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The goal of the present study was to provide further validation evidence to the Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS). This was accomplished by using the IMS as a basis to create the Actual Mentor Scale (AMS). By comparing graduate students’ (N=117 for the IMS and N=214 for the AMS) notions of an ideal mentor with the actual mentoring received, the study was able to show that the three AMS subscales (integrity, guidance, and relationship) were measuring the same constructs as the IMS subscales. The AMS was then used to establish the relationship of the scale to numerous outcome variables: mentor satisfaction, positive well-being, self-esteem, general self-efficacy, negative well-being, program satisfaction, and career goals. A positive relationship was found between the actual mentoring received and the degree of satisfaction experienced with the mentor, revealing that relationship quality does play a positive role in relationship satisfaction (e.g., the protégé’s needs being met, not being disappointed, and believing that the mentor was effective in his or her role). Significant correlations were also found between general self-efficacy and goal understanding for the relationship subscale. Discussion includes the complexities associated with the mentoring relationship. Overall, the present research suggests that even in the presence of a high quality mentoring relationship, there
are various other factors to consider with regard to outcome evaluation, and that the constructs of mentoring and advising have potential for overlap. Finally, the development of an evaluation tool that measures the degree of satisfaction from various contributions (e.g., course availability, curriculum quality, instructional quality, job preparation, internship opportunities, library resource quality, financial support, and overall organizational climate) is an endeavor worthy of additional consideration.
Acknowledgements

I would especially like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Susan Davis, whose unremitting conscientiousness, expertise, and fortitude has made this project possible. I am particularly grateful that she gave so freely of her time to ensure that I would complete this project in a timely manner. I would like to thank my advisors, Dr. Charles Kimble and Dr. Carolyn Roecker Phelps, for their patience, professionalism, and diligence in providing feedback as the manuscript progressed. I would like to thank Dr. David Biers and the Department of Psychology for the endorsement and confirmation of this thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Gail Rose for her suggestions and guidance, and Dr. Brad Gilbreath for his support, mentoring, and scholarly input along the way. Most important, I would like to thank my husband Ron, my children, and my parents for your love, encouragement, and prayers, to walk this path of life.

"For I know the plans I have for you," declares the Lord, "plans to prosper you and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future."
(Jeremiah 29:11)
Table of Contents

ABSTRACT ...................................................................................................................... iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ............................................................................................ v

LIST OF TABLES ........................................................................................................ viii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................ 1

   a. Review of Related Research and Literature
      i. The Effects of Mentoring on Protégés’ Experiences
      ii. Outcomes of the Mentoring Relationship
      iii. Organizational and Supervisory Practices in Relationship to Outcomes
      iv. Scales Designed to Measure the Mentoring Relationship
   b. Foundations for the Present Research

II. METHODS ............................................................................................................. 22

   a. Participants
   b. Materials
   c. Procedure

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .............................................................................. 46

   a. Correlation between the IMS and the AMS Scores
   b. The Relationship between Having a Mentor and Outcomes

      i. Satisfaction with Mentor and the AMS
      ii. Positive Well-being and the AMS
      iii. Self-esteem and the AMS
      iv. Self-efficacy and the AMS
      v. Negative Well-being and the AMS
      vi. Program Support and the AMS
      vii. Career Goals and the AMS
viii. Gender and Satisfaction with Mentor  
ix. Gender and Well-being  
x. Type of Relationship and Program Satisfaction  
xii. Type of Relationship and Career Goals  
xii. The Effect of Past Mentoring Experiences

II. GENERAL DISCUSSION ................................................................. 66
   a. Overview
   b. Methodological Considerations
   c. Conclusions and Future Directions

REFERENCES ................................................................. 75

APPENDICES ................................................................. 87

   A. Ideal Mentor Scale ............................................................... 87
   B. Actual Mentor Scale .............................................................. 89
   C. Psychological Well-being Scale ............................................. 91
   D. General Health Questionnaire-12 ......................................... 92
   E. Rosenberg’s Self-esteem Scale ................................................ 94
   F. Satisfaction with Mentor Scale .............................................. 96
   G. New General Self-efficacy Scale ........................................... 97
   H. Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction Scale ............................... 98
   I. Program Support/Value Scale ............................................... 99
   J. Career Goals Scale .............................................................. 100
   K. Demographics ................................................................ 101
   L. Letter to Participants ............................................................ 103
   M. Debriefing ....................................................................... 105
   N. Follow-up e-mail ............................................................... 107
List of Tables

1. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the AMS and the IMS.............47
2. Correlations between the AMS Subscale Scores and Outcome Variables...........49
3. Observed Proportions of the Nature of the Mentoring Relationship According to Program Satisfaction.................................................................62
4. Observed Proportions of the Nature of the Mentoring Relationship According to Career Goals.........................................................................................64
CHAPTER I

Introduction

Mentorship evokes ideas of trusted counseling, guiding, role modeling, and advising (Henderson & Welch, 1993). In Homer’s *The Odyssey*, Telemachus was placed in the care and charge of Odysseus’ good friend, Mentor, who functioned as a quasi-parent in Odysseus’ absence, providing nurturance, guardianship, and leadership to the boy, Telemachus (Beye, 1976). Recently, researchers and the popular press have been examining the nature of the mentoring process and its importance from a variety of perspectives. No longer is the mentoring relationship exclusively characterized by a high-ranking corporate male executive grooming the next generation privileged protégé to power the organization (for review see Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978; Ragins, 1997). Instead, mentoring has increasingly been used to describe a variety of roles in multiple types of occupational fields (Anderson & Shannon, 1988). For example, Anderson and Shannon point out that a good definition of mentoring includes notions of a more skilled or more experienced person guiding a less skilled or less experienced person toward personal and professional development. Furthermore, organizations today are rife with change and ambiguity; mergers, breakups, global competition, and technological advances are now a way of life (Goleman, 1998). Therefore, contemporary personal and professional development processes may be increasingly dependent on more diverse interactions than previously thought.
Given the possibility toward increased dependency on more diverse interactions, the mentoring relationship is both a personal and professional development process that can be used effectively in various forms in almost any career domain (Alleman & Clarke, 2002; Anderson & Shannon, 1988; Cohen, 1998; Kram, 1985; Mathews, 2003). The cultivation of the process has been associated with a variety of positive outcomes such as reduced stress and job turnover, job satisfaction, increased promotions, increased job performance, and higher salaries (Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Scandura, 1992). People, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, class, disability, sexual orientation, or age, often need mentors in some form throughout their lives to accomplish developmental objectives (Ragins, 1997).

In light of the transformation from a male-to-male prototype to a more inclusive person-to-person process, the present research has taken a different approach to assessment: instead of looking through a single lens that dictates one particular or hierarchical model, the present research has examined mentoring from the individual, yet multifaceted perspective of the protégés’ perceptions regarding their ideal mentor. This particular approach may serve to ultimately better prepare people and the organizations they serve by maximizing the mentoring relationship. Likewise, thinking in terms of a person-to-person process will tend to encourage further portrayals of the relationship.

The term “mentor” has been characterized in several ways. Based purely on a male model, Levinson et al. (1978) provided a working definition of a mentor, which, although limited, prompted other researchers to expand the topic of mentoring. Their definition included a description of an older male of more senior status who was experienced by the protégé as, “a responsible, admirable older sibling” (p. 99). Samplings
of later definitions include Phillips-Jones (1998) description of a mentor as an influential person who assists in the protégé’s major life goals. Similarly, Kram (1983, 1985) described a mentor as an experienced person who relates well to a less experienced person and facilitates his or her development for the benefit of the individual, as well as that of the organization. Furthermore, Kram’s conceptualization of mentoring included two supportive aspects of developmental relationships: instrumental and psychosocial. Instrumental support refers to the tangible and influential day-to-day roles that constitute the more concrete qualities of the relationship and include sponsorship, coaching, exposure, protection, and provision of challenging assignments. On the other hand, psychosocial support refers to the less tangible interface between psychological and social factors and includes acceptance, counseling, emotional support, and role modeling (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Kram, 1985).

Similar to Phillips-Jones (1998), Ragins (1989) described mentors as higher ranking, influential senior organizational members with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward mobility and support to a protégé’s professional career. Some have also emphasized mentoring as being process-based. For example, Applebaum (2000) characterizes mentoring as, “...a process of empowering individuals by helping them capitalize on their personal and professional strengths, giving them the support and guidance to challenge themselves and take risks, and helping them to find an appropriate and rewarding career path (p. 19).”

Not only can mentoring relationships be described in terms of adult personal and professional development processes, but a number of researchers have asserted that mentoring is also an essential component of graduate education (Phillips & Pugh, 2000;
Roberts & Sprague, 1995; Wilde & Schau, 1991). Graduate students are a diverse group of people who initially enter into and attempt to adjust to an environment and culture that may be very different from that which was experienced prior to entering graduate school. Juggling increased expectations regarding coursework, performing so as to gain respect from others, working towards a thesis or dissertation completion, and possibly managing an outside job or university assistantship have the potential to be just as demanding as career transition, adjustment, and success.

Mentoring may encompass many behaviors common to both career-oriented adults and graduate students, including: sponsorship, protection, challenge, providing exposure and visibility, counseling, acceptance, confirmation, and coaching (Green & Bauer, 1995). However, in addition to the aforementioned functions, graduate students may also need to think in terms of research opportunities and publications.

People, including graduate students, have distinctive views as to what mentoring means (Rose, 2003; Wilde & Schau, 1991). One could also logically argue that since the definition of mentor varies with each author’s perspective, a protégé’s (or potential protégé’s) definitions of roles, dispositions, and functions of the relationship might also be idiosyncratic. Thus, the success of a mentoring relationship may vary depending on the interface between the ideal and the actual experience of mentoring.

Indeed, in an attempt to assist graduate students in finding a suitable mentor, Rose (2003) built on the mentoring measure developed by Wilde and Schau (1991) by including a larger and more diverse sample. Her new measure, the Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS) was grounded in Anderson and Shannon’s (1988) framework of mentoring based on the underlying notion that mentoring means different things to different people (Rose,
2003). Whereas Wilde and Schau’s version focused only on those graduate students who were currently involved in a mentoring relationship, the development of the IMS included even those graduate students who were not currently involved in a mentoring relationship. The IMS was designed to identify those qualities that graduate students consider most important in a potential mentor by assessing their definitions of their own hypothetical “ideal mentor.” Through factor analysis, the IMS yielded three constructs: integrity, guidance, and relationship; the three factors collectively define the characteristics of a mentor. The integrity subscale is reflective of a mentor who exhibits virtue, principled action, and is worthy of being introduced as a role model. The guidance subscale is indicative of a mentor who counsels, sponsors, and teaches. Finally, the relationship subscale is suggestive of a mentor who shares personal problems, social activities, and life visions or worldviews (Rose, 2003).

The implications of delineating between an ‘ideal’ and ‘actual’ mentor are that greater knowledge about one’s own preferences, potential, and power, tends to lead to more successful personal and professional outcomes, in general (Kram, 1985). Conversely, people who lack sufficient self-knowledge tend not to enjoy the same benefits as those who have assessed their preferences and then applied their energies towards securing a successful mentoring relationship (Morstain, 1977). However, the common link among researchers, organizations, and others remains: Mentoring means different things to different people. The present research demonstrates that successful mentoring outcomes may well depend on the congruency between ideal notions and actual experiences.
Review of Related Research and Literature

The Effects of Mentoring on Protégés' Experiences

It is apparent from looking at the general body of career development, business, and higher education research on mentoring in today’s organizations that much of the current literature and many of the available mentoring measurement scales are generally independent of individual preference considerations. Instead, they are inclined to focus on determinants of successful relationships (Noe, 1988), relationship or program outcomes (Dreher & Ash, 1990; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Gilbreath & Benson, 2004), recommendations (Ragins, 1997), particular group (e.g., minority or mixed dyad) dilemmas (Ragins), or mentoring skills assessments (Cohen, 1998; Field, 2000; Phillips-Jones, 1998). Furthermore, not all mentoring scales in current use have been validated and assessed for reliability (e.g., Cohen; Field; Phillips-Jones).

Some of the ways that researchers have attempted to conceptualize mentoring outcomes are illustrated by one of two general dimensions: career and psychosocial functions (Kram, 1983). Career-related functions relate directly to the protégé’s career advancement and include: the provision of sponsorship, exposure, visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. On the other hand, psychosocial functions include activities that enhance the protégé’s self-image and competence and include: provision of role modeling, acceptance, confirmation, counseling, and friendship. A brief summary of earlier research on mentoring and outcomes follows.

Outcomes of the Mentoring Relationship

Based primarily on Kram’s (1983) two mentoring functions, career and psychosocial, Noe (1988) was able to investigate the determinants of successful assigned
mentoring relationships. By including a mentoring program as part of a comprehensive personal and career development program for educators who aspired to attain administrative positions (e.g., principal, superintendent of schools), the author examined the mentor’s role in the development of the educators. This was accomplished via an original scale, the *Mentoring Functions Scale* (MFS), which was designed to assess the various functions performed by the mentors. The goal of the study was to investigate the influences of the protégés’ job and career attitudes, the gender composition of the dyad, and the quality of the interaction on the career and psychosocial benefits experienced by the protégés. Because the functions provided by mentors can vary in purpose and extent, the meaning of mentoring is not always entirely clear. For that reason, the authors do not define mentoring for the protégé prior to their scale completion. Factor analysis was used to identify the underlying constructs of the mentoring functions items. All mentor functions were represented by the two factors, career and psychosocial, with the exception of friendship, which did not clearly load on either factor. High internal consistency estimates were found for both factors (Cronbach’s alpha = .89 and .92, respectively).

Examination of job and career attitudes (e.g., the importance placed on one’s current work situation or one’s career in general) indicated that attitudes about one’s job or career had no effect on the time spent with the mentor or the quality of the relationship. However, active involvement of the protégé with career development did correlate with psychosocial benefits from the mentoring relationship and was reported by both male and female protégés. This finding can be attributed to the notion that if people already have well-developed career plans, or have a reasonable dedication to their work,
they may also have an increased need for their mentors to provide an environment in which career-related concerns and disappointments can be openly discussed. As a result, Noe (1988) asserts that organizations might benefit from a “readiness for mentoring” (p. 475) measure. Such a measurement scale would help to identify those employees who would be most likely to benefit from participating in a mentoring program. Therefore, as Noe so aptly reveals, the significance of the investigation lies in the notion that the differential effect of career attitudes and career planning may be subtle to establish; the determinants of successful mentoring relationships may not always be easily recognized.

As a further comment on the gender variable, mentors matched with protégés of the opposite gender reported that these protégés utilized the relationship more effectively than did protégés of the same gender as the mentor. The study also found that women received significantly more psychosocial benefits from the mentoring relationship than did men. As a corollary, when making inquiries about mentor functions, researchers need to be cognizant not only of dyadic, but individual attitudes and preferences, and gender effects, even in assigned relationships (Noe, 1988).

Although both psychosocial and career benefits have been discussed in mentoring research, Dreher and Ash (1990) have focused on the career benefits associated with protégés’ mentoring experiences. By comparing the career outcomes for men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions, Dreher and Ash were able to assess the relationship between mentoring experiences and gender and four outcome variables: total income, number of promotions, and two measures of compensation outcomes.

Dreher and Ash (1990) accomplished their research through the development and use of the Global Measure of Mentoring Practices (GMMP) a measure consisting of
items used by other researchers (i.e., Noe, 1988; Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1988). The purpose of developing the GMMP was to create an instrument that measures the career and psychosocial functions described by Kram (1983). Although the authors did not report providing a specific definition of mentoring to the participants prior to responding to the scale, they did ask the participants to: “consider your career history since graduating from our program and the degree to which influential managers have served as your sponsor or mentor (this need not be limited to one person)” (parentheses according to Dreher & Ash, p. 541). The study’s findings showed that although important career and psychosocial benefits can be derived from mentoring, some career aspects do not appear to be impacted. For example, their study revealed that men and women received approximately the same number of promotions and reported the same levels of compensation satisfaction. However, there was an unexplained pay differential of over $7,000, with men earning more than women, with or without the specification of mentoring. Still, this is not an unusual outcome considering the differences in income between men and women, in general, performing the same work (Graham & Smith, 2005; Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005). Accordingly, the results suggest that even though the effects of mentoring may be strong for both men and women on other career-related outcomes, it does not appear to be strong enough to have an effect on the pay differentials between men and women. However, the Dreher and Ash study has made a valuable contribution to the literature by examining the degree to which mentoring is differentially associated with career outcomes by means of structural (i.e., gender) differences.
Organizational and Supervisory Practices in Relationship to Outcomes

The effect of socially supportive interactions on one's physical and mental well-being has received considerable attention from social scientists, psychiatrists, and epidemiologists (Cobb, 1976; Turner, 1981). More specifically, social support has been demonstrated to have an effect on workplace productivity and positive psychological well-being (Park, Wilson, & Lee, 2004).

The general climate of mentoring within any organization can be associated with outcomes such as increased (or decreased) psychological well-being. Ragins (1997) proposed that organizations need to take the initiative to improve the general climate of mentoring. Further, it is reasonable to assume that those in supervisory positions will have some influence regarding mentoring on the organizational structure, as well as on the processes of the organization. For example, supervisors are often consulted to determine if, when, or how mentoring facilitation can occur. People who hold supervisory positions have opportunities to provide social support and, by extension, presumably will affect the well-being of those placed in their charge. In fact, some supervisors take on the role of mentor, which suggests that they may have a better assessment of the career needs of their protégés than non-supervisory mentors.

Although their study focused on supervisors, and not mentors, per se, Gilbreath and Benson (2004) attempted to assess the types of outcomes that might result from particular supervisor behaviors by conducting an exploratory correlational study involving men and women (N = 167) from a variety of organizations, occupations, and industries in the United States. The authors hypothesized that supervisor behavior would contribute to the rate of psychiatric disturbance in supervisees above and beyond the
other variables examined in the study. Participants included employees from healthcare and retail and were predominantly female (69%) and white (92%). Ages ranged from 18 to 75 years, with a mean of 35 years. Scales were completed that examined the overall effect of supervisor behavior on supervisees’ health practices, perceptions of social support, the degree of impact from stressful life events, and the number of stressful work events. The researchers’ hypothesis was supported; their measure of positive supervisor behavior was negatively correlated with employees’ reported psychiatric disturbance as measured by the 28-item General Health Questionnaire (GHQ; Goldberg & Williams, 1991). This study provides evidence for the relationship between supervisor behavior and employee well-being; employees who are within the care and charge of people who exhibit positive behaviors tend to experience positive outcomes.

The association between positive mentoring relationships and increased psychological well-being has also been reported in the youth mentoring literature. For example, DuBois and Silverthorn (2005) conducted a study (N = 2,053) whereby youth in grades 7 – 12 were asked about familial versus non-familial mentoring. Compared to relationships with familial adults, ties with adults in either non-familial informal (e.g., neighbor or coach) or professional (e.g., educator or counselor) settings were more likely to be associated with favorable outcomes such as increased psychological well-being. These results are consistent with theory and research that suggests that mentoring contributes to the building of social resources (Darling, Hamilton, & Niego, 1994; Rhodes, 2002). By assisting protégés in making connections to resources outside their immediate domains, supportive ties with others are strengthened and competence is
promoted. These results are analogous to Kram’s (1983) findings regarding career and psychosocial functions.

Also based on Kram’s (1983) framework of career and psychosocial functions, numerous researchers (e.g., Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Fagenson, 1989; Ragins & Cotton, 1999) have compared the effect of specific mentoring functions received by protégés in terms of compensation and promotions. For example, in a sample that included male \( (n = 257) \) and female \( (n = 352) \) protégés, from the perspective of both formal and informal mentoring relationships, the authors examined various outcomes in terms of gender. The Ragins and Cotton study was based on Ragins (1997) proposal that mentors’ power within an organization will have an effect on their ability to provide their protégés with benefits often associated with career development functions, such as protection, exposure, and sponsorship. Ragins had suggested that since men, typically, have more power than women within organizations they would be in better positions to provide more positive organizational outcomes for their respective protégés. Consistent with their hypothesis, the authors found that protégés, regardless of gender, who had worked with male mentors reported more compensation and promotions than protégés with female mentors. While controlling for differences in position tenure, number of career interruptions, occupation, length of mentoring relationships, supervisory status of mentors, and type of mentor (formal versus informal), protégés with a history of male mentors received compensation \( (M = \$60,140) \) significantly greater than that of protégés with a history of female mentors \( (M = \$41,354) \). An additional trend, although not statistically significant, was that protégés with a history of male mentors reported more promotions \( (AT = 2.6) \) over the past 10 years than those with a history of female mentors.
Interestingly, male protégés with male mentors did not report more mentoring functions or greater satisfaction with their mentors than any other gender combination of mentoring relationships. Thus differences appeared more strongly related to the mentor’s role in the organization than the mentoring relationship itself.

In a similar study comparing mentored with non-mentored participants, Chao, Walz, and Gardner (1992) examined mentor role functions as described by Noe (1988) in terms of organizational socialization, intrinsic job satisfaction and salary. Although job satisfaction and salary are fairly straightforward concepts, for the purpose of their study, organizational socialization was defined for the participants as, “the extent to which the individual felt he or she had learned the information necessary to adjust to his or her role in the organization” (p. 626). The study included protégés who were involved in informally developed mentoring relationships ($n = 212$), protégés who were involved in formal mentoring programs ($n = 53$), and people who did not have mentors ($n = 284$). The authors found support for their hypotheses that protégés in informal mentoring relationships reported significantly greater career-related support than did protégés in formal relationships. Likewise, protégés in informal relationships also reported higher levels of organizational socialization, intrinsic job satisfaction, and higher salaries than those who were not involved in a mentoring relationship.

Scales Designed to Measure the Mentoring Relationship

There have been several attempts to assess the various aspects of the mentoring relationship. Furthermore, mentoring has been examined from a variety of perspectives: adult learner, style preferences, and stages, among others. However, many of the existing scales (e.g., Cohen, 1998; Field, 2000; Phillips-Jones, 1998) are lacking extensive
validation and reliability assessments. Furthermore, many of the available scales have not honed in on what it means to assess individuals’ needs, but instead focus on existing relationships (Wilde & Schau, 1991). Following is a review of some of the scales that are available for use, given these deficiencies.

**Principles of Adult Mentoring Inventory (PAMI; Cohen, 1998).** The process of the mentoring relationship that affects outcomes and advantages for the protégé has also been recognized at the applied level. For example, regarding mentoring skill development, Cohen has examined mentoring from an adult-learner perspective. The adult-learner perspective was derived from theory and practice related to adult education, counseling, and work-related literature relevant to mentoring (Cohen).

Cohen (1998) defined the mentoring relationship as, “an interactive and dynamic process between the mentor and the employee” (p. 18). Thus, the PAMI is a self-report questionnaire that asks mentors about past and current mentoring experience or, for those with no experience as a mentor, their impressions of how they would probably interact at the current time with a protégé. Consequently, the purpose of the PAMI is to assess the mentor’s expected mentoring proficiency, without regard to the protégé’s specific desires.

One of the PAMI’s greatest strengths may lie in the nature of its overall interactive training process. It provides facilitators with materials and instructions geared toward creating an understanding of how mentor-protégé relationships can enhance the collective power of the organization. However, although it may be useful for facilitating discussions among people who are being prepared for mentoring roles, there is no provision made for the protégé’s specific preferences or needs. The manual that accompanies the PAMI does not provide information regarding the technical or
psychometric characteristics of the instrument. Neither does the manual provide references to either published or unpublished studies using the PAMI. Some evidence of validation would enhance the value of the PAMI as a measure of mentoring behaviors.

*Mentoring Skills Assessment* (MSA; Phillips-Jones, 1998). In another attempt to measure the mentoring relationship, Phillips-Jones developed the *Mentoring Skills Assessment* (MSA) which focuses on mentoring proficiencies, experiences, and recommendations. The purpose of the MSA is to identify particular mentoring styles and to assist mentors and protégés in evaluating their style preferences. The author defined mentoring as, “the process in which protégés are helped to establish their goals and develop skills in order to achieve them” (p.1). The MSA uses a rating system that encompasses skills in nine areas and would be useful in providing mentors an objective assessment of their behaviors by seeing where their perceptions differ from those of their protégés.

Perhaps the MSA’s greatest asset is that it evaluates mentoring from several perspectives: the mentor, the protégé, and colleagues. By focusing on both the quality and frequency of mentoring behaviors, the MSA has been effectively used to prepare senior managers who desired to mentor high-potential employees. The MSA has also been used as a leadership training tool for consultants. The completed profile includes scoring that clarifies for mentors where their self-perceptions diverge from those expressed by their protégés.

Although the MSA was developed within the context of a leadership development program at a Fortune 500 Company, no specific psychometric data are yet available for the MSA (L. Phillips-Jones, personal communication, August 12, 2005). However,
content validity was presumably built into the instrument as a result of its review by subject matter experts during the scale development phase, and convergent validity is supported by the use of multiple data sources. Furthermore, although the MSA has made a hearty attempt to consider the protégé’s goals and skill development aims, the main focus of the instrument is not the protégé’s particular preferences.

*Mentoring in the Moment (MITM; Field, 2000)*. Field has provided yet a different approach to discussing the structure and process of the mentoring relationship. The purpose of the MITM assessment is to challenge mentors to make the best use of brief daily opportunities for mentoring by responding to various scenarios that may be encountered by the mentor in the course of a typical workday. This is accomplished by describing four distinct phases (i.e., stages) of mentoring.

The protégés are seen as being on a journey and mentors are seen as having opportunities to respond with support, challenge, and vision to various scenarios provided in the instrument. The four phases described by Field (2000) include: identification (idealizing the mentor and asking for guidance), growth (sensing strengths and experimenting with behaviors), separation (wanting an independent identity), and mutuality (seeking and sharing experiences as an equal).

Although the author reports that the instrument has been “used by numerous human resource practitioners since its development” (M. Field, personal communication, January 20, 2005), a Social Sciences Citation Index (2006) search yielded no citations. Further, there does not appear to be sufficient support for the four theoretical phases on which the instrument is based. The developer of the instrument reports internal (alpha) coefficients for the four subscales as follows: Identification = .13; Growth = .36;
Separation = .08; and Mutuality = .03 (M. Field, personal communication, January 20, 2005). However, no specific information is given about the sample or procedure used to produce the coefficients reported, nor are the coefficients substantial (Nunnally, 1970). In short, these data indicate that items on these subscales may not be reliably measuring the same construct. Even when examining the instrument for face validity, one may find the response options to be somewhat confusing; it is possible that a good mentor may engage in more than one of the alternatives in any given situation. Moreover, one of the prime issues with face validity is that although general agreement may have been reached that an idea looks operationally effective, whether or not true operational effectiveness has been reached is a matter worthy of further empirical exploration. Additionally, the concept of stages itself has been criticized as being artificial, rigid, and not true to life in many psychology domains (e.g., human development, Vygotsky, 1934/1962). Finally, the approach does not address the idiosyncratic nature of mentoring preferences from the protégé’s perspective. In sum, it does not appear that there are currently any scales available that adequately measure the idiosyncratic nature of the mentoring relationship.

As a result of these limitations, the scales assessing various outcomes were chosen for the current study because previous research has shown that mentoring is positively associated with both career and psychosocial functioning (e.g., Kram, 1983, 1985). Some examples of positive outcomes include reduced stress and job turnover, job satisfaction, increased promotions, increased job performance, and higher salaries (Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Scandura, 1992).
Foundations for the Present Research

In sum, although attempts have been made to characterize and measure the mentoring relationship from various perspectives (i.e., adult learner, style preferences, and stages), there has yet to be an in-depth look at the structure and process of the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the protégé. Such a focus has the potential to provide information that will better prepare those seeking to utilize mentoring to respond to some of the challenges posed by mentoring relationships within an organization.

While adequate research exists to verify that mentoring programs and policies are important for personal and professional development as well as organizational success, the current research has focused on the understudied area of protégés’ perceived ideal mentor characteristics as compared with actual mentor behaviors. The current investigation has examined mentoring from the perspective that graduate students may have few tools to assist them in finding faculty mentors and maintaining a healthy relationship with that mentor (Rose, 2003). The current study has also been based on Rose’s (2003) work asserting that assessing student preferences for particular mentor behaviors is important for four reasons: raising student awareness about desirable relationships, facilitating mentor-protégé matches, enhancing communication with existing dyads, and finally, fostering a “culture of mentoring” within the department or program.

Given current measurement scales (e.g., Field, 2000), it has been somewhat difficult to quantify the effectiveness of various mentoring programs (Noe, 1988; Short, 1997; Kavoosi, Elman, & Mauch, 1995; Wilde & Schau, 1991). By testing the validity of
a relatively new scale, the Ideal Mentor Scale (Rose, 1999, 2003), practitioners may develop a better understanding of the types of mentoring relationships most desired by protégés, be better prepared to assist in the matching of students’ needs with mentors’ qualifications or attributes, and be more effective facilitators of communication between those in the dyad.

Additionally, because the mentoring relationship is often characterized by complexities embedded within cognitive appraisals of both positive and negative experiences (Barker, 2006; Wilkes, 2006) it would be most prudent to keep in mind that positive outcomes could quite conceivably be shaped by factors other than the dyad alone. Positive outcomes such as success, satisfaction, and well-being have been shown to be associated with factors such as, but not limited to, curriculum quality, course availability, instructional quality, job preparation, internship opportunities, library resource quality, financial support, and overall organizational climate (El Ansari & Oskrochi, 2006; Glenn, 2001; Grimmett, Bliss, Davis, & Ray, 1998; Ramanan, Taylor, Davis, & Phillips, 2006). If students are less than satisfied with any of these opportunities, the positive benefits derived from mentoring may be strained to the extent of nullification.

Because mentoring is a complex and dynamic idiosyncratic process (Barker, 2006; Kram, 1983; Wilkes, 2006), the present research sought to contribute to the development and advancement of mentorship theory by adding validation to the IMS through extending its use to include actual mentoring behaviors in relationship to hypothesized ideal mentoring behaviors. This was accomplished by developing the Actual Mentor Scale (AMS). The AMS maintains congruency with the IMS by making
only one change, and that is, taking the statements from the IMS and phrasing them as past tense statements. I expected that results of the comparison of the IMS with the AMS would give mentors, protégés, and their organizations a broader understanding of the mentorship process (see Applebaum, 2000; Wilde & Schau, 1991).

Specifically, if actual mentor behaviors are reflective of the protégés’ ideal expectations, this relationship may then subsequently manifest itself through constructive outcomes. These outcomes may include increased positive psychological well-being, self-esteem, general self-efficacy, mentoring relationship satisfaction, program satisfaction, feelings of support by the graduate program, and clarity concerning career goals. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the present research will find:

1. A positive correlation between the IMS and the AMS subscale scores
2. A positive correlation between the AMS scores and all outcomes, except the Negative Psychological Well-being Scale, with which a negative correlation is expected
3. Protégés matched with mentors of the opposite gender will report a greater degree of satisfaction with their mentor.
4. Women will report significantly higher positive well-being scores and significantly lower negative psychological well-being scores from the relationship than men, regardless of the gender of the mentor.
5. Protégés in informal mentoring relationships will report significantly greater program/academic unit satisfaction scores than protégés who report having had no mentor.
6. Protégés in informal mentoring relationships will report a significantly greater understanding of their career goals than those who report having had no mentor.
Chapter II

Method

Participants

Participants from a private, medium-sized Midwestern university were recruited for the present study and included 125 women and 63 men. Twenty-six participants chose not to respond to the gender question. The participants were recruited by e-mail from the campus mailing list and included students enrolled either in a master’s (n = 138), Ph.D. (n = 25) or other graduate (n = 40) degree program. Eleven participants chose not to respond to the program question. The total number of students contacted was 2,673, indicating that the response rate was approximately 8%. The age of the participants fell into four age brackets: 21 – 30 (60.3%), 31 – 40 (18.6%), 41 – 50 (15.7%) and 51 – 60 (5.4%). The majority of participants were enrolled in the College of Education/Allied Professions (44.6%). The remainder of the participants consisted of those enrolled in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences (21.1%), Engineering (14.2%), Law (12.3%), Business Administration (6.9%), and Other (1%). The majority of participants were Caucasian (84.7%), with African American comprising the next largest group of participants (4.9%). Other than 4% who chose not to describe themselves, the remaining participants (6.4%) consisted of Hispanic, Puerto Rican, or Asian. Of the 214 participants, 119 (56%) reported having a mentor, either past or present; the remaining 92 participants reported not having a mentor at any point in time. Three participants chose not to respond to the
mentor question. The number of participants completing the AMS portion of the questionnaire was 119.

Although 214 graduate students responded to the questionnaire, some analyses, particularly those with the AMS, have a smaller n due to the fact that there were 92 participants who reported not having had mentors. Therefore, those participants did not respond to the AMS. Further, in other analyses, any deviation in n from both the IMS and the AMS is due to incomplete questionnaires. In these cases, only one or two questions were left unanswered. To participate in the mentoring group in the present study, the participants must have been involved, at some point following high school, in a mentoring relationship as a protégé. The length of time of the mentoring relationships ranged from less than 6 months to more than 3 years.

Materials

The materials used in the present study fall under the headings of ideal mentoring (IMS), actual mentoring (AMS), and outcome variables. The IMS assessed hypothetical preferences desired in a mentor, and the AMS assessed actual behaviors exhibited by a mentor. The outcome variables were measured by scales that have been validated and assessed for reliability by other researchers, as well as scales and a demographic questionnaire developed for the purposes of the present study. The validated scales include: the Positive Psychological Well-being Scale (Nowack, 1990), the Negative Psychological Well-being Scale (GHQ-12; Goldberg, 1972, 1978; Goldberg et al., 1997), Rosenberg’s Self-esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965, 1989), Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (Ragins & Cotton, 1999), and the New General Self-efficacy Scale (NGSE; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). The scales developed for the present study used to examine other
outcome variables included: Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction, the Program Support/Value, and the Career Goals scales.

**Ideal Mentoring: The Ideal Mentor Scale**

The IMS (Rose, 1999; see Appendix A) was used to assess protégés’ hypothetical preferences in a mentor. This instrument, used by permission of the author, is a published scale; the original target audience was doctoral students.

**Underlying theory and definition of mentoring.** The IMS is grounded in Anderson and Shannon’s (1988) framework of mentoring, and is based on the underlying notion that mentoring means different things to different people (Rose, 2003; Wilde & Schau, 1991). Rose’s (1999) definition of the ideal mentor of a doctoral student reflects the IMS items most strongly endorsed by participants in her scale development studies: “The ideal mentor is an experienced person who exhibits intellectual curiosity, reliability, research ethics and good communication skills. This person is available to the student, provides challenge and constructive criticism, and conveys a belief in the student’s capabilities” (p. 5).

**Instrument development.** As described in detail by Rose (2003), the item pool for the instrument was built via successive stages of literature review, consultation with experts in mentoring and experts in graduate education, and extraction of criteria from focus groups of doctoral students. Selection of items to include or discard from the scale was determined through an iterative rational-statistical process. Three rounds of data collection and item analysis were conducted with samples of doctoral students ($N = 712$) from three different institutions. After each administration, item statistics were examined; reliable items (e.g., having no missing data, sufficient or strong item-total correlation,
appropriate item distributions, and internal consistency) were retained. Exploratory factor analysis was used to determine factor structure. A three-factor solution was replicated across two samples, with items reflecting the concepts of integrity, guidance, and relationship.

As a result of the convergence analyses regarding the final 34-item version of the IMS, distinctions among the three subscales were found to be consistent with the characterizations of mentoring given by Anderson and Shannon (1988) and Levinson et al. (1978), as well as with the NEO Personality Inventory of Costa and McCrae (1985). Specifically, the integrity subscale yielded 14 items that embody respectfulness for the self and others; the guidance subscale yielded 10 items that reflect the typical day-to-day work of a graduate student; and the relationship subscale yielded 10 items that reveal the more personal and deeper aspects of the mentoring relationship.

Characteristics of the instrument. Participants responding to the IMS are instructed to rate each of 34 items according to how important it would be for their ideal mentor to exhibit the characteristic associated with the item. Items begin with the following stem, “My ideal mentor would….” Response options range from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important). Summary scores are arrived at by totaling the scores for each item on the given scale and then dividing by the number of items. The procedure was performed on each scale: integrity, guidance, and relationship.

Psychometric properties. Content validity was built into the scale from the outset through the use of subject matter experts in the item selection process (Rose, 2003). Furthermore, the range of item content was initially expanded beyond the realm of mentoring into nomologically proximal variables such as demographic and personality
characteristics, professional conduct, and personal relationship indicators to more clearly demarcate what is important to a doctoral student’s definition of the ideal mentor.

Internal consistency (alpha) coefficients for the three factor-based subscales for the third administration of the IMS were .89 (integrity), .87 (guidance), and .79 (relationship). While the IMS shows high reliability, its predictive validity has not been systematically evaluated.

**Actual Mentoring: The Actual Mentor Scale**

The AMS (based on Rose, 2003; see Appendix B) was used to assess protégés’ appraisals of the actual behaviors exhibited by a present or former mentor. The AMS was created by altering the wording of the IMS to reflect what was experienced (actual) versus what is desired (ideal).

An initiation sentence introduces the scale, “As I think about my relationship with a specific mentor, here’s what has ACTUALLY taken place,” followed by, “My mentor has...” preceding each item on the scale. Response options range from 1 (never) to 5 (as much as could be expected) with an addition of 6 (not applicable). The mean AMS subscale scores did not include items scored as “not applicable”.

There are 43 items that measure the same three broad preferences for mentoring (integrity, guidance, and relationship) as does the 34-item IMS. Each of the items replaces the original future tense of verbs on the IMS with the past tense in order to reflect protégés’ experiences with their mentors’ actual behaviors. The reason for including the nine items over and above the 34-item IMS is that during the IMS scale development process these nine items constituted the core definition of the ideal mentor for the vast majority of students (G. Rose, personal communication, August 21, 2006).
That is, from an initial pool of over 100 items that were pre-tested in earlier versions of the scale, there were nine items that were universally agreed upon by students as "extremely important" to their definition of an ideal mentor. The resulting 34-item scale consisted of items on which there was variability in responses in the original testing of the scale. Consequently, since nearly all participants would be presumed to provide the same answers to the nine items, it would be redundant to include them on the IMS. The nine items constitute a fourth subscale, known as attributes (G. Rose, personal communication, August 21, 2006). In spite of this, in devising the AMS, one could not assume that all participants have an actual mentor who is performing the core functions of the ideal mentor. Thus, the nine additional items were included in the AMS.

Positive Psychological Well-being Outcomes: Psychological Well-being Scale

The Psychological Well-being Scale (Nowack, 1990; see Appendix C) was used to assess overall psychological well-being and satisfaction in the protégés' family, work, and life domains. By the very nature of their situations, those who have been afforded organizational supervisory positions have opportunities to provide social support and will have some measurable effect on the well-being of those placed in their charge (see Gilbreath & Benson, 2004; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005).

The Psychological Well-being Scale (Nowack, 1990) consists of 12 questions addressing protégés' appraisals of feelings and attitudes experienced during the previous 3 months. Designed to assess employee stress and health-risk behavior within organizational health promotion and wellness programs, the original target audience was 621 employees attending management training workshops in several large organizations.
in the Los Angeles area. The scale is published by Western Psychological Services (WPS; 1990).

*Underlying theory and definition of psychological well-being.* The Psychological Well-being Scale is grounded in Lazarus' (1966) cognitive-transactional theory of stress, and is based on the underlying notion that the moderation of short- and long-term physical and psychological health outcomes will be reflected through the cognitive, behavioral, and affective factors experienced in a relationship (Cobb, 1976; French, 1973; Kobasa & Puccetti, 1983; LaRocco, House, & French, 1980; Rabkin & Strueining, 1976). Nowack’s (1990) definition of psychological well-being reflects an overall work and life satisfaction and positive affect: “Psychological well-being is an overall life satisfaction and absence of psychological distress on a regular basis. It is characterized by satisfaction with one’s self, ability to enjoy life, and feeling happy with one’s family, work, interpersonal relationships, and achievements” (p. 175).

*Instrument development.* The Psychological Well-being Scale was developed as part of an eight-scale, 123-item tool, the *Stress Assessment Inventory* (Nowack, 1990), which, in its entirety, examines perceived stress, social support, health habits, Type A behavior, cognitive hardiness, and coping style. As described in detail by Nowack (1990), the item pool for the larger instrument was adapted from numerous resources, including health psychology tests and behavioral medicine textbooks. Items were constructed so as to reflect the complete range of characteristics defined by each scale construct. Each scale was constructed by generating lists of items that appeared to have content validity with a priori scale definitions based on previous research. The selection of items to include or discard from the scale was determined by agreement of three health professionals with
knowledge of the stress and health psychology literature; these judges revised and edited the original 1,000-item pool down to 300 items. Two rounds of data collection and item analysis were conducted with samples of full-time employees (approximately half had 4-year college degrees) from a variety of companies in the Los Angeles area ($N = 196$). After each administration, the item statistics examined included: inter-item correlations, item-scale correlations, factor analysis results, and within-scale homogeneity. Items which correlated .30 or higher with scales other than the one for which they were intended (or theoretically congruent) were eliminated. Scales with alphas below .65 (internal consistency) were eliminated. Ultimately, five scales were dropped from the original to form the revised 123-item, eight-scale Stress Assessment Inventory, of which the 12-item Psychological Well-being Scale is a component.

*Characteristics of the instrument.* Participants responding to the Psychological Well-being Scale are instructed to rate each of the 12 items according to how frequently they experienced each statement within the previous three months. Response options range from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). An example of an item is: "I genuinely enjoy the things that I’m involved in." Along with the seven other scales included in the inventory, the instrument is scored by summing the responses to the statements. The instrument is scored by calculating a total score for the 12 items. The scores can range from less than 35 (low) to 35 – 50 (moderate) to greater than 50 (high). Total scores above 50 indicate that respondents are satisfied with themselves and are able to relax and enjoy life. Those people generally feel happy with their families, work, interpersonal relationships, successes and achievements.
Psychometric properties. Scale homogeneity was built into the instrument through the use of subject matter experts in the item selection process. Additionally, items were retained only if they exemplified the construct of the scale for which they were written and efforts were made to cover the broad range of beliefs and behaviors typified by a given scale. Norms based on 1,530 employees in manufacturing, aerospace, communications, and health care organizations show that the Psychological Well-being Scale has an internal consistency (alpha) coefficient of .93. The test-retest reliability of .86 was based on a two-week interval between test administrations to a sub-set (n = 46) of the original sample. Although the scale shows high reliability, its validity as a mentoring outcome has not yet been assessed. Since previous evaluations have been the focus of management trainees’ workshops, the present research has the potential to contribute to the predictive validity of the scale as a mentoring outcome. This measure has been shown to be a sensitive outcome measure of positive affect, while being negatively associated in several studies with measures of pessimism, job burnout, anxiety, and depression (cf. Greene & Nowack, 1996; Nowack, 1994; Nowack & Pentkowski, 1994).

Negative Psychological Well-being Outcomes: The General Health Questionnaire-12

The General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12; Goldberg, 1972, 1978; Goldberg et al., 1997; see Appendix D) was used to measure negative psychological well-being by addressing protégés’ appraisals of how they’ve been feeling lately. The 12-item instrument is one of a family of General Health Questionnaires (GHQ) and is a shortened derivative of the GHQ-60 and the GHQ-28. The rationale for balancing this study with measurements of both positive and negative psychological well-being was that since the
IMS needs further validation, one would expect divergent validity between responses to the Positive Psychological Well-being Scale and a measure of negative psychological well-being, particularly if the mentoring relationship has been successful as measured by the AMS. The GHQ-12 is a published scale; the original target audiences were comprised of participants in community settings and non-psychiatric clinical settings (Goldberg & Williams, 1988).

*Underlying theory and definition of negative psychological well-being.* The GHQ was originally designed to assess disruptions in normal psychological functioning and to identify the emergence of new distressing symptoms (Shevlin & Adamson, 2005). Goldberg and Williams (1988) state that the scale is aimed at “detecting psychiatric disorders among respondents in community settings and non-psychiatric clinical settings” (p. 1). In other words, measuring negative psychological well-being has to do with going beyond an assessment of feeling “well” or “not well” by measuring the severity of major psychological disturbances.

*Instrument development.* The GHQ has evolved from the original 60-item scale, to 30-, 28-, and 20-item scales. Although the GHQ-60 would be most appropriate if the researcher wished to have scaled scores in addition to a total score, the GHQ-12 has been shown to have the advantage of quick administration, while still retaining many of the desirable psychometric properties of the longer versions (Goldberg et al., 1997; Shevlin & Adamson, 2005).

*Characteristics of the instrument.* Participants responding to the GHQ-12 are instructed to respond to each of the 12 statements about how they have been feeling about themselves over the previous few weeks. Items begin with the following stem, “Have you
recently…” Response options range from 1 (*better than usual or more so than usual*), to 4 (*much less than usual or not at all*), depending on each question’s specific wording.

Research based on a random sample of adults living in Northern Ireland was the focus of the Shevlin and Adamson (2005) study that explored alternative factor models of the GHQ-12. The authors identified a three-factor model to be the best explanation of the sample data ($N = 5,205$). Subsequently, the three factors were labeled Anxiety-Depression (four items), Social Dysfunction (six items), and Loss of Confidence (two items). High Anxiety-Depression scores indicate feelings of apprehension, concern, or worry. An example of this type of item is: “Have you recently been feeling unhappy and depressed?” High Social Dysfunction scores indicate feelings of inability, powerlessness, or vulnerability. An example of this type of item is: “Have you recently felt that you are playing a useful part in things?” High Loss of Confidence scores indicate feelings void of poise, buoyancy, or self-reliance. An example of this type of item is: “Have you recently felt you couldn’t overcome your difficulties?” Higher scores on the GHQ indicate a higher degree of psychiatric disturbance. The instrument is scored by totaling all scores; the higher the total score, the greater the disruption in the performance of daily life activities and the experience of subjective distress (Shevlin & Adamson, 2005).

*Psychometric properties.* Internal consistency (*alpha*) coefficients for the three factor-based subscales are .85 (Anxiety-Depression), .80 (Social Dysfunction), .82 (Loss of Confidence), and .89 for the entire scale. The GHQ-12 has been used extensively over the past 25 years in well-being research, including an international study of psychological disorders in primary health care by the World Health Organization (Goldberg et al., 1997).
Self-esteem Outcomes: Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965, 1989; see Appendix E) was used to assess protégés’ perceived global self-esteem. Given that the benefits of mentoring have been shown to positively contribute to protégés’ career outcomes, such as increased compensation, promotions, and career mobility (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Roche, 1979; Scandura, 1992), one could reasonably postulate that a positive dyadic relationship might convey to the protégé that he or she is cared for, esteemed, and valued to a greater degree than in a less nurturing relationship. Although the original target audience was a population of high school juniors and seniors (N = 5,024) from 10 high schools in New York State, this measure is now well-recognized and well-established in social science research (Rosenberg, 1989).

Underlying theory and definition of self-esteem. The underlying variables of interest in the RSES are the cognitive and perceptual correlates of the construct, global self-attitude. Rosenberg (1965) characterized self-esteem as a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the self (p. 15). Self-esteem is generally considered to be the evaluative and affective components of the self-concept; it may be considered the extent to which an individual values, approves of, appreciates, prizes, or likes him or herself. In a similar vein, Blascovich and Tomaka (1991) define self-esteem as, “the overall affective evaluation of one’s own worth, value, or importance (p. 115).

Instrument development. The RSES was originally developed to assess high school juniors’ and seniors’ self-image. As described by Rosenberg (1989), the aim of the original study was to consider self-esteem from multiple perspectives: the consequence of social, cultural, contextual, and interpersonal influences, as well as a cause of socially
relevant behavior, and then to consider the contributions that self-esteem may make to behavior, especially within our educational, political and economic institutions.

Construction of the measure was guided by both practical and theoretical considerations: (a) ease of administration (checking answers to 10 questions) (b) economy of time (cooperating with school authorities on class period restraints) (c) unidimensionality (item adequacy was determined by its relationship to all other scale items) and (d) face validity (the scale’s degree of correlation with similar scales) (Rosenberg, 1989). The results of pre-testing focused on the broader social, and the narrower interpersonal factors associated with the self-concept.

Characteristics of the instrument. Participants responding to the RSES are instructed to indicate the degree to which each statement represents their personal reactions or feelings for each of the 10 items. Response options range from 1 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*very much like me*). Items measure four broad concepts enveloping self-esteem: self-satisfaction, self-worth, self-respect, and personal pride. High self-satisfaction scores indicate a perception of being satisfied with one’s self, position, or achievements. An example of this type of item is: “I am able to do things as well as most other people.” High self-worth scores indicate a perception of having merit, of deserving respect, and of being comparable with others. An example of this type of item is: “I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.” High self-respect scores indicate a perception of consideration for oneself, proper respect for oneself as a human being, and a regard for one’s standing or position in society. An example of this type of item is: “I wish I could have more respect for myself” (reverse coded). High personal pride scores indicate a perception of self-satisfaction, gratification, and
fulfillment that accompany performances or accomplishments. An example of this type of item is: “I feel I do not have much to be proud of” (reverse coded). The RSES is scored by totaling all scores and then dividing by the total number of scores; the higher the mean, the higher the self-esteem (items 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10 are reverse-scored).

Psychometric properties. The RSES has received more psychometric analysis and empirical validation than any other self-esteem measure (Byrne, 1996; Wylie, 1989). Support for convergent validity was found by Robins, Hendin, and Trzepiński (2001) by weighing the RSES against the Single-Item Self-Esteem Scale (SISE), whereby participants responding to the SISE indicate their degree of agreement to a single statement: “I have high self-esteem.” Internal consistency as measured by coefficient alpha ranged from .76 to .87 in studies summarized by Curbow and Somerfield (1991). Additionally, Tippett and Silber (1965) demonstrated that the RSES had good test-retest reliability in a self-image stability study sample of 28 subjects ($r = .85$).

Mentoring Relationship: Satisfaction with Mentor Scale

The Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (Ragins & Cotton, 1999; see Appendix F) was used to assess the degree of satisfaction experienced while in the mentoring relationship. The importance of examining mentor-protégé satisfaction is based on Morstain’s (1977) examination of congruency between particular faculty orientations and students’ satisfaction. For example, some faculty emphasizes structured teaching-learning modes, while others focus on more informal and independent teaching-learning arrangements. It was found that the more satisfied students differed from the less satisfied students in their preferences for faculty-student interactions; those who were more satisfied tended to prefer traditional teaching-learning relationships, whereas those who were less satisfied
tended to prefer more of a collegial (i.e., egalitarian) role with faculty in educational decision-making. Therefore, it is reasonable to postulate that satisfaction with one’s mentor may be enhanced by the degree of congruency between one’s ideal mentor and one’s actual mentor.

The Satisfaction with Mentor Scale is a published scale and has been used to investigate the effects of the gender composition of the mentoring relationship on mentor functions and outcomes. Ragins and Cotton (1999) tested the scale with 1,500 men and 1,500 women in the professions of engineering (male dominated), social work (female dominated), and journalism (gender-integrated). The authors report that the scale addresses perceived overall satisfaction, needs fulfillment, disappointment (reverse-coded), and role effectiveness.

**Underlying theory and definition of mentoring relationship satisfaction.** The Satisfaction With Mentor Scale is grounded in Kram’s (1985) mentor role theory, which states that mentors can provide two broad categories of mentor functions: career development and psychosocial. Career development functions consist of helping protégés become more familiar with organizational protocol and facilitating their advancement through the organization. This can be accomplished by sponsorship, coaching, protecting, providing challenging assignments and increasing the protégés exposure. On the other hand, psychosocial functions address the interpersonal aspects of the relationship. This can be accomplished through enhancement of the protégés’ sense of competence, self-efficacy, and professional and personal development.

**Instrument development.** The Satisfaction with Mentor Scale was developed with the intention to measure the degree of satisfaction experienced with the quality of
mentoring provided. Although Rose (2003) used one question to assess mentor satisfaction ("If you currently have a mentor please rate how satisfied you are with your current mentor relationship"), the Ragins and Cotton (1999) four-question published version was used in the present study because of its increased comprehensiveness.

Characteristics of the instrument. Participants responding to the Satisfaction with Mentor Scale are instructed to answer each of the four items according to their degree of agreement with each item. Items begin with the following stem, "My mentor..." Response options range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Items measure satisfaction with and the effectiveness of the relationship. Thus, summed scores could range from 4 to 20. High satisfaction scores indicate a preference for a mentor who provides acceptance for the protégé’s professional development. An example of this type of item is: "My mentor is someone I am satisfied with." An example of an effectiveness item is: "My mentor has been effective in his/her role." Consistent with the method used by Ragins and Cotton (1999), a score for the Satisfaction with Mentor Scale was obtained by summing the answers to the items for each participant. The higher the sum, the greater was the satisfaction with the mentor. However, contrary to Ragins and Cotton, a 5-point, rather than a 7-point Likert-type scale was used in the present research, so as to maintain consistency with the other 4- and 5-point scales used in the current study.

Psychometric properties. The scale, developed by the authors, appears to have a degree of face validity. The internal consistency (alpha) coefficient is .83.

General Self-efficacy: The New General Self-efficacy Scale

The New General Self-efficacy Scale (NGSE; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001; see Appendix G) was used to assess protégés' beliefs in their capabilities to mobilize their
cognitive resources, strategies, and procedures needed to meet a choice of influences. This measure is a published scale, and was obtained from an academic journal (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001); the measure was developed using three study samples which consisted of undergraduate psychology students \((n = 316)\) and \((n = 323)\), respectively, and managers \((n = 54)\) who were attending a Masters of Business Administration executive program at an Israeli university.

**Underlying theory and definition of general self-efficacy.** The NGSE is grounded in Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory as well as more recent research focusing on general self-efficacy, termed GSE, which includes the more trait-like generality dimensions of self-efficacy (e.g., Eden, 1988; Gardner & Pierce, 1998; Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998; Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997).

**Instrument development.** The NGSE scale was developed by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001) to assess “one’s estimate of one’s overall ability to perform successfully in a wide variety of achievement situations” (p. 79). As described by the authors, the impetus for constructing the instrument was evidence that a commonly used 17-item general self-efficacy scale was problematic. Specifically, the Self-efficacy Scale (SGSE), developed by Sherer et al. (1982), make findings difficult to interpret due to its multidimensionality and seemingly low content and discriminant validity. For example, whether the SGSE scale also captures constructs related to general self-efficacy, such as self-esteem, effort, or persistence is open for debate (Chen, Gully, & Eden). Although the SGSE appears to have fairly high internal consistency and predictive validity, and may have made contributions to understanding motivation and behavior, Chen, Gully, and Eden assert that a general self-efficacy scale focusing on unidimensionality and high content and
discriminant validity would make a unique contribution to organizational theory, thus facilitating the work of both researchers and practitioners.

In order to distinguish from global self-esteem, which is “the overall affective evaluation of one’s own worth, value, or importance” (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991, p. 115; also see Rosenberg, 1965), and from the SGSE, an exploratory 11-item instrument was developed. It was found that seven of the items diverged from the Rosenberg’s (1965) 10-item Self-esteem Scale and the 17-item SGSE scale. In order to test for the validity of the NGSE scale, the construct validity of the NGSE was compared to that of the SGSE scale through three studies: two studies examined the reliability, dimensionality, and distinctness as compared to the SGSE, while the third study was a replication of the first two. The result was a 14-item scale used for the three studies. By examining inter-item correlations and factor loadings across all three studies, six items were ultimately eliminated due to redundancy with other items, resulting in the current eight-item NGSE scale.

*Characteristics of the instrument.* Participants responding to the NGSE are instructed to rate each of the eight items according to their degree of agreement. Response options range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). An example of this type of item is: “I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.” Items measure self-efficacy from a unidimensional global perspective. The instrument is scored by averaging the individual responses across the eight items; the mean ranges between 1 and 5. For descriptive purposes, a score at the mean is treated as medium self-efficacy and scores one standard deviation below or above the mean are treated as low or high self-efficacy, respectively. However, for the purposes of the
present study and in order to compare the summed scores of other variables in this research with the NGSE, a total score instead of a mean will be used.

*Psychometric properties.* Through the use of subject matter experts in the item selection process, content validity was incorporated from the beginning. Furthermore, through the use of inter-item correlations and factor loadings, an eight-item instrument was retained that appeared to capture the notion of general self-efficacy. Principal components analyses yielded a single-factor solution for the eight items in all three studies. Internal consistency (*alpha*) coefficients for the three administrations of the first study were .87, .88, and .85, respectively. The test-retest reliability coefficients were high as well, $r = .65, .66, \text{ and } .62$. Principle components analysis revealed that the NGSE scale is unidimensional, with eigenvalues of 4.17 and 4.76, respectively, accounting for 52% and 59% of the total item variance in the first two studies. In sum, the NGSE scale yielded higher content and predictive validity than the SGSE.

*Additional Variables*

Since no existing scales measuring program satisfaction, program support, or career goals fit the scope of the present study, the following scales were developed in consultation with another mentoring researcher. The intention of the scales was to measure protégés’ perceptions of: (a) Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction, (b) Program Support/Value, and (c) Career Goals (B. Gilbreath, personal communication, March 6, 2006; see Appendices H, I, and J). The participants answered questions pertaining to the degree of agreement with statements about satisfaction with their program/academic unit, perceived program support/value, and career goals and expectations following the
graduate program. Since these scales were developed for the sole purpose of the present study, their psychometric properties have not been evaluated.

Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction. The Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction scale was used to assess the degree of satisfaction experienced with the graduate program (see Appendix H). Like the degree of satisfaction associated with one’s mentor, the degree of satisfaction associated with the program/academic unit in which one is involved could reasonably be thought of as being enhanced by the degree of congruency between one’s ideal mentor and one’s actual mentor. The framework for this assumption rests in person-environment (P-E) fit theory (Lewin, 1936). P-E fit theory posits that well-being and performance is a function of the interaction between the person and his or her environment. This theory provides an effective context from which to examine one’s satisfaction with a given program/academic unit. Since the present study proposes that mentoring means different things to different people, by examining satisfaction, mentors and the organizations they serve may be in a better position to fine-tune the mentoring relationship in order to better meet the protégés’ needs. Although the Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction scale is not based on any particular theory, its inclusion in the current study was driven by Kram’s (1985) mentor role theory with regard to helping protégés by way of both career development functions, as well as the more personal psychosocial functions.

Characteristics of the instrument

Participants responding to the Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction scale are instructed to respond to a single item. Response options range from 1 (very much disagree) to 5 (very much agree). The item reads: “I’m satisfied with my graduate
program.” The higher the score on the item reflects greater satisfaction with the program/academic unit.

*Program Support/Value.* The Program Support/Value scale was used to assess the degree of perceived program support/value experienced while in the graduate program (see Appendix I).

**Underlying theory and definition of program support/value**

The Program Support/Value scale was modeled after Locke’s (1984) Value Theory. This conceptualization claims that job satisfaction exists to the extent that job outcomes (i.e., rewards) an individual receives match those outcomes that are desired. The key to satisfaction in the theory is the discrepancy between those aspects that are actually received and those that one would ideally like to have. That is, the lesser the discrepancy, the greater the satisfaction.

**Characteristics of the instrument**

Participants are instructed to respond to each of the two items on the Program Support/Value scale according to their agreement with each statement. Response options range from 1 (*very much disagree*) to 5 (*very much agree*). The items include: “I feel valued by my graduate program”, and “I feel supported by my graduate program.” The two items are evaluated individually. Higher scores for each reflect a greater degree of perceived program support/value experienced, respectively, while in the graduate program.

**Career Goals.** The Career Goals scale was used to assess the degree of agreement with statements about career goals and expectations following the graduate program (see Appendix J).
Underlying theory and definition of career goals

The Career Goals scale is modeled after the expectancy piece of Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory. In essence, the theory asserts that people are motivated to work when they expect that they will be able to achieve the things they want from their jobs. In addition to focusing on peoples’ thoughts regarding expectancy (the belief that one’s effort will result in performance), instrumentality (the belief that one’s performance will be rewarded), and valence (the perceived value of the rewards to the recipient), it also gives credit to unique opportunities associated with the job. Since career goals are idiosyncratic to the individual, no definition of career goals was provided.

Characteristics of the instrument

Participants are instructed to respond to the Career Goals scale according to their agreement with each statement. Response options range from 1 (very much disagree) to 5 (very much agree). The items include: “I am clear about my career goals” and “I have a good understanding of what to expect, career-wise, after graduation.” The two items are evaluated individually. Higher scores for each reflect a greater degree of understanding about career goals and expectations, respectively, following the graduate program.

Demographics

In order to assess the characteristics of the sample, a demographic questionnaire was developed (see Appendix K). Participants responding to the demographic questionnaire were given the following preface: “...to help assure value and usefulness...the following questions are simply used to help analyze the results of this questionnaire.” The instrument is a 13-item questionnaire consisting of gender,
education, race, and age queries, along with questions regarding the nature of the mentoring relationship and mentoring in general.

The rationale for not including a ‘time spent with mentor’ quantification question was that a time assessment would be more appropriate when addressing issues of advising, rather than issues of mentoring. Characteristics of advising-type relationships are that they are usually one-way (e.g., more directive expression of requests and instructions) and time is typically scheduled for advisors and advisees to meet for specific purposes (e.g., class scheduling). The advising relationship is considered to be more superficial than a mentoring relationship. On the other hand, a mentoring relationship is considered to be more of a two-way relationship (e.g., more exchange of thoughts and ideas). The relationship may involve less formal time structure (e.g., having lunch together, sending personal e-mails, etc.). Furthermore, in today’s technologically driven world, it is quite possible that the parties rarely meet face-to-face. However, there is also a greater potential for the affiliation to exhibit a greater degree of richness, reciprocation, and resonance. As one participant anonymously noted, “A large investment of time is not always necessary and is not indicative of the quality of the mentor.” Although there may be degrees of overlap between advising and mentoring functions, for the purposes of the present study, assessing relationship quality is deemed superior to assessing relationship quantity. Therefore, a time quantification assessment was not included.

Procedure

An e-mail containing a cover letter was distributed via the campus mailing list (see Appendix L). The cover letter contained the web link taking prospective participants directly to the questionnaire. For ease of response, a web tool known as SurveyMonkey
(1999) was used to collect and summarize the data. Participants were informed that participation was strictly voluntary; informed consent was implied by virtue of a reply. Participants were told that the purpose of the questionnaire was to better understand the nature of mentoring relationships. They were asked to complete self-report questionnaires regarding their notion of the ideal mentor and their actual mentor, if applicable. Since the present research is based on the notion that ideal mentoring characteristics are idiosyncratic to the individual, no specific definition of mentor or mentoring was provided for the participants. As an alternative, in order to prompt participants to reflect on past mentors, the preface to the questionnaire stated, “...you’ll want to narrow your focus to the one who has had the most influence on your professional development since beginning your post-high school academic journey.” Since the present research also examined outcomes in the absence of a mentor, the SurveyMonkey program simply skipped the AMS scale for those participants who had not had a mentor since their post-high school years and then continued with the rest of the questionnaire. Upon completion of the questionnaire, they were directed to a debriefing page that contained contact information and references (see Appendix M). Three weeks later, a follow-up e-mail (see Appendix N) was sent to the prospective participants to remind them of the opportunity to participate. Responses were collected for an additional week, at which point the questionnaire was closed. The data was copied from SurveyMonkey, and then transferred to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 14, for analysis.
CHAPTER III
Results and Discussion

Data analyses focused on ideal mentor scores and actual mentor scores, each a variable measured on an interval scale, and outcome variables to test the hypotheses generated for this research. Outcome variables were measured either on an interval (RSES), or ordinal (Satisfaction with Mentor, Positive Well-being, NGSE, GHQ-12, Program Value, Program Support, Goal Clarity, Goal Understanding, gender and satisfaction with mentor, and gender and well-being, nature of relationship and program satisfaction, nature of relationship and career goals) scale of measurement. In some cases, outcomes were compared for those individuals who reported having had no mentor. Although 214 graduate students responded to the questionnaire, some analyses, particularly those with the AMS, have a smaller n because not all participants had a mentor and, thus, did not respond to the AMS. Further, in other analyses, any deviation in n from both the IMS and the AMS is due to incomplete questionnaires. In these cases, only one or two questions were left unanswered. The number of graduate students completing the AMS portion of the questionnaire was 119. The level of significance used throughout the analyses reported for this research was p < .05, unless otherwise noted.

Correlation between the AMS and the IMS Scores

Before evaluating the correlation between the AMS and the IMS, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were derived for each of the subscales to assess their similarity to those derived by Rose (2003). As can be seen in Table 1, coefficients were
strong for each subscale of the AMS and paralleled those for each respective subscale of the IMS. Further, the magnitude of the coefficients (.96, .93, and .83, for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively) confirmed that for the present sample of graduate students ($N = 119$) all of the items in each of the AMS subscales were measuring the same construct for that subscale. These coefficients are quite large in magnitude and exceed an alpha of .70, the criterion that researchers tend to use in order for a measure to be considered acceptable, with an alpha higher than that indicating higher reliability (Nunnally, 1970). Rose’s (2003) coefficients for the IMS are also included in Table 1 and are quite similar to those of the AMS used in the present research.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>.955 ($n = 104$)</td>
<td>.933 ($n = 103$)</td>
<td>.829 ($n = 106$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>.930 ($n = 250$)</td>
<td>.979 ($n = 250$)</td>
<td>.927 ($n = 250$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The IMS coefficients are from Rose (2003).

To test the hypothesis that the AMS scores would be positively correlated with the IMS scores in the present research, Pearson product moment correlation analyses addressed the relationships between AMS integrity ($M = 62.40$, $SD = 11.78$) and IMS integrity ($M = 57.88$, $SD = 7.44$), AMS guidance ($M = 41.13$, $SD = 10.96$) and IMS guidance ($M = 36.94$, $SD = 7.46$), and AMS relationship ($M = 31.83$, $SD = 8.78$) and IMS relationship ($M = 24.05$, $SD = 6.42$), individually for each subscale. The correlation for the integrity subscale was found to be statistically significant $r (100) = .254$. Likewise, the correlation for the relationship subscale was found to be statistically significant $r (99)$
= .231, p < .05, indicating that for these two subscales of the AMS and IMS, people are responding similarly. In contrast, the observed correlation coefficient between the AMS and IMS guidance subscales was not statistically significant \( r (101) = .096 \).

One explanation for a non-significant correlation between the two guidance subscales is that this subscale is more a representation of the day-to-day activities in the academic setting rather than the more personal aspects of the relationship (Rose, 2003). Guidance in a mentoring relationship for a graduate student seems to be most directly related to solving research problems and planning presentations of the protégé’s work (Rose, 2003). It is possible that participants were at different stages of adjusting to their graduate work environments and their mentors were not seen to be providing the degree of resources needed to accommodate those adjustments. Whereas guidance can be understood in terms of the day-to-day labor associated with the work itself, the significance of the integrity and relationship correlations can be understood in terms of being tied to the dynamics of the dyad. Integrity has to do with the underlying notions of virtue, principled action, and emulation of a role model (Anderson & Shannon, 1988; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978). In addition, relationship has to do with openness to experience and the absence of neuroticism (Levinson et al.). Therefore, integrity and relationship mirror those aspects of mentoring that are more independent of the daily routine efforts that are principal components of the guidance function (Anderson & Shannon, 1988). Because of these findings—similar reliability coefficients and a high correlation on the integrity and relationship subscales, but not on the guidance subscale of the AMS and IMS—subscales of the AMS were evaluated separately for relationships with outcomes.
The Relationship between Having a Mentor and Outcomes

The relationship between experiences with a mentor and potential positive outcomes in feelings about self, and program and career support were evaluated. Since it was established that the AMS correlated well with the IMS, correlations between the AMS subscale scores and all outcomes were performed. To this end, AMS scores were compared with Satisfaction with Mentor, Positive Well-being, RSES, NGSE, GHQ-12, Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction, Program Support/Value, and Career Goals.

Positive correlations between the AMS scores and all outcomes were expected, except for negative psychological well-being, whereby a negative correlation was expected. As can be seen in Table 2, the only outcomes that showed significant correlations were mentor satisfaction (all three subscales), self-efficacy (relationship subscale) and goal understanding (relationship subscale).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Mentor Scale</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-being Scale</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale***</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New General Self-efficacy Scale</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.260**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Health Questionnaire-12</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Value</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Clarity</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Understanding</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.203*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  *p < .05
** *p < .01
***denotes an interval scale; all other scales are ordinal
Satisfaction with Mentor and the AMS

Rose (2003) used one question to assess mentor satisfaction, “If you currently have a mentor please rate how satisfied you are with your current mentor relationship.” Thus, in order to obtain greater reliability in the present research, a four-question survey of satisfaction with mentoring (Ragins & Cotton, 1999) was used. The scores in the present data set ranged from 4 – 20, with a median of 20. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that each of the AMS subscale scores would be positively correlated with the sums of the Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (Ragins & Cotton). Therefore, to test this hypothesis, AMS subscale scores were compared with the summed scores assessing satisfaction with mentor and a Spearman rank-order correlation analysis was performed. The correlation coefficients were found to be statistically significant, \( r_s (97) = .414 \), \( r_s (96) = .332 \), and \( r_s (100) = .318 \), for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively, \( p < .01 \). These results indicate that satisfaction with mentor is higher the more that those participants espouse the importance of the characteristics of integrity, guidance, and relationship.

It should be noted that the distribution of Satisfaction with Mentor scores is highly negatively skewed, with a median of 20 being the highest that could be obtained. This means that more than half of the participants rated their satisfaction the highest they could. The impact is that such high satisfaction produced a high correlation with all subscales of the AMS, and thereby, consistent with the goal of this research—to validate the IMS. Not only is the reliability of these data high, but the correlations between satisfaction with mentor and the subscales of the AMS provide construct validity for the IMS.
Positive Well-being and the AMS

It was expected that each of the AMS subscale scores would be positively correlated with the Positive Well-being Scale (Nowack, 1990). A Spearman rank-order correlation analysis addressed the relationship between total scores for each of the AMS subscales and ranked positive well-being total scores. The responses to the 12 statements of the Positive Well-being Scale were summed to arrive at a total score for each participant. The scores in the present data set ranged from 23 - 60, with a median score of 46.

The observed correlation coefficients for each of the AMS subscales and the Positive Well-being Scale scores were found to be non-significant, \( r_s (99) = .024, r_s (98) = -.034, \) and \( r_s (101) = .078, \) for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively. One explanation for these results suggests that since the scale was designed to be used in a variety of populations, statements may not completely capture constructs pertinent to the mentoring dyad. Such an explanation is supported by previous findings that graduate school contact consists not only of faculty-student relationships, but student-student relationships, as well (Baird, 1969). For example, if the student-student relationships are arranged to be unduly competitive, students will feel duress regardless of the nature of their other graduate student roles (Baird). In the same way, Roberts and Sprague (1995) have suggested that graduate students who are able to avoid undue competition from other students will tend to feel more positive toward their academic climates. Such findings suggest that for graduate students, well-being outcomes may be based more on peer than on faculty relationships.
It was expected that each of the AMS subscale scores would be positively correlated with the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965). The mean self-esteem score was 41.88 ($SD = 7.56$). Consistent with Rosenberg, a Pearson product moment correlation analysis evaluated the relationship between total scores for each of the AMS subscales and self-esteem. The correlation coefficients for each of the subscales were found to be non-significant, \( r (102) = -.008, r (101) = .020, \) and \( r (104) = .021, \) for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively.

One explanation for these results is that past research on the RSES has shown that scale score distributions among college students tend to be negatively skewed. Consequently, even tripartite splits of the distribution produce “low” self-esteem groups that have relatively high self esteem in an absolute sense (Bringle, Phillips, & Hudson, 2004). That is, when the total sample is split into three groups—low, medium, and high self-esteem—even the lowest group may well endorse the scale at least moderately. It should be noted that the authors do not specify the scores that were used to identify where the splits occur. However, such findings do suggest that because graduate students participating in the current study revealed at least moderate endorsement of scale items, they may well possess unmistakable feelings of worthiness, pride, and self-respect. Although the mentoring dyad may facilitate feelings of affective and cognitive evaluations of self-worth, the responses may not be robust enough to produce even a modest effect. Furthermore, the RSES was designed to understand self-esteem in a broad, general sense (Rosenberg, 1965), and is not focused on the mentoring dyad, per se.
Therefore, the responses may not be entirely reflective of the specific mentoring relationship at hand.

**Self-efficacy and the AMS**

It was expected that each of the AMS subscale scores would be positively correlated with the NGSE (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). For the purposes of the present study, and consistent with the authors’ procedure, a sum of each participant’s responses to the eight questions was calculated (G. Chen, personal communication, May 10, 2006). The summed scores in the present study ranged from 16 – 40, and the median was 34.

A Spearman rank-order correlation analysis addressed the relationship between total scores for each of the AMS subscales and summed scores for the NGSE. The observed correlation coefficients for integrity and guidance subscales were found to be non-significant, $r_s (101) = .111$, and $r_s (100) = .171$, respectively. However, the correlation coefficient for the relationship subscale was found to be statistically significant, $r_s (103) = .260, p < .01$.

One explanation for these results may be that the integrity and guidance subscales are more reflective of one’s respect for the self and others and one’s typical day-to-day graduate student task activities. Self-efficacy includes notions of a sense of self-worth together with confidence in one’s abilities. On the other hand, the relationship subscale is more reflective of the deeper aspects of the mentoring relationship (Rose, 2003). The results suggest that the presence of the more personal and deeper aspects of the mentoring dyad may be a factor in one’s belief in one’s overall competency toward performance across a wide variety of situations. Examples of personal and deeper relationship...
characteristics could include, but are not limited to, having lunch or dinner together, or having meaningful conversations about life beyond the academic task at hand (Rose).

Having opportunities for lunch, dinner, or meaningful conversations may further prepare students to think in terms of attainment and accomplishment. However, as Scherbaum, Cohen-Charash, and Kern (2006) assert, measuring those successes can be challenging, as confidence in the precision of any measurement scale will vary according to student preparedness for academic rigor. For example, one would expect an A-level student to be prepared to think in terms of success and achievement possibilities, whereas a struggling student may tend not to have that same mindset. Thus, course grade fluctuations may result in an inconsistency between perceived and reported competencies, suggesting that the degree of confidence in the assessment will vary as a function of the level of self-efficacy for academic rigor.

*Negative Well-being and the AMS*

It was expected that each of the AMS subscale scores would be negatively correlated with the Negative Psychological Well-being Scale (GHQ-12; Goldberg, 1972, 1978; Goldberg et al., 1997). On the GHQ-12 to follow, the summed scores of the 12 items from the present study ranged from 17 – 48, and the median was 37. To test the hypothesis, a Spearman rank-order correlation analysis addressed the relationship between each of the AMS subscale scores and negative psychological well-being scores. The observed correlation coefficients for each of the subscales were found to be non-significant, $r_s (100) = .009$, $r_s (99) = .009$, and $r_s (102) = .035$, for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively. One explanation for the lack of support for the hypotheses is that the mentoring relationship is affected by various dynamics. For example, Gilbreath
and Benson (2004) emphasize the notion that multiple factors have the potential to affect supervisor behavior towards employees. By examining how the supervisor plays a role in factors such as providing social support, acknowledging stressful work-associated events, and facilitating prudent health practices, the authors were able to demonstrate how supervisor behavior can be both a source and a moderator of stress. Based on effect size research by Dunlap (1994), the authors also assert that if employees can rate their supervisor’s behavior above average, the probability is 63% that their psychological well-being score would also be above average. These results suggest that well-being outcomes are dependent on a psychologically healthy environment at various levels. Therefore, numerous concerns, events, or support systems may obscure the actual nature of the dyadic relationship (Gilbreath & Benson). Finally, since the GHQ-12 scale was designed to identify a breaking down of normal functioning (Goldberg & Williams, 1991), statements may not entirely capture the comprehensive nature of the mentoring dyad.

*Program Support and the AMS*

It was expected that each of the AMS subscale scores would be positively correlated with both program value and program support. Program value and program support were assessed by one question each and so the response on the Likert-type scale was used as the data point entered into analysis for each participant for each question. Higher scores reflected a greater degree of perceived program support and value experienced, while in the graduate program. To test these two hypotheses, Spearman rank-order correlation analyses addressed the relationship between total scores for each of the AMS subscales and the score for program value (“I feel valued by my graduate program”) and between total scores for each of the AMS subscales and the score for
program support ("I feel supported by my graduate program"). The scores for each question used in the present study ranged from 1 – 5. The correlation coefficients for each of the subscales were found to be non-significant, $r_s (101) = .140$, $r_s (99) = .010$, and $r_s (102) = .100$, for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively for program value. Likewise, the correlation coefficients for each of the subscales were found to be non-significant, $r_s (101) = .182$, $r_s (100) = .075$, and $r_s (103) = .095$, for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively for program support.

One explanation for the lack of support for the two hypotheses is that the mentoring relationship is independent of program support. Specifically, protégés may feel valued and/or supported by their mentors, but may still not feel valued and/or supported by the program itself. Thus, if protégés turn to their mentors for inspiration, focus, or collegiality, but the graduate program is not sensitive to those needs, the scale responses may not accurately capture the true nature of the dyadic relationship (Hansman, 2003). Further, mentors are subject to power and influence issues within the organization. Generally, mentors who perceive that they possess greater organizational power should also be able to provide enhanced resources to the protégé. Likewise, a mentor with limited organizational power would be expected to have the reverse effect (Ragins, 1997). Therefore, a lack of power for the mentor within the academic structure and a concurrent lack of resources to benefit the graduate student could lead to that student’s dissatisfaction with the support of the program. Finally, since the data are positively skewed, this could affect the analyses in a couple of ways. First, a positive skew may indeed be an indicator of program dissatisfaction. However, a positive skew cannot automatically lead one to assume that students are necessarily dissatisfied. They may still
be satisfied in an absolute sense (Bringle, Phillips, & Hudson, 2004). Therefore, while acknowledging that although it is within the realm of possibility that the shape of the skew can be an indicator of dissatisfaction, its magnitude may not be significant in the practical sense.

*Career Goals and the AMS*

Two questions were used to assess separately attitudes about career goals. It was expected that each of the AMS subscale scores would be positively correlated with each of clarity of career goals (first statement) and understanding of career goals (second statement). The two items were scored individually. Higher scores reflected a greater degree of perceived goal clarity and understanding experienced, respectively, while in the graduate program. The scores from the present study ranged from 1 – 5, and the median was 4, which was the case for both statements.

To test these two hypotheses, Spearman rank-order correlation analyses addressed the relationship between ranked total scores for each of the AMS subscales and goal clarity (“I am clear about my career goals”) and between ranked total scores for each of the AMS subscales and goal understanding (“I have a good understanding of what to expect, career-wise, after graduation”). The observed correlation coefficients for each of the subscales were found to be non-significant, $r_s(101) = .088$, $r_s(98) = .117$, and $r_s(101) = .144$, for integrity, guidance, and relationship, respectively for goal clarity. Finally, with the exception of the relationship subscale, the observed correlation coefficients for each of the integrity and guidance subscales were found to be non-significant $r_s(102) = .147$, $r_s(101) = .150$, respectively. A significant correlation was found between the AMS relationship subscale and goal understanding, $r_s(104) = .203$. 
One explanation for the mixed findings (i.e., only the AMS relationship subscale with goal understanding was found to be significant) is that the characteristics associated with the relationship subscale (e.g., sharing personal experiences or problems) may be influenced to the degree that the mentor is able to provide unique insight as related to career expectations. On the other hand, characteristics associated with integrity (e.g., one’s respectfulness for the self and others) or guidance (e.g., one’s typical day-to-day current tasks or high-priority presentations) may not be completely indicative of how the mentoring relationship makes use of career goal information. An explanation for the significant correlation for the relationship subscale with goal understanding but not with goal clarity is that graduate students have presumably had opportunities to observe and network, at least on a limited basis, with career adults. By observing and exchanging ideas with others, they have opportunities to form opinions of their career expectations, while at the same time, looking toward a mentor to help map out their own career plans in a meaningful way may require more effort (Kass, Souba, & Thorndyke, 2006). The authors point out that the ability to set clear career goals is one of the most important, but often overlooked, aspects of academic career success.

Making effective use of career goal information is crucial, given that organizations today are in a permanent state of flux, typified by reorganization, downsizing, and outsourcing (Yukl, 1981). Furthermore, some assert that everyone is self-employed and the concept of ‘job’ is disappearing (Hall & Mirvis, 1995). Additionally, the career needs of adults aged 18 – 25 are not necessarily being met. For example, only 30% of adults have even discussed career choices with college counselors (Hoyt & Lester, 1995). However, graduate students may have a distinctive propensity to
want to explore career information with the mentor who is able to relate in a more personal way as opposed to seeking information from other sources that may not have the same degree of individual attention (Davidson & Gilbert, 1993). As the findings indicate, the notion of personal attention is a prerequisite to more effectively mapping out one's career goals.

**Gender and Satisfaction with Mentor**

It was expected that protégés matched with mentors of the opposite gender would report a greater degree of satisfaction with their mentor than protégés matched with mentors of the same gender. Summed scores assessing participants’ satisfaction with mentor were derived; the higher the sum, the higher the satisfaction with the mentor. The scores in the present data set ranged from 4 – 20, with a median of 19 for cross-gender dyads and 20 for same-gender dyads. A median of 20 indicates that more than half of the participants rated their satisfaction the highest they could, resulting in a highly negatively skewed distribution. To test the original hypothesis, a Mann-Whitney test for independence of ranks addressed the relationship between mentor satisfaction (Ragins & Cotton, 1999) for same-gender dyads with mentor satisfaction for cross-gender dyads. The difference between the mean ranks (53.83 for same-gender dyads, $N = 65$; and 42.68 for cross-gender dyads, $N = 34$) was found to be reliable, $z = -2.070, p = .038$, indicating that protégés matched with mentors of the same gender reported a greater degree of satisfaction with their mentor than protégés matched with mentors of the opposite gender.

There are distinct advantages to being involved in a same-gender dyad. For example, male-to-male and female-to-female friendship can be a powerful force in that when people form close relationships with others who are similar to themselves, they
tend to understand the other person’s obstacles, appreciate their strengths, and build on existing successes (Brown, 2005). Also, Ragins and Cotton (1999) performed a study focusing on formal and informal mentoring relationships and found that for the cross-gender combination of men who were mentored by women, the men reported less mentor satisfaction than any other gender composition. Given these outcomes, the ability to recognize satisfaction may more likely be found in the dynamics of the camaraderie of the same-gender dyad than would ordinarily be found in the cross-gender dyad.

**Gender and Well-being**

It was expected that women would report significantly higher positive well-being scores from the relationship than men, regardless of the gender of the mentor. The responses to the 12 statements were summed to arrive at a total score for each participant. The scores ranged from 23 – 60, with a median of 46.50 for men and 46 for women. To test the hypothesis, a Mann-Whitney test for independence of ranks addressed the relationship between positive well-being for men with positive well-being for women (Nowack, 1990). The difference between the mean ranks (96.99 for men, $N = 60$; and 87.25 for women, $N = 120$) was not found to be reliable, $z = -1.183$, $p = .237$, indicating that women did not report significantly higher positive well-being scores from the relationship than men, regardless of the gender of the mentor.

It was also expected that women would report significantly lower negative psychological well-being scores than men, regardless of the gender of the mentor. The responses to the 12 statements were summed to arrive at a total score for each participant. The higher the sum, the greater the disruption in the performance of daily life activities and the experience of subjective distress (Shevlin & Adamson, 2005). The scores ranged
from 17 to 48, with a median of 38 for men and 37 for women. To test this hypothesis, a Mann-Whitney test for independence of ranks addressed the relationship between negative well-being for men and negative well-being for women (Goldberg, 1972, 1978; Goldberg et al., 1997). The difference between the mean ranks (99.69 for men, $N = 63$; and 87.96 for women, $N = 120$) was not found to be reliable, $z = -1.428$, $p = .153$, indicating that women did not report significantly lower negative psychological well-being scores than men, regardless of the gender of the mentor.

One explanation for these findings is that both men and women perceive similar benefits from the mentoring relationship, regardless of the gender of the mentor. This concept is based on research demonstrating that mentoring is associated with increased income (Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1988), higher job satisfaction (Collins, 1994), and increased job motivation (Gaskill & Sibley, 1990), regardless of the gender of the mentor or the protégé. Furthermore, both men and women who have been mentored in the past are more likely to serve as mentors themselves (Roche, 1979). Although psychosocial benefits are an important part of the mentoring relationship, career-related benefits can also be perceived as a factor that can equally contribute to one’s well-being. Therefore, based on past research, it seems reasonable to postulate that positive benefits such as increased income, higher job satisfaction, increased job motivation, and likelihood of serving as a mentor will tend to be associated with increased well-being and will be extended to both men and women.

*Type of Relationship and Program Satisfaction*

It was hypothesized that protégés in informal mentoring relationships would report significantly greater program/academic unit satisfaction scores than protégés who
reported having no mentor. The observed proportions of agreement can be found in Table 3. To test this hypothesis, a Chi-Square test of independence was performed on the nature of the relationship (e.g., formal versus informal) and program satisfaction ("I am satisfied with my graduate program"). The results did not indicate a reliable relationship, $\chi^2(2, N = 99) = .54, p = .46$.

Table 3

*Observed Proportions of the Nature of the Mentoring Relationship According to Program Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Relationship</th>
<th>Agree $n = 120$</th>
<th>Disagree $n = 16$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mentor</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One explanation for this finding may be that program satisfaction could conceivably be based on factors other than whether the relationship is a formal or an informal one. Given that graduate education outcomes can often be explained by the interaction between student characteristics and institutional factors, program satisfaction may well be a function of the degree of resources provided in order to complete one’s degree in a timely manner (Ferrer de Valero, 2001). Another factor to consider with regard to program/academic unit satisfaction may have to do with the degree of financial support that is offered (e.g., teaching or research assistantships; Ferrer de Valero). As a result, a lack of financial support can impede the possibility of successfully completing graduate school (Gillingham, Seneca, & Taussig, 1991), leaving the student feeling less satisfied than if the degree were within reasonable reach.
Another matter of concern is that only one statement was used ("I am satisfied with my graduate program"). Most instruments gain their reliability from multiple questions assessing the same variable. By using only a single statement, reliability could not be assessed, nor is there much power. However, the statement was developed for the purpose of the present study, as no other questionnaire was found to address graduate program satisfaction within the context of mentoring.

*Type of Relationship and Career Goals*

It was hypothesized that protégés in informal mentoring relationships would report a significantly greater understanding of their career goals than protégés who reported having had no mentor. To test this hypothesis, a Chi-Square test of independence examined the nature of the mentoring relationship and the career goals statement, "I am clear about my career goals." The observed proportions of agreement can be found in Table 4. The test did not produce statistically significant results, $\chi^2 (2, N = 136) = 2.02, p = .37$. Similarly, the Chi-Square test of independence examined the nature of the mentoring relationship and the career goals statement, "I have a good understanding of what to expect, career-wise, after graduation." The observed proportions of agreement can also be found in Table 4. Again, the results did not indicate a reliable relationship, $\chi^2 (2, N = 140) = 1.55, p = .46$, indicating that protégés in informal mentoring relationships did not report a significantly greater understanding of their career goals than protégés who reported having had no mentor.
Table 4

*Observed Proportions of the Nature of the Mentoring Relationship According to Career Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Relationship</th>
<th>Goal Clarity</th>
<th>Goal Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree $n = 22$</td>
<td>Disagree $n = 114$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Mentor</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No support was found for either hypothesis evaluated here. Since only two statements were used regarding career goals, there was not enough statistical power. Since no other questionnaire was found that addressed career understanding within the context of mentoring, these questions were developed for the present study.

One possible explanation for these findings is that even though a mentoring relationship—either formal or informal—may exist to some degree it is conceivable that the quality of that relationship may be in question. For example, interviews with female surgeons ($N = 10$), revealed that 90% of them had been involved in a mentoring experience. However, 50% of them stated that the relationship was ineffective.

Effectiveness was described not as having a mentor who was “nice” (Kass, Souba, & Thorndyke, 2006, p. 183), but rather having one who was empowered to help direct the career path (e.g., through networking) and to provide information and insight regarding lifestyle issues pertinent to the surgical career. Likewise, graduate students, regardless of formality of the relationship or the existence of a mentor, have similar desires and aspirations: they need to be surrounded by people who can effectively guide them through graduate school with an eye toward eventually being able to balance a profession
with lifestyle choices (Kass, Souba, & Thorndyke). It is also important to recall that satisfaction was evident in participants’ relationships with their mentors, as indicated by the Satisfaction with Mentor Scale. Additionally, responses indicated that the type of mentoring that was occurring was characteristic of all three AMS subscales: integrity, guidance, and relationship. The data analyses indicated that participants were generally pleased with the quality of the relationship. Taken together, these results indicate a possible disadvantage of using only two questions; statistical power needs to be taken into consideration in the design of this type of questionnaire for future studies.

The Effect of Past Mentoring Experiences

Although no hypotheses addressed the question of whether respondents who reported having a mentoring experience (either past or present) might differ in their expectation of the ideal mentor as compared to respondents who reported having had no mentor, the concept was nevertheless explored. It was expected that participants who had at least one previous mentoring experience would differ significantly in their responses from participants who had not had at least one previous mentoring experience. A one-way analysis of variance compared the mean ideal mentor scale score for informal, formal, and no mentor relationships, and found no reliable results, $F (2, 141) = .497, p = .61$. This result suggests that regardless of whether or not the respondent identified a mentor, the concept of ideal was consistent across conditions. Past experiences have the potential to shape current perspectives. However, for this particular group of respondents, the effect of the mentoring experience was not robust enough to be detected by the one-way analysis of variance.
CHAPTER IV
General Discussion

Overview

The current study sought to add validation evidence to the IMS (Rose, 2003). The first task was to develop a scale, the Actual Mentor Scale (AMS), which measured actual mentoring received. This was to be accomplished by using the IMS as a basis for the AMS. All language and connotations of the IMS were retained; the only difference was that, rather than responding to the present notion of the ideal mentoring that would like to be received, the AMS presented the statements in terms of the actual mentoring received (i.e., past tense). The current study did indeed successfully meet the main objective of adding validation evidence to the IMS (Rose). Furthermore, by using the IMS as a foundation, I was able to create a new measurement tool, the AMS.

The second task was to ascertain that the two scales were indeed measuring the same constructs. By comparing respondents’ notions of an ideal mentor with the actual mentoring received, the current study was able to successfully demonstrate that the three AMS subscales (integrity, guidance, and relationship) were indeed measuring the same constructs as the IMS subscales, as was demonstrated by the Pearson correlation tests. Therefore, sufficient rationale existed for using the AMS as a basis for examining the outcome variables of interest.

The third task was to use the AMS to establish whether or not the scale was related to numerous outcome variables. Although some significant correlations were
noted (i.e., relationships exist between the actual mentoring received and various outcomes), there were also a number of non-significant results of the analyses (i.e., the actual mentoring received does not necessarily predict particular outcomes). This is, no doubt, because mentoring is a very complex relationship and but one aspect of a person’s life (Hansman, 2003; O’Neil & Wrightsman, 1982; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). Furthermore, graduate students, similar to career adults, may have multiple ways of defining mentoring and its associated outcomes. As in many organizations, change is ubiquitous in today’s colleges and universities; students must think about the best ways to navigate that permanent white water of change (Yukl, 1981). As they maneuver, no two people are likely to define any type of success, including mentoring success, in exactly the same way. Satisfaction, well-being, self-esteem, and self-efficacy are dependent on constructs other than mentoring; mentoring is but one important component of graduate school success, satisfaction, and professional development (see El Ansari & Oskrochi, 2006; Glenn, 2001; Grimmett, Bliss, Davis, & Ray, 1998; Ramanan, Taylor, Davis, & Phillips, 2006).

In addition to issues associated with personal and professional development, the quality of the relationship and its impact regarding career understanding may well depend on the parameters by which success is defined. For example, if the mentor is defining career success on his or her own terms, rather than taking into consideration the views of the protégé, then there may be a degree of difficulty in helping the protégé clarify the meaning of success and then to relate career goals to that meaning (Meggison & Clutterbuck, 2005). It is also a fair statement that one’s own interpretation of success will be evident in how that person manages his or her skills. For example, Murphy and Ensher
(2001) assert that self-goal setting is a form of self-management that refers to how a person takes responsibility for professional functioning and has been suggested as a strategy for obtaining career objectives (Wexley & Latham, 1991). Perhaps the mentoring relationship is not entirely indicative of how protégés interpret success, develop strategies, or plan for career outcomes. Finally, self-management may be even more useful for goal clarity and understanding in the absence of mentor support (Murphy & Ensher).

One of the major strengths of the current study is that it successfully demonstrated the validity of the IMS for graduate students. Previously, Rose (2003) demonstrated the relationship between the IMS and students who were not all necessarily involved in a mentoring relationship. The IMS was designed to identify those qualities that graduate students consider most important in a potential mentor; the AMS successfully supported those findings by demonstrating that the two scales were measuring the same constructs. The current study also demonstrated a positive relationship between the actual mentoring received and the degree of satisfaction experienced with the mentor, revealing that relationship quality does indeed play a positive role in relationship satisfaction (e.g., the protégé’s needs being met, not being disappointed, and believing that the mentor was effective in his or her role).

Most mentoring studies have examined actual mentoring in terms of psychosocial or career benefits (e.g., Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Kram, 1985; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Scandura, 1992) while overlooking the notion of the ideal mentor. Focusing on determinants of successful relationships (Noe, 1988), relationship or program outcomes (Dreher & Ash; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Gilbreath
recommendations (Ragins, 1997), minority or mixed dyad dilemmas (Ragins), or skills assessments (Cohen, 1998; Field, 2000; Phillips-Jones, 1998) are important endeavors. However, consideration also needs to be given to potential protégés’ views regarding the behaviors they would prefer receiving (i.e., ideal) versus what they are actually receiving.

Therefore, the present study was an attempt to add validation evidence to graduate students’ notion of their ideal mentor (see Rose, 2003). The actual mentoring behaviors experienced may play a role in the way protégés choose to seek out mentors for traversing through the sometimes demanding environment of graduate school. The relationship between the ability to make sound choices and mentoring relationship quality would be a topic worthy of further exploration.

Given that research has already shown that mentoring is an important component of personal and professional development (Alleman & Clarke, 2002; Cohen, 1998; Kram, 1985; Mathews, 2003), the present study is relevant to almost any domain and will contribute to increased understanding of the nature of the mentoring relationship. Furthermore, graduate students are in a unique position to benefit from others’ experiences and networking opportunities, as the academic backdrop is typically the defining setting for further advancement, whether that advancement involves additional education and/or career choices (Mathews). Finally, positive outcomes such as reduced stress and job turnover, job satisfaction, increased promotions, increased job performance, and higher salaries have been associated with mentoring (Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Scandura, 1992) and will be of increasing concern as graduate students enter the job market.
There are a number of methodological limitations of the present study that should be taken into consideration for future research. The first is that the participants in this study are a relatively homogenous population from the mid-west (85% Caucasian) and most (60%) were between the ages of 21 and 30. Additionally, the sample consisted primarily of students in the academic division of Education (45%). The remainder of the sample was split among Arts and Sciences (21%), Engineering (14%), Law (12%), Business Administration (7%), and Other (1%). Therefore, the results of the current study should not necessarily be generalized to people from other geographic areas, minority populations, adults who are generally career-oriented (versus academically-oriented), or to students in other types of schools.

A second limitation has to do with the fact that the current study did not differentiate between those who have been mentored in the past, but are not currently involved in a mentoring dyad, and those who have not been mentored in the past, but are currently involved in a mentoring dyad. Although it is difficult to speculate how the responses might differ, past social experiences, interactions, and expertise (e.g., as found in role modeling) do help to shape current thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Bandura, 1977).

A third limitation has to do with counterbalancing of the statements/questions on the questionnaire. Due to the confidential nature of the graduate student e-mail list, it was not possible to address counterbalancing issues such as statement/question ordering, respondent fatigue, or response-choice bias. Since the prospect of being able to partition
the list in any manner was not an option, carryover effects related to ordering, fatigue, or bias should be considered to be a potential weakness of the study.

Although some might consider the issue tenuous, another consideration nevertheless has to do with the nature of the scales used. For example, the Psychological Well-being Scale (Nowack, 1990), the GHQ-12 (Goldberg, 1972, 1978; Goldberg et al., 1997), the RSES (Rosenberg, 1965, 1989), and the NGSE (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001), do not specifically address the nature of the mentoring dyad. Instead, these scales were originally designed for the general population. Perhaps questionnaires that specifically address the nature of the mentoring dyad would produce support for the hypotheses.

Not only are the scales designed for a broad audience, but the audiences’ responses may well reflect the notion that multiple factors can be related to each of the constructs. For instance, Rosenberg’s Self-esteem Scale was designed as a unidimensional measure of global feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance (Bringle, Phillips, & Hudson, 2004). One of the questions reads, “I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others”. However, one cannot speculate on the respondents’ thought processes just prior to offering a reply: Was the respondent thinking about academia, a current job, a newly learned skill, a high school bully, the professor who now offers unconditional regard and support, or something else entirely? Therefore, the nature of the questions requires respondents to somehow “compartmentalize” the total construct package, and then to do so for each of the questions being asked throughout. Finally, it cannot be assumed that the mentoring dyad is the primary focus when responding; responses will be mediated by multiple factors.
Similarly, although the additional variables of Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction, Program Support/Value, and Career Goals (B. Gilbreath, personal communication, March 6, 2006) are associated with graduate student experiences, they too, can be a part of a more complex mentoring experience. For instance, a student could have a really effective mentor, but if he or she is not doing well in the statistics course, the responses might be different if the student had a really effective mentor and was doing exceptionally well in the statistics course.

Since it did not appear that there were currently any scales available that adequately measure the idiosyncratic nature of the mentoring relationship, the current study was an attempt at adding validation evidence to the notion of the ideal mentor. The concept of an ideal mentor may be a factor in the way protégés choose to seek out mentors to first assist them in understanding the graduate school culture and then to succeed within that culture. The relationship between the ability to make sound choices and mentoring relationship quality would be a topic worthy of subsequent exploration.

A final consideration was that although the cover letter and the questionnaire’s introductory paragraphs explained the general nature of a mentoring relationship to the participants, there are still no guarantees that the responses were reflective of mentoring behaviors, exclusive of advising behaviors. Oftentimes, students are paired with advisors who exhibit behaviors that may be characteristic (or not) of mentoring. Nevertheless, advising and mentoring are not one and the same. An advising relationship involves more consultation-type interactions and tends to be less reciprocal than a mentoring relationship (Barker, 2006). The respondent may have provided answers that would lead one to believe that a mentoring relationship existed, while in reality the relationship may
have been more characteristic of an advising relationship. Since the present study addressed possible outcomes of the mentoring relationship, future investigations could attempt to sort out the differences between the constructs of mentoring and advising. Research such as this would shed light on ways that both parties in a mentoring relationship could more clearly delineate the roles of each, with the ultimate goal of further cultivating and improving the relationship.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Given that mentoring is a complex and dynamic relationship (Barker, 2006; Hansman, 2003; Kram, 1983; O’Neil & Wrightsman, 1982; Wilkes, 2006), it is but one component of graduate school fulfillment and graduate students’ perceptions of success, satisfaction, and well-being. Future endeavors could include the development of an evaluation tool that measures the degree of satisfaction from various contributions. Aspects such as curriculum quality, course availability, instructional quality, job preparation, internship opportunities, library resource quality, financial support, peer support, and overall organizational climate each make unique contributions to graduate school satisfaction (see El Ansari & Oskrochi, 2006; Glenn, 2001; Grimmett, Bliss, Davis, & Ray, 1998; Ramanan, Taylor, Davis, & Phillips, 2006; Roberts & Sprague, 1995 for reviews). Indeed, each feature has the potential to impact responses which are dependent upon the mentoring relationship. If students are unhappy about the lack of internship opportunities, for example, the mentoring relationship may become strained. The mentor may have little, if any, control over such opportunities and is often at the mercy of the department represented. Possible future investigations could include factor analytic studies that examine how mentoring loads on various measures of satisfaction.
Overall, the results of this study demonstrated the validity of the IMS for graduate students and that the three AMS subscales (integrity, guidance, and relationship) were measuring the same constructs as the IMS subscales. Additionally, the analysis showed mixed results regarding the actual mentoring received and various outcomes. All told, the results of this study suggest that the mere presence of a mentor is not the same as a high quality mentoring relationship (see Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). Although successfully standing up to the rigors of graduate school is not always an easy task, it is hoped that by quantifying the desired (i.e., ideal), the reality (i.e., actual), and various outcomes, the current study will shed light on future research with an aim toward better understanding the mentoring relationship.
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Appendix A

Ideal Mentor Scale

*Directions:* Answer each item by circling a number 1–5 according to the following importance rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Minimally important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Reasonably important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I think about characteristics in a mentor that are important to me, here’s what my IDEAL mentor would be like: Right now, at this stage of my program, my ideal mentor would...

1. ...show me how to employ relevant research techniques. 1 2 3 4 5
2. ...give me specific assignments related to my research problem. 1 2 3 4 5
3. ...give proper credit to graduate students. 1 2 3 4 5
4. ...take me out for dinner and/or drink after work. 1 2 3 4 5
5. ...prefer to cooperate with others than compete with them. 1 2 3 4 5
6. ...help me to maintain a clear focus on my research. 1 2 3 4 5
7. ...respect the intellectual property rights of others. 1 2 3 4 5
8. ...be a role model. 1 2 3 4 5
9. ...brainstorm solutions to a problem concerning my research project. 1 2 3 4 5
10. ...be calm and collected in times of stress. 1 2 3 4 5
11. ...be interested in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition. 1 2 3 4 5
12. ...treat me as an adult who has a right to be involved in decisions that affect me. 1 2 3 4 5
13. ...help me plan the outline for a presentation of my research. 1 2 3 4 5
14. ...inspire me by his or her example and words. 1 2 3 4 5
15. ...rarely feel fearful or anxious. 1 2 3 4 5
16. ...help me investigate a problem I am having with research design. 1 2 3 4 5
17. ...accept me as a junior colleague. 1 2 3 4 5
18. ...be seldom sad or depressed. 1 2 3 4 5
19. ...advocate for my needs and interests. 1 2 3 4 5
20. ...talk to me about his or her personal problems. 1 2 3 4 5
21. ...generally try to be thoughtful and considerate. 1 2 3 4 5
22. ...be a cheerful, high-spirited person. 1 2 3 4 5
23. ...value me as a person. 1 2 3 4 5
24. ...have coffee or lunch with me on occasion. 1 2 3 4 5
25. ...keep his or her workspace neat and clean. 1 2 3 4 5
26. ...believe in me. 1 2 3 4 5
27. ...meet with me on a regular basis. 1 2 3 4 5
28. ...relate to me as if he/she is a responsible, admirable older sibling. 1 2 3 4 5
29. ...recognize my potential. 1 2 3 4 5
30. ...help me to realize my life vision. 1 2 3 4 5
31. ...help me plan a timetable for my research. 1 2 3 4 5
32. ...work hard to accomplish his/her goals. 1 2 3 4 5
33. ...provide information to help me understand the subject matter I am researching. 1 2 3 4 5
34. ...be generous with time and other resources. 1 2 3 4 5

Integrity item numbers (14 items): 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 29, 32
Guidance item numbers (10 items): 1, 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 27, 31, 33, 34
Relationship item numbers (10 items): 4, 11, 15, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 28, 30
Appendix B

Actual Mentor Scale

**Directions:** Answer each item by circling a number 1 – 6 according to the following frequency rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>As much as could be expected</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I think about my relationship with a specific mentor, here’s what has ACTUALLY taken place: At some point in the past, **my mentor has...**

1. ...shown me how to employ relevant research techniques. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. ...given me specific assignments related to my research problem. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. ...given proper credit to graduate students. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. ...taken me out for dinner an/or drink after work 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. ...preferred to cooperate with others, rather than compete with them. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. ...helped me to maintain a clear focus on my research. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. ...respected the intellectual property rights of others. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. ...been a role model. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. ...brainstormed solutions to a problem concerning my research project. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. ...been calm and collected in times of stress. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. ...been interested in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. ...treated me as an adult who has a right to be involved in decisions that affect me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. ...helped me plan the outline for a presentation of my research. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. ...inspired me by his or her example and words. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. ...rarely felt fearful or anxious. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. ...helped me investigate a problem I was having with research design. 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. ...accepted me as a junior colleague. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. ...been seldom sad or depressed.
19. ...advocated for my needs and interests.
20. ...talked to me about his or her personal problems.
21. ...generally tried to be thoughtful and considerate.
22. ...been a cheerful, high-spirited person.
23. ...valued me as a person.
24. ...had coffee or lunch with me on occasion.
25. ...kept his or her workspace neat and clean.
26. ...believed in me.
27. ...met with me on a regular basis.
28. ...related to me as if he/she was a responsible, admirable older sibling.
29. ...recognized my potential.
30. ...helped me to realize my life vision.
31. ...helped me plan a timetable for my research.
32. ...worked hard to accomplish his/her goals.
33. ...provided information to help me understand the subject matter I was researching.
34. ...been generous with time and other resources.
35. ...had experience in his/her field.
36. ...had a lot of intellectual curiosity.
37. ...could be counted on to follow through when s/he made a commitment.
38. ...treated research data in an ethical fashion.
39. ...communicated openly, clearly, and effectively.
40. ...been available to students to discuss academic problems.
41. ...challenged students to explore alternative approaches to a problem.
42. ...provided honest feedback (both good and bad) to students about their work.
43. ...expressed a belief in the students’ capabilities.
Appendix C

Psychological Well-being Scale

**Directions**: Please answer each item by circling a number 1 – 5 to indicate the degree to which the following statements represent how you’ve been feeling during the last 3 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel happy and satisfied with my social life. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I feel stimulated and challenged by my work and life. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I am able to relax and enjoy myself without difficulty. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I feel mentally and physically calm, relaxed, and free of tension. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I wake up anticipating an exciting and interesting day ahead. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I feel sincerely loved, wanted and supported by others. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I genuinely enjoy the things that I’m involved in. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I feel that my future looks hopeful and promising. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I feel positive, confident, and secure with myself. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I am pleased with my life overall. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I feel committed to my present day-to-day activities and relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I feel satisfied with personal and professional accomplishments. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix D

General Health Questionnaire-12

**Directions:** Please read the following statements and circle the answer that you think most relates to you over the last few weeks.

**Have you recently:**

1. Been able to concentrate on whatever you’re doing?
   - Better than usual
   - Same as usual
   - Less than usual
   - Much less than usual

2. Lost much sleep over worry?
   - Not at all
   - No more than usual
   - Rather more than usual
   - Much more than usual

3. Felt that you are playing a useful part in things?
   - More so than usual
   - Same as usual
   - Less useful than usual
   - Much less useful

4. Felt capable of making decisions about things?
   - More so than usual
   - Same as usual
   - Less so than usual
   - Much less capable

5. Felt constantly under strain?
   - Not at all
   - No more than usual
   - Rather more than usual
   - Much more than usual

6. Felt you couldn’t overcome your difficulties?
   - Not at all
   - No more than usual
   - Rather more than usual
   - Much more than usual

7. Been able to enjoy your normal day to day activities?
   - More so than usual
   - Same as usual
   - Less so than usual
   - Much less than usual
8. Been able to face up to your problems?

| More so than usual | Same as usual | Less able than usual | Much less able |

9. Been feeling unhappy and depressed?

| Not at all | No more than usual | Rather more than usual | Much more than usual |

10. Been losing confidence in yourself?

| Not at all | No more than usual | Rather more than usual | Much more than usual |

11. Been thinking of yourself as a worthless person?

| Not at all | No more than usual | Rather more than usual | Much more than usual |

12. Been feeling reasonably happy, all things considered?

| More so than usual | About same as usual | Less so than usual | Much less than usual |
Appendix E
Rosenberg’s Self-esteem Scale

Directions: For the items below, indicate the degree to which each statement represents your personal reactions or feelings by circling the appropriate response.

1. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me

3. *All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me

5. *I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me

6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me

8. *I wish I could have more respect for myself.
   Not at all like me  Somewhat unlike me  Neither like nor unlike me  Somewhat like me  Very much like me
9. *I certainly feel useless at times.

Not at all  Somewhat  Neither like  Somewhat  Very much
like me    unlike me  nor unlike me  like me  like me

10. *At times I think I am no good at all.

Not at all  Somewhat  Neither like  Somewhat  Very much
like me    unlike me  nor unlike me  like me  like me

**Items marked with an asterisk (items 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10) are reverse-coded.**
Appendix F

Satisfaction with Mentor Scale

**Directions:** Indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My mentor is someone I am satisfied with. 1 2 3 4 5
2. *My mentor fails to meet my needs.* 1 2 3 4 5
3. *My mentor disappoints me.* 1 2 3 4 5
4. My mentor has been effective in his/her role. 1 2 3 4 5

**Items marked with an asterisk (items 2 and 3) are reverse-coded.**
Appendix G

New General Self-efficacy Scale

Directions: Indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate response.

1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
Appendix H

Program/Academic Unit Satisfaction Scale

**Directions:** Indicate your degree of agreement with the following statement by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Very much Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am satisfied with my graduate program.  
   1  2  3  4  5
Appendix I

Program Support/Value Scale

**Directions:** Indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I feel valued by my graduate program.  
3. I feel supported by my graduate program.
Appendix J

Career Goals Scale

*Directions:* Indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Very much Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I am clear about my career goals.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. I have a good understanding of what to expect, career-wise, after graduation.  
   1 2 3 4 5
Appendix K

Demographics

Finally, the following questions are simply used to help analyze the results of this questionnaire. It is important to remember that all of your responses will be kept completely CONFIDENTIAL. Data will be presented only in grouped average format. Your honesty is appreciated.

1. If you did identify a mentor, approximately how long would you estimate the length of the relationship?
   a. Less than six months
   b. Six months to one year
   c. Between one and three years
   d. More than three years
   e. I did not identify a mentor

2. If you did identify a mentor, this person was...
   a. Inside my academic program
   b. Outside my academic program
   c. I did not identify a mentor

3. The relationship could best be described as...
   a. Informal (e.g., initiated by either you or the mentor)
   b. Formal (e.g., initiated by your organization)
   c. I did not identify a mentor

4. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

5. What is (or was) the gender of your mentor?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. I did not identify a mentor

6. In which degree program are you enrolled?
   a. Master’s
   b. Ph.D.
   c. Other (please specify)

7. In which academic division are you enrolled?
   a. Arts and Sciences
   b. Business Administration
   c. Education/Allied Professions
   d. Engineering
e. Law
f. Other

8. Within your division, which graduate school program are you pursuing? ______

9. Approximately how far along are you toward degree completion?
   a. Less than 25%
   b. 25%
   c. 50%
   d. 75%
   e. More than 75%

10. Aside from coursework, describe the nature of the work that you need to complete in order to qualify for your degree.
   a. Thesis
   b. Dissertation
   c. Group project
   d. Portfolio
   e. Internship
   f. Other (please specify)

11. How do you describe yourself?
   a. Caucasian
   b. Black or African American
   c. Latin American, South American, Central American, or other Hispanic
   d. Puerto Rican
   e. Mexican American
   f. Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
   g. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   h. Other
   i. Do not wish to disclose

12. What is your age?
   a. Under 20
   b. 21 – 30
   c. 31 – 40
   d. 41 – 50
   e. 51 – 60
   f. Over 70

13. Now, take just one more moment to reflect on your experiences...If you could send a single message about mentoring to other adults today, what would it be? (Please write your response below).
Appendix L

Letter to Participants

February 1, 2007

FROM:
Kim Dietrich, Graduate Student
Department of Psychology
University of Dayton
300 College Park
Dayton, OH 45469-1430

Dear Participant:

Because you are special—you are a person who has gone above and beyond in order to pursue your graduate school aspirations—you now have the opportunity to share some of your experiences with other individuals who value important relationships. As you reflect on your educational/professional development, I suspect that there have been—and still are—a few people who’ve provided support and encouragement along the way. This is a survey that looks at your relationships with these people.

I am a graduate student of psychology at the University of Dayton (UD). The purpose of this letter is to request your participation in a master’s thesis research study that will assess some of the possible variables that may or may not contribute to your accomplishments. Here are some specifics regarding the study:

- Your participation is strictly voluntary. Although no discomfort is anticipated in your responding, you may cease participation at any time.
- The questionnaire format is user-friendly and fast.
- All answers will remain confidential; no identifying information will be included.
- Only group or mean scores will be tabulated; no individual responses will be published in the results.
- The results will be used for knowledge advancement in the areas of leadership, education, and psychology, as well as in other areas of adult development.
- While there are no right or wrong answers, your candid answers are important in that they provide accuracy throughout the study.
- The questionnaire will probably take **less than 20 minutes** to complete.
- If you leave the questionnaire, you may resume it at a later time; however, you must use the same computer for access and you will need to re-enter answers from that particular page.

Allow yourself to indulge for just a few minutes. And as you do, you may recall those special people in your life who’ve supported and encouraged you, and you may even smile and find yourself with a sense of appreciation. Additionally, participating in this study might even provide you with a good feeling inside, knowing that you are helping
another student to gain understanding and also accomplish something worthwhile.

Simply click on this link to begin:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=364343088714

(Please note: If clicking on the link does not take you to the site, then simply copy and paste the link into your Internet Explorer browser.)

Sincerely,

Kim Dietrich
Graduate Student, General Psychology
dietrike@notes.udayton.edu
937-229-2715 or 937-229-2713

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact me, or my thesis chair, Dr. Susan Davis at: Susan.Davis@notes.udayton.edu (St. Joseph’s 327; telephone: 937-229-1345). If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the chair of the Research Review and Ethics Committee, Dr. Greg Elvers at: Greg.Elvers@notes.udayton.edu (St. Joseph’s 312; telephone: 937-229-2171).
Appendix M

Debriefing

I would like to thank you for your contribution to the present research on mentoring. Because of your helpfulness, researchers will be better prepared to understand the importance of healthy mentoring relationships.

The mentoring relationship is both a personal and professional development process that can be used effectively in various forms in almost any career domain. The cultivation of the process has been associated with positive outcomes such as reduced stress and job turnover, job satisfaction, increased promotions, increased job performance, and higher salaries. However, the present research is an attempt to assess peoples’ notions of their ideal versus actual experiences. My hypothesis is that the closer the actual experience is to the ideal mentor notion, the better the personal and professional outcomes.

One application of the present research includes being able to identify potential mentors based on characteristics of the perceived ideal mentor. Another potential application is that of evaluating the mentoring relationship that has occurred as a result of that identification.

Whether or not you are already in a mentoring relationship, it is an advantage to know how to better facilitate present and future relationships towards successful outcomes. It is my hope, that by sharing your experiences (whether good ones or otherwise), that you have learned a little more about important personal and professional relationships.

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact me, or my thesis chair, Dr. Susan Davis at: Susan.Davis@notes.udayton.edu (St. Joseph’s 327; telephone: 937-229-1345). If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the chair of the Research Review and Ethics Committee, Dr. Greg Elvers at: Greg.Elvers@notes.udayton.edu (St. Joseph’s 312; telephone: 937-229-2171).

I will be happy to share the findings of this study with you; you can view the complete rationale and results of the study by accessing the published thesis, on the second floor of UD’s Roesch Library, by Spring 2007. In addition, I have included below a few references about mentoring, its advantages, and one focus that I have in conducting my research—identifying the ideal mentor. I would be happy to hear any additional comments you have about mentoring. If you are interested in the mentoring process at the University of Dayton, you can contact: University of Dayton Women’s Center, 212 Alumni Hall, Dayton, OH 45469-0322; telephone: (937) 229-5390; or: http://womenscenter.udayton.edu.

References


*Please note:* You may save and/or immediately print a copy of this form for future reference.
Appendix N

Follow-up e-mail

Dear Participant,

Within the past couple of weeks you should have received a brief survey regarding mentoring relationships. If you have already responded to the questionnaire, I offer you my sincere thanks. If you would still like the opportunity to share your experiences (good, bad, or indifferent), as well as contribute something valuable to other individuals, organizations, and the mentoring literature, you still have time to do so. Remember, even if you have never had someone you would consider to be a mentor, your information is still valuable, and I do appreciate your effort. Simply click on this link:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=364343088714

Thank you so much!

Sincerely,

Kim Dietrich,
UD Graduate Student