scales. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 56: 848-857.
- <sup>59</sup> Kram, 1985
- <sup>60</sup> Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992
- <sup>61</sup> Scandura, 1992
- <sup>62</sup> Noe, 1988
- <sup>63</sup> Seibert, 1999
- <sup>64</sup> Ragins & Cotton, 1999
- <sup>65</sup> Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992
- <sup>66</sup> Noe, 1988
- <sup>67</sup> Kram, 1985
- <sup>68</sup> Scandura, T.A., & Katerberg, R.J. 1998. Much ado about mentors and little ado about measurement: Development of an instrument. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA, August.
- <sup>69</sup> Ragins & McFarlin, 1990
- <sup>70</sup> Ragins & Cotton, 1999
- <sup>71</sup> Fagenson-Eland, E.A., Marks, M.A., & Amendola, K.L. 1997. Perceptions of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51: 29-42.
- <sup>72</sup> Kram, 1985
- <sup>73</sup> Ragins & McFarland, 1990
- <sup>74</sup> Fagenson-Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997
- <sup>75</sup> Merriam, S. 1983. Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33(3): 161-173.
- <sup>76</sup> Aryee, S., Chay, Y.W., & Chew, J. 1996. The motivation to mentor among managerial employees. *Group & Organization Management*, 21: 261-277.
- <sup>77</sup> Ragins, B.R. 1989. Barriers to mentoring: The female manager's dilemma, *Human Relations*, 42: 1-22.

- <sup>78</sup> Ibarra, H. 1995. Race, opportunity and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38:673-703.
- <sup>79</sup> Cappeli, P. & Rogovsky, N. 1998 Employee involvement and organizational citizenship: implications for labor law reform and "lean production." *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 51: 633-654.
- <sup>80</sup> Simerly, R.L., & Hunt, J. 1998. The effect of contextual factors on organizational responses to women's issues and advancement. *International Journal of Management*, 15: 357-363.
- <sup>81</sup> Gaffney, N.A. (Ed.). 1995. *A conversation about mentoring: Trends and models*. Washington DC: Council of Graduate Schools.
- <sup>82</sup> Welch, O.M. 1996. An examination of effective mentoring models in the academy. (Report No. HE 029 160). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 464).
- <sup>83</sup> Green, S.G. & Bauer, T.N. 1995. Supervisory mentoring by advisers: Relationships with doctoral student potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 537-561.
- <sup>84</sup> Schockett, M.R. & Haring-Hidore, M. 1985. Factor analytic support for psychosocial and vocational mentoring functions. *Psychological Reports*, 57: 627-630.
- <sup>85</sup> Green & Bauer, 1995
- <sup>86</sup> Jacobi, M. 1991. Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, 61: 505-532.
- <sup>87</sup> Taylor, L. 1997. Mentoring: A strategy for success. Wright State University Center for *Teaching and Learning*, 5(5), March/April: 1-3.
- <sup>88</sup> Leon, D.J. 1993. *Mentoring minorities in higher education: Passing the torch*. (Report No. HE 026 970). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365-195).
- <sup>89</sup> Taylor, 1997
- <sup>90</sup> Leon, 1993
- <sup>91</sup> Blackburn, R.T., Chapman, D.W. & Cameron, S.M. 1981. "Cloning" in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 15(4): 315-328.
- <sup>92</sup> Schockett & Haring-Hidore (1985)
- <sup>93</sup> Kram, 1985
- <sup>94</sup> Zey, M.G. 1995. *The mentor connection: Strategic alliances in corporate life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publisher.
- <sup>95</sup> Hasenauer, H. 1998. USMA mentors: Helping players succeed. *Soldiers*, September, pp. 28-29.
- <sup>96</sup> Secretary of the Air Force. 1994. Air Force Instruction 36-2103. Individualized Newcomer Treatment and Orientation (INTRO) Program. Washington, DC: Department of Defense. 3-Jun-94, pp. 1-6.
- <sup>97</sup> Secretary of the Air Force. 1996. Air Force Policy Directive 36-34. Air Force Mentoring Program, Washington DC: Department of Defense, p. 1-5.
- <sup>98</sup> Secretary of the Air Force. 1997. Air Force Instruction 36-3401. Air Force Mentoring. Washington, DC: Department of Defense, (July 1997, p. 1-10).
- <sup>99</sup> Seitzinger, C.E. 1997. Mentoring means guarding and guiding. *The Mercury*, 24(6), March: 11.
- <sup>100</sup> Welsh, D. 1998. WO mentor program expands to cut attrition. *Army Reserve*, Summer: 9.
- <sup>101</sup> Huwe, 1999
- <sup>102</sup> TRADOC. 1990. FM 22-100, Military leadership. Washington DC: HQ Department of the Army.

- <sup>103</sup> Field, B. & Field, T. (Eds.). 1994. *Teachers as mentors: A practical guide*. London: The Falmer Press.
- <sup>104</sup> Halatin, T.J. 1981. Why be a mentor? *Supervisory Management*, February, pp. 36-39.
- <sup>105</sup> Kram, K.E. 1988. Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. New York: University Press of America.
- <sup>106</sup> Leon, 1993
- <sup>107</sup> Zey, 1995
- <sup>108</sup> Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994
- <sup>109</sup> Morgan, R.B. 1989. Reliability and validity of a factor analytically derived measure of leadership behavior and characteristics. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49: 911-919.
- <sup>110</sup> Sosik, J.J. & Godshalk, V. M. 2000. Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21: 365-390.
- <sup>111</sup> Bass, B.M. 1998. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- <sup>112</sup> Yukl, G. 1998. *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- <sup>113</sup> TRADOC, 1990
- <sup>114</sup> Ragins & Cotton, 1999
- <sup>115</sup> Siebert, 1999
- <sup>116</sup> Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992
- <sup>117</sup> Noe, 1988
- <sup>118</sup> Aryee, Chay, & Chew, 1996
- <sup>119</sup> Megginson, D. 2000. Current issues in mentoring. *Career Development International*, 256-260.
- <sup>120</sup> Glueck, W. 1978. *Personnel: A diagnostic approach*. Dallas, TX: Business Publications, Inc.
- <sup>121</sup> Linstone, H.A. & Turoff, M. 1975. *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- <sup>122</sup> Helmer, O. 1983. *Looking forward: A guide to futures research*. London: Sage Publications.
- <sup>123</sup> Uhl, N.P. 1971. Identifying institutional goals encouraging convergence of opinion through the Delphi technique. (National Laboratory for Higher Education Monograph No. 2). Durham, NC: North Carolina Central University.
- <sup>124</sup> Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981
- <sup>125</sup> Kram, 1985
- <sup>126</sup> Leon, 1993
- <sup>127</sup> Taylor, 1997
- <sup>128</sup> TRADOC, 1990
- <sup>129</sup> Kilbourne & Williams, 1996
- <sup>130</sup> Zey, 1995
- <sup>131</sup> Darwin, 1999
- <sup>132</sup> Rose, 1999
- <sup>133</sup> Kilbourne & Williams, 1996

<sup>134</sup> Ibid.

<sup>135</sup> Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. 1995. *The knowledge creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

<sup>136</sup> Peterson, R.A. 1994. A meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21: 381-392.

<sup>137</sup> Hale, R. 2000 To match or mis-match? The dynamics of mentoring as a route to personal and organizational learning. *Career Development International*. 5(4/5): 223

<sup>138</sup> Pegg, M. 1999. The art of mentoring. *Industrial and Commercial Training*. 31(4): 136.

<sup>139</sup> Russell & Adams, 1997

<sup>140</sup> Seibert, 1999

## Authors

### **Wanda J. Smith**

Department of Management  
Pamplin College of Business  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Blacksburg, VA 24061  
Phone: (540) 231-6105  
Fax: (540) 231-3076  
E-mail: wjsmith@vt.edu

**Wanda J. Smith** is an associate professor at Virginia Tech and a professional consultant to public and government organizations. Her research interests include human resource practices, diversity, and corporate social responsibility. She has published in numerous journals including *Business and Society*, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, and *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.

### **Jerusalem T. Howard**

Department of Management  
Goodwin College  
Drexel University  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
Phone: (973) 617-4302  
Fax: (973) 617-4030  
E-mail: jth27@drexel.edu

**Jerusalem T. Howard** received his BS degree from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, his MS from the University of Pennsylvania, and his Ph.D. from Syracuse University. His dissertation topic was "Identifying Essential Mentor Traits in Business, the Military and Academe."

### **K. Vernard Harrington**

Department of Management and Marketing  
College of Business and Economics  
Radford University  
Radford, VA 24142  
Phone: (540) 831-5591  
Fax: (540) 831-6261  
E-mail: kvharring@radford.edu

**K. Vernard Harrington** received his Ph.D. from Texas A&M University. He is an assistant professor at Radford University and a professional consultant. His research interests include mentoring, workforce diversity, organizational learning, and information technology. His publications include manuscripts in *Public Personnel Management* and *Business & Society*.