1987

# A Comparison Of Formally Mentored And Unmentored Participants Of A Women'S Leadership Training Institute

Margaret Ann Fallon
*Indiana State University*

Order Number 8727273

# A comparison of formally mentored and unmentored participants of a women's Leadership Training Institute

Fallon, Margaret Ann Wichers, Ph.D.

Indiana State University, 1987



U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

# VITA

## Margaret Ann Wichers Fallon

Born: June 19, 1946

Muscatine, Iowa

Educational Experience:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A.A. | Muscatine Community College | 1966 |
| B.S.E. | Northeast Missouri State University<br>Speech/Theatre/English Education | 1974 |
| M.A. | Northeast Missouri State University<br>Counseling and Guidance | 1975 |

Professional Experience:

Therapist
Hutchinson and Associates
Kansas City, Missouri 1986-1987

Instructor
Avila College
Kansas City, Missouri 1985-1986

Assessment Team Psychologist
Regional Diagnostic Center
St. Joseph, Missouri 1984-1985

Director
AWAKEN Counseling and Adult Re-Entry Center
Women's Program
Lake Land Community College
Mattoon, Illinois 1978-1982

Counselor
Student Counseling Center
Lake Land College
Mattoon, Illinois 1976-1978

Director of Counseling, Counselor
Clark County R1 Schools
Kahoka, Missouri 1975-1976

# A COMPARISON OF FORMALLY MENTORED AND UNMENTORED PARTICIPANTS OF A WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Department of Counseling Psychology

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Margaret Ann Wichers Fallon

May 1987

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation of Margaret Ann Wichers Fallon, Contribution to the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University, Series III, Number 402, under the title A Comparison of Formally Mentored and Unmentored Participants of a Women's Leadership Training Institute is approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

5/4/87
Date

J. Laurence Passmore
Chairperson

Rebecca Chaney
Committee Member

Ellen J. Brown
Committee Member

Russell L. Hamm
Committee Member

Deborah L. Watts
Committee Member

May 4, 1987
Date

Stephen E. Connelly
For the School of Graduate Studies

# ABSTRACT

A comparison of formally mentored and unmentored participants of a Women's Leadership Institute was made utilizing instruments representing six variables reported in the research literature as outcomes of successful informal mentoring relationships. The six variables included job advancement, creativity, job satisfaction, salary increase, self esteem and social status.

The instruments used in an attempt to objectively compare the two groups were the CREE Questionnaire, the Minnesota Questionnaire, the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire, and the Rosenburg Self Esteem Scale.

Fifty formally mentored and fifty unmentored subjects were each randomly assigned to predictor profile groups of 30 and validation groups of 20. Discriminate analysis was used on the two groups of 30 to generate a prediction profile for mentored individuals. The remaining two groups of 20 were then examined to determine the validity of the original prediction equation. A chi square analysis was used to determine the number of correct and incorrect classifications of the variables.

Results revealed that three of the six variables used in comparison were found to be significant--salary increase, job satisfaction and self esteem. The variables promotion, social status and creativity were not signifi-

cant. The prediction equation was not validated by the second group of subjects. Though the three variables were identified as predictors of group membership, the amount of difference in classification between the two groups was not significant.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this endeavor to my Godmother and Aunt, Dorathea Wichers, without whose modeling and support--both financial and psychological--I would never have been able to achieve this degree. She is without a doubt my first true and continuing mentor.

I would like to thank the members of my committee: Dr. J. Lawrence Passmore, Dr. Debby Watts, Dr. Reece Chaney, Dr. Glen Brown, and Dr. Russ Hamm, for their investment of time and effort, constructive feedback, and contributions to my development as a scholar, researcher and person.

To Dr. Lawrence Passmore, my great appreciation for the chairing of the dissertation committee, assistance in direction and design, and encouragement to choose a topic in my long term area of interest, career advancement potential of women.

I would like to thank Dr. Debby Watts for her insightful co-direction of the content of this study, as well as her empathetic advocacy.

I wish to express my gratitude for the assistance of:

Dr. Margaret and Mark Seever who provided invaluable consultation and support regarding statistics and design.

Dr. Joe Doerr, Vice Chancellor of the University of Missouri, Kansas City, who was a valuable reference for

university resources for a far-from-home campus doctoral student.

Marcy Caldwell, Director of the Avila College Leadership Institute for Women, for her many efforts in accessing the subjects for this study.

The Alumni of the Avila Leadership Institute for Women for their volunteer cooperation in completing several extensive instuments.

The Psychodrama Trainers Group at Western Missouri Mental Health and Regional Diagnostic Center--Nancy Richart, Rene Renick, Dr. Ron Szymankowski, and Dave Doolittle--for their reinforcement of my skills, their colleagueship, expertise, unfailing love and support.

The Faculty Association of Lake Land College, Mattoon, Illinois, for having the integrity to support me in my career, thus providing the means for me to finish my doctorate.

Sally Ryan, Marie Kistler and Louise Jackson representing the professional women's network of Coles County, Illinois, who stood up for me and my career in the truest sense of mentoring.

Dr. Merle Ohlsen for being one of the great Group Psychology mentors of all time, and for his continued encouragement of my skills as a group therapist.

Dr. David Gilman for his humanistic help with the doctoral French Proficiency.

Dr. Jack Reiske of Northeast Missouri State University

for his continued support, enthusiasm, and modeling of competence and humanism.

A helping network of past and present I.S.U. doctoral students--especially Dr. Ellie McCabe, Dr. Elfrieda Krebs, Dr. Tim North, Dr. Gary Greven, Dr. John Walker, Dr. Mary Chaney, and Sheri Hatfield, who all extended themselves beyond the norm to directly affect my progress.

Last, but certainly not least, the utmost laud to my daughter Jocelyn, my parents--Margaret and Siegfried Wichers--and myself for having the courage to persist through this process despite personal and professional life traumas.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# Chapter 1

# INTRODUCTION

## Statement of the Problem

The number of women advancing into upper levels of occupational fields remains proportionately low. Although the mentor-protege helping relationship has been explored as a career advancement aid, and the literature indicates that successful men and women report the importance of such a process, the problem remains of increasing the frequency of mentoring experiences to assist more women in their career development. The question is, can these heretofore informal relationships be formalized to provide more access to these helping experiences for the upward movement of women in the workplace? In addition, can the characteristics and outcomes of these relationships be assessed in a concise, objective way to determine if the formal mentorship experience can provide the specific psychological and behavioral benefits mentioned in the literature as resulting from informal meetings in the workplace, i.e., creativity, job advancement, job satisfaction, salary increase, self esteem, and social status?

## Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to compare formally mentored and unmentored participants of a Leadership

Training Institute. It attempted to determine if a formalized mentorship program could duplicate benefits to career advancement attributed in the literature to informal mentor-protégé experiences. Furthermore, because previous research has been primarily descriptive and has concentrated on the subjective perceptions of protégés in defining the benefits of mentorship, this study examined outcomes of the mentor-protégé relationship in a concise, objective manner through several forms of instrumentation.

The Avila College Women's Leadership Institute of Kansas City, Missouri provided the opportunity to investigate unique formalized mentorship experiences for women. In the workplace, informal mentor-protégé relationships are initiated by mentors who choose their protégés. The Avila Institute formalizes this process by assisting Institute participants who volunteer as protégés in obtaining a volunteer mentor. These mentors and protégés are also aided by being informed about the goals and potential positive outcomes of mentoring.

The study of formally mentored and unmentored Avila Leadership Institute Alumnae involved comparison of outcome variables noted in the literature to result from successful informal mentor-protégé relationships. Differences between the two groups were evaluated through the variables of creativity, job advancement (promotion), job satisfaction, salary increase, self esteem, and social status as measured by the respective scores of the CREE Leadership

Inventory, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and questions 19 and 20 of the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire.

## Theoretical Background

According to the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor (1983), "Despite some changes and progress, there remain in place many historical patterns that have the effect of concentrating women in lower paying jobs which offer limited opportunities for advancement" (p. 91). Barnier (1981), reviewing the literature on mentoring, stated that special training and development programs instituted in the 1970's do not appear to have increased the number of women in positions of upper level influence and decision making, e.g., manager, administrator, or full professor. Cronin (1973), Lyon and Saario (1973), and Taylor (1973), in the Phi Delta Kappan, examined the number of women currently in educational leadership roles, the need for an increase, and a plan to deal with essential educational issues involved. Barnier (1981) echoed many other researchers of the career development of women by expressing the concern that new strategies are needed to assist women in career advancement.

A career development strategy that is currently being explored as a possible aid to the advancement of women's career status is the mentor-protégé helping relationship. That liaison, in which an older, experienced, powerful and successful mentor aids in the career devel-

opment and advancement of a less experienced protégé, has been noted as a key factor in the career gains of many professionals. Jennings (1971) found that most male corporate presidents had mentors who were vital to their career success. Roche (1979) reported that nearly two-thirds of the prominent male executives in his study had mentors and the mentored individuals consistently received higher salaries, bonuses, and total compensation than did the unmentored. Dalton, Thompson, and Price (1977) reported that their survey of 550 men in the fields of science, engineering, accounting, and higher education revealed that mentoring was the first of four career stages identified by their subjects as important for self and peer perception of success.

Because of earlier studies relating the success of mentoring for men, recent studies have investigated this concept as an aid for women in their careers. Missirian (1980) stated that a review of the literature revealed no mention of the effect of mentoring upon women managers. Since that time, several studies have been undertaken to explore the mentorship concept for women. However, research in this area is limited, and most of the available studies are descriptive, involving the use of survey questionnaires and, in a few instances, interviews with various groups of upper level women to determine if they report having been mentored. Some of these studies examined the status of mentored women and attempted to define the career development process. Groups that have been assessed in this way

are college and university administrators (Davis, 1984; Follon, 1983; Malone, 1982; McNeer, 1981; Moore, 1983; Nolan, 1982; Queralt, 1981), managers (Phillips, 1977; Vaudrin, 1983), academic women (Fowler, 1980; Melillo, 1981), public school administrators (Robinson, 1981), state agencies (Ryan, 1983), law students (Katz, 1980), psychotherapists (Arbetter, 1980), and school of education graduate students (Busch, 1985). Other studies examined the nature of the mentor-protégé relationship of successful women from surveys of various groups in upper level positions and attempted to report characteristics, stages, and models. Parkham (1982), Kram (1983), and Bearden (1984) developed stages of mentoring from the relationships of the women they studied. Gilmour (1983) and Gordon (1983) developed models of this helping process. Outcomes of mentor-protégé relationships women experienced were described from the results of surveys given by Alleman (1982; 1984), Pierce (1983), Hanson (1983), and Villani (1983). The impact of sex of mentor and protégé in the workplace was investigated by Clawson and Kram (1984) and in academia by Shockett (1984).

Successful men and women report mentoring as a key experience which they feel benefited their career advancement and success. Yet the problem remains that few women reach the upper echelons of influence. It has been suggested that women may have less chance for the mentoring experience as it occurs in the natural work environment.

Larwood and Blackmore (1978) found that same-sex

acquaintances are solicited more frequently than cross-sex acquaintances because people groom for leadership those with whom they enjoy an in-group relationship. As most occupants of upper level positions of power are male; they are, then, thought to be likely to select males to groom for advancement. In addition, Staines, Tarvis, and Jayaratne (1974) found a shortage of available women mentors due to the lack of women in upper level positions who would be able to perform this helping function. They also discovered that some successful women executives exhibited what they call a "queen bee syndrome" exemplifying a set of attitudes that makes them resistant to increasing the number of women in the organization because they want to preserve their unique status in a man's world.

Orth and Jacobs (1976), in the Harvard Business Review, stated that there is a major problem organizations face in advancing women--that the traditional sex role stereotypes of male and female behaviors cause resistance to change. They felt, however, that "some changes can be initiated that may be perceived as nonthreatening by everyone, that clearly benefit the company, and that improve the picture as far as women are concerned" (p. 32). They go on to suggest training programs designed to assist men and women in addressing these issues productively in the work place. Gordon and Meredith (1982) note that it is important for any organization to effectively monitor the flow of managerial talent through the ranks. They reported that the

retention and promotion of qualified managers enhance the capacity and long-term strategic advantage of a company or agency. They also stated that the majority of organizations do not perform this function well for men or women. "The problem, as we defined it, was that of creating a model to assist executives in monitoring the flow of managerial resources, including women and minorities through the ranks" (p. 47).

Baron (1982), in her study of 8,000 managers, suggested that a company earnestly dedicated to promoting women into the upper management hierarchy should put women with male mentors or supervisors who have a high degree of education and experience in working with women as peers and colleagues. Her research revealed that these men are less likely to believe the negative stereotypes about women advancing to leadership roles. Phillips-Jones (1983) stated that "arranged" relationships between mentors and mentees have been implemented in a few organizations in the public and private sectors. She reported that formalized mentoring programs have been utilized in the last five to ten years by companies, government agencies, and professional organizations. Each of these programs is considered to be formal because junior employees or new members are linked directly with more senior individuals. These programs are usually for a specific length of time and have optional or required goals and activities. The main goal is to "introduce new people to the inner workings of the organizations and to

help them with career advancement" (Phillips-Jones, 1983, p. 38). Zey (1984) studied several formalized programs and reported common elements which were successful. Mentees are said to favor such programs because they reduce much of the initial shock and ambiguity of joining the group. Organizations are said to favor such programs because it allows closer observation of the skills of both mentors and mentees.

Problems with these formal programs include the lack of research, the multiplicity and inconsistent use of terms and goals, and the failure to provide consistent objective measurement of outcomes. There are few research studies concerning the assessment of formalized programs. Only Alleman (1982) and Alleman, Cochran, Doverspike and Newman (1984) have attempted to study this process in an objective manner. However, they used a personality inventory and an experimental leadership questionnaire to examine differences in mentor and non-mentor behavior. Gordon (1983) reported that the majority of research on mentorship was vague, generalized, and anecdotal. Speizer (1981) stated, "systematic studies that explore the definition of a mentor and examine what function such a person might perform have yet to be undertaken." The in-house investigation of formal programs appears to mirror this tendency. Evaluation is accomplished by subjective self-report. A continuing formalized mentor program at the Merrill Lynch Company was reported by Farren, Dreyfus-Grey, and Kay (1985) as successful, but no objective measures were used to determine

consistent criteria for "success." Phillips-Jones (1983) reports that the terms used to identify mentors and protégés differ as well as the kinds of help offered. Nina Colwill (1984), Ganz-Sarto (1985), and Zey (1985) reported that existing research is questionable due to the lack of usage of a standard definition of the term mentor. Therefore, current formalized programs may or may not include all the elements noted by the literature as those of the "true" mentor-protégé relationship which has been cited as achieving certain desirable advancement outcomes or results. Similarly, there is no objective measurement of such programs.

The mentor-protégé relationship described in the literature as contributing to the outcomes involved in successful career advancement contains specific elements above and beyond what can be taught in educational settings or seminars regarding leadership, management skills, or styles. To determine if formal programs can be developed for women which replicate this experience, an objective way is needed to set up and measure formalized mentoring experiences to determine if this experience produces positive measurable results similar to those indicated in the research literature.

This study attempted to determine if a formal program providing information uniform to that reported as successful in the literature to volunteer mentors and protégés can demonstrate the outcomes attributed to this process. By utilizing instruments rather than merely self-report questionnaires, outcomes can be assessed in an objec-

tive, concise manner.

## Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following terms are operationally defined and used:

Avila College Leadership Institute for Women--A leadership training program for women which consists of 15 sessions on leadership styles and strategies for career advancement. In addition, an optional, formalized mentorship experience is offered upon completion of the 15 sessions. Participants in this study are alumnae of this Institute.

Formalized Mentorship Experience--A mentor-protégé experience in which a third party, such as the Avila Institute, establishes the relationship. Both parties, mentor and protégé, are made aware of the goals and positive outcomes of a mentoring relationship as noted in the research literature.

Informal Mentorship Experience--A mentor-protégé experience in which the relationship occurs naturally in the work place and is not set up by a third party, such as the Avila Institute. Possible outcomes of a mentoring relationship, as noted in the research literature, may or may not be known by mentor and protégé.

Positive Outcomes from Mentoring--For purposes of this study, positive outcomes will be represented by the six variables of creativity, job advancement (promotion), job satisfaction, salary increase, self esteem, and social

status.

## Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made concerning the scope of this study:

1. The instruments used in this study are valid and reliable measures for ascertaining each respective variable they are reported as measuring.

2. Variables measured by instruments used in this study, which are represented as those reported as positive outcomes of mentoring, are reasonable approximations of those reported in the literature.

## Limitations

The following are the limitations of this study:

1. This study was limited to alumnae of the Avila College Leadership Institute for Women.

2. This study was limited to volunteer participants from the Avila Institute Alumnae.

# Chapter 2

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This chapter contains a review of the literature and research which is relevant to the content of this study. Included are sections on the economic status of women, the definition of mentorship and the outcomes of mentorship.

### The Economic Status of Women

This section notes the economic status of women in the American workforce. Presented is statistical information demonstrating the occupational distribution of women which contributes to their economic inequities. Examination of women's economic needs and the current lack of employment in positions which effectively meet these needs explains the concern with career development and advancement which this study addressed.

The Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor (1982) states that 62% of all women aged 18-64 were workers in 1982, compared to 91% of men in the same age group. Women accounted for nearly three-fifths (60%) of the increase in the civilian labor force in the last decade--more than 13 million compared with 9 million men. It is further projected that by the year 1990 more than 70% of all women will be in the labor market.

However, as reported by the U.S. Department of Labor

in 1983, although women are 53% of the total work force, they are still employed predominantly in lower status and lower paying positions. The majority of women are currently working in a very limited number of occupational fields. Women were 80% of all clerical workers in 1981, but only 6% of all craft workers; 62% of service workers, but only 45% of professional (teachers and nurses) and technical workers; 63% of retail sales workers, but only 24% of managers and 5% of top managers.

Women's salaries are 59% (three-fifths) of men's, with $14,192 as the average for women and $22,410 for men. The earnings gap between men and women has continued to widen. A comparison of median earnings for full-time workers by sex, 1955-1977, revealed a gap of $1,911 in 1955 and $3,310 in 1977 (Appendix A, Table 1, Department of Labor, 1983). Data concerning earnings distribution indicate that only 0.9% of women earned $25,000 or more (Appendix A, Table 2, Department of Labor, 1983). Comparison of earnings by sex within occupational groups reveals a dollar gap in every occupational area (Appendix A, Table 3, Department of Labor, 1983). Women workers with four or more years of college had an income slightly above that of men who had only one to three years of high school with $14,679 and $12,177, respectively.

Women are being paid less, yet they need to work. In 1983, two-thirds of all women in the work force were single (25%), divorced (11%), widowed (5%), separated (4%),

or had husbands earning less than $15,000 (21%). Of all women workers, one out of six maintained a family. The proportion of poor families maintained by women increased substantially between 1971 (40%) and 1981 (47%). Contrary to myths about alimony and child support, only 21% of the 44% of cases in which support is awarded receive payment.

Focusing on upper-level positions, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) found that very few women have reached top levels in major companies by holding positions such as president, vice president, chairperson, and chief executive officer where the annual salaries are $100,000 or more. Women employed by the Federal Government as of November 1978, in grades GS-16 through GS-18, had increased from 230 to 260 in one year. During the same time period the number of men at those levels declined from 6,599 to 6,338. Tergborg, Peters, and Ilgen (1977) found differential treatment of male and female leaders regarding selection, remuneration, promotion policies, employee satisfaction and employee development. Stumpf and London (1981), reporting on the individual and organizational factors influencing promotions, found that although performance is a common criterion, its evaluation varies from company to company and is likely to be confounded by sex, race, friendship, and appearance.

Summary

Thus it has been shown that the economic and occupational situation for women needs improvement. Consideration

of additional career development and advancement strategies is therefore warranted. The following section reviews how mentorship has been investigated as a successful career advancement technique that could alleviate (aid) the current economic and occupational status of women.

## The Definition of Mentorship

This section reviews the literature concerning the definition of mentorship and the unique helping components which have been reported as being essential to the success of persons in upper level leadership positions. Examination of this research reveals the nature of this helping process and suggests why this strategy is currently being explored as a career advancement strategy for women.

The mentorship relationship, as described initially by many authors, referred to that process as it occurs with male mentors and protégés. Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee (1978) were the first to give emphasis to the concept in their book Seasons of a Man's Life which described results of a study of the careers of forty Harvard graduates. They defined the mentor relationship as "one of the most complex and developmentally important that a man can have in early adulthood" (p. 48).

> No word currently in use is adequate to convey the nature of the relationship we have in mind here. Words such as "counselor" or "guru" suggest the more subtle meanings, but they have other connotations that would be misleading. The term mentor is generally used in a much narrower sense to mean teacher, advisor, or sponsor. As we use the term, it means all these things and more. The mentoring relationship is often situated in a work setting, and the mentoring functions are taken by a

> teacher, boss, editor, or senior colleague. Mentoring is defined not in terms of formal roles but in terms of the character of the relationship and the functions it serves. A student may receive very little mentoring from his teacher-advisor, and very important mentoring from an older friend or relative. (Levinson, et al., 1978, p. 50)

Levinson goes on to further define the concept of mentor in terms of the functions observed in his study: a teaching function, enhancing skills and development; a sponsor function, facilitating entry and advancement; a host and guide function, initiating the protégé into the social and political circles with accompanying awareness of values, customs, resources, and cast of characters; a model function, exhibiting successful behaviors for the protégé to emulate; and a counselor function, providing counsel and moral support. The most crucial mentor function of all, according to Levinson, is described as that of being the dream facilitator, helping the protégé believe in himself and his ultimate goal of success.

Since Levinson, other studies have confirmed the existence of this type of helping relationship developed in an informal manner with various groups of upper level men and women. Dalton, Thompson, and Price (1977) surveyed 550 male professionals in four career fields, science, engineering, accounting, and higher education, to explore career patterns relating to successful performance. They discovered that having a mentor was the first of four stages that seemed to be experienced by those who were self and peer identified as successful performers in their careers.

Hennig (1970) did an in-depth field study of the life and career histories of 25 top level women executives. She found that relationships with their previous bosses tended to be mentoring ones with advocacy, support, and reinforcement for the subjects. Hennig concluded that the subjects' successes would not have been possible without these supportive helping relationships. Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978) defined the mentor-protégé relationship as the most intense, hierarchical, parental, exclusionary, and elitist of any supportive career relationship. Kantor's (1977) in-depth research on the political system of one corporation also identified the presence of mentors who were at the top of a continuum of helpers as the most powerful, followed in turn by sponsor, guide, and peer pal. Alleman (1982) investigated behaviors and personality differences between mentors and nonmentors. She administered the Jackson Personality Scale, an adjective checklist, a Superior-Subordinate questionnaire and biographical information sheet to 29 mentored and 21 unmentored pairs. Her results indicated that the difference between the two groups was in the behaviors performed by the mentors. Hanson (1973) surveyed 12 subjects from business, professional, and academic areas. She administered a Structural Analysis of Social Behavior Instrument and Interpersonal History Questionnaire and found that differences in the mentor-protégé relationship were related to mentor "types." Roles of the mentors identified by Bearden (1984) in her study of 25 black and 25 white

protégés were teacher, coach, guide, advisor, friend, counselor, and critic.

The reviews of the mentorship research by Hunt and Michael (1983) and Merriam (1983) noted specific mentor characteristics which involve the differences between the mentor and the protégé in terms of the mentor's age, gender, organization position, power, and self-confidence. Mentors are generally older than their protégés as they must have been able to accumulate the experience necessary to benefit the protégé. Levinson et al. (1978) found that mentors were usually older than their protégés by half a generation, approximately 8-15 years. Roche (1979) listed key characteristics of mentors as including: position, power, knowledge, and respect.

Carr-Ruffino (1982) summarized activities attributed to mentoring as follows:

1. Teach, advise, counsel, coach, guide, and sponsor.
2. Give insights into the business.
3. Serve as a sounding board for decision-making.
4. Be a constructive critic.
5. Provide necessary information for career advancement.
6. Show how to move effectively through the system.
7. Help cut through red tape.
8. Teach the "political ropes" and introduce protégé to the right people.
9. Stand up for the protégé in meetings or discussion with his or her peers; defending in case of controversy.

10. Suggest protégé as a likely candidate when appropriate opportunities come along.

11. Increase protégé visibility; single protégé out from the surrounding crowd of competitors and argue protégé's virtues against theirs.

12. Provide an important signal to other people that protégé has his or her backing, helping to provide protégé with an aura of power and upward mobility.

Summary

This section has presented verification and descriptions of informal mentor relationships as observed and described in the literature pertaining to the career development of men and women. Thus the informal existence of such helpers has been demonstrated. The next section explores the outcomes of such experiences for protégés as they have been reported in the research literature.

## The Outcomes of Mentorship

This section explores the research which has assessed outcomes of mentor-protégé relationships as they occur informally in the environment. Positive career gains reported are an incentive for consideration of increasing the frequency of these relationships in formalized programs, as this study attempted to assess.

Jennings (1971) found that most corporate presidents in his study reported that having a mentor was vital to helping them in their career advancement, providing inside information, psychological support, candid constructive criticism, and positioning into advancement opportunities.

From a population of 1,250, two-thirds of the mentored participants in Roche's (1979) study of Heidrick and Struggles, Inc., had received higher salaries, bonuses, and total compensation than those executives who were not mentored. White's (1970) subjects reported that mentoring reinforcement was helpful in the development of commitment and self-image development. The executives which Levinson, et al. (1978) and Kram (1980) interviewed reported that results of mentoring include positive and secure self-image and help in the integration of career and family responsibility.

Phillips (1977) interviewed 331 subjects and examined data on 2,312 women managers and executives. Her subjects identified the following kinds of mentoring assistance: encouragement and recognition of potential, instruction and training, provision of opportunities and responsibilities, advice and counsel, help with career moves, inspiration and role modeling, visibility, friendship, and exposure to power.

Torrance (1983) reported that his 22 year longitudinal study of 96 males and 116 females suggested a significant relationship between mentoring and creativity. Criteria examined involved the following: (a) rated quality of highest adult creative achievement, (b) rated creativeness of future career image, (c) number of recognized creative achievements, and (d) number of creative lifestyles.

Villani (1983) did in-depth interviews with nine

mentor-protégé pairs of women in educational administration. They found that the following benefits were reported: overcoming political barriers, support, encouragement, and having a catalyst for formulation of a career dream.

Self-concept was reported as more enhanced by mentor than by parents in a study by Hanson (1983). She surveyed 12 subjects from academic, professional, and business settings.

Pierce (1983) surveyed 224 female and 241 male A.P.A. psychologists who received their doctorates between 1966-1976. She found that the men, and the mentored had more publications to their credit.

Queralt (1981) explored by self-report questionnaire outcomes of mentoring experiences for university faculty members and academic administrators. She found that a higher percent of the mentored had published articles, received grants, assumed leadership roles, gained full professorship, achieved higher incomes from professional activities, reported higher levels of job satisfaction, published more books, and served as an editor of publications a greater number of times.

Summary

Many career development and advancement outcomes are reported to result from informal mentoring experiences. As the number of these experiences are limited by the informal selection process, the need to examine formalized mentorship experiences is apparent.

In addition, mentoring outcome research has been primarily descriptive. Examination of this process in a uniform and concise manner by the use of instruments which are designed to measure results of the mentoring process in an objective manner can aid in more realistic evaluation.

# Chapter 3

# PROCEDURES

This study compared groups of participants in a leadership training institute who chose and who did not choose to experience a formalized mentorship component. In this section, the design and procedures for the study are presented including: sample description, design, instrumentation, research questions, data collection, statistical treatment, and delimitations.

## Sample of the Study

The sample of subjects for this study was taken from the 400 alumnae of the Avila College Leadership Institute of Kansas City. Participants in the Avila Leadership Institute were nominated by other individuals or organizations for their leadership potential. Nominees were then evaluated and selected by the Avila Institute Director on the basis of criteria noted on the nomination form (see Appendix B). All Institute alumnae had experienced 15 sessions on leadership strategies and styles (see Appendix B). From the group of 400 alumnae, two categories of subjects were selected for comparison:

Group 1: Participants of the Avila Leadership Institute who did elect to participate in the formalized mentorship component.

Group 2: Participants of the Avila Leadership Institute who did not elect to participate in the formalized mentorship component.

Participation in the study was on a volunteer basis. Invitations to participate in the study were mailed to all of the 400 alumnae with updated addresses, which represented a total of 100 formally mentored and 200 unmentored. Due to the length of time the Institute has existed, seven and one half years, some alumnae had moved to other areas and were no longer accessible. Of the 55% of mentored alumnae who 60 returned questionnaires, 5% were eliminated due to errors in completion. Of the 32% of unmentored alumnae who returned questionnaires, 7% were eliminated due to errors in completion.

A random sample of equal groups of 30 each were drawn from a pool of 50 formally mentored and 50 unmentored subjects to be used in discriminate analysis to generate a predictor profile for mentored individuals.

The remaining sample of subjects from each of the two groups was examined to determine the validity of the original prediction equation.

## Design

This was a descriptive study utilizing correlational methods, specifically discriminate analysis, to compare the differences between mentored and unmentored subjects. In addition, a validation sample was employed to test the results of the discriminate analysis equation.

## Instrumentation

The following instruments were utilized in this study:

### The CREE Questionnaire

The CREE Questionnaire is a semi-disguised psychological test designed to assess an individual's creative leadership potential. The CREE was developed by L. L. Thurstone and T. G. Melinger at the Psychometric Laboratory of the University of North Carolina under a grant from the General Motors Corporation and further developed by the Human Resources Center of the University of Chicago. The CREE has been normed on a variety of higher level personnel, including managers, professional personnel in staff positions, engineers, sales representatives and their managers, and school administrators.

Each of the 145 items in the questionnaire asks the subject to respond in terms of whether or not the behavior described is typical of him/her. The subject can respond in three ways: by circling a "Y" if the answer is "Yes"; an "N" if the answer is "No"; or a "?" if the answer is undecided. The subject's overall creative potential is based on the number of times his/her responses are the same as those of norm groups of identified creative, innovative individuals. In addition to the score for Overall Creative Potential, the CREE provides scores on 13 technical dimensions (scales).

The CREE Questionnaire was chosen for this study

because the 13 technical dimensions of which the CREE is composed represent some of the variables noted in the research literature as positive outcomes of the informal mentor-protege experience. The 13 dimensions of the CREE are grouped into four categories:

1. Social Orientation Dimensions

    a. Dominance vs. Submission
    b. Indifference vs. Involvement
    c. Independence vs. Conformity

2. Work Orientation

    a. Unstructured vs. Structured Situation
    b. Unsystematic Selective vs. Systematic Prescribed Activity
    c. Personally Involved vs. Detached Attitude
    d. Pressure vs. Relaxed Structure

3. Internal Functioning

    a. High-energy vs. Low-energy
    b. Fast vs. Slow Reaction
    c. High Ideational vs. Low Ideational Spontaneity

4. Interests and Skills

    a. High vs. Low Scientific and Theoretical
    b. High vs. Low Artistic
    c. High vs. Low Mechanical

In this study the overall score was used to represent the variable of creativity. The score from scale one was used to represent the variable of social status.

Validity/Reliability. Several approaches were taken in the investigation of the validity of the CREE Questionnaire scores according to the CREE Manual (1967). However, it should be noted that neither the manual nor the research department of the London House Publishing Company, which

distributes the instrument, could provide specific data on validity. Information on reliability was not included. Munger, reviewing the CREE in The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, noted the lack of data and suggested that the instrument should be considered only as a "well designed experimental test with certain research findings which need to be studied in each new environment."

According to the CREE Manual (1967), a general approach to validity was achieved through correlational analyses. Examination of intercorrelations among its scoring variables yielded information about its internal structure and cohesiveness. The manual stated that construct validity was determined by analyzing the correlations of the CREE variables with scores from other instruments whose validity had been established in other studies. No specific examples were given. Validity for occupational placement was undertaken in two ways. Initial study showed that scores on the CREE could differentiate between occupational groups which differed widely by type and level of functioning in the organization. More recent studies have shown that it could differentiate in the more stringent comparisons across levels of functioning within a number of traditional job hierarchies.

Another approach noted in the CREE Manual was the use of the CREE with other psychological tests in traditional performance criterion validation studies. Validity for job performance was done with a comparison of the mean scores of

groups of incumbents at three levels in each of two traditional functional departments in organizations. The significance of the differences among the mean scores of the hierarchical groups on each dimension of the CREE and for the overall score was tested through a one-way analysis of variance. A study of these in combination with the profiled scores revealed that in the line-management hierarchy, there is a systematic increase in creative potential evident in the successive positions. In the management of professionals hierarchy, although the first two groups are at about the same level, the top level managers have a significantly higher level of creative potential with probability of chance difference of 1 in 1,000 or less. Goddard (1980) collected salary data from 1975-1979 (with adjustment for inflation) for line managers and managers of professionals groups. A multiple regression of the CREE dimension scores against the salary criterion produced multiple correlations of .60 and .64 with a probability of 1 in 100 chance association. A study done by the University of Chicago, Industrial Relations Center, Manpower Research and Development Division (1971), investigated the importance of creativity for successful job performance by using the CREE Questionnaire scores together with other psychological tests in traditional performance criterion validation studies. It was found that the CREE contributed to the predictor equation for each of the three criterion measures used in the study, a supervisory paired comparison rating of overall

performance, salary, and tenure between high level railroad executives and engineering and mechanical personnel.

CREE 1

Scale one of the CREE was used to address the variable of social status ability. Scale one was derived from a pattern of social dominance with three main dimensions (CREE Manual, 1967). The first dimension is social leadership which is described as a tendency to seek out and enjoy contact of either structural and formal or less structural and informal group situations. The second dimension of scale one is a liking for communicating with others, as in presiding as the principal speaker in structured and formal circumstances. Self concept is the third dimension and consists of a liking for entertaining others.

Validity/Reliability. The same caution applies to the use of this scale as was mentioned concerning the CREE on an overall score basis. Although factor analysis is mentioned (CREE Manual, 1967), indicating that the individual factors cover a wide range of behaviors, this test is regarded by The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook as an experimental instrument.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is an instrument that measures satisfaction with several aspects of the work environment. Work adjustment is predicted by matching an individual's work personality with work environ-

ments. Work adjustment is defined as how well an individual's abilities correspond to the ability requirements in work and how well his/her needs correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment.

The long-form MSQ consists of 100 items. Each item refers to a reinforcer in the work environment. The respondent indicates how satisfied he/she is with the reinforcers on his/her present job. A Likert Scale of five response alternatives is presented for each item: "Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither (dissatisfied nor satisfied); Satisfied; Very Satisfied." The MSQ scores include:

1. Ability utilization: The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
2. Achievement: The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
3. Activity: Being able to keep busy all the time.
4. Advancement: The chances for advancement on this job.
5. Authority: The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company policies and practices: The way company policies are put into practice.
7. Compensation: My pay and the amount of work I do.
8. Co-workers: The way my co-workers get along with each other.
9. Creativity: The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
10. Independence: The chance to work alone on the job.
11. Moral values: Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
12. Recognition: The praise I get for doing a good

job.

13. Responsibility: The freedom to use my own judgment.

14. Security: The way my job provides for steady employment.

15. Social service: The chance to do things for other people.

16. Social status: The chance to be "somebody" in the community.

17. Supervision: Human relations, the way my boss handles his men.

18. Supervision: Technical, the competence of my supervisor in making decisions.

19. Variety: The chance to do different things from time to time.

20. Working conditions: The working conditions.

The MSQ is self-administered and takes 15-20 minutes to finish with no imposed time limit. Scores are converted to percentiles which can be compared to the appropriate norm groups which correspond to the individual's own profession. Scoring of the MSQ also yields a general satisfaction scale. This scale uses 20 items--one for each of the 20 scales--yielding a score ranging from 20 to 100.

The MSQ was chosen for this study because the scales comprising it contain advancement variables addressed in the literature as positive outcomes of the mentor-protégé relationship. The general satisfaction scale is a measure of a subject's percentage of satisfaction with an overall composite of these 20 scales. This general satisfaction score was used to represent the variables of job satisfaction in the study. A comparison was then made concerning differ-

ences between the two groups of subjects when utilizing norms for satisfaction developed on a top level executive classification.

Validity/Reliability. Albright and Foley, individually reviewing the MSQ in Buro's Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook (1972), found acceptable standards of reliability and somewhat less but adequate reports of validity. Strengths of the instrument are noted by these reviewers that concerned the extensive norms for the long form and the practicality of use surveying large groups with time restrictions. Guion, in Tests and Reviews: Vocations (1968), also notes that "validity on the MSQ is limited to a few studies from which construct validity is implied." However, he indicates that the section on validity in the manual is a model of scholarly restraint "with realistic claims and forthrightness regarding scales not performing according to theoretical expectations." Guion also responds favorably to the "reasonably reliable, valid, well normed indications of general satisfaction at work and of 20 aspects of that satisfaction, collapsible into intrinsic and extrinsic components." His overall response to the MSQ is that it is well developed, compares well with other similar instruments, and can give detailed diagnostic summary information as needed. Guion does recommend that the next manual include a complete history and underlying assumptions upon which the test is based.

Data on the internal ccnsistency reliability of the

MSQ are presented in median and range of Hoyt reliability coefficients for 27 normative groups (Weiss, et al., 1967). They range from a high of .97 on Ability Utilization (for both stenographers and typists) and on Working Conditions (for social workers) to a low of .59 on Variety (for buyers). Of the 567 Hoyt reliability coefficients reported, 27 vocational groups with 21 scales each, 83% were .80 or higher and only 2.5% were lower than .70. The reliability of some scales tends to vary across groups, and it is suggested that internal consistency reliability coefficients be computed for a sample representing the group on which the MSQ is used.

Canonical correlation analysis of the test-retest data yielded maximum coefficients of .97 over the one week interval and .89 over the one year interval. The coefficients, significant beyond the .001 level of significance, indicate that about 95% of the variance of the canonical variates is predictable on one week retest from knowledge of the first set of scores (and vice versa) and about 80% over the one year period.

Evidence for the validity of the MSQ as a measure of general job satisfaction is reported in the MSQ Manual (1977) as derived from other construct validation studies based on the Theory of Work Adjustment. The Theory of Work Adjustment is a conceptual framework for research developed at the University of Minnesota. The theory uses "the correspondence or lack of it between the work personality and the work

environment as an explanation for observed work adjustment outcomes." In these construct validation studies general job satisfaction was the dependent variable and Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) scale scores were the independent variables in a multivariate prediction problem. The MIQ was the first instrument developed in response to the Theory of Work Adjustment. Reinforcement was assumed to be constant since each prediction study involved individuals who were all employed in the same type of position. Thus, with the reinforcer system of the work environment held constant, satisfaction (MSQ) becomes a linear function of the linear composite of needs (MIQ). The results of these studies are considered indicative that the MSQ measured satisfaction in accordance with expectations from the Theory of Work Adjustment.

Concurrent validity is derived from the study of group differences in satisfaction, especially occupational differences in satisfaction. The research literature accumulated over the last 30 years (Weiss, et al., 1967) indicates that there are occupational differences in job satisfaction in both level and variability. Professional groups have been noted as the most satisfied, while nonprofessional groups were the least satisfied. The data on the MSQ confirms this tendency. For example, high-level management consultants had the highest means on seven scales: Ability Utilization, Achievement, Co-workers, Creativity, Social Service, Supervision, Human Relations, and Supervision,

Technical. Managers were highest on four scales: Creativity, Moral Values, Recognition, and Responsibility.

Content validity was supported by results of factor analyses of the 21 scales which indicated half of the MSQ scale score variance can be represented by an extrinsic satisfaction factor and defined by the two supervision scales, and by Company Policies and Practices, Working Conditions, Advancement, Compensation and Security. The remaining scales define one or more intrinsic satisfaction factors accounting for the other half of the common variance. These results also indicate that the factor structure of satisfaction varies among occupational groups.

Avila Mentorship Questionnaire

The Avila Mentorship Questionnaire (AMQ) was designed by the present researcher of this study--noting the research literature regarding similar instruments utilized to assess the mentor-protégé experience. Included were the following: (a) The Framework for the Study of Mentorship in the review article of Hunt and Michael (1983); (b) the Stages of Development noted by Hennig (1970); (c) Kram's (1980) characteristics of Developmental Relationships in Managerial Careers; and (d) Phillips (1977) survey questionnaire of career pattern focus.

Part 1 of the AMQ elicits information concerning the Avila Institute and general identifying information. Part 2 contains questions which assess the mentoring experiences of the formally mentored Avila Alumnae group. Part 3 consists

of questions regarding career needs of Institute participants to assist Avila College in the evaluation and future planning of their leadership program.

The Avila Mentorship Questionnaire was designed to assess the subjects concerning demographic data and behavioral variables not addressed by other instruments utilized in this study. Specific information regarding salary and promotion is identified. In addition, the questionnaire contains items which identify the mentor relationship, protégé information, and protégé behavioral self-report of mentorship outcomes. This latter information helps to confirm that the subject population is representative of populations utilized in past research. The results generated will assist the Avila Institute in future development and study of their mentorship component. Question 19 of the AMQ was used to represent the variable of advancement in this study, while question 20 was used to represent the variable of salary increase.

Field Trial of Avila Mentorship Questionnaire: A field trial was conducted on a group of ten individuals not included in the research population to determine reactions concerning item appropriateness and assessment time. The AMQ was adjusted in response to comments regarding item repetitiveness and questionnaire length.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) is a ten-item Guttman scale. Subjects are presented with four response

categories--strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. The scale is based on contrived items (Stouffer, et al., 1953) and yields a seven-point scale (Rosenberg, 1979). The instrument is scored by combining the responses to three items and if the subject answers two or three out of three positively, he/she receives a low self esteem score for that scale. For example, Scale I is composed of items 3, 7 and 9, and if the subject responds positively to two or three of these items, the rating for Scale I would be low self esteem.

This instrument was chosen to address the variable of self esteem as it is noted in the literature as one of the key outcomes of informal mentoring relationships.

Validity/Reliability. Rosenberg (1979) stated that reproducibility and scalability coefficients suggest that the RSES has satisfactory internal reliability. He found 92% reproducibility and 72% scalability (1965). Silber and Tippett (1965) were reported to have found two week test-retest reliability of 85%, while McCullough found a similar percent of 88 in a two week test-retest study. The Directory of Unpublished Experimental Mental Measures (Coldman & Osborne, 1985) gives a reliability coefficient of 75%, but no validity is mentioned.

## Research Questions

The following questions were posed to determine if formalized mentorship experiences for women are an aid to

career advancement of women professionals.

Question 1

Among the following variables that the literature indicated are benefits of informal mentoring, which are the best discriminators in predicting group membership of those subjects who experienced the Avila Leadership Institute Mentoring component and those who did not:

> job advancement (promotion) (via the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire--question number 19);
>
> creativity (via the CREE Creative Leadership Questionnaire--overall score);
>
> job satisfaction (via the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--overall score);
>
> salary increase (via the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire--question number 20);
>
> self esteem (via the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale--overall score);
>
> social status (via the CREE Creative Leadership Questionnaire--Scale number 1)?

Question 2

If a random sample of equal groups of 30 are drawn from a pool of 50 formally mentored and 50 unmentored participants of the Avila Leadership Institute Alumnae and discriminate analysis is used to generate a predictor profile, will the remainder of the sample of 20 from each group validate the predictor equation?

## Data Collection

An announcement of this research study was placed in the Avila Institute Alumnae Newsletter by the Director of

the Institute, encouraging alumnae to volunteer to participate. Instruments were mailed to every available alumna until a minimum of 50 formally mentored and 50 unmentored volunteers returned satisfactorily completed packets. The instruments consisted of the CREE Leadership Questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire, which in combination represent variables identified in the literature as the positive outcomes of informal mentor-protege relationships. Scores from a random sample of 30 subjects from each of the two groups were compared utilizing discriminate analysis. Discriminating variables included:

1. self esteem (via the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale--overall score);
2. advancement (via the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire--question number 19);
3. salary increase (via the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire--question number 20);
4. social status (via the CREE Questionnaire--scale number 1);
5. job satisfaction (via the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--overall score);
6. creativity (via the CREE Questionnaire--overall score).

Data from the remaining pool of 20 subjects from each of the two groups, formally mentored and unmentored, were examined utilizing the previously generated prediction equation to determine the validity. In addition, a Chi Square analysis was conducted on the number of correct and incorrect classifications.

Results of the study determined which variables best distinguish between formally mentored and unmentored alumnae of the Avila Institute.

## Statistical Analysis of the Data

The research questions were tested by the use of discriminate analysis to determine a prediction equation from the six discriminating variables. The prediction equation was tested for validity with the remaining data--20 subjects from each of the two original sets of 50. In addition, a Chi Square analysis was conducted on the number of correct and incorrect classifications to determine if the equation was accurate in distinguishing between mentored and unmentored subjects.

# Chapter 4

## RESULTS

This chapter includes the analysis of the data related to the research questions, discussion of the results of this study, and a summary of the results. The research questions were: (1) Among the variables that the literature indicates are benefits of informal mentoring--job advancement, creativity, job satisfaction, salary increase, self esteem, and social status--which are the best discriminators in predicting group membership of those subjects who experienced the Avila Leadership Institute mentoring component and those who did not? (2) If a random sample of equal groups of 30 are drawn from a pool of 50 formally mentored and 50 unmentored participants in the Avila Leadership Institute and discriminate analysis is used to generate a predictor profile, will the remainder of the sample of 20 from each group validate the predictor equation?

An initial analysis of the data to explore the first research question was conducted to assess differences between mentored and unmentored subjects regarding six variables attributed to positive informal mentoring in the workplace. The six variables were job advancement (promotion) via item 19 of the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire (AMQ), creativity via the overall score of the Creative Leadership Questionnaire (CREE), job satisfaction via the

overall score of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), salary increase via item 20 of the AMQ, self esteem via the overall score of the Rosenburg Self Esteem Scale (RSES), and social status via scale number 1 of the CREE. A stepwise discriminate analysis based on the Wilks' Lambda of each individual variable was performed on the data. The results of the initial discriminate analysis answered research question 1 and indicated that three of the 6 variables assessed for comparison between the two groups were significant in distinguishing the formally mentored from the unmentored subjects (see Table 1). The eigenvalue was .2579, the canonical correlation was .4527984, and the Wilks' Lambda was .7949736 with significance beyond .05 (.0034) and df = 3 (see Table 2).

The three variables in order of contribution to the significance of the equation were salary increase with Wilks' Lambda of .82971 and significance beyond .05 (.0008), job satisfaction with Wilks' Lambda of .80929 and significance beyond .05 (.0018), and self esteem with Wilks' Lambda of .79497 and significance beyond .05 (.0034), (see Table 1). The standardized discriminant function coefficients were salary increase .90135, job satisfaction .39679, and self esteem .31012 (see Table 3).

The three variables which were not found to be contributors to the significance of the equation were job advancement with Wilks' Lambda of .79135, creativity with Wilks' Lambda of .79336, and social status with Wilks'

TABLE 1

SUMMARY TABLE OF STEPWISE DISCRIMINATE ANALYSIS ON THE WILKS' LAMBDA COMPARISON OF THE THREE SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

| Step Entered | Wilk's Lambda |
|---|---|
| 1. Salary Increase (AMQ 20) | .82971* |
| 2. Job Satisfaction (overall score MSQ) | .80929* |
| 3. Self Esteem (overall score RSES) | .79497* |
| 4. Job Advancement (AMQ 19) | .79135 |
| 5. Creativity (overall score CREE) | .79336 |
| 6. Social Status (Scale 1 - CREE) | .79442 |

* $p<.05$

TABLE 2

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE DISCRIMINATE ANALYSIS FUNCTION

| Eigenvalue | Canonical Correlation | Wilk's Lambda | df | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| .25790 | .4527984 | .7949736 | 3 | .0034 |

TABLE 3

SUMMARY TABLE OF STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS

| Test | Function |
|---|---|
| 1. Job Satisfaction (MSQ) | .39679 |
| 2. Salary Increase (AMQ) | .90135 |
| 3. Self Esteem (RSES) | .31012 |

Lambda of .79442 (see Table 1).

For the discriminate analysis of the 30 subjects in the unmentored group, the equation correctly classed 20, or 65%, and incorrectly classed 10, or 35%. For the 30 mentored subjects the discriminate analysis equation correctly classified 17, or 56.7%, and incorrectly classified 13, or 43%. The overall correct classification rate is 60.32% with the a priori rate of 50%, or results the same as would have been possible merely due to chance. A chi square analysis was applied to determine significance. The chi square was 2.5, indicating non significance at the .05 level.

The second phase of the study to examine research question number 2 concerned an initial examination of validation of the prediction equation generated by the initial discriminate analysis, utilizing the sample upon which the equation was not generated--20 subjects from the unmentored and 20 subjects from the formally mentored group. Research question 2 was not supported as the prediction equation was not validated by the second sample of subjects. Of the 20 formally mentored subjects, the equation correctly classified 13 or 65%, and incorrectly classified 7, or 35%. Of the 20 unmentored subjects, 10 or 50% were correctly classified, while 10, or 50%, were incorrectly classified. The chi square analysis of 1.48 (df=1) was not significant at the .05 level.

## Discussion of Results

This section includes a discussion of the results of this study. The discussion consists of consideration of the relation of the results to other studies and exploration of factors which may explain the study outcomes. Factors which are explored concerning study outcomes include sample size, sample similarities, and time dependence considerations of some variables noting both length of time in mentoring experience and actual number of mentor/protégé meetings. A final factor for examination is the position and field diversity of the Institute alumnae.

The statistical results of this study indicated a significant difference between the first group of 30 formally mentored and 30 unmentored subjects regarding three of the six variables examined. The three significant variables were salary increase, job satisfaction and self esteem. Variables which were not significant were promotion, social status, and creativity. Statistically, though there appears to be some evidence that three variables are related to formal mentoring, the significance did not yield practical results, as the generated equation did not hold up on the validation sample.

As all of the six variables were chosen because they were reported in the informal mentoring literature, the significance of the three variables of salary increase, job satisfaction, and self esteem is understandable. Roche (1979) reported that two-thirds of the 1,250 mentored sub-

jects in her study had received higher salaries, bonuses and total compensation than unmentored individuals. Queralt (1981) reported higher levels of job satisfaction in mentored individuals. Self concept was noted as enhanced in mentored subjects by Hennig (1970), White (1970), Levinson, et al. (1978), Kram (1980), and Hanson (1983).

The remaining three variables examined in this study were also supported in the literature though they were not significant in the prediction equation. Jennings (1971), Phillips (1977), and Villani (1983) reported positioning into advancement opportunities among other positive outcomes of mentoring. Phillips (1977) examined data on 2,312 subjects, interviewed 331, and found that visibility, friendship, exposure to power, and provision of opportunities were some of the positive mentoring assistance experienced. Creativity was reported to have a significant relationship with mentoring by Torrance (1983) in his 22-year-long longitudinal study of 96 male and 116 female subjects.

Though all variables examined in this study were supported in the literature, several factors may have affected the lack of significance of three of the variables and the inability of the equation to be validated by using the sample upon which it was generated. The first factor of possible influence concerns the smallness of the sample which affects the robustness of the equation and how useful it would be when applied to the validation sample. Because the original population of formally mentored subjects was

limited to 100, the number of returned usable questionnaires was 50--the minimum necessary for the study. Thus, a larger group of subjects could provide a better opportunity for assessment as the smaller the number of subjects the larger the amount of variance must occur in order for significance to be determined statistically.

A second factor for consideration is the similarity of the formally mentored and unmentored samples. As all subjects were alumnae of the Avila Leadership Institute, they may have been more similar than different due to participation in the fifteen training sessions. Information in the training sessions may have provided some of the aspects of mentoring, especially exposure to information which one might obtain from a mentor (see appendix B). In addition, the nomination and selection process for acceptance into the Avila Institute may have added to the number of commonalities. Institute participants are nominated by their organization, or apply for membership themselves. This means that they may be selected or seek selection in a way similar to that as a mentor is said to choose a protégé who displays potential. In addition, there is a selection process employed by the Avila Institute which could also be viewed as choosing as a mentor is said to do--based on indication of past performance and promising future potential.

A third factor for investigation regarding the results of this study is the issue of time dependence for some variables. Promotion may not have been shown to be

significant in this study due to the seven and one-half years that the Avila Leadership Institute has been in existence. During that time there have been 15 groups that have received the leadership training experience. Thus, later groups would not have had the time to have gained many promotions. Similarly, time may have also been a factor which influenced the results regarding creativity and social status. More recent participants of the Institute would not have had as much time to develop creative abilities or relationships with social contacts.

Because of the former factors indicating time could be related to mentoring outcomes, closer examination of the data was done regarding length of relationship. The mentored subjects were compared in three groups--unmentored, mentored less than 12 months, and mentored more than 12 months. Observation of the means of the discriminating variables indicated that there was a gradual increase of higher scores for three discriminating variables--salary increase, job satisfaction, and creativity, and a decrease in score which indicates higher self esteem across all three groups (see Table 4). There were 50 in the unmentored group, 40 in the mentored less than 12 months group, and only 10 in the mentored more than 12 months group. On the MSQ the mean score ranged from 360.9 for the unmentored, 376.7 for the mentored less than 12 months, and 387.2 for those mentored more than 12 months, indicating a gradual increase in job satisfaction. The variable of salary

TABLE 4

SUMMARY TABLE OF MEANS FOR DISCRIMINATING VARIABLES FOR UNMENTORED, MENTORED TWELVE MONTHS OR LESS, AND MENTORED MORE THAN TWELVE MONTHS

| Variable - Test | Unmentored N = 50 | Mentored Less 12 Mo. N = 50 | Mentored More 12 Mo. N = 10 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Salary Increase AMQ | 1.38 | 2.675 | 3.5 |
| 2. Salary Amount AMQ | $2663.00 | $5945.00 | $7279.60 |
| 3. Job Satisfaction MSQ | 360.9 | 376.7 | 387.2 |
| 4. Self Esteem RSES | .58 | .625 | .20 |
| 5. Social Status CREE - Scale 1 | 7.24 | 7.5 | 8.4 |
| 6. Promotions AMQ | .74 | 1.125 | 1.4 |
| 7. Creativity CREE | 74.4 | 75. | 74.8 |
| 8. % of Female Mentors | 0 | 63.3 | 55.6 |

increase followed a similar pattern with a mean of 1.38 salary increases at a total of $2663.00 gained for unmentored, 2.68 salary increase at $5945.00 for mentored less than 12 months, and 3.5 at $7272.60 for those proteges mentored more than 12 months. Promotion also rose with an increase relative to time with the unmentored reporting an average of .74, mentored less than 12 months 1.13, and mentored more than 12 months 1.4. Social status as represented by scale one of the CREE increased from 7.24 for unmentored, to 7.5 for mentored less than 12 months, and 8.4 for mentored more than 12 months. The sixth variable investigated, self esteem as measured by the RSES, had a decrease in score means for those mentored more than 12 months with .58 unmentored, .63 mentored less than 12 months, and .2 for mentored more than 12 months. This indicates a gain in self esteem for the mentored more than 12 months as on the RSES, the lower the score, the higher the self esteem. This indication of gradual increases in the discriminating variables when comparing protégés by length of time of mentoring experience may help to explain the lack of inclusion of three of the variables in the prediction equation.

Related to the issue of time dependence is the factor of number of actual mentor-protégé sessions. The average number of actual sessions with the mentor in the Avila Leadership Institute mentoring component was 3.78 (see Table 5). In the workplace, mentoring occurs on a more frequent basis, as it usually occurs on the job or in the same

TABLE 5

SUMMARY TABLE OF MEAN FREQUENCY COMPARISONS OF UNMENTORED AND FORMALLY MENTORED SUBJECT RESPONSES ON THE AMQ

| | Question | Unmentored | Mentored |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Years in Field | 9.20 | 8.980 |
| 2. | Years in Present Position | 3.67 | 3.79 |
| 3. | Years of Education | 15.878 | 17.020 |
| 4. | Years Having Highest Degree | 10.675 | 9.27 |
| 5. | Age | 40.16 | 40.08 |
| 6. | Stage in Career, 1-4 | 2.16 | 2.041 |
| 7. | Institute Sessions Attended | 57.083 | 69.191 |
| 8. | No. of Mentor Sessions per Protege in the Study | 0 | 3.78 |
| 9. | No. of Career Sponsors | 2.82 | 4.60 |
| 10. | No. of Career Guides | 1.60 | 3.68 |
| 11. | No. of Career Peer Pals | 2.98 | 8.10 |
| 12. | No. of Networking Groups | .40 | .60 |
| 13. | Other Workplace Mentoring | .160 | .320 |
| 14. | No. of Males Mentored | .64 | 2.26 |
| 15. | No. of Females Mentored | 1.12 | 3.24 |
| 16. | Intent to Mentor Males | .30 | 2.420 |
| 17. | Intent to Mentor Females | .90 | 2.8 |
| 18. | No. of Promotions | .755 | 1.18 |
| 19. | No. of Salary Increases | 1.408 | 2.84 |
| 20. | Amount of Salary Increase | $2663.00 | $6212.02 |

organization where contact between mentor and protégé would be more readily available. It is surprising with an average of only 3.78 contacts between mentor and protégé that the significance of even three of the variables was obtained.

A final factor for speculation regarding the results of this study is the number of career fields that the Avila Institute alumnae represent. Research on formal and informal mentoring has been primarily concerned with homogeneous groupings studying subjects from one profession or organization at a time. As the Avila Institute participants and their mentors are not from one exclusive business field or corporation, variables such as promotion may not be attainable in certain positions, or advancement may be marked in a different manner. For example, in the field of higher education, after an individual receives tenure and/or advances to full professor, there is no further "promotion" possible unless it is considered an advancement to change to an administrative role. "Advancement" in the field of higher education may be demonstrated by other activities such as the writing and publishing of articles and books, having a reputation as an expert who is called upon for consultation by others in the field, and serving leadership roles in professional organizations. Similarly, if an individual is in public office, he or she might "advance" in ways other than direct promotion, such as by the power or prestige associated with becoming a member of various committees. Thus, the lack of significance of three of the variables,

especially promotion, may be due to the diversity of career fields and respective varying of ways to advance in them.

## Summary of Results

Summarizing the findings of this study, three of the six variables used in the comparison of unmentored and formally mentored subjects by discriminate analysis were found to be significant. The three variables in order of most weight were salary increase, job satisfaction, and self esteem. Promotion, social status, and creativity were found to be non-significant variables. Though the three variables were identified as predictors, the accuracy of classification for the two groups as determined by chi square analysis was not significant. Though the prediction equation was significant, the lack of validation of the equation may have been due to several factors. Initial factors include the limited number of subjects available to compose equal groups for comparison, and sample similarities. Other factors for consideration consisted of time dependence regarding both length of time in mentoring experience and number of actual mentor-protégé sessions. Last to be examined was the factor of profession and position diversity of Avila Institute alumnae.

The results of this analysis support, on a limited basis, the research literature which suggests formalized mentoring can duplicate the positive outcomes ascribed to informal mentor-protégé experiences. As the average number

of mentoring sessions was limited, further research seems warranted as additional examination of the data revealed the possibility of a trend of increasing scores related to length of the mentoring relationship. The findings also suggest that descriptive reports of the benefits of mentoring experiences may be validated by objective instrumentation which affords more precise measures of actual outcome gain.

## Additional Observations Regarding Subjective Responses on the AMQ

This section includes observations regarding the results of the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire (AMQ). Although these subjective responses are not directly related to the research questions of this study involving objective instrumentation, they do provide information which could be useful in developing future research. As most of the current literature regarding mentoring has been descriptive, derived from the subjective self report of protégés, it is also intriguing to contrast AMQ responses with the more objective instrumentation results. The organization of this section consists of consideration of observations regarding the various sections on the AMQ and a summary which will illuminate those points which might be considered in future research.

The first area of the AMQ for examination is that of "characteristics of the Avila Institute mentor as indicated by their protégés." Characteristics reported had some con-

currence with the literature (see Appendix D, Table 6). Thirty-five protégés said their mentors had high self concepts, 39 felt their mentors were successful and accomplished, 31 said their mentors were older by an average of 14.69 years, and 28 said their mentors were role models. However, only 15 protégés felt their mentor really cared about their career advancement, 14 indicated their mentor went out of their way to "bring them along," 6 said their mentor had a close paternalistic/maternalistic feeling toward them, and 17 thought their mentor had a great deal of confidence in them. Seven protégés reported negative characteristics, including three indications of sexual harassment. As 30 mentors were identified by the Avila Institute, compared to 11 identified by protégés (9 protégés failed to indicate who identified their mentor), perhaps the selection of the mentor and the way mentor and protégé are paired in a formalized program needs closer examination. The literature indicates that in informal mentor-protégé relationships, the successful altruistic mentor chooses the protégé because they see potential and are motivated to help him or her. The Avila mentorship program attempts to match mentors and protégés, and participation by all is on a willing and volunteer basis. However, perhaps this process bears additional aid in establishing more intense relationships in future formalized mentoring programs.

Sex of the mentor is approached in an egalatarian manner by the Avila Institute. An equal number of male and

female mentors are asked to participate. In this study, 24 proteges indicated they had female mentors, 15 proteges indicated they had male mentors, and 11 proteges did not identify the sex of the mentor. An approximately equal percentage of male/female mentors was reported as helping in the mentored less than 12 and more than 12 months categories. Further exploration of mentor sex might prove beneficial.

Three additional areas of the AMQ to be considered involve subjective subject responses relating to information, education and support (Appendix D, Tables 7, 8, 9). These AMQ questions were based on information, education and support reported as having been obtained by protégés in informal relationships. Responses by mentored and unmentored subjects were similar in pattern in each of these areas. Career assistance in these areas was desired by twenty to thirty subjects for both the mentored and unmentored groups. Career achievements were reported by thirty to forty subjects. There were a few more mentored subject responses to each question in this area, however, no more than one to five responses per question.

In contrast, responses by mentored protégés regarding the same assistance, but derived from the Avila mentorship experience, were in a similar but less frequent pattern relating to the three areas of information, education, and support. A similar number of Avila mentored protégés said they were aided--19 to 26 subjects--in obtaining information regarding the political roles, awareness of the "inside"

informal system; education about insights and knowledge about the business; and support in terms of candid constructive criticism and self confidence. All other questions about information, education and support were responded to by 9 or less of the Avila mentored protégés. These latter questions concerned behaviors and outcomes that might require greater personal investment by a mentor, and/or time to develop, such as introduction to the "right people," help in cutting through red tape, ability to function appropriately in a system, considered an expert in the field, ability to work with people, counseling and support, defense in controversy, improvement in risk taking-assertiveness, decision making skills and independence.

The last AMQ area for review concerns questions regarding advancement (Appendix D; Table 10). A greater number of the mentored alumnae, from three to thirteen of the subjects, indicated advancement than did unmentored subjects in responding to each question. Those questions evaluating the Avila Leadership Institute mentorship experience were responded to by only one to ten mentored protégés. Perhaps the Avila mentorship component contributed to the greater number of mentored subjects indicating advancement in the various areas. However, a response rate of one to ten subjects from a group of 50 does not indicate that a majority of the proteges felt they advanced as a direct result of this process. As no more than eight to thirty-nine protégés felt they had advanced in regard to the

various questions with or without the Avila mentor, more protégés definitely could have been aided by the Avila mentoring experience.

In summary, examination of the subjective responses of mentored and unmentored subjects on the AMQ indicate several interesting observations which might be addressed in future research. Selection of mentor and pairing of mentor and protégé may effect the quality and in turn the outcomes of the experience. Related to this is the issue of what kinds of "aid" are available or possible in a formalized mentor-protégé experience. The most "aid" indicated by Avila alumnae seemed to concern activities which might require less involvement and/or time. Mentored subjects did indicate slightly more advancement than the unmentored in almost every question. Perhaps the Avila mentorship component aided in this edge and reflects the significance of three of the variables regarding the research questions in this study. However, many protégés did not report change as a result of their mentorship experience. Male and female mentors were approximately equally represented according to the Avila Institute, though 11 protégés did not identify the sex of their mentor. Further comparison of protégé gains regarding sex of mentor might prove to be beneficial. Finally, it seems that the mixed response patterns on the AMQ also reiterate the need for objective instrumentation to help clarify the actual amount of significance regarding the outcomes of mentoring.

# Chapter 5

# SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations based on research involving a comparison of the differences between formally mentored and unmentored alumnae of a leadership training institute for women.

## Summary

### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences between formally mentored and unmentored alumnae of a leadership institute for women in order to discern whether successful outcomes in informal mentoring could be duplicated by a formalized process. Further, as previous research on mentoring has been primarily descriptive, this study attempted to examine outcomes of the mentor-protégé relationship in a concise objective manner through instrumentation rather than self report. The variables addressed for comparison were taken from the research literature on positive outcomes of informal mentoring experiences. Variables used for comparison included job advancement (promotions) via item 19 on the AMQ, creativity via the overall score of the CREE, job satisfaction via the overall satisfac-

tion score of the MSQ, self esteem via the RSES, social status via scale number one of the CREE, and salary increase via item 20 of the AMQ.

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature revealed the need for strategies to assist women in career advancement, U.S. Department of Labor (1983), Barnier (1981), Cronin (1973), Lyon and Saario (1973), and Taylor (1973). Informal mentoring has been reported as an aid to career advancement by various professional groups of men and women. Such descriptive studies include: male corporate presidents (Jennings, 1971), prominent male executives (Roche, 1979), men in science, engineering, accounting, and higher education (Dalton, Thompson & Price, 1977), women managers (Missirian, 1980), college and university administrators (Davis, 1984; Follon, 1983; Malone, 1982; McNeer, 1981; Moore, 1983; Nolan, 1982; and Queralt, 1981), managers (Phillips, 1977; Vaudrin, 1983), academic women (Fowler, 1980; Melillo, 1981), public school administrators (Robinson, 1981), state agencies (Ryan, 1983), law students (Katz 1980), psychotherapists (Arbetter, 1980), and school of education graduate students (Busch, 1985).

Successful outcomes of informal mentor-protégé relationships are reported to include career advancement, inside information concerning organization, psychological support, candid constructive criticism, and positioning into advancement opportunities (Jennings, 1971; Phillips, 1977; Villani,

1983). Roche (1979) found mentored individuals had received higher salaries, bonuses and total compensation. Self concept was enhanced in subjects investigated by (Hennig, 1970; White, 1970; Levinson et al., 1978; Kram, 1980; and Hanson, 1983). Torrance (1983) found a significant relationship between mentoring and creativity. Queralt (1981) and Pierce (1983) discovered that the mentored in academia had more achievement in professional activities such as publication, grant awards, promotion to full professorship and assumption of leadership roles, such as editor of publications. Queralt (1981) reported higher levels of job satisfaction for mentored in education.

Though successful men and women report mentoring as a benefit to their career advancement, other research suggests that women may have less chance for this helping experience in the natural work environment (Larwood and Blackmore, 1978; Staines, Tarvis, and Jayartne, 1984). To alleviate this problem the provision of formalized mentorship programs has been suggested (Orth and Jacobs, 1976; Gordon and Mereith, 1982; Baron, 1982; Phillips-Jones, 1983; and Zey, 1984). However, problems with the evaluation of these formalized mentoring experiences include the lack of research, the multiplicity and inconsistent objective measurement of outcomes (Speizer, 1981; Phillips-Jones, 1983; Gordon, 1983; Colwill, 1984; Ganz-Sarto, 1985; Zey, 1985). Research has not been conducted previously to establish an effective means of evaluating the mentoring process in

formal or informal relationships.

This study was designed to objectively measure differences between formally mentored and unmentored individuals and to determine if outcomes associated with informal mentoring can occur in formalized experiences.

Research Questions Investigated. The following research questions were investigated in this study:

1. Among the following variables that the literature indicated are benefits of informal mentoring, which are the best discriminators in predicting group membership of those subject who experienced the Avila Leadership Institute Mentoring component and those who did not:

> job advancement (promotion) (via the Avila Memtorship Questionnaire--question number 19;
>
> creativity (via the CREE Creative Leadership Questionnaire--overall score);
>
> job satisfaction (via the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--overall score);
>
> salary increase (via the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire--question number 20);
>
> self esteem (via the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale--overall score);
>
> social status (via the CREE Creative Leadership Questionnaire--Scale number 1)?

2. If a random sample of equal groups of 30 are drawn from a pool of 50 formally mentored and 50 unmentored participants of the Avila Leadership Institute Alumnae and discriminate analysis is used to generate a predictor profile, will the remainder of the sample of 20 drawn from each group validate the predictor equation?

Sample. The sample for this study was drawn from the alumnae of the Avila College Women's Leadership Institute of Kansas City, Missouri. Invitations to participate in the study were mailed to all of the 400 alumnae with updated addresses. This included an initial pool of 100 formally mentored and 200 unmentored alumnae. As the Institute has been in existence for seven and one half years, some participants had moved to other areas and no longer were part of the local continuing network.

Collection of Data. Those alumnae electing to participate with correctly completed questionnaires included 50 mentored and 50 unmentored subjects. Formally mentored and unmentored subjects were then randomly divided into two groups--30 each to determine a prediction equation, and 20 each to test the equation.

Analysis of the Data. Research Question number one was tested by using discriminate analysis of the six variables to determine a prediction equation to distinguish between formally mentored and unmentored subjects. Question number two was addressed by testing the prediction equation generated by the discriminate analysis of the six variables. This was accomplished by applying the equation to the two groups of 20 subjects comprising the validation sample.

Results of the Study. The results of the analysis of the data related to the two research questions are summarized below.

1a. The three variables of salary increase, job satisfaction, and self esteem were identified by discriminant analysis as predictors of difference between formally mentored and unmentored subjects.

1b. The three variables of promotion, social status, and creativity were not identified as predictors of formally mentored vs. unmentored subjects.

1c. A chi square analysis on the sample used to generate the prediction equation determined that classification of the two groups by discriminate analysis was not significantly greater than chance.

2. The initial examination of the prediction equation generated by the discriminate analysis using the sample upon which the equation was generated was not significant.

## Conclusions

This study was developed to determine if a formal mentorship experience could duplicate positive outcomes indicated in the informal mentoring literature. In addition, measures used to examine these outcomes were objective instruments rather than subjective self report utilized in the majority of present research on this subject. Conclusions reached from the analyses of the data are made within the scope of the following limitations.

1. This study was limited to alumnae of the Avila College Leadership Institute for Women of Kansas City, Missouri.

2. This study was limited to volunteer research subjects.

3. The instruments used in this study are subject to the limitations with regard to their respective validities and reliabilities.

The results of this study appear to provide several conclusions which are discussed in this section. These conclusions include duplication potential of formalized mentoring, formalized mentoring as an aid for women's career advancement, the importance of standardized criteria and evaluation, length of mentoring considerations, and the use of formal mentorship programs for individuals from a variety of occupational fields.

The first conclusion concerns an indication that formalized mentoring can duplicate some of the outcomes of informal mentoring. As informal mentoring has been noted as a positive factor in the career advancement of professionals in many fields, and as that process is available only on a natural selection basis, continuing to provide formalized mentoring experiences could enhance the career advancement of a greater number of individuals of either sex.

Second, women have been shown to occupy fewer upper level positions in the workplace and the research suggests that they could benefit from formalized mentoring programs to aid their advancement. This study has demonstrated that formalized mentoring can achieve some of the outcomes of informal mentoring by utilizing both male and

female mentors.

A third conclusion involves the use of standardized criteria and objective instrumentation to evaluate program outcomes rather than or in addition to descriptive report. Just because participants of a program or study feel the process has been helpful does not mean they have made any real gains. Organizations using such programs need to be able to verify that the help they are offering really has significant long term results. Corporations offering programs to address affirmative action quotas would be better served if programs could demonstrate that objective outcomes are achieved.

Fourth, there is an indication that successful duplication of informal mentoring may be related to length of time. Therefore, this is a consideration to be addressed in formal programs. Short, less intense experiences of less than a year cannot hope to duplicate fully the outcomes of successful informal mentor-protégé relationships.

A final conclusion concerns the fact that this study was based on a population of mentors and protégés derived from a variety of professions. Kram (1984) and Zey (1985) reported that support from top level management was essential for program success. If individuals are in an organization without programs or without top level support, experiences provided by an outside organization may be a potential solution. The Avila Leadership Institute also has a community focus rather than just being business sector

oriented. For example, one of the Institute protégés was helped by her mentor to run for and succeed in obtaining political office in the state. Two other protégés gained city council offices.

## Implications

This section consists of implications suggested by the results and conclusions of this study. Implications which are addressed include the need for further objective examination of aspects of the mentoring experience and the need for more active involvement of education, the business sector and individual protégés in the exploration and implementation of this process.

This study attempted to examine a formalized mentorship program which incorporated the recommendations presented in the research literature such as those reiterated by Zey (1985). Zey's initial recommendation concerned having clearly defined goals and methods. In addition, he suggested communicating of program goals to all participants, enlisting the cooperation of the entire organization, making the selection process as autonomous as possible, permitting withdrawal from the progam, continual evaluation of the program and giving the program a long term test period. The Avila College Women's Institute mentoring component incorporated Zey's recommendations. In spite of these considerations, only three of the six variables investigated representing positive outcomes of informal

mentoring were significant. This may suggest that current recommendations such as Zey's need additional exploration.

This study also used instrumentation in an attempt to obtain more concise evaluation of formalized mentorship outcomes. Perhaps other aspects of formalized mentorship programs need examination by objective instrumentation. Characteristics of mentors and protégés and the actual mentoring process could be examined objectively and in greater detail. It would seem that determining what specific characteristics and processes produce which desired results would greatly aid in determining mentoring's true potential for individuals and various work settings.

Another implication from the results of this study concerns greater consideration of formalized mentoring by both those who could provide it as well as those who might benefit from it. Colleges and universities wishing to aid students and alumnae could research and offer such activities and provide a service to the workplace and community as well. A service of this nature could also aid the individual in being more assertive regarding mentoring in their own organization. As the research indicates that informal mentoring is most often offered by mentors who have experienced mentoring themselves, sharing this process with students, alumnae, community and workplace could stimulate individual initiative in obtaining and providing this helping experience.

Similarly, the business sector, concerned with

affirmative action issues, as well as leadership and productivity, could benefit from continued commitment to the exploration of mentoring. The literature reports many companies which are offering programs (Kram, 1984; Zey, 1985). However, it would seem that more rigorous research techniques which are undoubtedly utilized by these same organizations regarding profit and loss might well be applied to assessing and developing the most "successful" formalized mentoring program.

The last implication concerns the possibility that the workplace may fulfill certain kinds of mentoring needs, while an independent organization such as a university or college setting, could provide others. As Zey (1985) has suggested, the goals, definitions and personnel utilized in a program need to be considered in a realistic and consistent manner.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations for future research are made based upon the conduct and results of this study.

1. It is recommended that further examination of the formalized mentoring process could be enhanced by utilizing a larger sample.

2. It is recommended that the mentoring process needs to be defined not only in content, but also in frequency and duration. A minimum of four contacts per month for a year's duration would seem to be a place to begin

further research.

3. Pre-test as well as post-test over desired outcome variables could aid in assessment of actual mentoring relationship gains.

4. It is recommended that further research on the outcomes of mentoring should consider the use of other instruments. For example, the CREE, as it was reviewed by The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, has questionable reliability and validity. Perhaps the criteria utilized by Torrance (1983) in his 22-year longitudinal study in which he found significance between mentoring and creativity, would be more relevant to address this variable.

## Recommendations from Observations Of Subjective Responses on the AMQ

The following recommendations regarding future research are made based on observations from the subjective responses of subjects on the Avila Mentorship Questionnaire (AMQ).

1. It is recommended that the process for selection of the mentor in formalized programs be examined with regard to mentor qualities reported in the literature.

2. It is recommended that the pairing of mentor and protégé in a formalized program be addressed with regard to developing characteristics of successful relationships as reported in the literature.

3. It is recommended that the content and process of the formalized mentor protégé relationships be monitored

on an ongoing basis to observe if and how goals are met.

4. It is recommended that comparison of aid from male and female mentors could provide beneficial information.

# APPENDIX A

# EARNINGS DATA

COMPARISON OF MEDIAN EARNINGS OF YEAR-ROUND FULL-TIME WORKERS, BY SEX, 1955-1977
(PERSONS 14 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER)

| YEAR | MEDIAN EARNINGS WOMEN (1) | MEN (2) | EARNINGS GAP IN DOLLARS (3) | WOMEN'S EARNINGS AS A PERCENT OF MEN'S | WOMEN'S | 1967 DOLLARS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1977 | $8,618 | $14,626 | $6,008 | 58.9 | 69.7 | $3,310 |
| 1976 | 8,099 | 13,455 | 5,356 | 60.2 | 66.1 | 3,141 |
| 1975 | 7,504 | 12,758 | 5,254 | 58.8 | 70.0 | 3,259 |
| 1974 | 6,772 | 11,835 | 5,063 | 57.2 | 74.8 | 3,433 |
| 1973 | 6,335 | 11,186 | 4,851 | 56.6 | 76.6 | 3,649 |
| 1972 | 5,903 | 10,202 | 4,299 | 57.9 | 72.8 | 3,435 |
| 1971 | 5,593 | 9,399 | 3,806 | 59.5 | 68.0 | 3,136 |
| 1970 | 5,323 | 8,966 | 3,643 | 59.4 | 68.4 | 3,133 |
| 1969 | 4,977 | 8,227 | 3,250 | 60.5 | 65.3 | 2,961 |
| 1968 | 4,457 | 7,664 | 3,207 | 58.2 | 72.0 | 3,079 |
| 1967 | 4,150 | 7,182 | 3,032 | 57.8 | 73.1 | 3,032 |
| 1966 | 3,973 | 6,848 | 2,875 | 58.0 | 72.4 | 2,958 |
| 1965 | 3,823 | 6,375 | 2,552 | 60.0 | 66.8 | 2,700 |
| 1964 | 3,690 | 6,195 | 2,505 | 59.6 | 67.9 | 2,696 |
| 1963 | 3,561 | 5,978 | 2,417 | 59.6 | 67.9 | 2,637 |
| 1962 | 3,446 | 5,974 | 2,528 | 59.5 | 73.4 | 2,790 |
| 1961 | 3,351 | 5,644 | 2,293 | 59.4 | 68.4 | 5,559 |
| 1960 | 3,293 | 5,417 | 2,124 | 60.8 | 64.5 | 2,394 |
| 1959 | 3,193 | 5,209 | 2,106 | 61.3 | 63.1 | 2,308 |
| 1958 | 3,102 | 4,927 | 1,825 | 63.0 | 58.8 | 2,108 |
| 1957 | 3,008 | 4,713 | 1,705 | 63.8 | 56.7 | 2,023 |
| 1956 | 2,827 | 4,466 | 1,639 | 63.3 | 58.0 | 2,014 |
| 1955 | 2,719 | 4,252 | 1,422 | 63.9 | 56.4 | 1,911 |

Notes: For 1967-77, data include wage and salary income and earnings from self-empoloyment; for 1955-66, data include wage and salary income only.

Column 3 = column 2 minus column 1.
Column 4 = column 1 divided by column 2.
Column 5 = column 2 minus column 1, divided by column 1.
Column 6 = column 3 times the purchasing power of the consumer dollar (1967 = $1.00).

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: "Money Income of Families and Persons in the United States," Current Population Reports, 1957 to 1977, U.S. Department of Labor.

EARNINGS DISTRIBUTION OF YEAR-ROUND FULL-TIME WORKERS BY SEX, 1977
(PERSONS 14 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER)

| Earnings group | Number (in thousands) Women (1) | Men (2) | Distribution Women (3) | Men (4) | Likelihood of a woman rather than a man to be in each earnings Group 1/ (5) | Women as percent of all Earners (6) | Cumulative distribution Women (7) | Men (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number and distribution | 19,238 | 39,263 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1.0 | 32.9 | | |
| Less than $3,000 | 713 | 1,026 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 41.0 | 3.7 | 2.6 |
| $3,000 to $4,999 | 1,667 | 1,057 | 8.7 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 61.2 | 12.4 | 5.3 |
| $5,000 to $6,999 | 3,810 | 2,356 | 19.8 | 6.0 | 3.3 | 61.8 | 32.2 | 11.3 |
| $7,000 to $9,999 | 5,921 | 4,955 | 30.8 | 12.6 | 2.4 | 54.4 | 63.0 | 23.9 |
| $10,000 to $14,999 | 5,234 | 10,883 | 27.3 | 27.7 | 1.0 | 32.5 | 90.3 | 51.6 |
| $15,000 to $24,999 | 1,692 | 13,888 | 8.8 | 35.4 | .2 | 10.9 | 99.1 | 87.0 |
| $25,000 and over | 180 | 5,099 | .9 | 13.0 | (2/) | 3.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Notes: Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.
Column 5 = column 3 divided by column 4.
Column 6 = column 1 divided by the sums of columns 1 and 2, times 100.

EARNINGS DISTRIBUTION OF YEAR-ROUND FULL-TIME WORKERS BY SEX, 1977--CONTINUED

1/ This measure would show earnings equality if the coefficient for each income group were equal to 1.0. This is a more accurate method of assessing the earnings disparity than simply comparing medians.

2/ Less than 09.1.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Reports, P. 60, No. 118.

MEDIAN EARNINGS OF YEAR-ROUND FULL TIME CIVILIAN WORKERS
BY OCCUPATION GROUP AND SEX, 1977
(PERSONS 14 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER)

| Occupation group | Women | Men | Dollar gap | Women's earnings as a percent of men's | Percent men's earnings exceeded women's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | $8,618 | $14,626 | $6,008 | 58.9 | 69.7 |
| Professional and technical | 11,995 | 18,224 | 6,229 | 65.8 | 51.9 |
| Accountants | 11,155 | 17,312 | 6,157 | 64.4 | 55.2 |
| Computer specialists | 15,135 | 18,849 | 3,714 | 80.3 | 24.5 |
| Health workers (except physicians, dentists, and related practioners) | 12,093 | 13,360 | 1,267 | 90.5 | 10.5 |
| Teachers | 11,970 | 15,790 | 3,820 | 75.8 | 31.9 |
| College and university | 15,172 | 20,337 | 5,165 | 74.6 | 34.0 |
| Elementary and secondary | 11,732 | 15,029 | 3,297 | 78.1 | 28.1 |
| Engineering and science technicians | 11,566 | 15,147 | 3,581 | 76.4 | 31.0 |
| Managers and administrators | 9,799 | 18,086 | 8,287 | 54.2 | 84.6 |
| Salaried | 10,272 | 19,023 | 8,751 | 54.0 | 85.2 |
| Manufacturing | 11,277 | 22,523 | 11,246 | 50.1 | 99.7 |
| Retail trade | 8,437 | 15,076 | 6,639 | 56.0 | 78.7 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate | 10,684 | 19,696 | 9,012 | 54.2 | 84.4 |
| Public administration | 12,568 | 18,673 | 6,105 | 67.3 | 48.6 |
| Other industries | 10,839 | 20,220 | 9,381 | 53.6 | 86.5 |
| Self-employed | 4,258 | 12,428 | 8,170 | 34.3 | 191.9 |
| Retail trade | 4,732 | 10,554 | 5,822 | 44.8 | 123.0 |

MEDIAN EARNINGS OF YEAR-ROUND FULL TIME CIVILIAN WORKERS BY OCCUPATION GROUP AND SEX, 1977--CONTINUED

| Occupation group | Women | Men | Dollar gap | Women's earnings as a percent of men's | Percent men's earnings exceeded women's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sales workers | 6,825 | 16,067 | 9,242 | 42.5 | 135.4 |
| Insurance, real estate, and stock agents and brokers | 11,000 | 18,907 | 7,887 | 58.3 | 71.6 |
| Retail trade | 5,529 | 11,110 | 5,581 | 49.8 | 100.1 |
| Sales clerks | 5,413 | 10,114 | 4,701 | 53.5 | 86.8 |
| Clerical workers | 8,601 | 13,966 | 5,365 | 61.6 | 62.4 |
| Bookkeepers | 8,516 | 13,520 | 5,004 | 63.0 | 58.8 |
| Cashiers and counter clerks (except food) | 6,632 | 10,139 | 3,507 | 65.4 | 52.9 |
| Office machinery operators | 9,019 | 13,076 | 4,057 | 69.0 | 45.0 |
| Craft and kindred workers | 8,902 | 14,517 | 5,615 | 61.3 | 63.1 |
| Blue-collar worker supervisor, N.E.C. | 9,138 | 16,202 | 7,064 | 56.4 | 77.3 |
| Operatives, including transport | 7,350 | 12,612 | 5,262 | 58.3 | 71.6 |
| Manufacturing | 7,479 | 12,644 | 5,165 | 59.2 | 69.1 |
| Durable goods | 8,305 | 12,648 | 4,343 | 65.7 | 52.3 |
| Nondurable goods | 6,736 | 122,631 | 5,895 | 53.3 | 87.5 |
| Nonmanufacturing | 6,401 | 12,436 | 6,135 | 51.1 | 95.8 |
| Operatives (except transport) | 7,342 | 12,384 | 5,042 | 59.3 | 68.7 |
| Laborers (except farm) | 7,441 | 10,824 | 3,383 | 68.7 | 45.5 |
| Manufacturing | 7,533 | 12,061 | 4,528 | 64.5 | 60.1 |

MEDIAN EARNINGS OF YEAR-ROUND FULL TIME CIVILIAN WORKERS
BY OCCUPATION GROUP AND SEX, 1977--CONTINUED

| Occupation group | Women | Men | Dollar gap | Women's earnings as a percent of men's | Percent men's earnings exceeded women's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Service workers (except private household) | 6,108 | 10,332 | 4,224 | 59.1 | 69.2 |
| Cleaning services workers | 6,353 | 9,201 | 2,848 | 69.0 | 44.8 |
| Food service workers | 5,255 | 7,332 | 2,007 | 71.7 | 39.5 |
| Health service workers | 7.050 | 8,643 | 1,593 | 81.6 | 22.6 |
| Personal service workers | 6,097 | 9,553 | 3,456 | 63.8 | 56.7 |
| Farm workers | 1,635 | 6,412 | 4,777 | 25.5 | 292.2 |

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, P-60, No. 118.

# APPENDIX B

## AVILA WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE MATERIALS

THE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
NOMINATION FORM

STATEMENT OF NOMINATION

To be completed by organization/business wishing to nominate and sponsor a participant.

Please consider _____ as a candidate to the next session of the Women's Leadership Institute. This individual possesses demonstrated leadership ability, has a commitment to community betterment, and has agreed to participate fully in the weekly training sessions and the mentor program that follows. If our candidate is selected, we agree to pay the $200 tuition fee by the class starting date unless alternative arrangements are made.

Nominated by _____
Position/Title _____
Organization _____
Address _____
Phone _____

____ We are also interested in providing financial assistance in the amount of $_____ to sponsor a worthy candidate (in lieu of or in addition to our own candidate).

____ If our candidate is selected, we request your consideration of scholarship assistance in the amount of $_____.

____ RETURN BY AUGUST 1st TO: Marcy Caldwell, Project Director
WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
Avila College
11901 Wornall Road
Kansas City, Missouri 64145

AVILA COLLEGE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

DATES & TIMES FOR SESSION XII

Session XII of the Women's Leadership Institute will begin Tuesday, September 4, 1984, and will meet weekly on Tuesday evenings (with the exception of one all-day Saturday Retreat) from 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. for sixteen weeks in the Whitfield Center Conference Room, Avila College Campus, 11901 Wornall Road, Kansas City, Missouri.

TUITION COSTS

Because partial funding has been received, we are able to offer the Institute training at a nominal fee to the thirty women selected to participate in each training session. The fee for the sixteen-week training period and the mentor program that follows is $200.

DEADLINE FOR NOMINATIONS

All Nomination and Profile Forms must be returned no later than Wednesday, August 1, 1984, in order to be eligible for consideration. consideration. Candidates will be notified of their selection by August 15th.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Please contact MARCY CALDWELL, WLI Project Director, Avila College, Department of Continuing Education: 942-8400, ext. 280

THE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
CANDIDATE PROFILE FORM

PERSONAL DATA

NAME _____ EMPLOYER (if any) _____

HOME ADDRESS _____ JOB FUNCTION/POSITION _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____ EMPLOYER ADDRESS _____

HOME PHONE # _____ WORK PHONE # _____

WLI PARTICIPATION SPONSORED BY_____
ORGANIZATION PAYING TUITION FEE OR "SELF"

LEADERSHIP & BACKGROUND
Please give a brief description of past and/or present leadership experience. This may be salaried or non-salaried; include professional/ civic organizational involvement and offices held if any:

1)_____
2)_____
3)_____
4)_____

Because the Women's Leadership Institute is committed to providing leadership training to women representing a broad cross-section of the community, please indicate race/ethnic origin and religious preference.

____ Black--Non-Hispanic Origin
____ White--Non-Hispanic Origin
____ Hispanic
____ American Indian
____ Other

____ Protestant
____ Catholic
____ Jewish
____ Other

STATEMENT OF PARTICIPATION
Briefly describe reasons for wanting to participate in the Women's Leadership Institute:

_____
_____

I understand that the purpose of the Women's Leadership Institute is to increase the number of women in leadership roles in the Kansas City community; hence, I pledge a commitment to community betterment and to increasing my impact in our community. I further agree to participate fully in the sixteen weekly training session and consider the mentor program that follows.

_____
Nominee Signature

AVILA COLLEGE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
CURRICULUM SCHEDULE

September 4 -- INTRODUCTION & ORIENTATION; STRENGTH BOMBARDMENT

September 11 -- LEADERSHIP AND YOUR PERSONAL STYLE
Marcella Womack

September 18 -- BREAKING FREE: MOVING BEYOND SOCIALIZATION
Marcella Womack

September 22 -- SATURDAY RETREAT: POT LUCK & "ME" BOXES

September 25 -- WOMEN & POWER: PERSONAL & ORGANIZATIONAL
Dr. Linda Moore

October 2 -- PANEL OF ROLE MODELS

October 9 -- THE PSYCHOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP
Dr. John O'Hearne & Barbara Myers O'Hearne

October 16 -- THE POWER STRUCTURE: PLAYING THE SYSTEM
Mark Shapiro

October 23 -- COMMUNITY VISION PANEL

October 30 -- THE HOW-TO'S OF LEADERSHIP
Kay Waldo

*November 6 -- NO SESSION DUE TO ELECTION

November 13 -- ISSUES & ANSWERS PANEL
Panelists to be announced

November 20 -- BALANCING ROLES
Marcella Womack

November 27 -- GOAL SETTING
Marcella Womack

December 4 -- THE MENTOR SYSTEM

December 11 -- YES, YOU CAN DO IT TOO!
Success stories of WLI alumna

TEA ---------- GRADUATION & PARTY

NOTE: Participants must attend a minimum of ELEVEN sessions in order to receive CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION. If a participant does not meet this requirement, missed sessions can be "made Up" next semester and the certificate will be awarded at that time.

AVILA COLLEGE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MENTOR SYSTEM

One of the most unique features of the Women's Leadership Institute is the MENTOR SYSTEM. The object of this segment of the Institute is to allow WLI participants the opportunity to better understand leadership and how it operates by putting them in contact with an established community leader of their choice who is willing to serve as an information and resource person for the WLI participant. Below are some points that characterize the MENTOR SYSTEM:

1) The Mentor System is designed to be five months in length with perhaps one meeting per month. This time frame is only a guideline; we have found that some individuals have been able to accomplish their relationship objectives in one or two meetings while others have established on-going relationships.

2) Mentor-mentee relationships are very individual; hopefully tailored to the particular needs of the participant, as well as to the style and level of time commitment of the mentor.

3) Mentors serve as resource persons and information sources for participants.

4) Participants chose mentors on a variety of bases; some in terms of current or prospective careers, others in terms of community involvement.

5) The Mentor System serves as a means of broadening and enlarging the network system that is already underway among WLI participants.

6) In addition to meeting(s) between mentor and mentee, a variety of other activities can take place if both parties are willing:

   * The mentor may arrange for the mentee to observe and/or attend meetings or other appropriate functions;
   * The mentee may invite her mentor to activities, meetings, etc.;
   * The mentor may recommend reading materials, etc. for the mentee.

To date over seventy-five community leaders have participated in the Women's Leadership Institute Mentor Program (see back).

It is recommended that the first interaction between mentor and mentee (whether it be a telephone conversation or meeting) be devoted to dialogue clarifying the goals and objectives for the relationship. The WLI participant should have her objectives for this portion of the project clearly in mind and be prepared to present these goals to her prospective mentor. The mentor and participant can then develop a "plan" for achieving those objectives. Should a mentor feel the participant has outlined goals that he/she cannot assist the participant in achieving, the relationship may be terminated at the first meeting.

AVILA COLLEGE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
PARTICIPANT GUIDELINES FOR THE MENTOR SYSTEM

MENTOR SELECTION

As a WLI participant, you are encouraged to select an individual to be your mentor. This selection can be made on a variety of bases:

1) In some cases, the participant is already personally acquainted with the individual she wishes to serve as her mentor. She may chose this individual because she would like to become better acquainted with him/her or become acquainted on another level;

2) Frequently, a participant only knows of someone she would like to serve as her mentor. She generally selects this individual because of some position she/he holds or because of some knowledge, skill or expertise possessed;

3) Occasionally, a participant may be interested in a particular area but not know of a prospective mentor. In this case, the participant should talk with the project director, facilitators and other participants who can recommend an individual with expertise in her area of interest.

MENTOR GUIDELINES: HOW DOES IT WORK?

1) Complete the MENTOR REQUEST FORM and provide as much information as possible about your mentor choice;

2) The Project Director will then make the initial contact in a letter introducing the program concept and YOU to your mentor choice. The introductory letter will also outline briefly your reasons for selecting that individual. You will be sent a copy of this letter.

3) It is then YOUR RESPONSIBILITY to contact your mentor choice to verify his/her willingness to commit to the relationship and discuss your goals for the relationship. This contact should be made WITHIN TWO WEEKS of receiving notification that the introductory letter was sent.

4) Contact Marcy Caldwell and let her know the results of your initial conversation. If your first mentor choice is not willing to commit to the relationship, the above process will then be repeated with your second mentor choice.

TIPS FOR A SUCCESSFUL MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

1) DO contact your mentor within two weeks after receiving notice that the initial contact has been made.

2) DO outline what you hope to accomplish in the relationship prior to your initial interaction and share these goals with your mentor. If your mentor is going to assist you in meeting your needs, she/he needs to be aware of what they are. Also, the mentor needs to have an opportunity for input in the process. It may be the mentor will not be able to help you with all of your objectives.

3) DO ask for what you need (i.e., attend meetings w/mentor, etc.). Write down your objectives and give a copy to your mentor at your first meeting. You can then go down the list item for item with your mentor negotiating each point.

4) DO thank your mentor in writing. Your mentor needs to know when your relationship is officially over (for the purposes of the project that is) so that she/he isn't left wondering what happened to you.

DON'T HESITATE TO CALL Marcy, Joan, Jody or Marcella if you find yourself in an uncomfortable mentor relationship and want to discuss it. We want to serve as a resource for you in this important aspect of the project and we may be able to help you on the basis of prior experience. We want you to have an enjoyable and profitable mentor experience!

AVILA COLLEGE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
MENTOR REQUEST FORM

Participant Name_____ Day Phone_____

Home Address_____ Eve Phone_____

_____ Session #_____

Identify the primary area in which you would like mentor guidance:

_____

Have you had previous experience in this area?_____

If so, please detail_____

Briefly outline your goals for your mentor relationship?_____

_____

_____

Name of 1st mentor choice_____

Mentor Address_____

Mentor Phone #_____

Briefly state your reasons for selection this individual:

_____

_____

Name of 2nd mentor choice_____

Mentor Address_____

Mentor Phone #_____

Briefly state your reasons for selecting this individual:

_____

_____

***You may wish to attach your resume and/or goals to be mailed with introductory letter to your mentor choice.

AVILA COLLEGE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
WHAT MENTORS DO

Daniel Lea, Ph.D.
Zandy B. Leibowitz Ph.D.
Counseling Psychologist
University of Maryland

**Teaching**
The mentor instructs the mentee in the specific skills and knowledge necessary for successful job performance or otherwise assists in the person's career development. The method of instruction can be formal, informal, direct or subtle.

**Guiding**
Every organization has its "unwritten rules," and the more experienced mentor orients the novice mentee in these. Despite a wealth of formal skills and knowledge, a novice mentee could very quickly become a "bull in a china shop" without some instruction in the informal rules of the organization. For example, coffeebreak rap sessions may appear to be a waste of time on the surface; however, in actuality these informal chats may serve as an essential team-building function. A novice who unwittingly overlooks this group norm could run the risk of being ostracized.

**Advising**
Teaching and guiding are mentoring behaviors usually initiated by the mentor while advising often occurs in response to a request by the mentee. The difference between the advice of mentors and the advice of others should be the quality of advice. The mentor should be imparting wisdom based on a high degree of competence and extensive expertise. In a relatively short time span, the mentee benefits from experiences that often have taken a lifetime to accumulate.

**Counseling**
The mentor provides emotional support in stressful times. The mentor listens to the mentee's concerns and communicates an empathetic understanding of those concerns. In addition, the mentor often helps the mentee to clarify career goals and to develop plans of action to achieve those goals.

**Sponsoring**
The mentor's influence or clout provides growth opportunities for the mentee. The mentor can but does not always have to "pull strings" to be helpful. Sometimes the mere fact that the mentee is associated with the mentor opens doors. Sponsoring does not mean giving someone a "free ride." What happens once inside those doors is largely the mentee's responsibility.

**Role-modeling**
The mentor serves as a person whom the mentee can emulate. Role modeling usually occurs subtly as an outcome of the relationship rather than by conscious design by either the mentor or mentee. The mentor's traits and behaviors become a blueprint that the mentee unconsciously uses to pattern his or her manner. The mentor epitomizes the mythical "who you want to be when you grow up" or sometimes, "who you don't want to be."

**Validating**
The mentor evaluates, possibly modifies, and finally addresses the mentee's goals and aspirations. In essence, the mentor bestows his or her blessings on the mentee's aspirations, suggesting they are realistic goals. If a mentor cannot at least accept the possibility of the mentee achieving his or her aspirations, it is doubtful whether a mentor relationship can be maintained for very long.

**Motivating**
Validating involves helping mentees to believe in their goals. In motivating, the mentor provides the encouragement and impetus for the mentee to move toward achievement of those goals. Whether done through a "kick in the pants" or a "pat on the back," the end result is action. Some mentors are drill sergeants; some are cheerleaders.

**Protecting**
The mentor serves as a buffer for the mentee's risk taking. He or she provides a safe environment where the mentee can make mistakes without losing self-confidence. The mentee learns, not only how to succeed, but also how to fail without feeling defeated. This aspect of mentoring makes it easier for mentees later to make decisions or otherwise act when faced with uncertainty.

**Communicating**
The mentor establishes open lines of communication through which concerns can be discussed clearly and effectively. Communication is insufficient by itself to insure good mentoring. However, the effectiveness of the other nine mentoring behaviors is largely mediated by the mentor's effectiveness as a communicator. Expertise means little if it cannot be communicated.

COMMUNITY LEADERS WHO HAVE SERVED AS MENTORS FOR THE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE:

Ruth Achelpohl, Asst. Executive Director
KC Association of Mental Health

Marjorie Allen, President
Powell Family Foundations

Jean Bacon, Director
Dept. of Aging/ MAJC

Barbara Barickman
Public Ralations & Promotions

Dr. Richard Biery, Director
Kansas City Health Department

Dr. Monica Breidenbach, Executive Director
Full Circle

Joanne Collins
KCMO City Council

Kent Crippin, Mayor
City of Leawood, Kansas

Charles Curran, President
KC Association of Trusts & Foundations

Joan D'Agostino, Manager
Alameda Plaza Hotel Operations

Pat Ferris
KCMO Public Schools

Joanne Field, Director
Concern Counts

Don Flora, Director
MAHSA

Jane Flynn, Director
KCMO Landmarks Commission

Karen Foss, Anchorwoman
KCMO TV-5

Euphemania Foster, Director
Women's Bureau, Dept. of Labor

Sue Ellen Fried

Samella Gates, Director
KCMO Urban Affairs Department

Dawn Gibaau, Editor
National Catholic Reporter

Barbara Haar
Greater KC Mental Health

Adele Hall, Chairperson
United Way Campaign

Barbara Harlow
Management Consultant

Thomas J. Higgins
Principal Regional Officer
Dept. of HEW

Irvine O. Hockaday, President
Kansas City Southern Industries

Mamie Hughes, Director
Black Economic Union

Steve Israelite
Neighborhood Consumer Affairs Officer
Dept. of HUD

Ann Jacobson, Director
Voluntary Action Center

Bill Johnson
Director of Public Relations
Hallmark Cards, Inc.

Ona Lee Johnson, Coordinator
Continuing Education Services
American Nurses Association

Jan Kreamer, President
KC Association of Trusts & Foundations

Marian Kreamer

Norma Lewis
UMKC Nursing

Johanna Lingle

Ruth Margolin, Director
Women's Resource Service

Karen McCarthy-Benson
MO House of Representatives

Bob McGregor, Vice-President
KC Chamber of Commerce

Dr. Diane McKinstry
UMKC Counseling Center

Elizabeth Mixon, Sr. Vice-President
Research Medical Center

Dr. Linda Moore
Psychologist & Counselor

Annette Morgan
MO House of Representatives

Marl Neal
Mid-Continent Council of Girl Scouts

Clifford Nesselrode, President
Home State Bank of KCK

Dell Myland, Executive Director
KC Area Hospital Association

Dorothy Ochner
Waddell & Reed

Dr. Phil Olson
UMKC Professor of Sociology

Lenore Park, Vice-President
United Missouri Bank of KC

Terry Patterson

Barbara Pendleton, Executive VP
City Bank

Robert Rasmussen, Director
Prime Health

Jack Reardon, Mayor
City of Kansas City, Kansas

Denise Regan
Urban League

Mark Robinson
KC Royals Stadium

Roy Rogers
North American Plant Breeders

Ruth Ronfeldt, Assoc. Exec. Director
St. Luke's Hospital

Arlene Schley

Mark Shapiro, Director
KC Historical Foundation

George Sims, Personnel Director
First National Bank of KC

Terri Springer
Community Relations Coordinator
St. Luke's Hospital

A. H. Campbell Schanck
Manager of Personnel Administration
Trans World Airlines

Dr. Linda Talbot, Director
Clearinghouse for Mid-Continent Foundations

Jeannette Terry
Manager of Career Planning & Placement
Johnson County Community College

Charlotte Thayer
Attorney

Mary Vernassie, President
Real Estate Board of KCMO

Dean Vogelaar
Director of Public Relations
KC Royals Baseball Club

David Wagoner
Director of Air & Hazardous Materials
Division of EPA Region VII Office

Kay Waldo
KCMO City Council

Gwendolyn Wells
Attorney

Alan Wheat
U. S. Congressman

Dr. Robert Wheeler, Superintendent
Kansas City School District

Marcella Womack
Trainer, Consultant

Dr. Chris Wyatt
Senior Social Systems Analyst
Midwest Research Institute

NOTE: Job titles/positions listed are those held at the time of the mentor's participation in the program.

# APPENDIX C

# INSTRUMENTS

AVILA COLLEGE WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE
ALUMNI SURVEY

This survey is part of a study on women and leadership. Please be as candid and accurate as you can. We do not need your name as this information is for research purposes only. This research will hopefully make a significant contribution to the literature in the women's leadership and mentoring area as well as provide feedback for the Avila College Program.

INFORMATION ON SELF - Part 1

1. What is your present occupational field? _____
   Number of years in it. _____

2. What is your present Position? _____
   Number of years in it. _____

3. How many years of education do you have? _____

4. What is your highest degree? _____ Major? _____
   Number of years you have had it. _____

5. What is your age? _____

6. What career stage do you consider yourself to be in?

   a. ____ Initiation: Beginning level, getting my bearings in my position, in my field

   b. ____ Independent Contributor: Have my bearings in my position, field; have become an initiator of my own projects in the organization

   c. ____ Mentor to Others: Have achieved success in career and can now help others who are beginning careers

   d. ____ Overseer: Have achieved success inside and outside of the organization; shapes direction of organization; leadership role in organization or field, not as much direct contact with content area of expertise

7. Your occupational history, beginning with present position:

| Type of Organization | Type of Position | Dates Held | Wage (Yr) |
|---|---|---|---|

Avila College Leadership
Institute Alumni Survey
Part 1

8. Who nominated you to be in the Avila College Leadership Institute?

   Organization _____ Position _____

9. How many sessions were you able to attend? Date began _____

10. In retrospect, which sessions were the most helpful? Why?

_____

_____

_____

11. What do you feel were the positive and/or negative outcomes of participating in this Leadership Institute?

_____

_____

12. Did you participate in the Mentor/Protege component in the Avila College Women's Leadership Institute? _____

    If so, when? _____ Date began _____

13. What is your definition of a Mentor? _____

_____

_____

14. Using the Helping Continuum as a guide, indicate any other types of relationships you have experienced, state the number of each:

    The Helping Continuum: Mentor..Sponsor..Guide..Peer Pal

    a. ____ Sponsor: Strong patrons, but less powerful than mentors in promoting and shaping the careers of their proteges.

    b. ____ Guide: Less able than a mentor or sponsor to fulfill the roles of benefactor, protector, or champion, but can explain the system and provide valuable information about pitfalls and shortcuts.

Avila College Leadership
Institute Alumni Survey
Part 1

c. ____ Peer Pal: Colleagues of an equal level who share information and strategies and help each other to succeed and progress.

15. Do you belong to any professional career networking groups for women? Name and give number of years.

_____

_____

16. Does your employing organization provide any type of mentoring or other helping experience? _____

If so, describe. _____

_____

17. Have you acted as a mentor for others? ___#male ___#female

18. In the future, is it likely that you will act as a mentor for others?
____# male ____# female

19. How many promotions have you received since completing the Avila Leadership Institute? _____

20. How many salary increases have you received since completing the Avila Leadership Institute? _____

Approximate total amount _____

Avila College Leadership
Institute Alumni Survey
Part 2

1. Characteristics of the Avila Institute Mentor Relationship:

   a. Information
      1) ___ taught political ropes
      2) ___ introduced you to the "right" people
      3) ___ helped cut through red tape in the organization

   b. Education
      1) ___ gave insights into the business
      2) ___ showed how to move effectively through the system
      3) ___ modeled appropriate professional behaviors

   c. Support
      1) ___ candid, constructive criticism
      2) ___ sounding board for decision making
      3) ___ counseling and support
      4) ___ stood up for you in meetings, defended you in controversy

   d. Advancement
      1) ___ increased your visibility in the organization
      2) ___ singled you out from the crowd of competing peers and suggested you as a candidate for opportunities
      3) ___ provided clear signals to others that you had their backing
      4) ___ helped provide you with an aura of power and upward mobility
      5) ___ was career dream/goal facilitator

2. Did the Avila Institute Mentor Relationship change you in any of the following areas?

   a. Information
      1) ___ awareness of "inside" informal system in organization
      2) ___ ability to function appropriately in system
      3) ___ acquainted with "the right" key people

   b. Education
      1) ___ knowledge of job content, the business
      2) ___ expert in field
      3) ___ ability to work with people in organization

Avila College Leadership
Institute Alumni Survey
Part 2

c. Support
   1) ___ self-confidence
   2) ___ risk taking skills, assertiveness
   3) ___ decision making skills
   4) ___ independence

d. Advancement
   1) ___ promotions
   2) ___ salary raise
   3) ___ increased fringe benefits
   4) ___ better job, new organization
   5) ___ feelings of achievement, accomplishment
   6) ___ others feel you have achieved, accomplished
   7) ___ you have reached a top level position in field and/or organization
   8) ___ reached career "dream/goal"

3. Describe any negative characteristics and/or outcomes of the Avila Mentorship component. _____

_____

_____

4. Check the characteristics of your Avila Institute mentor:

a. Position _____ Sex _____
b. Length of active relationship _____
c. ___ self-confident
d. ___ successful and accomplished
e. ___ in a position of power, authority in organization/ field
f. ___ older ____ number of years at the time
g. ___ younger ____ number of years at the time
h. ___ approximately the same age
i. ___ really cared about my career advancement
j. ___ went out of his/her way to "bring me along"
k. ___ close, almost paternalistic/maternalistic
l. ___ had a great deal of confidence in me
m. ___ was a role model for me
n. ___ negative characteristics, describe: _____

_____

5. Was the mentor identified initially by you or the Institute?

Avila College Leadership
Institute Alumni Survey
Part 3

1. Check all areas in which you would like assistance in your career.

   a. Information
      1) ___ teach political ropes
      2) ___ introduce you to the "right" people
      3) ___ help cut through red tape in the organization

   b. Education
      1) ___ give insights into the business
      2) ___ show how to moved effectively through the system
      3) ___ model appropriate professional behaviors

   c. Support
      1) ___ candid, constructive criticism
      2) ___ sounding board for decision making
      3) ___ counseling and support
      4) ___ stand up for you in meetings, defend you in controversy

   d. Advancement
      1) ___ increase your visibility in the organization
      2) ___ single you out from the crowd of competing peers
      3) ___ provide clear signals to others that you have their backing
      4) ___ help provide you with an aura of power and upward mobility
      5) ___ is your career dream/goal facilitator

2. Check all that you feel you possess or have achieved regarding your career.

   a. Information
      1) ___ awareness of "inside" informal system in organization
      2) ___ ability to function appropriately in system
      3) ___ acquainted with the "right" key people

   b. Education
      1) ___ knowledge of job content, the business
      2) ___ expert in field
      3) ___ ability to work with people in organization

   c. Support
      1) ___ self-confidence
      2) ___ risk taking, assertiveness
      3) ___ decision making skills
      4) ___ independence

Avila College Leadership
Institute Alumni Survey
Part 3

d. Advancement
   1) ___ promotions
   2) ___ salary raise
   3) ___ increased fringe benefits
   4) ___ better job, new organization
   5) ___ feelings of achievement, accomplishment
   6) ___ others feel you have achieved, accomplished
   7) ___ you have reached a top level position in field and/or organization
   8) ___ reached career "dream/goal"

# APPENDIX D

## TABLES FROM THE AVILA MENTORSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE 6

SUMMARY TABLE OF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AVILA INSTITUTE FORMALIZED MENTOR REPORTED BY ALUMNI ON THE AMQ

| | Characteristics | Protégé Response N = 50 |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Self Confident | 35 |
| 2. | Successful and Accomplished | 39 |
| 3. | In a Position of Power, Authority | 37 |
| 4. | Age Difference - Older | 31 |
| 5. | Age Difference - Older, Mean of Years | 14.69 |
| 6. | Age Difference - Younger | 4 |
| 7. | Age Difference - Younger, Mean of Years | 6 |
| 8. | Age Difference - Same | 5 |
| 9. | Really Cared About Protégé Career Advancement | 15 |
| 10. | Went Out of Way to "bring me along" | 14 |
| 11. | Close, almost parental feeling | 6 |
| 12. | Had a Great Deal of Confidence in Me | 17 |
| 13. | Was a Role Model | 28 |
| 14. | Had Negative Characteristics | 7 |
| 15. | Mentor Was Identified by Institute | 30 |
| 16. | Mentor Was Identified by Protégé | 11 |
| 17. | Mentor Identification Not Indicated | 9 |
| 18. | No. of Male Mentors in Study | 15 |
| 19. | No. of Female Mentors in Study | 24 |
| 20. | No. of Mentors, no sex identified by subjects in the study | 11 |

TABLE 7

SUMMARY TABLE OF UNMENTORED AND MENTORED SUBJECTS' RESPONSES TO AMQ QUESTIONS REGARDING INFORMATION

| | Unmentored N = 50 | Mentored N = 50 |
|---|---|---|
| Questions Regarding Desired Career Assistance | | |
| 1. Teach Political Ropes | 18 | 20 |
| 2. Introduce to "Right" People | 30 | 29 |
| 3. Help Cut Through Red Tape in Organization | 19 | 16 |
| Questions Regarding Characteristics of the Avila Mentorship Relationship | | |
| 1. Teach Political Ropes | | 27 |
| 2. Introduce to "Right" People | | 8 |
| 3. Help Cut Through Red Tape in Organization | | 2 |
| Questions Regarding Career Achievements | | |
| 1. Awareness of "Inside" Informal System | 32 | 33 |
| 2. Ability to Function Appropriately in System | 36 | 38 |
| 3. Know "Right" Key People | 22 | 18 |
| Questions Regarding Changes Due to Avila Mentorship Relationship | | |
| 1. Awareness of "Inside" Informal System | | 21 |
| 2. Ability to Function Appropriately in System | | 7 |
| 3. Know "Right" Key People | | 5 |

TABLE 8

SUMMARY TABLE OF UNMENTORED AND MENTORED SUBJECTS' RESPONSES TO AMQ QUESTIONS REGARDING EDUCATION

| | Unmentored N = 50 | Mentored N = 50 |
|---|---|---|
| Questions Regarding Desired Career Assistance | | |
| 1. Give Insights into Business | 16 | 25 |
| 2. Show How to Move Through System | 22 | 22 |
| 3. Model Appropriate Professional Behaviors | 20 | 20 |
| Questions Regarding Characteristics of the Avila Mentorship Relationship | | |
| 1. Gave Insights into Business | | 26 |
| 2. Show How to Move Through System | | 6 |
| 3. Model Appropriate Professional Behaviors | | 10 |
| Questions Regarding Career Achievements | | |
| 1. Knowledge of Jobs, Business | 35 | 38 |
| 2. Expert in Field | 17 | 15 |
| 3. Ability to Work with People | 37 | 41 |
| Questions Regarding Changes Due to Avila Mentorship Relationship | | |
| 1. Knowledge of Job, Business | | 22 |
| 2. Expert in Field | | 4 |
| 3. Ability to Work with People | | 9 |

TABLE 9

SUMMARY TABLE OF UNMENTORED AND MENTORED SUBJECTS' RESPONSES TO AMQ QUESTIONS REGARDING SUPPORT

| | Unmentored N = 50 | Mentored N = 50 |
|---|---|---|
| **Questions Regarding Desired Career Assistance** | | |
| 1. Candid Constructive Criticism | 25 | 30 |
| 2. Sounding Board--Decision Making | 28 | 29 |
| 3. Counseling and Support | 25 | 31 |
| 4. Stood Up for You in Meetings, Controversy | 10 | 14 |
| **Questions Regarding Characteristics of the Avila Mentorship Relationship** | | |
| 1. Candid Constructive Criticism | | 19 |
| 2. Sounding Board--Decision Making | | 15 |
| 3. Counseling and Support | | 6 |
| 4. Stood Up for You in Meetings, Controversy | | 0 |
| **Questions Regarding Career Achievements** | | |
| 1. Self Confidence | 34 | 37 |
| 2. Risk Taking, Assertiveness | 30 | 35 |
| 3. Decision Making Skills | 35 | 39 |
| 4. Independence | 35 | 35 |

TABLE 9--CONTINUED

| | Unmentored N = 50 | Mentored n = 50 |
|---|---|---|
| Questions Regarding Changes Due to Avila Mentorship Relationship | | |
| 1. Self Confidence | | 26 |
| 2. Risk Taking, Assertiveness | | 7 |
| 3. Decision Making Skills | | 3 |
| 4. Independence | | 2 |

TABLE 10

SUMMARY TABLE OF UNMENTORED AND MENTORED SUBJECTS' RESPONSES TO AMQ QUESTIONS REGARDING ADVANCEMENT

| | Unmentored N = 50 | Mentored N = 50 |
|---|---|---|
| Questions Regarding Desired Career Assistance | | |
| 1. Increase Visibility in Organization | 17 | 23 |
| 2. Single You Out From the Crowd of Competing Peers | 19 | 26 |
| 3. Provide Clear Signals to Others That You Have Their Backing | 18 | 21 |
| 4. Provide You with Aura of Power and Upward Mobility | 19 | 24 |
| 5. Have a Career Dream/Goal Facilitator | 13 | 18 |
| Questions Regarding Characteristics of the Avila Mentorship Relationship | | |
| 1. Increase Visibility in Organization | | 10 |
| 2. Single You Out From the Crowd of Competing Peers | | 6 |
| 3. Provide Clear Signals to Others That You Have Their Backing | | 5 |
| 4. Provide You with Aura of Power and Upward Mobility | | 6 |
| 5. Have a Career Dream/Goal Facilitator | | 9 |

TABLE 10--CONTINUED

| | Unmentored N = 50 | Mentored N = 50 |
|---|---|---|
| **Questions Regarding Career Achievements** | | |
| 1. Promotions | 17 | 22 |
| 2. Salary Raise | 19 | 25 |
| 3. Increased Fringe Benefits | 9 | 14 |
| 4. Better Job, New Organization | 15 | 25 |
| 5. Feelings of Achievement | 31 | 32 |
| 6. Others Feel You Have Achieved | 33 | 39 |
| 7. You Have Reached Top Position | 8 | 21 |
| 8. Reached Career Dream/Goal | 2 | 6 |
| **Questions Regarding Changes Due to Avila Mentorship Relationship** | | |
| 1. Promotions | | 8 |
| 2. Salary Raise | | 6 |
| 3. Increased Fringe Benefits | | 1 |
| 4. Better Job, New Organization | | 3 |
| 5. Feelings of Achievement | | 7 |
| 6. Others Feel You Have Achieved | | 0 |
| 7. You Have Reached Top Position | | 0 |
| 8. Reached Career Dream/Goal | | 1 |

# REFERENCES

# REFERENCES

Alabraith, J. R. (1982, Winter). Designing the innovating organization. Organizational Dynamics.

Alleman, E. (1982). Mentoring relationships in organizations: Behaviors, personality characteristics, and interpersonal perceptions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, Akron.

Arbetter, J. L. (1980). A season in a psychotherapist's life: an exploratory study of the mentor relationship and the role that it plays in the development of male and female psychotherapists. Unpublished Ed.D dissertation, Boston University School of Education, Boston.

Atwood, A. H. (1982). Effects of a three month mentorship on mentors and new graduate nurses in an acute care urban hospital (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(a-A), 3817.

Barnier, L. A. (1981). A study of the mentoring relationship: An analysis of its relation to career and adult development in higher education and business (Doctoral dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(07), 3012.

Baron, A. S. (1982). What men are saying about women in business. Business Horizon, 25, 10-14.

Bearden, K. W. (1984). Women protégés' perceptions of the mentoring process (Doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(06), 164D.

Bigoness, W. J. (1976). Effects of applicant sex, race, and performance on employer's performance ratings: Some additional findings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 80-84.

Blackburn, R. T., Chapman, D. W., & Cameron S. M. (1981). Cloning in academic careers. Research in Higher Education, 15(4), 315-327.

Borman, C. & Colson, S. (1984, March). Mentoring: An effective career guidance technique. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 32(3), 192-197.

Brown, M., & Richards, T. (1982, August). How to create creativity. Management Today, pp. 38-41.

Brown, S. (1979). Male vs. female leaders: A comparison of empirical studies. Sex Roles, 5(5), 595-600.

Buros, O. K. (Ed.). (1972a). Reading tests and reviews. Highland Park, NJ: Aryplion Press.

Buros, O. K. (Ed.). (1972b). The seventh mental measurement yearbook. Highland Park, NJ: Aryplion Press.

Buros, O. K. (Ed.). (1972c). The sixth mental measurement yearbook. Highland Park, NJ: Aryplion Press.

Busch, J. W. (1983). An analysis of mentoring relationships in schools of education. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of New Mexico. Order No. DA8501197.

Carnegie Corporation report to the president's council on women and education (1976). Women working: Toward a new society.

Carr-Ruffion, N. (1982). The promotable women: Becoming a successful manager. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Clawson, J. G. (1984, April). Is mentoring necessary? Training and Development Journal, 36-39.

Clawson, J. G., and Kram, K. E. (1984, May/June). Managing cross-gender mentoring. Business Horizons, 22-32.

Colwill, N. L. (1984). Mentors and protégés, women and men. Business Quarterly, 19-21.

Crawford, K. S. (1980, October-December). Pygmalion at sea: Improving the work effectiveness of low performers. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 16(4), 482-505.

Cronin, J. M. (1973, October). Educating the majority: A woman power policy for the 1970's. Phi Delta Kappan, 55, 138-139.

Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P. H., & Price, R. L. (1977). The four stages of professional careers: A new look at performance by professionals. Organizational Dynamics, 6(1), 19-42.

Dauw, D. C. (1980, July-August). Creativity, personal and organizational growth. Industrial Management, (US), 22.

Davis, R. D. (1984). The influences of schooling, job experience, information about job openings, mentoring geographic mobility, and discrimination on the

selection of college and university presidents (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(04), 1049.

Dayhoff, S. A. (1983). Single and multiple mentors: Perceived effects on managerial success (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(5-R), 1636.

Delmont, B., & Demond, R. (1983, September). Personal approaches to career planning. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 32(1), 6-15.

Estler, S. (1977). In proceedings of the conference on women's leadership and authority in the health professions. (HEW contract #HRH, 23-76-0269), pp. 197-217.

Fagan, M. M., & Walter, G. (1982, November-December). Mentoring among teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 76(2), 113-118.

Farren, C. Dreyfus, G. J., and Kaye, B. (1985, November-December). Mentoring: A boon to career development. Personnel, 20-25.

Follon, S. E. (1983). Role models and mentors: A study of the career patterns of women in higher education administration (Iowa). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Drake University, Des Moines.

Fowler, D. L. (1980). An analysis of sex and departmental differences in the perceptions of assistant professors regarding work environments, mentoring, and academic employment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Champaign.

Ganz-Sarto, K. (1985, April). Training today. Training, 13-15.

Gilmour, S. L. (1983). Toward a model of mentors' influence on the personal and professional development of principals (protégé, administrators, women). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse.

Gordon, C. L. (1983). Toward a conceptual framework of the mentor-mentee relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, Boston.

Gordon, D. J., & Meredith, P. H. (1982, January-February). Creating and using a model to monitor managerial talent. Business Horizons.

Hanson, P. A. (1983). Protégé perceptions of the mentor-protégé relationship: Its complementary nature and developmental tasks. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Hennig, M. (1971). Career development for women executives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Boston.

Hennig, M. M., & Jardim, A. (1977). The managerial woman. New York: Doubleday.

Jennings, E. E. (1971). Routes to the executive suite. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Katz, E. A. (1980). Women in professional training: A study of the influence of mentors and sex ratio. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.

Kram, K. E. (1985, April). Improving the mentoring process. Training and Development Journal, 40-42.

Kram, K. E. (1984). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Glenview, Il.: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Kram, K. E. (1980). Mentoring process at work: Developmental relationships in managerial careers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.

Kram, K. E. (1983, December). Phases of the mentor relationship. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26(4), 52-56.

Larwood, L., & Blackmore, J. (1978). Sex discrimination in managerial selection: Testing predictions of the vertical dyad linkage model. Sex Roles, 4, 359-367.

Levinson, D. J. , Darrow, C. M., Klein, E. G., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Lynch, D. (1980, February). The case for disorderly conduct: How to get the most out of managerial manpower. Management Review, 69, 15-19.

Lyon, C. C., & Saario, T. N. (1973, October). Women in public education: Sex discrimination in promotions. Phi Delta Kappan, 55, 120-123.

McClelland, D. C. (1905). Achievement and entrepreneurship: A longitudinal study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 359-392.

McNeer, E. J. (1981). The role of mentoring in the career development of women administrators in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Mehills, D. (1981). Role model and mentor influences on the career development of academic women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University.

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. Adult Education Quarterly, 33(3), 161-173.

Missirian, A. K. (1980). The process of mentoring in career development of female managers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Mitchell, J. V. (Ed.) (1983). Tests in print, III. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement, University of Nebraska Press.

Moore, D. (1983). California community college women administrators: A study of mentors and protégés. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Laverne.

Nolan, M. O. (1982). Mentoring and its influence on administrators in California community colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Laverne.

Orth, C. D., & Jacobs, F. (1971). Women in management: Pattern for change. Harvard Business Review, 49(4), 139-147.

Osipow, S. H. (Ed.). (1975). Emerging woman: Career analysis and outlooks. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, Co.

Parham, W. D. (1982). Mentors and mentees: Stages of development in a mentoring relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Phillips, L. L. (1979). Mentors and protégés: A study of the career development of women managers and executives in business and industry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1983). Establishing a formalized men-

toring program. Training and Development Journal, 37(2), 38-42

Pierce, C. A. (1983). Mentoring, gender, and attainment: The professional development of academic psychologists (Doctoral dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(03), 0793.

Queralt, M. (1981). The role of the mentor in the career development of university faculty members and academic administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, Miami.

Quinn, R., Tabor, J., & Gordon, L. (1968). The decision to discriminate: A study of executive selection. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Randsapp, E. (1980, October). Nurturing managerial creativity. Administrative Management, 41, 32-33.

Roach, J. M. (1980, March). Creativity training, B. F. Goodrich's new approach. AMA Forum, 69(3).

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. Harvard Business Review, 57(1), 14-28.

Robinson, D. J. (1981). Mentoring, sponsorship and support networks: Relationships with significant others in the career advancement of successful Illinois public school administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Rogers, E. M., & Bhowmik, D. K. (1971). Homophily-heterophily: Relational concepts for communicative research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 34, 523-538.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ryan, M. C. (1983). A study of career mentoring in a state government agency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Scarf, M. (1980). Unfinished business: Pressure points in the lives of women. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Schein, E. H. (1965). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shapiro, E., Hazetine, F., & Rowe, M. (1978). Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the patron system. Sloane Management Review, 19, 51-58.

Shockett, M. R. (1984). Relation among gender of mentor, gender of student, and mentoring functions. Ph.D. Dissertation, Arizona State University. #DA8415481.

Speizer, J. J. (1981). Review essay--role models, mentors and sponsors: The elusive concepts. Signs, 6(4), 692-712.

Staines, G., Travis, C., & Jayaratne, T. E. (1974, January). The queen bee syndrome. Psychology Today, pp. 55-58, 60.

Stumpf, A., & London, M. (1981). Management promotions: Individual and organizational factors influencing the decision process. Academy of Management Review, 6, 539-549.

Sweetland, R. C., & Keyser, D. J. (Eds.) (1983a). Tests: A comprehensive reference for assessments in psychology, education, and business. Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.

Sweetland, R. C., & Keyser, D. J. (Eds.) (1983b). Tests: A comprehensive reference for assessments in psychology,education, and business. Supplement. Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.

Taylor, S. (1973). Educational leadership: A male domain. Phi Delta Kappan, 2(55), 124-128.

Thurstone, T., & Mellinger, J. (1967). CREE manual. Park Ridge, IL: Human Relations Center, University of Chicago, London House.

Torborg, J. A., Peters, L. H., & Ilgen, D. R. (1977). Organizational and personal correlates of attitudes toward women as managers. Academy of Management Journal, 20(1), 89-100.

Torrence, E. P. (1983). Role of mentors in creative achievement. Creative Child and Adult Quarterly, 8(1), 8-15.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1983). Women at work: A chartbook, 2168, 1-29.

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, Women's Bureau (1982). Economic responsibiliities of working women, pp. 1-5.