

Fall 2011

Interrelationships Among Elements of Formal Mentoring and the Dimensions of Organizational Socialization

John Connelly

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Connelly, J. (2011). Interrelationships Among Elements of Formal Mentoring and the Dimensions of Organizational Socialization (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/430>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillips@duq.edu.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG ELEMENTS OF FORMAL MENTORING AND
THE DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Education

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education

By

John T. Connelly

December 2011

Copyright by
John T. Connelly

2011

**DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL
LEADERS**

Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

Presented by:

John Thomas Connelly
MSOL., Organizational Leadership, Geneva College, 2005
B.S., Occupational Therapy, Thomas Jefferson University, 1985
B.S., Health and Physical Education, West Chester State College, 1982

June 27, 2011

INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG ELEMENTS OF FORMAL MENTORING AND THE
DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

Approval

_____, Chair
James E. Henderson, Ed.D.
Professor of Educational Leadership and
Director, Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders
Duquesne University School of Education

_____, Member
Keith Taylor, Ph.D.
President
Gannon University

_____, Member
Philip H. Kelly, Ph.D.
Professor, English Department
Director of New Faculty Mentoring Program, Academic Affairs
Gannon University

_____, Member
Gibbs Y. Kanyongo, Ph.D.
Professor, Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders
Duquesne University School of Education

Program Director

James E. Henderson, Ed.D.
Professor of Educational Leadership and
Director, Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders
Duquesne University School of Education

ABSTRACT

INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG ELEMENTS OF FORMAL MENTORING AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

By

John Thomas Connelly

December 2011

Dissertation supervised by Dr. James E. Henderson

Organizations created formal mentoring programs to replicate the benefits of informal mentoring. With regard to measuring mentoring functions, organizations are using informal measures to measure formal mentoring programs. As a result, empirical measurements of the effectiveness of university formal mentoring programs are limited. Researchers suggest that using organizational socialization measures may be a way to assist the formal mentoring measurement process. The overall purpose of this study is to examine the interrelationships among mentor relationship functions (MRI), mentor relationship satisfaction (SWMS), perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring (PEQ), and the dimensions of organizational socialization (OSQ) as it relates to a formal mentoring program at a university.

The university in this study is located within an urban area in Western Pennsylvania. The target population was comprised of faculty members within the university that have been involved in a one year formal mentoring program. The faculty completed a formal mentoring questionnaire that is made up of four questionnaires/surveys that combine informal mentoring, formal mentoring, and organizational socialization. A correlation and mediation approach was used to examine the data.

Results suggest that while there were strong relationships between satisfaction, effectiveness and mentor functions, there were no correlations between organizational socialization, formal mentoring effectiveness and mentor functions. In terms of the two mediation studies, organizational socialization was not found to mediate between the mentor functions and perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring in the first study. In the second study, satisfaction with the mentor relationship was found to partially mediate between mentor functions of the relationship and perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring. Based on this study, together the MRI, SWMS, and the PEQ share a relationship that may offer more of a comprehensive picture when it comes to measuring the effectiveness and satisfaction of formal mentoring.

Key Words: Formal and informal mentoring, organizational socialization, satisfaction with the mentor, and perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring.

DEDICATION

To my Family and Friends

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to personally acknowledge and express my gratitude to the following:

I thank God for the strength, courage, and tenacity to complete this doctoral dissertation. I am thankful to my wife Marcy for giving me the time away from our marriage and family duties to work on and complete this project. Your support and love when times were tough, and your ability to put up with my actions and behaviors are the gifts that made this project attainable. Thank you from the bottom of my heart! Also thank you to Maegan and John, your thoughtfulness and gratitude for all the work I do and recognizing my accomplishment is payment in full.

Next, I would like to thank Ann for her undying support throughout the process. For all those times that you edited and re-worked my papers (and this dissertation), God bless you and your trusty red pen! You are a great friend and confidant!

I am also thankful for my academic colleagues. Thank you, Dr. James Henderson, for all the support and wisdom that you offered to me. The truth is, you really don't know what you don't know, until you know it. And you knew that the whole time. And to Dr. Keith Taylor for being there when I needed you most, even if it was just a phone call. It was greatly appreciated, especially in those busiest of times. And thank you Dr. Philip Kelly for your calm cool collected manner, and the time that you allotted me on your busy schedule. You have been a great mentor and someone I feel deserves a great deal of credit for all you do for the university and its family. And thank you Dr. Kanyongo for your love of statistics, it was just enough to help me appreciate how great it really can be!

And last but not least, thank you to all my IDPEL colleagues, especially Gary and our many phone calls we shared along the way into class (hands-free of course).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
CHAPTER 1: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Clarifying the Problem.....	5
Purpose.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
Summary	7
Definitions.....	8
Mentoring	8
Formal Mentoring	8
Informal Mentoring	8
Mentor	9
Mentee	9
Newcomer.....	9
Mentoring functions	9
Career development functions	9
Psychosocial development functions	9
Organizational socialization	9

Serial-disjunctive categorization.....	9
A Pearson product-moment correlation	10
Mediation analysis	10
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review.....	11
Mentoring Definitions.....	11
Evolution of Mentoring in Education.....	13
Difference between Formal and Informal Mentoring.....	16
Formal Mentoring and the Relationship between Mentor Phases and Functions.....	18
Satisfaction with Formal and Informal Mentoring Relationships.....	20
Effectiveness of Formal and Informal Mentoring	22
Defining Organizational Socialization	24
Formal Mentoring Functions and Socialization Dimension Relationships	25
Career Functions Compared to Socialization Dimensions	26
Psychosocial Functions Compared to Socialization Dimensions.....	27
Describing a University Model	28
CHAPTER 3: Methodology.....	30
Research Design.....	30
Description of Instrumentation.....	31
Mentor Role Instrumentation (MRI).....	31
Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (SWMS)	31
Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire (PEQ)	31
Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ).....	32
Sample Population.....	32

Method of Sampling	33
Data Collection Procedures.....	34
Sample Size	34
Data Analysis Plan	35
Preliminary Analyses	35
Research Question 1	36
Research Question 2.....	36
Research Question 3.....	37
Analysis Justification.....	38
Pearson Product-Moment Correlation.....	38
Mediation Analysis	38
CHAPTER 4: Results.....	40
Research Sample Characteristics.....	40
Preliminary Analysis	41
Research Question 1	42
Research Question 2	44
Research Question 3	48
CHAPTER 5: Discussion	52
Statement of the Problem.....	52
Findings and Interpretations.....	54
Summary.....	60
Limitations to the Study.....	61
Implications for Future Research	63

Implications for Practice	64
Conclusion	65
References.....	67
Appendix A	79
Appendix B	81
Appendix C	85
Appendix D	89
Appendix E	91
Appendix F.....	93
Appendix G	96

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Length of Time Mentoring at the University.....	40
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Total Scores on the MRI, SWMS, PEQ, and OSQ.....	41
Table 3: Reliability and Internal Consistency for the MRI, SWMS, PEQ, and the OSQ..	42
Table 4: Pearson Correlation between the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ	43
Table 5: Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting PEQ Scores.....	45
Table 6: Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting SWMS Scores.....	46
Table 7: Linear Regression Analysis with SWMS Scores predicting PEQ Scores.....	46
Table 8: Linear Regression Analysis with SWMS Scores predicting PEQ Scores after Controlling for MRI Scores.....	47
Table 9: Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting PEQ Scores.....	49
Table 10: Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting OSQ Scores.....	50
Table 11: Linear Regression Analysis with OSQ Scores predicting PEQ Scores.....	50
Table 12: Six Dimensions of Organizational Socialization.....	99

Chapter 1

Introduction

Today, mentoring faculty in many universities has been recognized as a significant component of faculty development and retention and an important element of the academic environment (Zeind, Zdanowicz, MacDonald, & Parkhurst, 2005). There is a vast amount of research suggesting the benefits of mentoring for the mentee (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Scandura, 1992; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Fagenson, 1989; Viator & Scandura, 1991) and mentor (Chao, 2009; Ragins & Scandura, 1994; Kram, 1985; Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H., & McKee B. 1978; Janasc & Sullivan 2004; Ehrich et al. 2004, & Gardiner et al. 2007) in business, industry and some fields of education. When it comes to benefits of the organization and universities in particular, formal mentoring programs continue to gain popularity within organizations despite the lack of empirical research (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006).

Mentoring is multidimensional and developmentally complex (Levinson et al. 1978). As it relates to this project, the definition of mentoring combines the schools (Psychology, Education, and Management) of thought into one definition: Mentoring is a complex developmental and interpersonal relationship (Levinson et al. 1978) occurring between a senior, more experienced organizational member (mentor) and a junior, less experienced (in some cases-newcomer) organizational member (mentee) who receives career support and guidance, as well as personal and psychosocial support (Klaus, 1981; Kram 1985; Noe, 1988) as part of a coordinated approach designed to enhance the goals and values of both the individual and the organization (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009).

In order to understand mentoring in academe, it is important to distinguish the differences in the types of mentoring classifications. There are two types of mentoring; formal and informal. The main difference lies in the formation of the relationship (Choa & Gardner, 1992). Informal mentorships (lasting 3-6 years in length) are not managed, structured, and are not formally recognized by the organization. Conversely, formal mentorships (lasting 1 year in length) are programs that are managed, sanctioned, and coordinated by the organization (Murray, 1991). In academe, it was suggested that earlier forms of mentoring were informal (Bell, 1999) and that it wasn't until the late 1980s and 1990s that formal mentoring programs appear to have evolved (Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004).

Research suggests that mentoring functions (career and psychosocial development) serve and benefit the mentee (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992, Ragins & McFarlin, 1990), the mentor (Ragins & Scandura, 1994; Eby & Lockwood, 2005), and the organization (Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). The outcomes of those functions are said to influence attitudes and perceptions of the mentee (Kram, 1985) which in turn relate to satisfaction of the mentor relationship and perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (Ragins & McFarlin, 1990, Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000; Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006). When it is effective (in the eyes of the mentee), formal mentoring is said to have numerous benefits to the organization (Chao, 2009), particularly recruitment, improved retention, commitment, and motivation (Fagenson-Eland, Marks & Amendola, 1997).

It is important to realize the intention of the organization. One of the intentions of the organization as it relates to the rationale for formal mentoring is that it provides

members with a common value base, with the knowledge of organizational expectations, and what they can expect in return from the organization (Singh, Bains, & Vinnicombe, 2002). As a benefit, enhanced socialization occurs between a mentee and the organization (Benabou & Benabou, 2000). This leads to specific goals, values, and expectations which enhance the understanding and learning of the organization's mission and values (Singh, Brains, & Vinnicombe, 2002), and logically speaking creates a connection between those mentored and the broader organization (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009).

Statement of the Problem

When it comes to formal mentoring, not all faculty mentees perceive formal mentoring in the same way as intended by the organization, especially if the process fails to meet their expectations (Barbain, 2002). As it relates to this research project, there are at least three main concerns or issues that may contribute to the confusion or perceived differences when it comes to organizational intentions.

First, the history of mentoring in academe may be part of the reason why the mentee is on guard when it comes to certain types of relationships. In the late 1970s, faculty lack of trust for the higher organizational system led to skepticism and uneasiness which often resulted in mentoring relationships being charged and sometimes even adversarial (Bell, 1999). In the early 1980s, individualism marked the culture of teaching both in school and universities where teachers and professors taught their classes in isolation (Rosenholtz, 1989). Formal mentoring offered a way for organizations to control the process in terms of affirmative action (Edwards, 1995) and diversification

based on improving the promotion and retention of women and people of color (Gunn, 1995).

Second, Kram and Brager (1992) suggest that organizations make the assumption that formal mentoring relationships will be as effective as informal relationships. They further discuss that not all mentees are as willing to be part of formal relationships that are planned and coordinated via the organization. At times, the mentee sees the relationship as ineffective (Donaldson, Ensher, & Grant-Vallone, 2000). And in certain cases the authors note that some partners in formal mentoring relationships may feel organizational pressure to persist in trying to make the relationship work beyond the point when an informal relationship may have ended via lack of attention (Feldman, 1999). Still, in other cases, relationships in the eyes of the mentee could end up being more superficial because the faculty mentee views the mentor as a hierarchical figure in the organization and thus believes that the exchange is occurring more with the organization and not the actual mentor (Raabe & Beehr, 2003).

Finally, the third issue relates to measurement of outcomes. Baugh and Fagenson-Eland (2007) discuss that the evidence presented in the literature supports the view that formal mentoring is a less desirable substitute for informal mentoring relationships and that the measures used to inform the studies are based on informal mentoring and fail to acknowledge that formal mentoring programs in most cases are designed around achieving specific goals and values. Chao (2009) adds that formal mentoring programs are suggested as having an effective socializing process and that the measurements of formal mentoring program goals may not be adequately evaluating criteria in relation to socialization.

Clarifying the Significance of the Problem

While each of the areas discussed thus far have been organized to explain reasons why the intentions of the organization might be misunderstood, the intent of this research project is to build towards understanding how to clarify factors that might influence the way formal mentoring is measured and understood. Chao (2009) offers the idea that looking closer at the socialization process may be a better way to measure one year formal mentoring programs. She suggests that formal mentoring is an agent of socialization and that further research should focus on the relationship between formal mentoring and organizational socialization.

Louise (1980) notes that organizational socialization is a process where an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member (p. 229-230). Bauer, Morrison, and Callister (1998) discussed that socialization is generally associated with job and career outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment, career progress, and salary progression. Organizations have become tactical when it comes to the coordination of programs that build on socialization.

The connection for this research project lies in relation to the tactic known as the serial-disjunctive categorization. Serial-disjunctive categorization is defined as a tactic which involves a veteran as a role model (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and emphasizes the relationship between a person higher up in an organization with more tenure and the newcomer. This categorization appears similar to the mentee and mentor relationship. In most discussions in the human resource literature mentoring is not discussed in relation to

serial-disjunctive categorization. There are, however, studies that indicate there is a link between organizational socialization dimensions and mentoring and that the numerous elements of organizational socialization are thought to overlap with various functions such as; career development and psychosocial functions (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992). These overlaps provide a lens to view the various mentoring functions with the specific dimensions of organizational socialization (Chao et al. 1994).

Purpose of the Study

It is clear in the literature that very few studies (especially in academe) measure the effects of formal mentoring from an empirical perspective. The objective of this study is to understand the interrelationships of the functions of the mentoring relationship, satisfaction with the mentor, effectiveness of the formal mentoring program and organizational socialization measures. Baugh and Fagenson-Eland (2007) discuss that the evidence presented in the literature supports the view that formal mentoring is a less desirable substitute for informal mentoring relationships and that the measures used to inform the studies are based on informal mentoring and fail to acknowledge that formal mentoring programs in most cases are designed around specific goals. With this being noted, it opens the door for consideration in terms of appropriate measurement parameters that are inclusive of the elements related to organizational socialization. To date, very few studies connect formal mentoring with organizational socialization, especially in terms of academe and faculty formal mentoring programs.

The researcher plans to investigate the interrelationships among the mentor relationship functions (Mentoring Functions), mentoring relationship satisfaction

(Satisfaction with Mentor), effectiveness of formal mentoring (Perceived Effectiveness), and the dimensions of organizational socialization (Organizational Socialization).

As it relates to the following research questions, each category will be analyzed as per the total score for the questionnaire and will be referred to throughout the project as per the specific initials for the questionnaire/scale; Mentor Functions-Mentoring Role Instrument (MRI), Satisfaction with Mentor-Satisfaction With Mentor Scale (SWMS), Perceived Effectiveness-Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire (PEQ), and Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ). The following are the research questions:

Research Questions

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ?

RQ2: Does the SWMS mediate the relationship between the MRI, and the PEQ?

RQ3: Does the OSQ mediate the relationship between MRI, and PEQ?

Summary

In summary, the literature offers that organizations created formal mentoring programs to replicate the benefits of informal mentoring. Research suggests that mentoring functions (career and psychosocial development) serve and benefit the mentee, the mentor, and the organization. However, when it comes to measuring the mentoring functions, organizations are using informal measures to measure formal mentoring programs. It is also evident that when it comes to the mentee, mentoring satisfaction and mentoring effectiveness may not be as accurate based on the perceived intentions of the

organization. Current research suggests that empirically the measurement of formal mentoring is limited.

This project informs the literature in terms of the interrelationships that may exist between the elements of formal mentoring and organizational socialization. The hope is that the results inform practice as to the relationship formal mentoring has with regard to organizational socialization and that organizations will see the value in using other measures to describe or report on the outcomes of formal mentoring.

Definitions

Mentoring. a complex developmental and interpersonal relationship occurring between a senior, more experienced organizational member (mentor), and a junior, less experienced (in some cases-newcomer) organizational member (mentee), who receives career support and guidance, as well as personal and psychosocial support (Kram, 1988; Kram, 1985) as part of a coordinated approach designed to enhance the goals of both the individual and the organization.

Formal Mentoring. a mentor-mentee relationship where career and psychosocial support is provided by the mentor to the mentee as part of an organizationally sanctioned and supported program (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009).

Informal Mentoring. a mentor-mentee relationship where career and psychosocial support is provided by the mentor to the mentee; however, the mentoring relationship is not sanctioned or managed by the organization and can be characterized as a naturally occurring relationship based on personal attributes, attraction and similar interests (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009).

Mentor. a higher-ranking, influential individual in your work environment who has advanced experience and knowledge and is committed to providing upward mobility and support to your career (Ragins, Cotton & Miller, 2000).

Mentee. a less experienced employee who is offered special guidance and support by a respected and trusted person with more experience (Kram, 1985).

Newcomer. An individual who is considered to be new to an organization (Feldman, 1989).

Mentoring functions. These are functions identified as career development and psychosocial development that influence the relationship between the mentee and the mentor (Kram, 1985).

Career development functions. Those aspects of the mentoring relationship that enhance career advancement (Kram, 1985).

Psychosocial development functions. Those aspects of the mentoring relationship that enhance sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role (Kram, 1985).

Organizational socialization. “a process by which an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member” (Louis, 1980, pp. 229-230).

Serial-disjunctive categorization. A tactic which involves a veteran as a role model (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and emphasizes the relationship between a person higher up in an organization with more tenure (the mentor) and the newcomer (mentee).

A Pearson product-moment correlation. (r): Is a bivariate measure of association (strength) of the relationship of two variables (Cohen, 1988).

Mediation analysis. Is used to assess whether a given variable functions as a mediator in the relationship between an independent/predictor variable and a dependent/criterion variable, meaning that it accounts for the relationship between those two variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Chapter II

Literature Review

This project seeks to inform the fields of study as it relates to the connection or interrelationship among mentoring functions, mentee satisfaction, mentoring effectiveness, and organizational socialization. The literature review will begin by defining mentoring. It will proceed to discuss how mentoring evolved in education and academe. An outline of the differences between informal mentoring and formal mentoring will set the stage for this project. Satisfaction with the mentor relationship will be discussed in detail. Perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program will be addressed. Organizational socialization will be defined. The connection between formal mentoring and organizational socialization will be described and the dimensions will be integrated with the functions of the mentoring relationship. And finally, a short summary will discuss how this research project evolved to where it is now, and how a model for looking at other universities will be used to guide sampling of the population.

Mentoring Definitions

The term mentor originates in Greek mythology. Odysseus's son Telemakhos was entrusted to the fatherly Mentor who looked after Telemakhos when Odysseus was away from his son at the time of the Trojan War. He imparted wisdom, protection, and caring in the upbringing of Telemakhos (Homer, Translated by Fitzgerald R. 1963).

While it would appear that there are plenty of definitions, there seems to be no consensus on the operational definition of mentoring (Gibson, 2004). Definitions from education, management, and psychology are not clearly conceptualized. In earlier literature, this led to confusion as to what was being measured or offered as an ingredient

to success (Merriam, 1983). It is important to establish a foundation for this research project and evolve to a definition that can be used in the context of this project. The following offers definitions from the three frames of reference; psychology, education, and management.

The precise definition of mentor is difficult to pin down, but in his book, *The Seasons of a Man's Life*, David Levinson noted that the mentor relationship is one of the most important and developmentally important aspects in a person's life. Levinson and associates (1978) approached mentoring from the psychological frame of reference and studied 40 mid-life men. They identified the mentor as a developmentally significant transitional figure for men in the novice phase of early adulthood (ages 17-33). The mentor is usually eight to fifteen years older than the protégé, is situated in the same work setting, and generally serves for two or three years as a mixture of parent and peer. Levinson summarized the mentoring relationship by offering that in its most basic form, mentoring is simply friendship with someone who is a little more experienced. That person offers guidance in regard to a new career, profession, job, or development state.

Merriam (1983) approaches the concept from an educational frame of reference, and describes mentoring as a powerful emotional interaction between an older and younger person. He suggests that it is a relationship where the older person is trusted, loving, and experienced in the guidance of the younger. It is viewed in this context that the mentor helps to shape the growth and development of the protégé. Blackwell (1989), also from the educational frame of reference, suggests that mentoring is a process by which persons of superior rank, who have achieved success in the

profession, and are viewed as prestigious instructors, counselors, and guides, facilitate the intellectual and/or career development of persons identified as protégés.

Kram (1985) looks at mentoring from a management frame of reference and notes that mentors have been defined in the literature as higher ranking, influential senior organization members with advanced experience and knowledge, who are committed to providing upward mobility and support to a protégé's professional career. Furthering this definition Fagenson (1989), also from a management frame of reference, notes that a mentor is someone in a position of power. This individual looks out for you, or gives you advice, or brings your accomplishments to the attention of other people who have power in the company.

As it relates to this project, the definition of mentoring combines these schools of thought (Levinson, 1977, Noe, 1988, Kram, 1988, Klaus, 1981). Mentoring is a complex developmental and interpersonal relationship occurring between a senior, more experienced organizational member (mentor), and a junior, less experienced (in some cases-newcomer) organizational member (mentee), who receives career support and guidance, as well as personal and psychosocial support (Kram, 1988; Kram 1985) as part of a coordinated approach designed to enhance the goals of both the individual and the organization (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009).

Evolution of Mentoring in Education and Academe

The earlier history suggests that mentoring was once very strong in the circles of higher education. Schneider (1997) notes that faculty clubs at colleges and universities in the late 1950s and early 1960s promoted interdepartmental collegiality, intra-institutional collaboration and cohesiveness, and esprit de corps. It was very common for senior

faculty to impart/mentor the wisdom of the fields of education and to engender scholarship to younger faculty members. He notes their demise, in that over time the clubs were viewed more as social entities and therefore not important or relevant to faculty. Younger scholars argued the fact that their research was more important than gaining social acceptance by the university community. This created a breed of individuals that became wary of institutional hierarchy and skeptical of mentoring programs that would suggest inadequacy on the part of a faculty member (Bell, 1999).

Bell (1999) goes on to explain that by the mid to late 1970s new Ph.D's were arriving not merely apprehensive but deeply suspicious of authoritarian structures. Young faculty mindsets were significantly different in the areas of gender, race, religion, background and upbringing. Mentoring evolved to being charged and sometimes even adversarial. Some senior professors, suspecting they would be charged with being retrograde, became reluctant to intervene, and many abandoned their responsibility to teach and mentor younger teachers.

In the early 1980s, individualism marked the culture of teaching both in secondary schools and universities where teachers and professors taught their classes in isolation (Rosenholtz, 1989). During this time frame there were few empirical studies on the mentoring of professors. It was presumed that faculty members were well prepared for their careers and, as a result, they did not feel that mentoring was required. Within the academic environment it was understood that professors typically had the same educational levels, relatively similar experiences and responsibilities (Janaz & Sullivan, 2004). The belief was that they were better prepared than other disciplines and just didn't feel mentoring was needed (Betz , 1997). By the late 1980s research documentation drew

attention to the concept of isolation and pushed for faculty mentoring programs that would address the growing concerns (Boice 1992, Nyquist, Manning, Sprague, Frazier, Calcagno, & Woodford, 1990).

While the realization that isolation and individualism became clear, other issues began to enter into the picture. It was soon realized that diversity (women and minority issues) was becoming a problem that would further subdivide the world of academe. Organizations began looking for ways to resolve the issues. Gunn (1995) discusses that mentoring became a way to integrate, develop, and socialize women into the American workforce. Formal mentoring programs were becoming a way for organizations to address affirmative action legislation (Edwards, 1995) with the intent that it would make mentoring more available to women and members of different minority groups (Noe, 1998).

As the literature suggests, the late 1980s and early 1990s introduced formal mentoring. Organizations realized that they could replicate the benefits of mentoring by designing programs that would formalize the developmental process (Chao, 2009). Formal programs would soon give way to controlling who was mentored, when they were mentored, and even how they were mentored (Baugh & Fagendon-Eland, 2007). As a result, organizations soon realized that formal mentoring could be used as a way to develop faculty towards specific goals and values that would be considered beneficial for both faculty and organization. What becomes clear in the literature is that there are many advantages to informal mentoring. Transforming it into formal mentoring is how organizations approached the process.

The Difference Between Formal Mentoring and Informal Mentoring

While formal mentoring evolves from the principles of informal mentoring, it helps to understand the difference between the two. Within the literature, there are three noted differences between formal and informal mentoring; one is the initiation of the process or the formation of the relationship (Chao & Gardner, 1992), the second notes the goals, duration, and phases of the relationship (Kram, 1985), and the third is the process and functions involved in the mentor relationship (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). As far as the initiation of the process is concerned, members of formal mentoring relationships are typically assigned to one another by an individual designated to coordinate the mentoring program (Chao & Gardner, 1992), as opposed to the informal mentoring process where initiation of the relationship develops naturally or spontaneously without outside formal assistance (Ebby, Rhodes, & Allen 2007).

The second difference involves the goals and the duration of the relationship. Formal mentorships are usually of a shorter duration than informal mentorships. Formal lasting 6 months to a year and informal lasting 3 to 6 years (Kram, 1985). Members of informal relationships will tend to meet when desired, however, the mode, frequency and location of contact for the formal mentoring is often dictated by the organization, and in many cases is identified in a written agreement between the mentee and the organization (Murray, 1991). Allen and Ebbey (2003) offered that when there are goals involved in the informal relationships, they are discussed and agreed upon by the parties themselves, rather than being imposed by external sources as those of the formal mentoring programs.

When it comes to the third difference, the most challenging aspect to understand is in relation to the function of the mentoring relationship. The following offers a description of the functions followed by the current supporting research for both areas.

In terms of the functions, Kram (1983) identified the mentor role theory and suggested that there were two areas of support or functions that mentors provided the mentee. The first was career development, and the second was psychosocial development. Kram (1983) was the leading expert and was the one responsible for the most detailed systematic work regarding the mentoring process. Noe (1988) reportedly used the work of Kram's (1983) themes. He developed headings (scale development) for each of the career functions and psychosocial functions.

The career functions included nominating the mentee for desirable projects, lateral moves, and promotions (sponsorship); providing the mentee with assignments that increased visibility to organizational decision makers and exposure to future opportunities (exposure and visibility); sharing ideas, providing feedback, and suggesting strategies for accomplishing work objectives (coaching); reducing unnecessary risks that might threaten the mentee's reputation (protection); and providing challenging work assignments (challenging assignments) (Noe, 1988, p. 459).

The psychosocial functions were thought to enhance the protégé's sense of competence, identity and work role effectiveness. These functions included serving as a role model of appropriate attitudes, values, and behaviors for the mentee (role model); conveying unconditional positive regard (acceptance and confirmation); providing a forum in which the mentee is encouraged to talk openly about anxieties and fears

(counseling); and interacting informally with the protégé at work (friendship) (Noe, 1988, p. 459).

The next area is related to the phases of mentoring. A number of authors have described the dynamic nature of mentoring relationships in terms of phases (Kram, 1985 & Mullen, et al., 2000). There are four phases of mentoring; initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition (Kram, 1985). The initiation phase is where the mentor and the protégé begin initial interactions that involve learning the other's personal style and work habits.

If the relationship matures, the next phase progresses to cultivation. In this phase, career development, role modeling, and psychosocial mentoring functions are proposed to be at their highest. Also in this phase, the mentor promotes and protects the protégé. The protégé gains knowledge from the mentor and the mentor gains loyalty and support for the protégé. Kram (1985) discusses the third phase as separation. She notes that this involves structural and psychosocial disconnection. In most cases this is where the protégé gains independence from the mentor.

The last phase of mentoring is the redefinition phase. This is where the mentor and protégé frequently develop a relationship that is more peer-like, characterized by mutual support and informal contact (Kram, 1985; Chao, 1997).

Formal Mentoring and the Relationship between Mentor Phases and Functions

When looking at the differences between formal and informal mentoring in terms of mentoring functions and the phases, there appear to be some differences in the reported findings that support as well as negate formal mentoring. Various studies that compared formal versus informal mentoring function noted higher levels of career

support for mentees involved informally in the relationships (Allen, et al. 2005; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura, 1992), while other studies, involving or focused on just formal mentoring supported more psychosocial support than career support for formal mentoring (Allen, McManus, & Russell, 1999; Noe, 1988; Raabe & Beehr, 2003). In either case, the literature indicates that the amount and duration of a mentoring relationship would be based on the phase or level of mentoring being received by the mentee. The following offers more details in relation to the studies reported.

It is not until after the first phase (6-12 months) that an individual begins to cultivate the functions of the relationship (Kram,1983; 1985). Kram suggested that a mentoring relationship at the beginning stage of development lacks the emotional depth, intensity, and involvement of long-term mentoring (such as that of a formal 3-6 year informal mentoring program). Her studies indicated that formal mentoring programs would not provide the same level of psychosocial and emotional support functions of established informal mentoring relations.

Chao (1992) studied the mentoring phases and outcomes. She noted that developmental sequence for mentoring phases was found and mentorship length was consistent with Kram's (1983) phases and guidelines. The mentee in the initiation phases reported the lowest levels of psychosocial and career related support compared with mentees in all other phases. Ragins and Cotton (1999) studied closely the differences in the relationship functions as it relates to formal and informal mentoring. Their study noted that mentee's with informal mentors received greater benefits than mentee's with formal mentors. Overall, mentees with informal mentors reported that their mentors

provided more career related development and psychosocial functions than those mentees with formal mentors.

High levels of psychosocial mentoring occurring in the relationship (not in career related mentoring) were related to the mentee satisfaction with one's mentor (Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller & Marchese, 2006). Psychosocial was also found to be the stronger correlate of the two functions (career and psychosocial) as it related to relationship satisfaction and perceived effectiveness of the mentoring program (Allen et al., 2004).

Regardless, the organization and the mentee both stand to gain from maximizing the level of functions. Chao et al. (1992) examined relationships between mentoring functions and career outcomes. The study showed correlations between two functions and job/career satisfaction, socialization, and salary. Strong relationships exist between career-related functions and socialization on organizational goals, politics, and history. Orpen (1995) further tested mentoring functions in relation to time. Correlations between a career coaching mentoring function and two outcome measures were significant and also suggested a strong relationship between organizational and mentee benefits.

Satisfaction with Formal and Informal Mentoring Relationships

Mentee satisfaction with the mentor relationship is well documented as it relates to relationships (dyads), mutuality of the relationship, the amount of time and commitment invested in the relationship, trust and perceived benefits related to the relationship, and involvement of the mentee in program design as it relates to structure and training. The following offers details related to each area.

Relationship satisfaction is a key outcome as it relates to measuring the success for all forms of relationships, including mentoring (Allen & Eby, 2003). Drigotas,

Rusbult, and Verette (1999) explored the concept of non-mutuality in relationships. They suggested that non-mutuality exists when an individual is either committed or less committed to his or her partner. As it relates to couple well-being, they noted that many times when someone is less committed to their relationship than their partner, they will experience unwanted responsibility, irritation, guilt, and resentment. In their study, the negative effect was negatively related to mutuality of commitment and well-being. Being committed to a relationship both by the level of commitment and the mutuality of the commitment are key factors in a relationship. When both are achieved, partners are equally and fully committed to each other.

Ortiz-Walters and Gilson (2005) studied mentor commitment as it related to mentor relationship satisfaction in academe. They found mentor commitment to be positively associated with mentor relationship satisfaction as perceived by the mentee. They suggested that it makes perfect sense to suggest the connection between commitment and relationship satisfaction and mentoring.

Mentoring is a dyad relationship consisting of a mentee and a mentor, and the outcome of the function of the relationship is related to the phases (Kram, 1985). It was suggested that the amount of time or extent of mentoring received is directly related to satisfaction with the dyad relationship (Young & Perrewe, 2000). The time spent in the dyad relationship was also directly related to the satisfaction with the relationship (Allen, Russel, & Maetzke, 1997). In a study related to the importance of relationship duration, it was found that there were spin-offs such as self-confidence and a positive perception of the relationship that occurred as a result of mentoring over a period of time (Waters, McCabe, Kiellerup, & Kiellerup, 2002).

Trust has been linked to satisfaction with the mentor. Trust must be mutual in order to support the mentor functions and generate mentee satisfaction with the mentor relationship (Ragins, 1977). One such study noted that satisfaction in academic mentoring was based on a mutual commitment to a relationship. The study found that perceived relationship satisfaction occurs when the mentee perceives high commitment on the part of both partners (Porteat, Shockley & Allen, 2009).

Another topic as it relates to satisfaction of the relationship is in the area of program design and its effect on relationship satisfaction. A strong correlation between relationship satisfaction and being involved in the design of the program was suggested (Ragins, et al., 2000). However, it was also noted that the degree of satisfaction with a mentoring relationship may overshadow any particular design feature of a formal mentoring program. Either way, it was suggested that even the best designed program may not be able to compensate for a marginal mentor.

And lastly, in many cases formal mentoring programs are created without the input from the mentee (Ragins, et al., 2000). The mentor proactivity and mentee perception of the mentor meeting their needs is related to the amount of mentoring that occurs in a formal mentoring relationship (Porteat, Shockley & Allen, 2009). In short, the same concept noted that the recognition by the mentor to understand the clarity and address the needs of the mentee drives both the effectiveness and satisfaction of the relationship (Eby & Lockwood, 2005).

Effectiveness of Formal and Informal Mentoring

The design of formal mentoring programs has been based on the assumption that formal mentoring programs should be designed in the way that mimics informal,

spontaneous mentorships (Ragins et al., 2000). Informal mentoring is based upon a number of factors that enhance the interpersonal process (Kram, 1985). The process is built on a relationship governed by identifying with an individual, being comfortable with the individual, and identifying with specific areas of common interest (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). As compared to the formal process, the relationship is one that is coordinated by a third party and regulated by organizational goals (Singh, Brains, & Vinnicombe, 2002). Interestingly enough, by designing formal mentoring programs in a way that corresponds to the interpersonal process, it is thought that program effectiveness can be enhanced (Allen, et al., 2006).

Allen, et al., (2006) noted a number of characteristics that were important to program effectiveness. Their study noted that having involvement in the mentor-mentee matching process is important and that it relates strongly to perceived program effectiveness, especially as it relates to mentor commitment and program understanding. Both program understanding and mentor commitment serve as full and partial mediators of the program characteristics and each related heavily to the program effectiveness relationship. As a result, the study suggested that providing participants with a voice regarding the matching process facilitates perceptions that the mentor was more engaged in the relationship.

In another study, program understanding has been noted as a key to perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring. Mentors and mentees in formal mentoring programs reported frustration related to not understanding what the program was supposed to accomplish or how to utilize the relationship as a developmental experience (Eby & Lockwood, 2005). By understanding and being involved in training prior to the

experience, an ownership and commitment to the mentoring process is more likely to occur and also the mentee may appreciate more the investment of time and energy by the mentor (Wanberg et al., 2003).

Defining Organizational Socialization

Organizational socialization is concerned with the learning content and process by which an individual adjusts to a specific role in an organization. General descriptions include “learning the ropes,” to a more detailed definition of “a process by which an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member” (Louis, 1980, pp. 229-230). Morrison and Hock (1986) suggest that socialization is a lifelong process that encompasses an individual’s entire career and that socialization does not apply only to the newcomer.

Organizational socialization is concerned with the organization’s influence on an individual’s learning (Schein & Ott, 1962). The process of socialization has been identified in two primary areas among the research; socialization tactics (Jones, 1986; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), and newcomer proactive behaviors (Ashford & Black, 1996). There is a vast amount of research to date that has focused on the newcomer to the organization (Chao, 1988; Louis, 1980; Feldman, 1976; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and the stages in which they evolve and grow within the organization (Ashforth, Sluss, Saks, 2007; Haueter, Macan, & Winter, 2003). Organizations have become sophisticated when it comes to employing tactics designed to socialize the newcomer.

The sophistication begins with Van Maanen (1978) and Van Maanen and Schein (1979), who evolved the concepts of organizational tactics that were established to assist

newcomers in adjusting to their roles within an organization. Formal and informal tactics were categorized throughout the research. The tactic most relevant to this research project involves serial-disjunctive categorization. This tactic involves a veteran as a role model (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and emphasizes the relationship between a person higher up in an organization with more tenure and the newcomer. The evolution of the formal mentoring process and its relationship with organizational socialization tactics is important to understand as part of this research project.

The connection lies in the dimensions of organizational socialization (Chao, Oleary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein & Gardner, 1994) and the relationships via three main resources Schein (1968), Feldman (1981) and Fisher (1986). The key is in relation to content areas that were judged to be under an organization's direct or legitimate influence. As a result, there are six dimensions or content areas of organizational socialization that were conceptualized and developed. They are as follows; (a) performance proficiency, or learning to perform the job successfully; (b) specific language related to organizational acronyms and jargon; (c) relationships and how to get along with other organizational members; (d) power struggles and organizational politics; (e) organizational goals and values, and (f) the history of specific organizational units as well as general organizational history (Chao, 2007, p.181).

Formal Mentoring Functions and Socialization Dimension Relationships

Research relating to the connection between the dimensions of organizational socialization (Chao, et al., 1994) and the use of serial-disjunctive tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) via formal mentoring appears to be expanding. Thus far, this discussion has defined mentoring, the history of mentoring in academe, and provided an

understanding of the functions which include career and psychosocial development (Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988), each of which drive the mentoring relationship. Organizations use many tactics to achieve socialization. Formal mentoring has been identified as a serial-disjunctive tactic and has been supported in literature. It is only recently that research has focused empirically on the relationships between mentoring and socialization. The following outlines the literature that connects various mentoring functions with the organizational socialization dimensions and outlines the foundation for this project.

Career Functions Compared to Socialization Dimensions

Chao (2007) summarized the existing research in relation to the functions of mentoring and the socialization dimensions suggesting that in most cases coaching/role modeling (part of career functions) were the most notable in the studies. Kram (1985) in her studies identified that learning the ropes and assisting the mentee in preparation for advancement was part of the coaching function of career development. Chao, Walz, and Gardner (1992) compared individuals (formal and informal mentorships) along the two dimensions: psychosocial and career related functions. Socialization dimensions were measured and statistical follow up tests compared non-mentored people with formal mentees on three socialization scales: politics, people, and goals and values. The results indicated formal mentored were significantly higher than non-mentored in the respective areas. Overall, they reported that informal mentoring had greater effects than those of formal mentoring.

Swap, Leonard, Sheilds and Abrams (2001) also looked at the coaching elements of formal mentoring and noted that mentors were socialization agents in the area of tacit

knowledge. They discussed that information was conveyed via organizational stories (socialization dimension-history). They also suggested that mentors, by illustrating/coaching the values and goals of the organization (socialization–value and goals), influenced the decision making process and the actions of the mentee.

In another study, Schrodt, Cawyer, and Sanders (2003) investigated new faculty members within the communication discipline using a socialization questionnaire designed by Cawyer and Frederick (1998). They found on numerous dimensions that those that were mentored (formally or informally) felt stronger ownership in their department and more connected to the work environment as opposed to those that were not mentored. They also determined that a higher level of loyalty and commitment to the organization had occurred as a result of socialization.

Psychosocial Functions Compared to Socialization Dimensions

Most of the literature focuses on Bandura (1977) and social learning theory as it relates to how role models, or in this case mentors, develop relationships that result in socializing newcomers to an organization. The whole premise is based on learning and observations. Mentors model attitudes and behaviors as they interact with various aspects of the environment. Mentees learn based on contextual situations where the mentor, or other role figures, model behaviors. This parallels the socialization dimensions of people, politics, organizational goals and values, and history (Choa, 2007), with the idea that each one of the areas works to develop a newcomer's identity as an organizational member, and as a professional.

Koslowski and Ostroff (1993) completed a study on various business and engineering faculty at a midwestern university. The results revealed different patterns of

informational acquisition via the newcomers and their relationship with the mentor or role model. This was said to enhance the newcomer's identity as an organizational member. This study showed that mentored newcomers learned more about organizational practices (socialization dimensions; organizational goals and values) and issues related to the work environment than did non-mentored individuals.

A study also involving serial-disjunctive tactics is worth mentioning. Simosi (2010) investigated the idea that information was communicated via role modeling/mentoring. She found that serial tactics moderated the relationship between organizational related information acquisition and newcomer's affective commitment during the early stages of the socialization process. Those socialized via the tactics, versus those that were not, indicated higher levels of affective commitment to the organization.

And finally, positive relationships between a mentee's report of the interpersonal closeness of the mentorship and the value of the program to organizational socialization has been documented (Heimann & Pittenger, 1996) and mentored tenured and tenure-track law faculty had significantly higher socialization scores on the organizational goals and values subscale of the OSQ, than non-mentored faculty (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009).

Describing a University Model

As discussed, the researcher plans to investigate the interrelationships among the mentor relationship functions (Mentoring Functions), mentoring relationship satisfaction (Satisfaction with Mentor), effectiveness of formal mentoring (Perceived Effectiveness), and the dimensions of organizational socialization (Organizational Socialization). As stated previously, most of the research focuses on the functions of the mentoring

relationship and uses the informal mentoring to measure the success of formal mentoring. The literature review suggests that organizational socialization may offer alternative measures that may be more specific to the intentions of a university.

As it related to this research project, a specific university was studied in relation to the goals and objectives of a one year formal mentoring program. The researcher investigated the program as part of the process. In this particular case, specific purposes and goals are stated via a comprehensive package of information that is provided each participant (see Appendix A). They are reviewed with each participant by the mentor. Upon further investigation, it was noted that the university had not formally measured the satisfaction and effectiveness of the program as it related to the specific goals and objectives.

As discussed, there are a number of studies that have correlated mentoring functions of the relationship (career development and psychosocial development) with those of the six dimensions of organizational socialization (Chao et al., 1994). As the literature indicates, the overlap provides a rationale as to why mentoring and organizational socialization become partners in assessing the outcomes of formal mentoring. Going one step further, the researcher noticed a possible relationship to the specific goals of the formal mentoring program at the university. A chart outlines the relationships between the organizational socialization dimensions, the relationship of the mentoring functions, and the specific goals of mentoring for the university (see Table 1). It is interesting to see the correlation between the literature review and the actual university goals and objectives. The hope of this project is that the relationships among the areas being studied will inform future literature.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Research Design

This study used correlation (Cohen, 1988) and mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986) to investigate the interrelationships among mentor relationship (functions), perceived relationship satisfaction, effectiveness of formal mentoring, and organizational socialization as it relates to faculty (mentees) that have been involved in a one year formal mentoring program within a university setting.

Mediation analysis is used to assess whether a given variable functions as a mediator in the relationship between a predictor variable and a criterion variable, meaning that it accounts for the relationship between those two variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Please refer to the Analyses Justification section for more details regarding the mediation concept.

Specifically, there were four questionnaires/instruments used to complete this study. Three measures/scales addressed formal mentoring, and one questionnaire measured the dimensions of organizational socialization. The Mentor Role Instrument (MRI, Ragins & McFarlin, 1990) examined the elements of the mentor relationship. Relationship satisfaction was examined using a four item scale labeled Satisfaction with Mentor (SWMS, Ragins & Cotton, 1999). A third instrument with six items was used to measure Perceived Effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (PEQ, Ragins & Cotton, 1999). The fourth instrument used is the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ) developed to measure six factors of organizational socialization (Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner 1994).

This design allowed the researcher the opportunity to examine the interrelationships among the specific areas chosen (Creswell, 2003) and to clarify the connection/relationship between the three formal mentoring measures, and the one measure used to measure the dimensions of organizational socialization.

Description of Instrumentation

As previously mentioned, this research combined three questionnaires related to formal mentoring and one questionnaire for the dimensions of organizational socialization. The following is an overview and discussion of the instrumentation

Mentor Role Instrumentation (MRI). Ragins and McFarlin (1990) utilized Kram's (1985) nine mentor roles, with two other additional roles (parent and social) that offer cross gender relationship functions, to measure mentor relationship functions. The 30-item instrument was developed via confirmatory analysis. It has three items per mentor role and uses a 7-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The reliability in terms of Cronbach's coefficient alphas ranged from .63 to .91 (see Appendix B).

Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (SWMS). The faculty mentee's satisfaction with a relationship was measured using a four item scale labeled "Satisfaction with Mentor" (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). This scale uses a 7-point Likert response format 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The higher the value, the greater the satisfaction with the mentor relationship will be. The coefficient alpha was .83 for the satisfaction scale (see Appendix B).

Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire (PEQ). This study utilized a six item instrument to address the faculty mentee perception of the effectiveness of the formal

mentoring program (Ragins, Cotton & Miller, 2000). The instrument uses a 7-point Likert scale format 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The coefficient alpha was .79. The higher the value, the greater the perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program will be (see Appendix B).

Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ). The OSQ consists of 34 items measured by a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein & Gardner, 1994). The questionnaire was developed to measure the six factors of organizational socialization; (a) performance proficiency; (b) politics; (c) language; (d) people; (e) organizational goals and values; and (f) history. Originally there were 39 items. A confirmatory factor analysis conducted on an independent sample of 5,460 full time employed college graduates was used to eliminate 13 items. Another 8 items were added for a final of 34 items. Results from the principal-components factor analysis reproduced the six a priori dimensions. According to Chao et al. (1994), an individual's level of socialization on a particular dimension was computed as the mean value of the a priori items for that dimension. They noted correlations among socialization dimensions ranged from .23 to .64, with a mean correlation of .42. The reliabilities of the six dimensions produced a Chronbacks greater than or equal to .78 (see Appendix B).

Sample Population

The surveys/questionnaires were administered and data collected from university campuses in Western Pennsylvania. A target population for this study was faculty members within two universities. The term faculty member in this study applied to any individual employed full time as a faculty member that completed a formal mentoring

program. Once access to a university was secured, a self selection sampling of the population was based on a volunteer process. According to the results of the G*Power 3.1.2, in order to achieve empirical validity, this study was required to have at least 82 participants (see section on sample size for details). At the studies completion, 149 faculty members completed the survey. Of the 149 surveys, there were 81 completed surveys by Gannon University faculty. Eighty one surveys were considered a sufficient sample. As a result, only one institution was needed to achieve a sample of appropriate strength that is representative of the population.

Method of Sampling

University's administration offices were contacted via phone. The process of selection of the university included discussing their current mentoring model and determining if the current program matches the proposed program as part of this study (see Appendix A for details). Gannon University was asked permission to allow for 2 methods of collection of the questionnaire; web based-Survey Monkey; and a paper questionnaire. The researcher followed the appropriate procedures of the institution and secured all necessary requirements before proceeding to administer the questionnaire. The prospective participants were sent an e-mail that provided a disclosure of the study (see Appendix D for web based version e-mailed to prospective participants). As part of the process to improve response rate, reminder e-mails followed and prompted the faculty to visit the web based questionnaire. As the study was administered, there were not enough responses at first. The researcher contacted the university administration and asked for permission to utilize previous human resource lists of formal mentoring graduates. Paper versions of the survey were mailed to the Faculty Senate on the

university campus (see Appendix E for paper based version distributed by a designated graduate assistant). The paper based version instructed the prospective participant to either visit the web site or contact the graduate assistant for them to administer the paper version.

Data Collection Procedures

As discussed, the introduction letter, the consent, and the questionnaire were administered via both paper and pencil and a web based version. Data was collected by means of a questionnaire (see Appendix C for Formal Mentoring Questionnaire).

Initially, each subject was sent an e-mail that described the study and a description of the benefits to the organization and the individual (see Appendix D for letter addressed “To Whom It May Concern”). The prospective participant was asked to connect to the URL code via the web based site. Inside the site, the participant was asked to read and verify they understood the consent for the project. The participant then was asked to proceed to answering the questionnaire. Once completed, the researcher obtained the data from Survey Monkey, and began the analysis process.

Each of the authors, Belle Rose Ragins and Georgia T. Chao, were contacted and agreed to allow the surveys/questionnaires to be distributed via a web based process.

Sample Size

Two types of analyses were conducted, Pearson product-moment correlations and mediation. The most stringent analysis is the correlation. Faul, Erdfelder, Bucher & Lang (2008) suggest using G*Power 3.1.2 to calculate the sample size for a correlation and regression study. A priori power analysis was carried out during the design stage of this study. According to the authors, given the three factors alpha (probability of a type I

error), sample size, and effect size, a fourth variable (beta) can be calculated. Beta is the probability of a type II error (acceptance of a false null hypothesis).

According to the results of the G*Power 3.1.2, in order to achieve empirical validity, this study should have at least 82 participants. This is derived by using the recommended medium effect size of .30, a generally accepted power of .80, and a significance level of .05 (Faul, Erdfelder, Bucher & Lang, 2008).

Data Analysis Plan

The analysis was run with all data being entered into PASW (version 18.0) SPSS for Windows. Descriptive statistics were identified in relation to the following questions; were you involved in the formal mentoring program at the university; have you been involved in an informal mentoring program, and the approximate length of time of your mentoring at the university, and described the sample (Creswell, 2003). Frequencies and percentages were calculated on nominal (categorical/dichotomous) data and the means/standard deviations were calculated on continuous (interval/ratio) data (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

Preliminary analyses. As part of the process, linearity and homoscedasticity were assessed as it relates to the assumptions of the analyses. According to Mertler and Vannatta (2010), linearity assumes a straight line relationship between the variables and homoscedasticity assumes that scores are normally distributed about the regression line. Scatter plots were also be used to examine and assess linearity and homoscedasticity (Stevens, 2009). Data were screened for outliers (variables were converted to a standardized z score) and anything with an absolute value greater than or equal to 3.29 was deleted (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010; Stevens, 2009).

The preliminary analyses also included Cronbach's alpha tests of reliability and internal consistency and was conducted on each subscale of the survey instruments. The closer Cronbach's alpha is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale. George and Mallery (2003) provide the following rules of thumb when measuring internal consistency: " $\alpha > .9$ – Excellent, $\alpha > .8$ – Good, $\alpha > .7$ – Acceptable, $\alpha > .6$ – Questionable, $\alpha > .5$ – Poor, and $\alpha > .5$ – Unacceptable (p. 231).

Research Question 1.

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ?

H1_a: There is a statistically significant relationship among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ, and the OSQ.

To investigate research question 1, Pearson product moment correlations were conducted to assess the relationship among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ, and the OSQ. The variables in this analysis were the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ, and the OSQ. Each of the above represents the total score for the questionnaire/scale. To review, the perceived mentor relationship function total was measured using the *Mentor Role Instrument* (MRI). Mentee relationship satisfaction was measured using the *Satisfaction With Mentor Scale* (SWMS). Effectiveness of total mentoring total was measured using the *Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire* (PEQ). Organizational socialization was measured using the *Organizational Socialization Questionnaire* (OSQ). All variables in the analysis were treated as continuous data.

Research Question 2.

RQ2: Does the SWMS mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ?

H2_a: The SWMS does mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ.

To examine research question 2, a mediation analysis using guidelines established by Baron and Kenny (1986) was conducted to assess if the mentee SWMS mediates the relationship between MRI and the PEQ. The outcome variable is the PEQ. The predictor or independent variable is the MRI and the mediator variable is SWMS.

In each mediation analysis, there are a number of regressions. The first regression analysis examined the independent variable prediction of the outcome variable (MRI total predicting the PEQ); the second regression examined the independent variable prediction of the mediator (MRI predicting the SWMS); and the third regression examined the mediator prediction of the outcome variable (SWMS predicting the PEQ). The analyses were significant which allowed for conducting a fourth regression. The final regression controlled for the independent variable (MRI) in step 1, and examine the mediator prediction (SWMS) of the outcome variable (PEQ) in step 2.

Research Question 3.

RQ3: Does the OSQ mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ?

H3_a: The OSQ does mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ.

To examine research question 3, a mediation analysis using guidelines established by Baron and Kenny (1986) was conducted to assess if the OSQ mediates the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ. The outcome variable is the PEQ. The predictor or independent variable is the MRI and the mediator variable is the OSQ.

To assess mediation, three regressions were conducted. The first regression analysis examined the independent variable prediction of the outcome variable, the second regression examined the independent variable prediction of the mediator, and the

third regression examined the mediator prediction of the outcome variable. When these analyses are statistically significant a fourth regression is conducted. In this case a fourth regression was not required.

Analysis Justification

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. A Pearson product-moment correlation (r) is a bivariate measure of association (strength) of the relationship of two variables (Cohen, 1988). In this research project all the variables are continuous (interval/ratio data) and the hypothesis seeks to assess the relationship. When variables are measured on a continuous interval level, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (r) should be used (Shannon & Davenport, 2000, p. 180). In this case, Pearson correlations are the appropriate bivariate statistic.

According to Shannon and Davenport (2000), correlation coefficients vary from 0 (no relationship) to -1 (perfect linear relationship). Positive coefficients indicate a direct relationship, whereas when one variable increases, the other variable also increases. Negative correlation coefficients indicate an inverse relationship, whereas when one variable increases, the other variable decreases. This project will utilize Cohen's (1988) standard to evaluate the correlation coefficient. Cohen's standard suggests that .10 represents a small association, .30 will represent a medium association, and .50 represents a large size effect or correlation between two variables (p. 77-81).

Mediation Analysis. Mediation analysis is used to assess whether a given variable functions as a mediator in the relationship between a predictor variable and a criterion variable, meaning that it accounts for the relationship between those two variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). To test for mediation, the authors note that one should

estimate the three following regression equations: first, regressing the mediator on the independent variable; second, regressing the dependent variable on the independent variable; and third, regressing the dependent variable on both the independent variable and the mediator (p. 1177).

There are numerous conditions that must be met in order for successful mediation to stand. In the first regression analysis, the independent variable must influence/affect the mediator; in the second regression, the independent variable must be shown to influence the dependent variable; and in the third regression, the mediator must have a unique influence/affect on the dependent variable. If these analyses are statistically significant a fourth regression will be conducted. The final regression will control for the independent variable in step 1, and examine the mediator prediction of the outcome variable in step 2. Mediation holds if there is a reduction in the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable once the mediator is added to the equation. A “perfect” mediation holds if the independent variable no longer has a significant influence on the dependent variable once the mediator is added to the regression equation (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

CHAPTER 4

Results

The intent of this research project is to build towards understanding how to clarify factors that might influence the way formal mentoring is measured and understood. The design of this study provided the researcher the opportunity to examine the interrelationship functions of the mentoring relationship (MRI), satisfaction with the mentor (SWMS), effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (PEQ), and organizational socialization measures (OSQ) as it relates to university faculty. The goal is to clarify the connection/relationship between the three formal mentoring measures, and the one measure used to measure the dimensions of organizational socialization. The following are the results of the study.

Research Sample Characteristics

The data set consisted of responses from 81 participants. All 81 participants were involved in a formal mentoring program. In addition, the majority 41 (50.6%) of participants reported they were also involved in an informal mentoring program and 40 (49.4%) reported they were not. Seventy-seven reported the length of time of mentoring at the university (this refers to both formal and informal mentoring). The range was 3 months to 60 months (five years) ($M = 14.06$, $SD = 9.91$). Descriptive statistics for length of time of mentoring at the university are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Length of Time Mentoring at the University

Characteristic (Includes all mentoring)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>

Length of time mentoring at the university	77	14.06	9.91
--	----	-------	------

All 81 participants took the MRI, SWMS, PEQ, and the OSQ. The scores on the MRI ranged from 37 to 136 of a possible 150 with a mean of 89.74 ($SD = 21.08$). The scores on the SWMS ranged from 7 to 20 out of a possible 20 with a mean of 15.68 ($SD = 3.41$). The scores on the PEQ ranged from 6 to 30 out of a possible 30 with a mean of 19.30 ($SD = 4.65$). The scores on the OSQ ranged from 95 to 160 out of a possible 170 with a mean of 128.94 ($SD = 12.62$). Descriptive statistics for length of time of mentoring at the university are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Total Scores on the MRI, SWMS, PEQ, and OSQ

Characteristic	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	%
MRI	81	89.74	21.08	59.83
SWMS	81	15.68	3.41	78.40
PEQ	81	19.30	4.65	64.33
OSQ	81	128.94	12.62	75.85

Preliminary Analysis

To examine reliability and internal consistency Cronbach's alpha tests of reliability were conducted on the survey scales: Mentoring Role Instrument (MRI), Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (SWMS), Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire (PEQ), and Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ). The alpha coefficients for each scale were found to be reliable, and ranged from good to excellent, according to the rules of thumb recommended by George and Mallery (2003) whereby, $> .9$ – Excellent, $> .8$ –

Good, > .7 – Acceptable, > .6 – Questionable, > .5 – Poor, < .5 – Unacceptable. The Cronbach’s alpha tests of reliability are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Reliability and Internal Consistency for the MRI, SWMS, PEQ, and the OSQ

Subscale	Items	α
MRI	30	.96
SWMS	4	.93
PEQ	6	.85
OSQ	34	.91

Research Question 1

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ?

To examine research question 1, Pearson product moment correlations were conducted to assess the relationship among Mentoring Role Instrument (MRI), Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (SWMS), Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire (PEQ), and Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ).

The correlation between MRI and SWMS was significant, $r(81) = .70, p < .001$, suggesting there is a statistically significant relationship between MRI and SWMS. As MRI scores increase, SWMS scores increase, and vice versa. According to Cohen’s standard (1988), where less than .30 represents a small association, .30 - .49 represents a medium association, and .50 or larger correlations represent a large size effect or correlation between the two variables, the correlation coefficient of .70 represents a large association between the two variables.

The correlation between MRI and PEQ was significant, $r(81) = .68, p < .001$, suggesting there is a statistically significant relationship between MRI and PEQ. As MRI scores increase, PEQ scores increase, and vice versa. The correlation coefficient of .68 represents a large association between the two variables.

The correlation between PEQ and SWMS was significant, $r(81) = .75, p < .001$, suggesting there is a statistically significant relationship between PEQ and SWMS. As PEQ scores increase, SWMS scores increase, and vice versa. The correlation coefficient of .75 represents a large association between the two variables.

The null hypothesis — that no relationship exists among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ — is partially rejected. There is a statistically significant relationship between the MRI and SWMS, the MRI and the PEQ, and the PEQ and SWMS. There is not a statistically significant relationship between the OSQ and the MRI or the SWMS and the PEQ. The correlation results are presented in Table 4.

In summary of question one, based on the correlations, the results are split (hypothesis partially rejected). First, there is a relationship between the MRI, the SWMS, and the PEQ. As discussed, these are the scales that measure formal and informal mentoring. Second, the results indicate that there is no relationship between the OSQ (Organizational Socialization Questionnaire) and the three Mentoring Questionnaires (MRI, SWMS, and the PEQ).

Table 4

Pearson Correlation between the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ

Variable	Total MRI	Total SWMS	Total PEQ
Total SWMS	.70**		
Total PEQ	.68**	.75**	
Total OSQ	-.08	.04	-.04

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Research Question 2

RQ2: Does the SWMS mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ?

To examine research question 2, a mediation analysis using guidelines established by Baron and Kenny (1986) was conducted to assess if the Satisfaction with Mentor Scale (SWMS) mediates the relationship between Mentoring Role Instrument (MRI) and the Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire (PEQ).

The independent or predictor variable was MRI scores, the mediator variable was SWMS scores, and the dependent variable was PEQ scores. These variables were interval level. In preliminary analysis, the assumptions of multiple regression were assessed. Linearity was assessed with an examination of P-P Plots and the assumption was met. Homoscedasticity was assessed with an examination of the residuals plot, the standardized residuals were roughly rectangularly distributed and the residuals did not suggest a deviation from normality. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were used to assess the absence of multicollinearity; VIF values over 10.0 will show a violation of the

assumption (Stevens, 2002). All of the VIF values were below 2.0 and the assumption was met.

MRI Scores Predicting PEQ Scores

The first regression analysis examined the independent variable (MRI scores) predicting the outcome variable (PEQ scores). The results of the regression were statistically significant, $F(1, 79) = 69.16, p < .001$, suggesting MRI scores were a statistically significant predictor of PEQ scores. MRI scores accounted for (R^2) 46.7 percent of the variance in PEQ scores. For every one unit increase in MRI scores, PEQ scores increased .68 units. The results of the regression are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting PEQ Scores

Independent Variables	B	SE	β	t	p
MRI Scores	0.15	0.02	.68	8.32	.001

Note. $F(1, 79) = 69.16, p < .001, R^2 = .467$.

MRI Scores Predicting SWMS Scores

The second regression examined the independent variable (MRI scores) predicting the mediator (SWMS scores). The results of the regression were statistically significant, $F(1, 79) = 77.17, p < .001$, suggesting MRI scores were statistically significant predictors of SWMS scores. MRI scores accounted for (R^2) 49.4 percent of the variance in SWMS scores. For every one unit increase in MRI scores, SWMS scores increased .70 units. The results of the regression are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting SWMS Scores

Independent Variables	B	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
MRI Scores	0.11	0.01	.70	4.59	.001

Note. $F(1, 79) = 77.17, p < .001, R^2 = .494.$

SWMS Scores Predicting PEQ Scores

The third regression examined the mediator (SWMS scores) predicting the outcome variable (PEQ scores). The results of the regression were statistically significant, $F(1, 79) = 98.89, p < .001$, suggesting SWMS scores are a statistically significant predictor of PEQ scores. SWMS scores accounted for (R^2) 55.6 percent of the variance in PEQ scores. For every one unit increase in SWMS scores, PEQ scores increased .75 units. The results of the regression are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Linear Regression Analysis with SWMS Scores predicting PEQ Scores

Independent Variables	B	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
SWMS Scores	1.02	0.10	.75	9.94	.001

Note. $F(1, 79) = 98.89, p < .001, R^2 = .556.$

Mediation

To assess mediation, a fourth regression was conducted, controlling for the independent variable (MRI scores) and examining the mediating variable (SWMS scores) in predicting the outcome variable (PEQ scores). The results of the regression were

statistically significant, $F(2, 78) = 59.97, p < .001$, suggesting SWMS scores were statistically significant predictors of PEQ scores, after controlling for MRI scores. SWMS scores accounted for (R^2) 60.6 percent of the variance in PEQ scores after controlling for MRI scores. After controlling for MRI scores, for every one unit increase in SWMS scores, PEQ scores increased .52 units.

In the fourth regression, the mediator (SWMS scores) was a significant predictor of PEQ scores, after controlling for MRI scores, but full mediation was not supported; the final regression beta coefficient did not reduce to a point where it was no longer significant ($\beta = .52, p < .001$). There was a decrease in the beta coefficients comparing the third ($\beta = .75, p < .001$) and fourth regressions, supporting partial mediation. The null hypothesis — that the SWMS scores do not mediate the relationship between the MRI scores and the PEQ scores — is rejected. Partial mediation is supported. The results of the regression are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Linear Regression Analysis with SWMS Scores predicting PEQ Scores after Controlling for MRI Scores

Independent Variables	B	SE	β	t	p
MRI Scores	0.07	0.02	.31	3.15	.002
SWMS Scores	0.72	0.14	.52	5.25	.001

Note. $F(2, 78) = 59.97, p < .001, R^2 = .606$.

In summary of question number two, there were four regression analyses that were conducted as part of the mediation process. The first three regressions indicated that the MRI scores predict the PEQ scores, the MRI scores predict the SWM scores, and

the SWMS scores predict the PEQ scores. Because all three of the regressions were statistically significant, the mediation process calls for a fourth regression. In this case, the fourth regression is designed to answer the second research question “Does the SWMS mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ?” The fourth regression indicates that the SWMS does not fully mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ. The results would indicate that by itself, the SWMS does not account for the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ and therefore the null hypothesis (the SWMS mediates the relationship between the MRI and PEQ) is rejected. Because the first three regressions were statistically significant, according to the process partial mediation did occur, and would suggest that the SWMS does play a role in influencing the relationship. However, in this case, the role is only partial and does not mediate fully.

Research Question 3

RQ3: Does the OSQ mediate the relationship between MRI and PEQ?

To examine research question 3, a mediation analysis using guidelines established by Baron and Kenny (1986) was conducted to assess if the Organizational Socialization Questionnaire (OSQ) mediates the relationship between the Mentoring Role Instrument (MRI) and the Perceived Effectiveness Questionnaire (PEQ),

The independent or predictor variable was MRI scores, the mediator variable was OSQ scores, and the dependent variable was PEQ scores. These variables were interval level. In preliminary analysis, the assumptions of multiple regression were assessed. Linearity was assessed with an examination of P-P Plots and the assumption was met. Homoscedasticity was assessed with an examination of the residuals plot, the standardized residuals were roughly rectangularly distributed and the residuals did not

suggest a deviation from normality. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were used to assess the absence of multicollinearity; VIF values over 10.0 will show a violation of the assumption (Stevens, 2002). All of the VIF values were below 2.0 and the assumption was met.

MRI Scores Predicting PEQ Scores

The first regression analysis examined the independent variable (MRI scores) predicting the outcome variable (PEQ scores). The results of the regression were statistically significant, $F(1, 79) = 69.16, p < .001$, suggesting MRI scores were a statistically significant predictor of PEQ scores. MRI scores accounted for (R^2) 46.7 percent of the variance in PEQ scores. For every one unit increase in MRI scores, PEQ scores increased .68 units. The results of the regression are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting PEQ Scores

Independent Variables	B	SE	β	T	p
MRI Scores	0.15	0.02	.68	8.32	.001

Note. $F(1, 79) = 69.16, p < .001, R^2 = .467$.

MRI Scores Predicting OSQ Scores

The second regression examined the independent variable (MRI scores) predicting the mediator (OSQ scores). The results of the regression were not statistically significant, $F(1, 79) = 0.50, p = .483$, suggesting MRI scores were not a statistically significant predictor of OSQ scores. MRI scores accounted for (R^2) 0.6 percent of the variance in OSQ scores. The results of the regression are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Linear Regression Analysis with MRI Scores predicting OSQ Scores

Independent Variables	B	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
MRI Scores	-0.05	0.07	-.08	-0.70	.483

Note. $F(1, 79) = 0.50, p = .483, R^2 = .006$.

OSQ Scores Predicting PEQ Scores

The third regression examined the mediator (OSQ scores) predicting the outcome variable (PEQ scores). The results of the regression were not statistically significant, $F(1, 79) = 0.12, p = .736$, suggesting OSQ scores were not a statistically significant predictor of PEQ scores. OSQ scores accounted for (R^2) 0.1 percent of the variance in PEQ scores. The results of the regression are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Linear Regression Analysis with OSQ Scores predicting PEQ Scores

Independent Variables	B	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
OSQ Scores	-0.01	0.04	-.04	-0.34	.736

Note. $F(1, 79) = 0.12, p = .736, R^2 = .001$.

Mediation

A fourth regression was not conducted to assess mediation. The independent variable (MRI scores) did not predict the mediator (OSQ scores) and the mediator (OSQ scores) variable did not predict the outcome variable (PEQ scores). Mediation is not

supported. The null hypothesis — the OSQ does not mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ — cannot be rejected.

In summary, as it relates to question number three, there were only three regression analyses that were conducted. As part of the mediation process, all three have to be significant and suggest that each predicts or influences the other. In this case, the first regression (MRI scores predicting the PEQ) was significant. This was already known from question number two. In the second regression, the MRI scores did not predict the OSQ scores and therefore there was no significance. In the third regression, the OSQ did not predict the PEQ, and therefore this was also not significant. As a result of the insignificance in the regression analyses from number two and number three, the mediation process determines that there is no need to conduct a fourth regression. In this case, the answer to question number three indicates that the OSQ does not mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

Statement of the Problem

The original statement of the problem suggested that as it relates to formal mentoring, not all faculty mentees perceive formal mentoring in the same way as intended by the organization. There are three primary issues that drive faculty perceptions; first, formal mentoring offers a way for organizations to control faculty (Edwards, 1995); second, faculty view relationships as planned and coordinated, and offer that relationships end up being more superficial because the mentee views the mentor as a hierarchical figure in the organization (Raabe & Beehr, 2003); and third, formal mentoring programs are suggested as having an effective socializing process and that measurements of formal mentoring program goals may not be adequately evaluating criteria in relation to socialization (Choa, 2009).

The writer's experience of being involved in Gannon University's one-year formal mentoring program, led to the need to clarify the significance of the problem or confusion regarding formal mentoring and whether or not there was a relationship to organizational socialization. To further this study, two other elements became apparent as part of the writer's experience. First, the faculty involved in the program (the one year the writer was involved in) had mixed feelings and emotions as it relates to the perceived effectiveness of the program. And second, the satisfaction with the mentor was varied.

Regardless of the reasons, it seemed fitting to investigate the role that perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring programs and satisfaction of the mentor had when it came to the functions of the mentor relationship and organizational socialization. And

would organizational socialization offer another avenue to assist in measuring formal mentoring programs. In order to build on the original assertions, it is important to understand the relationships between each of the instruments and the story they offer.

So, as stated, the purpose of this study was to examine the intended question: Are there interrelationships among the mentor relationship functions (Mentoring Functions-MRI), mentoring relationship satisfaction (Satisfaction with Mentor-SWMS), effectiveness of formal mentoring (Perceived Effectiveness-PEQ), and the dimensions of organizational socialization (Organizational Socialization-OSQ) when it comes to a formal mentoring program at a university. The research questions guiding this research project are as follows:

Research Question 1.

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ?

Research Question 2.

RQ2: Does the SWMS mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ?

Research Question 3.

RQ3: Does the OSQ mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ?

Previous chapters introduced this study, provided research and literature in support of the study being conducted, outlined the methodology used in this study and provided the reader with the results of the survey/questionnaires. This chapter will discuss the findings of the research by providing an interpretation of the results, connecting and drawing relationships to the literature provided in Chapter 2, analyzing the limitations of this study and discussing the implications of the results.

Findings and Interpretations

Research question number one: Is there a statistically significant relationship among the MRI, the SWMS, the PEQ and the OSQ was examined using the Pearson Product Correlations. The correlations suggested that there were strong correlations between the MRI and the SWMS, the MRI and the PEQ, and the PEQ and the SWMS. This is consistent with the literature suggesting that faculty with high perceptions of overall relationship functions (career and psychosocial) tend to have higher levels of satisfaction with the mentor and perceived effectiveness of the relationship (Kram, 1985). The results also suggest that the faculty at Gannon may be satisfied with the mentor relationship indicating that commitment to the relationship is high (Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005; Portest, Shockely & Allen, 2009), the time spent in the relationship (dyad) may be well spent (Allen, Russel, & Maetzke, 1997), and the level of trust must be mutual in support of the functions of the relationship (Ragins, 1977).

No evidence was found to support the second part of the question as it relates to the correlation study. There is not a statistically significant relationship between the OSQ and the MRI or the SWMS and the PEQ. The results are inconsistent with other findings especially in terms of mentoring being supported as a socializing process (Chao, 2009). Positive relationships between a mentee's report of the interpersonal closeness of the mentorship and the value of the program to organizational socialization has been documented (Heimann & Pittenger, 1996) and mentored tenured and tenure-track law faculty had significantly higher socialization scores on the organizational goals and values subscale of the OSQ, than non-mentored faculty (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009).

Research question number two: Does the satisfaction with the mentor relationship (SWMS) mediate the relationship between the mentor relationship functions (MRI) and the perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (PEQ)? As part of the mediation process (Barron & Kenny, 1986), there were four regressions performed. The first regression MRI scores predicting PEQ scores turned out to be statistically significant and suggested that the variations in the MRI scores significantly account for variations in the PEQ scores. Previous research suggests that the perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring (PEQ) has been demonstrated to be a measurable outcome of the mentor relationship functions (MRI). Also noted is that there is limited research between formal mentoring program design characteristics and reports of mentee program effectiveness (Allen, et al., 2006).

The results of this study suggested that variations in the levels of the MRI scores significantly account for predicting and or influencing the scores on the PEQ. This would suggest that the PEQ might assist an organization in evaluating the program characteristics in the areas of mentee involvement in the design and mentor-mentee matching process (Allen, et al., 2006). Because of the way the relationships are established in the formal mentoring process, many times the mentee does not have a choice as to who will mentor them. It has been well documented that formal mentoring programs are set up to mimic the interpersonal relationship process similar to informal mentoring (Raggins, et al., 2000). While some view it as not as fulfilling as the informal process (Kram, 1985), others suggest that program effectiveness is enhanced when formal mentoring programs are designed in a way that corresponds with the interpersonal process similar to informal mentoring (Allen, et al., 2006). While it is contrary to the

initial assertions of this study, it would support the notion that using informal measures may assist in measuring formal mentoring effectiveness.

Another characteristic that has been heavily discussed in the literature but not empirically validated with the exception of Eby and Lockwood (2003), relates to training programs that are set up between the mentor and mentee prior to the start of the formal mentoring program. Their qualitative study revealed that it makes sense that communicating prior to the event, and making sure that everyone is on the same page, could only improve the perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program. The results of this study would indicate that there is an empirical rationale for training as it relates to pre-formal mentoring program involvement.

In the second regression, the MRI scores predicted the SWMS scores and suggest that variations in the levels of the MRI significantly account for variations in the SWMS. The relationship between the two has been well documented in the literature and is consistent in that the total MRI scores suggest that high levels of overall relationship functions (career and psychosocial) tend to have higher levels on the SWMS (Kram, 1985). The results of this study concur with the body of literature noting that relationship mutuality (Drigotas, et al., 1999), commitment to the relationship via the mentor-mentee (Ortiz-Waters & Gilson, 2005), and the amount of time spent in the dyad relationship all contribute to the variations and the outcomes predicted by the MRI.

It makes sense, logically, that the next regression analysis (third regression) SWMS scores predicting PEQ scores would be significant, based on the fact that the correlations between the two were positive. The study results indicate that there is a positive relationship between the SWMS and the PEQ and is such that the levels of the

SWMS account for variations in the PEQ. The literature supports the idea that the satisfaction with the mentor relationship would suggest in most cases that when the mentor has met certain expectations of the relationship that it would indicate that some or all of the program's characteristics (mentor-mentee matching process, input from the mentee into the program design, and mentee-mentor training prior to the program) have been met. Thus, individual perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program would be influenced.

In this study, the writer/researcher having been involved in the formal mentoring program at Gannon, felt satisfied with the relationship with the mentor. However, in retrospect, the effectiveness of the program was not something that was given a great deal of thought. As reflection occurs, the induction program did offer how the process worked, but there was no involvement on the part of the researcher/writer in picking the mentor, or how the program would be set up. While this is just one example, others involved in this cohort felt that there could have been more involvement from other faculty in the process and that very little input from the mentees made some of the mentees feel uncomfortable with the program.

As it relates to the fourth regression, the mediator (SWMS) was a significant predictor of the PEQ scores, after controlling for the MRI scores, however full mediation was not supported. When controlling for the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ, the relationship was not reduced to zero, therefore suggesting that the SWMS is not a single dominant mediator, and that multiple influences may exist between the PEQ and the MRI. From a theoretical perspective, a significant reduction demonstrates that the SWMS is indeed potent to the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ even though it

is not both a necessary and a sufficient condition for an effect to occur (Barron & Kenny, 1986, p. 1176).

In terms of the last research question, number three; does the organizational socialization total (OSQ) mediate the relationship between perceived mentor relationship function (MRI), and the perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (PEQ), a mediation analysis was also conducted. The first regression analysis examined the independent variable (MRI scores) predicting the outcome variable (PEQ scores). The results are the same as indicated in research question number two. MRI scores predicting PEQ scores were statistically significant, suggesting variations in the MRI scores account significantly for variations in the PEQ scores. Please see previous discussion results for the summary of the MRI scores predicting the PEQ scores and validating the literature review findings.

A second regression analysis was conducted and examined the independent variable (MRI scores) predicting the mediator (OSQ scores). The results as indicated were not statistically significant. This suggests that there were no variations in the levels of the MRI scores accounting for the variations in the OSQ scores. Results are contrary to the literature and do not support the relationship as it relates to the connection between the dimensions of organizational socialization (Chao, et al., 1994) and the use of serial-disjunctive tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) via formal mentoring. As indicated in the literature review, there were numerous studies that suggested that organizational socialization was directly related to the career functions (Chao, et al., 1992; Swap et al., 2001; Schrodts et al., 2003) and psychosocial functions (Chao, 2007; Koslowski &

Ostroff, 1993; Simosi, 2010) in relation to the MRI. But again, no relationship was found to be evident in this study.

As it relates to organizational socialization and Gannon's formal mentoring program, the researcher also outlined specific criteria from the formal mentoring program and linked it to criteria related to the dimensions of organizational socialization (see Table 1 for details). The links clearly identified areas that were considered to be categorized via the dimension of organizational socialization (Choa, et al., 1992) and were described as formal mentoring goals and objectives. However, the results did not offer any relationships between the categories and the formal mentoring classification.

Positive relationships between a mentee's report of the interpersonal closeness of the mentorship, and the value of the program to organizational socialization have been documented (Heimann & Pittenger, 1996). Another study involving formally mentored tenured and tenure-track law faculty had significantly higher socialization scores on the organizational goals and values subscale of the OSQ, than non-mentored faculty (Haynes & Petrosko, 2009). Again, indicating that there was a relationship between formal mentoring and organizational socialization.

As part of the process, a third regression yielded the same results when examining the mediator (OSQ scores) predicting the outcome variable (PEQ scores). There was no statistical significance. This suggests that the OSQ scores did not account for variations in the PEQ scores. In the literature, it has been discussed that program characteristics including mentor-mentee matching process, input from the mentee into the program design, and mentee-mentor training prior to the program, are strongly related to the perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring programs (Allen et. al, 2006). While it

seems logical that these characteristics would also relate to the dimensions of organizational socialization, the results of this study suggest otherwise, and indicate that there is no relationship between the OSQ scores and the PEQ scores.

Summary

There is a strong relationship between the MRI, the SWMS, and the PEQ as per question number one. These questionnaires/scales share common principles with each other and may contribute to other measures related to formal mentoring. On the other hand, based on the correlations, the organizational socialization questionnaire shares very little in common with the MRI, SWMS, and the PEQ and suggests that there may be no relationship between organizational socialization measures and formal mentoring measures.

Based on the results, it seems most appropriate to elaborate on question number three (Does the OSQ mediate the relationship between the MRI and the PEQ?), prior to discussing question number two. In summary of question number three, the organizational socialization questionnaire total (OSQ) does not mediate the relationship between the mentor role inventory (MRI) and the perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring (PEQ). In other words, it implies statistically that there is no relationship between the organizational socialization questionnaire (OSQ) and the other two questionnaires used to measure formal mentoring.

While the results of question one and three do not support the notion that organizational socialization measures may assist in measuring formal mentoring, the first part of question number one and question number two provide interesting support for the mentor role inventory (MRI) as it relates to satisfaction of the mentor relationship

(SWMS), and perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (PEQ). This study suggests that while the MRI is an informal measure, it is partially mediated by the SWMS indicating that there are at least two paths feeding into the outcome variable (in this case the PEQ).

As indicated in this study, the MRI, SWMS and the PEQ together share a relationship that may offer more of a comprehensive picture when measuring formal mentoring. Satisfaction with the mentor relationship (SWMS) would suggest in most cases that when the mentor has met certain expectations of the relationship that it would indicate that some or all of the program's characteristics (mentor-mentee matching process, input from the mentee into the program design, and mentee-mentor training prior to the program) have been met. Thus, individual perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (PEQ) would be influenced. The idea that inside the mentor relationship functions (MRI) exists a strong connection to the satisfaction with the mentor (SWMS), and that the path between the two may influence formal mentoring program effectiveness (PEQ), implies that perhaps organizations should be paying greater attention (empirically) to the characteristics of the design of the formal mentoring program.

Limitations to the Study

With any study, there are limitations that are discovered before, during, and after the research is completed. These limitations could ultimately have an impact on the results of the research. However, by considering each limitation and the effect it could have on the study, efforts can be made to overcome the limitations and their influence.

In some cases those that did not respond to the survey may differ from those who did respond. As an example, perhaps those non-respondents were those who were unhappy with the formal mentoring program. Also, the study cannot say with any certainty the extent to which these results generalize to Gannon University as investigated, or for that matter to other formal mentoring programs.

Another limitation to this study is that it is a cross-sectional design with one post test measuring faculty at one point and time. Additionally, as the design is retrospective in nature, asking faculty to remember as much as thirteen years back the specific mentoring relationships may be difficult. It is possible that over time mentees forget the specific nature of their relationship with the mentor or experience an information processing bias where only positive or negative mentoring relationship functions are remembered.

The philosophy of the program as it relates to the goals and objectives of the formal mentoring program limits the results of this study. There was a change in the philosophy of the program between the mentors over the period of thirteen years and these changes may not have coincided with the definition as stated on the survey. This was learned after the study was already completed and may contribute to a difference in the perception of the relationship and the perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program.

As the population studied was faculty at a Catholic university and restricted to higher education, these characteristics might restrict the generalizability of the findings to other settings and might be considered a limitation. Another limitation may be related to the use of faculty self-reported measures of program effectiveness. While generalizations

were made in reference to the characteristics of perceived effective formal measures, the authors (Allen et al., 2006) also noted that because the data are cross-sectional, it is difficult to say for sure that they are predictors of behavior or the quality of the mentor relationship. As part of the same concept, it should be noted that only the mentee's side of the story was considered here.

One last limitation that should be mentioned is in relation to the specific mentor that the respondents were evaluating. With the way the study was designed, there is no way to know which mentor the respondents are evaluating when doing the survey. This is because the program has been in existence for over 13 years and has had more than two individuals responsible for the process.

Implications for Future Research

As this study unfolded, around every corner and on each path taken, implications presented to the researcher. The following outlines the implications for future research and offers possible ways to enhance the research process in the future:

1. Size of the study could be enhanced, thus allowing for greater generalizability.
2. Looking at other universities that share the same philosophy in regards to formal mentoring and including them in the process may enhance future study results and provide a wider base of respondents.
3. Clearly stating and defining formal mentoring and the specific goals and objectives of the program will allow for a comprehensive assessment and greater outcomes in relation to perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring.

4. Because this study is cross-sectional in design and does not capture a longitudinal perspective of formal mentoring, it would be of interest to conduct surveys pre and post (over time) to determine whether perceptions change or remain the same as it relates to the effectiveness of formal mentoring.
5. To expand the results of the current study, the test of mediation does allow for the implications of causation. Using a controlled experimental design may enhance the results of future studies.
6. More specifically, studying whether or not the characteristics of formal mentoring measures (mentor-mentee matching process, input from the mentee into the program design, and mentee-mentor training prior to the program) mediate the perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring and the satisfaction of the mentoring relationship would expand the present study results and inform the community of mentoring scholars.
7. And last but not least, involving the mentor, mentee, administrators of the program, and past members of the formal mentoring programs in participating in the overall program design and guidelines of the program would perhaps enhance the overall growth and development of the formal mentoring programs at universities.

Implications for Practice

This study suggests that while there is no relationship between organizational socialization and formal mentoring, there is a strong relationship between perceived

effectiveness of the formal mentoring program (PEQ), the functions of the mentoring relationship (MRI), and the satisfaction of the mentor relationship (SWMS). The literature offers that satisfaction with the mentor relationship is critical to the outcome of mentoring (both formal and informal). However, the literature falls short in terms of how the mentee perceives the effectiveness of the formal mentoring program. The results of this study offer that perceived effectiveness is influenced by the satisfaction with the mentor and whether or not the relationship with the mentor has met certain needs of the mentee.

Practical implications suggest that by having the mentee involved in the mentor-mentee matching process, the satisfaction with the mentor and the overall perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program could be enhanced. It is also implied that training the mentee and mentor prior to the program, as it relates to the purpose of the formal mentoring program, would most likely impact both perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program and the expectations of the relationship between the mentee and the mentor. And lastly, the idea of involving all parties (those who have graduated from the formal mentoring program, the current mentees-and mentors, and the administrators of the program) in the program review, development, and implementation, seems to be a logical way to promote both satisfaction with the mentor relationship and perceived effectiveness of the formal mentoring program.

Conclusion

Mentoring (formal and informal) is a complex multidimensional approach to the professional development of faculty, and because it is, it is very difficult to measure

effectively. Overall this study looked at just a few of the measures involved in formal and informal mentoring. The results were twofold. First, there is no relationship between informal mentoring measures (MRI) and perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring (PEQ) and organization socialization (OSQ) with faculty at Gannon University. On the other hand, the second part of this research suggests that there is a strong relationship between the MRI, the SWMS, and the PEQ. And perhaps satisfaction of the relationship (SWMS), and perceived effectiveness of formal mentoring (PEQ) offer an enhanced relationship to using informal measures such as the MRI, at least in this case with Gannon University faculty. Without a doubt, it offers the idea that future research should expand on satisfaction and effectiveness in an attempt to enhance the way formal mentoring programs are measured.

In short, the future of academia requires a strong foundation of effectively developing faculty as it relates to both career and psychosocial elements. Empirically measuring the relationship between the faculty mentee, mentor, and program are critical necessities to the future of academia. It is hoped that this study proves to be an extension of the research in the field of mentoring and more specifically that the information provided will further the knowledge base in the field of formal mentoring.

References

- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006). Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: Closing the gap between research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(3), 567-578. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.567
- Allen, T.D., Day, R., & Lentz, E. (2005). The role of interpersonal comfort mentoring relationships. *Journal of Career Development, 31*(3), 115-169.
- Allen, T.D., Poteet, M.L., Eby, L.T., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(1), 127-136.
- Allen, T.D., & Eby, L.T. (2003). Relationship effectiveness for mentors: Factors associated with learning and quality. *Journal of Management, 29*, 469-486.
- Allen, T.D., McManus, S.E., & Russell, J. E. A. (1999). Newcomer socialization and stress: formal peer relationship as a source of support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 453-470.
- Allen, T.D., Russell, J.E.A., & Maetzke, S. B. (1977). Formal peer mentoring: Factors related to protégés satisfaction and willingness to mentor others. *Group and Organization Management, 22*, 488-507.
- Ashford, S.J., & Black, J.S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: the role of desire and control. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 199-214.
- Ashford, S.J., Sluss, D.M., & Saks, A. M. (2007). Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*, 447-462. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.02.001

- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barbain, J. (2002). A little help from your friends. *Training*, 39(5), 38-42.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Bauer, T.N., Morrison, E.W., & Callister, R.R. (1998). Organizational socialization: A review and directions for future research. In G.R. Ferris (Ed) *Research in personnel human resource management* 16, p 149-214. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Baugh, S.G. & Fagenson-England, E. A. (2007). Formal mentoring programs: A “poor cousin” to informal relationships? In B. R. Ragins & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 249-271). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- Bell, R. H. (1999). Voices inside schools: On becoming a teacher of teachers. *Harvard Educational Review*, 69 (4), 447-455.
- Benabou C., & Benabou R. (2001). Establishing a formal mentoring program for organizational success. *National Productivity Review*, 19(4), 1-8. doi: 10.1002/1520-6734(200023)
- Betz, N.E. (1997), Increasing research involvement and interests among graduate students in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25, 88-93.
- Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. *Academe*, 75, 8-4.

- Blake, S. D. (1995). At the crossroads of race and gender: Lessons from the mentoring experience of professional Black women. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Boise, R. (1992). *The new faculty member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bouquillon, E.A., Sosik, J.J., and Lee, D. (2005). It's only a phase: Examining trust, identification and mentoring functions received across the mentoring phases. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 13(2), 239-258.
- Cawyer, C.S., & Friedrich, G. W. (1998). Organizational socialization: Process for new communication faculty. *Communication Education*, 47, 234-245.
- Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 15-28.
- Chao, G.T., Walz, P.M., & Gardner, P.D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 619-636. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Chao, G.T. (2007). Mentoring and organizational socialization. In B. R. Ragins & K.E. Kram (Eds.), *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, Research and Practice* (pp. 179-188). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- Chao, G.T. (2009). Formal mentoring: Lessons learned from past practice. *Professional Psychology: Researching Practice*, 40(3), 314-320. doi: 10.1037/a0012658
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Donaldson, S.I., Ensher, E.A., & Grant-Vallone, E.J. (2000). Longitudinal examination of mentoring relationships on organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Career Development, 26*(4), 233-249.
- Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(5), 539-546. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.539
- Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C.E., & Verette, J. (1999). Level of commitment, mutuality of commitment, and couple well-being. *Personal Relationships, 6*, 389-409.
- Eby, L.T., & Lockwood, A. (2005). Protégés' and mentors' reactions to participating in formal mentoring programs: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*, 441-458.
- Eby, L.T., Rhodes, J., & Allen, T.D. (in press). The definition and evolution of mentoring. In T.D. Allen, & L.T. Eby (Eds), *Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Edwards, J. (1995). *When race counts*, New York: Routledge.
- Ehrich, L.C., Hansford, B., Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: A review of the literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*, 518-540, doi: 10.1177/0013161X04267118
- Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*, 309-320.
- Fagenson, E. A., Marks, M.A. & Amendola, K. L. (1997) Perceptions of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*(1), pp. 29-42.

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.G. (2008). G*Power Version 3.1.2 [computer software]. Universität Kiel, Germany. Retrieved from <http://www.psych.uni-duesseldorf.de/abteilungen/aap/gpower3/download-and-register>
- Feldman, D.C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organizational members. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 309-318.
- Feldman, D.C. (1989). Socialization, resocialization, and training: Reframing the research agenda. In I. Goldstein (Ed.), *Training and Development in Organizations* (pp. 376-416). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Feldman, D.C. (1999). Toxic mentors or toxic protégés? A critical examination of dysfunctional mentoring. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9, 247-278.
- Fisher, C.D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 4, 101-145.
- Friday, E., & Friday, S.S. (2002). Formal mentoring: Is there a strategic fit. *Management Decision*, 40(2), 152-157.
- Gardiner, M., Tiggemann, M., Kearns, H., & Marshall, K. (2007). Show me the money! An empirical analysis of mentoring outcomes for women in academia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(4), 425-442. doi:10.1080/07294360701658633
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gibson, S. K. (2004). Being mentored: The experience of women faculty. *Journal of Career Development*, 30 (3), 173-188.

- Haueter, J.A., Macan, T.H., & Winter, J. (2003). Measurement of newcomer socialization: Construct validation of a multidimensional scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 90-104.
- Haynes, R.K., & Petrosko, J.M. (2009). An investigation of mentoring and socialization among law faculty. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 7(1), 41-52.
doi:10.1080/13611260802658520
- Hegstad, C.D., & Wentling, R.M. (2005). Organizational antecedents and moderators that impact effectiveness of exemplary formal mentoring programs in Fortune 500 companies in the United States, *Human Resource Development International*, 8(4), 467-487.
- Heimann, B., & Pittenger, K.S. (1996). The impact of formal mentorship on socialization and commitment of newcomers. *Journal of Management Issues*, 8(1), 108-117.
- Homer, Interpreted by Fitzgerald, R. (1963). *The Odyssey*. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Irving, E.S., Moore, W.D., & Hamilton, R.J. (2003). Mentoring for high ability school students. *Education and Training*, 45(2), 100-109.
- Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, 61 (4), 505-532.
- Janasz, S.C. & Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professional network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 263-283.
- Jones, G.R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 262-279.
- Klaus, R. (1981). Formalized mentor relationships for management and executive development programs in the federal government. *Public Administration Review*, 41(4), 489-496. Retrieved from JSTOR.

- Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentoring relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 608-625.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Kram, K. E., & Bragar, M. (1992). Development through mentoring: A strategy approach. In D. Montross & G. Shinkman (Eds.), *Career Development: Theory and Practice*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, p.221-254.
- Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H., & McKee B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Louis, M.R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.
- Merriam, S.B. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 161-173.
- Merriam, S.B., Thomas, T.K., & Zeph, C.P. (1987). Mentoring in higher education: What we now know. *The Review of Higher Education*, 11(2), 199-210.
- Mullen, C. A. (2000). Constructing co-mentoring partnerships: Walkways we must travel. *Theory into Practice*, 39 (1), 4-11.
- Mertler, C.A., & Vannatta, R.A. (2010). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods* (4th ed.). Pyrczak Publishing: Glendale, CA.
- Morrison, R.F., & Hock, R.R. (1986). Career building: Learning from cumulative work experience. In D.T. Hall (Ed.), *Career development in organizations* (pp. 236-2740). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Murray, M. (1991). *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: How to facilitate an effective mentoring program*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Noe, R.A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships, *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 457-479.
- Northern Illinois University- <http://www3.niu.edu/facdev/development/mentoring.htm>
- Nyquist, J., Manning, L., Wilff, D., Sprague A.J., Fraser, P., Calcagno, C., Woodford, B. (1999). On the road to becoming a professor. *Change*, 31 (3), 18-27.
- Ortiz-Walters, R., & Gilson, L.L. (2005). Mentoring in academia: An examination of the experiences of protégés of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 459-475.
- Orpen, C. (1995). The effects of mentoring on employees' career success. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 667-668.
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 170-183.
- Porteat, F., Shockley, K.M., & Allen, T.D. (2009). Mentor-protégé commitment fit and relationship satisfaction in academic mentoring. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 332-337.
- Raabe, B., & Beehr T.A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and co-worker relationships: Differences in perceptions and impact. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 271-293. doi: 10.1002/job.193
- Ragins, B.R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 482-521.

- Ragins, B.R. & McFarlin, D.B. (1990). Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 321-339. Retrieved from Ragins, B.R.
- Ragins, B.R. & Scandura, T.A. (1994). Gender differences in expected outcomes of mentoring relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 957-971. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Ragins, B.R. & Scandura, T.A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 13, 169-174. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Ragins, B.R. (1995). Diversity, power and mentorships in organizations: A cultural, structural, and behavioral perspective. In M.M. Chemers, S. Oskamp, & M. Constanzo (Eds.), *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace* (pp. 91-132) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ragins, B.R. & Cotton, J.L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 529-550. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Ragins, B.R., Cotton, J.L., & Miller, J.S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentoring, quality of relations, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1177-1194. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Rosenholtz, S.J. (1989). *Teachers workplace: The social organization of schools*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Russel, J. E. A., & Adams, D.M. (1997). The changing nature of mentoring in organizations: an introduction to the special issue on mentoring organizations, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 1-14.

- Sands, R.G., Parson, L. A., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 62 (2), 174-193.
- Savage H. E., Karp R. S., & Logue, R. (2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities. *College teaching*, 51 (1), 21-24.
- Scandura, T.A. (1992). Research note: Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation summary. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 169. Retrieved January 8, 2011, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 393034611)
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E.H., Ott, J.S. (1962). The legitimacy of organizational influence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 67, 682-689.
- Schrodt, P., Cawyer, C.S., & Sanders, R. (2003). An examination of academic mentoring behaviors and new faculty members' satisfaction and tenure and promotion processes. *Communication Education*, 52, 17-29.
- Schneider, A. (1977). Empty tables at faculty club worry some academics. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A (12), 1-5.
- Shannon, D.M., & Davenport, M.A. (2001). *Using SPSS to solve statistical problems: A self-instruction guide*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Simosi, M. (2010). The role of social socialization tactics in the relationship between socialization content and newcomers' organizational commitment, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25 (3), 301-27.
- Singh, V., Bains, D., & Vinnicombe, S. (2002). Informal mentoring as an organizational resource. *Long Range Planning*, 35, 389-405.

- Sosik, J. J., Godshalk, V. M. & Yammarino, F.J. (2004). Transformational leadership, learning goal orientation, and expectations for career success in mentor-protégé relationships: multiple level of analysis perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(2), 241-261.
- Stevens, J. P. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (5th ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge Academic.
- Swap, W., Leonard, D., Shields, M., & Abrhams, L. (2001). Using mentoring and storytelling to transfer knowledge in the workplace. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 95-114.
- Tyler, K. (1998). Mentoring programs link employees and experienced execs. *HR Magazine*, 43(5), 98-103.
- U.W. Oshkosh- <http://www.uwosh.edu/mentoring/faculty/benefits.html>
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing strategies for organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 7, 8-36.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E.H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B.M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 1, pp 209-264)*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Viator, R. E., & Scandura, T. A. (1991). A study of mentor-protege relationships in large public accounting firms. *Accounting Horizons*, 5(3), 20-30. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Wanberg, C.R., Kammeyer-Mueller J., & Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and protégé predictors and outcomes of mentoring in a formal mentoring program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 410-423.
- Washington State University- http://provost.wsu.edu/faculty_mentoring/guideline.html

- Waters, L., McCabe, M., Kiellerup, D., & Kiellerup, S. (2002). The role of formal mentoring on business success and self-esteem in participants of a new business start-up program. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17, 107-121.
- Whitney, W.T., & Coetsier, P. (1983). The relationship of career mentoring to early career outcomes. *Organization Studies*, 143 (3), 331-351.
- Wood, M., Des Jarlis, C.D. (2006). When post-tenure review policy and practice diverge: Making the case for congruence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (4), 561-585.
- Young, A. M., Perrewe, P.L. (2000). What did you expect? An examination of career related support and social support among mentors and protégés. *Journal of Management*, 26(4), 611-632.
- Zeind, C.S., Zdanowicz, M., MacDonald, K., Parkhurst, C. (2005) Developing a sustainable faculty mentoring program. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 69 (1), 165-179.

Appendix A

Purpose and Goals of the University Formal Faculty Mentoring Program

Purpose and Goals of the University Formal Faculty Mentoring Program

Purpose of the program is to help new faculty feel at home at the university and become fully integrated into the life of the university, to acquaint them with the mission of the university, university's history and culture, and the Catholic nature of the university.

They offer that the literature mentions two difficulties new faculty typically experience.

One is social isolation, and the second is intellectual under stimulation.

Goals of the Mentoring Program:

1. An understanding of the mission of university.
2. An understanding of the implications of teaching at a Catholic institution.
3. An introduction to procedures at the university: "How things are done here."
4. An understanding of what is expected of faculty at the university.
5. Improved teaching.
6. Strategies for student-centered learning.
7. An awareness of the diversity of the students and the implications for teaching and learning for a diverse student body.
8. An exchange of ideas between new and experienced faculty.
9. Formal and Informal insight into the Retention/Tenure/Promotion process.
10. Support for new faculty to make the first year an enjoyable experience.

Appendix B

Instruments

Instruments

Mentor Role Instrument MRI (Ragins and McFarlin, 1990)

My MENTOR:

(Sponsor)

1. Helps me attain desirable positions.
2. Uses his/her influence to support my advancement in the organization.
3. Uses his/her influence in the organization for my benefit.

(Coach)

4. Helps me learn about other parts of the organization.
5. Gives me advice on how to attain recognition in the organization.
6. Suggests specific strategies for achieving career aspirations.

(Protect)

7. Protects me from those who may be “out to get me.”
8. “Runs interference” for me in the organization.
9. Shields me from damaging contact with important people in the organization.

(Challenge)

10. Gives me tasks that require me to learn new skills.
11. Provides me with challenging assignments.
12. Assigns me tasks that push me into developing new skills.

(Exposure)

13. Helps me be more visible in the organization.
14. Creates opportunities for me to impress important people in the organization.
15. Brings my accomplishments to the attention of important people in the organization.

(Friendship)

16. Is someone I can confide in.
17. Provides support and encouragement.
18. Is someone I can trust.

(Social)

19. And I frequently get together informally after work by ourselves.
20. And I frequently socialize one-on-one outside the work setting.
21. And I frequently have one-on-one, informal social interactions.

(Parent)

22. Is like a father/mother to me.
23. Reminds me of one of my parents.
24. Treats me like a son/daughter.

(Counseling)

25. Serves as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself.
26. Guides my professional development.
27. Guides my personal development.

(Acceptance)

28. Accepts me as a competent professional.
29. Sees me as being competent.
30. Thinks highly of me.

Satisfaction with Mentor SWMS (Ragins and Cotton)

My MENTOR:

- Is someone I am satisfied with.
- Has been effective in his/her role.
- Fails to meet my needs (reversed).
- Disappoints me (reversed).

Perceived Program Effectiveness PEO (Ragins, Cotton & Miller)

- The formal mentoring program in my organization is effective.
- The formal mentoring program allows me access to mentors who otherwise would have been unattainable.
- I am satisfied with the formal mentoring program.
- The formal mentoring program smoothed the way for me to get a mentor.
- I would be unable to get a mentor if not for the formal mentoring program.
- The formal mentoring program is a waste of time (reversed)

Organizational Socialization OSQ Dimensions/Measures

Conceptual Factor: History

2. I know very little about the history behind my work group/department. (R)
9. I am not familiar with the organization's customs and celebrations. (R)
14. I know the organization's long-held traditions.
21. I would be a good resource in describing the background of my work group/department.
29. I am familiar with the history of my organization.

Conceptual Factor: Language

6. I have not mastered the specialized terminology and vocabulary of my profession.
12. I have not mastered this organization's slang and special jargon. (R)

15. I do not always understand what the organization's abbreviations and acronyms mean. (R)
 18. I understand the specific meanings of words and jargon in my profession.
 30. I understand what most of the acronyms and abbreviations of my profession mean.
-

Conceptual Factor: Politics

1. I have learned how things "really work" on the inside of this organization.
 7. I know who the most influential people are in my organization.
 23. I do not have a good understanding of the politics in my organization (R)
 26. I am not always sure what needs to be done in order to get the most desirable work assignments in my area.
 28. I have a good understanding of the motives behind the actions of other people in the organization.
 32. I can identify the people in this organization who are the most important in getting the work done.
-

Conceptual Factor: People

4. I do not consider any of my co-workers as my friends. (R)
 10. I am usually excluded in social get-togethers given by other people in the organization. (R)
 13. Within my work group, I would be easily identified as "one of the gang."
 27. I am usually excluded in informal networks or gatherings of people within this organization. (R)
 31. I am pretty popular in the organization.
 33. I believe most of my co-workers like me.
-

Conceptual Factor 5: Organizational Goals and Values

3. I would be a good representative of my organization.
 11. The goals of the organization are also my goals.
 16. I believe that I fit in well with my organization.
 17. I do not always believe in the values set by my organization. (R)
 20. I understand the goals of my organization.
 25. I would be a good example of an employee who represents my organization's values.
 34. I support the goals that are set by my organization.
-

Conceptual Factor 6: Performance Proficiency

5. I have not yet "learned the ropes" of my job. (R)
8. I have learned how to successfully perform my job in an efficient manner.
19. I have mastered the required tasks of my job.
22. I have not fully developed the appropriate skills and abilities to successfully perform my job. (R)
24. I understand what all the duties of my job entail.

Appendix C

Formal Mentoring Questionnaire

Formal Mentoring Questionnaire

For the purposes of this study, **formal mentoring** are those processes which are part of an organization's program, officially supported and sanctioned. A newcomer to the organization (mentee) is paired with a more experienced person (mentor). The programs are designed to select, train, pair, monitor and support mentor-mentee pairs in order to achieve organizational goals.

Please answer each question below with an "X" in the appropriate box

Were you involved in the formal mentoring program at the university?

YES _____ NO _____

Have you been involved in an informal mentoring relationship?

YES _____ NO _____

Approximate length of time of your mentoring at the university _____

Please Answer the following questions using the following scale:

1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree 4-Agree

5-Strongly Agree

My MENTOR:

1. ____ Helps me attain desirable positions.
2. ____ Uses his/her influence to support my advancement in the organization.
3. ____ Uses his/her influence in the organization for my benefit.
4. ____ Helps me learn about other parts of the organization.
5. ____ Gives me advice on how to attain recognition in the organization.
6. ____ Suggests specific strategies for achieving career aspirations.
7. ____ Protects me from those who may be "out to get me."
8. ____ "Runs interference" for me in the organization.
9. ____ Shields me from damaging contact with important people in the organization.
10. ____ Gives me tasks that require me to learn new skills.
11. ____ Provides me with challenging assignments.
12. ____ Assigns me tasks that push me into developing new skills.
13. ____ Helps me be more visible in the organization.
14. ____ Creates opportunities for me to impress important people in the organization.
15. ____ Brings my accomplishments to the attention of important people in the organization.
16. ____ Is someone I can confide in.
17. ____ Provides support and encouragement.
18. ____ Is someone I can trust.
19. ____ And I frequently get together informally after work by ourselves.
20. ____ And I frequently socialize one-on-one outside the work setting.

21. ____ And I frequently have one-on-one, informal social interactions.
22. ____ Is like a father/mother to me.
23. ____ Reminds me of one of my parents.
24. ____ Treats me like a son/daughter.
25. ____ Serves as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself.
26. ____ Guides my professional development.
27. ____ Guides my personal development.
28. ____ Accepts me as a competent professional.
29. ____ Sees me as being competent.
30. ____ Thinks highly of me.
31. ____ Is someone I am satisfied with.
32. ____ Has been effective in his/her role.
33. ____ Fails to meet my needs.
34. ____ Disappoints me.
35. ____ The formal mentoring program in my organization is effective.
36. ____ The formal mentoring program allows me access to mentors who otherwise would have been unattainable.
37. ____ I am satisfied with the formal mentoring program.
38. ____ The formal mentoring program smoothed the way for me to get a mentor.
39. ____ I would be unable to get a mentor if not for the formal mentoring program.
40. ____ The formal mentoring program is a waste of time.

Please Answer the following questions using the following scale:

**1-Strongly Disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree 4-Agree
5-Strongly Agree**

1. ____ I have learned how things “really work” on the inside of this organization.
2. ____ I know very little about the history behind my work group/department.
3. ____ I would be a good representative of my organization.
4. ____ I do not consider any of my co-workers as my friends.
5. ____ I have not yet “learned the ropes” of my job.
6. ____ I have not mastered the specialized terminology and vocabulary of my profession.
7. ____ I know who the most influential people are in my organization.
8. ____ I have learned how to successfully perform my job in an efficient manner.
9. ____ I am not familiar with the organization’s customs and celebrations.
10. ____ I am usually excluded in social get-togethers given by other people in the organization.
11. ____ The goals of the organization are also my goals.
12. ____ I have not mastered this organization’s slang and special jargon.

13. ____ Within my work group, I would be easily identified as “one of the gang.”
 14. ____ I know the organization’s long-held traditions.
 15. ____ I do not always understand what the organization’s abbreviations and acronyms mean.
 16. ____ I believe that I fit in well with my organization.
 17. ____ I do not always believe in the values set by my organization.
 18. ____ I understand the specific meanings of words and jargon in my profession.
 19. ____ I have mastered the required tasks of my job.
 20. ____ I understand the goals of my organization.
 21. ____ I would be a good resource in describing the background of my work group/department.
 22. ____ I have not fully developed the appropriate skills and abilities to successfully perform my job.
 23. ____ I do not have a good understanding of the politics in my organization
 24. ____ I understand what all the duties of my job entail.
 25. ____ I would be a good example of an employee who represents my organization’s values.
 26. ____ I am not always sure what needs to be done in order to get the most desirable work assignments in my area.
 27. ____ I am usually excluded in informal networks or gatherings of people within this organization.
 28. ____ I have a good understanding of the motives behind the actions of other people in the organization.
 29. ____ I am familiar with the history of my organization.
 30. ____ I understand what most of the acronyms and abbreviations of my profession mean.
 31. ____ I am pretty popular in the organization.
 32. ____ I can identify the people in this organization who are the most important in getting the work done.
 33. ____ I believe most of my co-workers like me.
 34. ____ I support the goals that are set by my organization.
-

Appendix D

Web based Version

Web based version to be e-mailed to prospective participants

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a Duquesne University Doctoral candidate and I am conducting a study that is looking at the experience of faculty involved in formal mentoring programs. Formal mentoring is a mentor-mentee relationship where career and psychosocial support is provided by the mentor to the mentee as part of an organizationally sanctioned and supported program. Formal mentoring programs are said to benefit both the individual and the organization that is involved in the program. Because you were involved in the mentoring program, you are considered eligible for this study.

The study involves a questionnaire that will ask questions in relation to your experience with the formal mentoring program. The questionnaire takes no longer than 10 minutes to complete. You are not obligated to be involved in this study, however, your assistance to better understand the mentoring experience is greatly appreciated. My hope for this study is that your feedback will inform the research community (including your organization) about the success of the mentoring program or perhaps assist them in making the program more successful for those involved in the future. Regardless, your feedback is anonymous and confidential.

Please read the following consent form. By advancing to the questionnaire, your implied consent is acknowledged. Thank you for your participation in this study!

Sincerely,

John Connelly

Appendix E
Paper based Version

Paper based Version to be distributed by a designated graduate assistant

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a Duquesne University Doctoral candidate and I am conducting a study that is looking at the experience of faculty involved in formal mentoring programs. Formal mentoring is a mentor-mentee relationship where career and psychosocial support is provided by the mentor to the mentee as part of an organizationally sanctioned and supported program. Formal mentoring programs are said to benefit both the individual and the organization that is involved in the program. Because you were involved in the mentoring program, you are considered eligible for this study.

The study involves a questionnaire that will ask questions in relation to your experience with the formal mentoring program. The questionnaire takes no longer than 10 minutes to complete. You are not obligated to be involved in this study, however, your assistance to better understand the mentoring experience is greatly appreciated. My hope for this study is that your feedback will inform the research community (including your organization) about the success of the mentoring program or perhaps assist them in making the program more successful for those involved in the future. Regardless, your feedback is anonymous and confidential.

If interested in completing the paper questionnaire, you may contact Name of Graduate/e-mail _____ and they will provide you a consent form and a questionnaire. Please make sure that you complete a consent form and the questionnaire as indicated by the graduate assistant. Both will be collected and placed in a sealed envelope. Thank you for your participation in this study!

Sincerely,

John Connelly

Appendix F
Web Based Consent

WEB BASED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

- TITLE:** The inter-relationship among formal mentoring measurements and the dimensions of organizational socialization
- INVESTIGATOR:** John Connelly
- ADVISOR:** The advisor for this research is Dr. James Henderson in the School of Education at Duquesne University. This research fulfills the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctorate of Education in the Interdisciplinary Doctorate of Education for Educational Leaders Program at Duquesne University.
- SOURCE OF SUPPORT:** This study does not have a funding source.
- PURPOSE:** You are being asked to participate in a research study that seeks to understand the experience of faculty who have been involved in a formal mentoring program offered by the organization.
- YOUR PARTICIPATON:** You will be asked to participate in the following procedure:
-Complete one survey questionnaire that will take you no longer than 10 minutes to complete.
This is the only request that will be made of you.
- RISKS AND BENEFITS:** Your participation will expand the understanding of measurements that are used to inform an organization as it relates to understanding the results/benefits of a coordinated formal mentoring program..

There are no known risks beyond those of everyday life.
- COMPENSATION:** Participants will not be compensated. Also, this study will not be of monetary cost to you.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

There are no identifiers in this study. The questionnaire will have a number that will identify the source of the questionnaire. All consent forms and information related to this study will be stored in a secure space within the university research specialist's center and will be destroyed two years post completion of the data gathering.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:

You may withdraw from the study at any time during the process.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

If requested, a summary of the results of this study will be provided to you at no cost. The results will be provided to you by Duquesne University IDPEL.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT:

I have read the above statements and understand what is being requested of me. I also understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, for any reason. On these terms, I certify that I am willing to participate in this research project.

I understand that should I have any further questions about my participation in this study, I may call the student investigator, John Connelly (724-462-0896), Dr. James Henderson, Advisor and Chair for this Study (412-396-4880), or Dr. Paul Richer, Chair of the Duquesne University Institutional Review Board (412-396-6326).

Consent will be implied when you continue through to the site and answer the questionnaire. Please proceed.

Appendix G
Paper Based Consent

PAPER BASED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

- TITLE:** The inter-relationship among formal mentoring measurements and the dimensions of organizational socialization
- INVESTIGATOR:** John Connelly
- ADVISOR:** The advisor for this research is Dr. James Henderson in the School of Education at Duquesne University. This research fulfills the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctorate of Education in the Interdisciplinary Doctorate of Education for Educational Leaders Program at Duquesne University.
- SOURCE OF SUPPORT:** This study does not have a funding source.
- PURPOSE:** You are being asked to participate in a research study that seeks to understand the experience of faculty who have been involved in a formal mentoring program offered by the organization.
- YOUR PARTICIPATON:** You will be asked to participate in the following procedure:
-Complete one survey questionnaire that will take you no longer than 10 minutes to complete.
This is the only request that will be made of you.
- RISKS AND BENEFITS:** Your participation will expand the understanding of measurements that are used to inform an organization as it relates to understanding the results/benefits of a coordinated formal mentoring program.

There are no known risks beyond those of everyday life.
- COMPENSATION:** Participants will not be compensated. Also, this study will not be of monetary cost to you.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

There are no identifiers in this study. The questionnaire will have a number that will identify the source of the questionnaire. Consent will be implied when you sign and date this form. All consent forms and information related to this study will be stored in a secure space within the university research specialist's center and will be destroyed two years post completion of the data gathering.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:

You may withdraw from the study at any time during the process.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

If requested, a summary of the results of this study will be provided to you at no cost. The results will be provided to you by Duquesne University IDPEL.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT:

I have read the above statements and understand what is being requested of me. I also understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, for any reason. On these terms, I certify that I am willing to participate in this research project.

I understand that should I have any further questions about my participation in this study, I may call the student investigator, John Connelly (724-462-0896), Dr. James Henderson, Advisor and Chair for this Study (412-396-4880), or Dr. Paul Richer, Chair of the Duquesne University Institutional Review Board (412-396-6326).

Participant's Signature

Date

Researcher's Signature

Date

6 Dimensions of Organizational Socialization:	Correlated Mentor Functions: Career Development and Psychosocial Development	University Goals: Formal Mentoring Program
Performance Proficiency: The extent to which the person has learned the job	Career Related: Teach how to be proficient in his or her job.	Improve Teaching Procedure “how things are done around here” Strategies for student centered learning
People: Relationships and how to get along with others	Career related: Enhance newcomer’s exposure and visibility in the organization Psychosocial: Help newcomer with acceptance and confirmation as an organizational member. Psychosocial: Enhance newcomer’s identity as an organizational member.	Exchange of ideas between new and experienced faculty Support for new faculty to help make your first year an enjoyable experience
Politics: Power struggles and organizational politics- ‘which people know more about them’.	Career related: Enhance newcomer’s exposure and visibility in the organization Career related: Protect newcomer from potentially negative contacts with other organizational members and teach them about organizational politics Psychosocial: Help newcomer with acceptance and confirmation as an organizational member.	Understanding politics by gaining Formal and Informal insight into the retention/tenure/ and promotional process
Language: Knowledge of the professions technical language as well as acronyms, slang, and jargon unique to the organization		
Organizational goals and values: learning of goals and values and rules and principles that maintain the integrity of the organization	Psychosocial: Role model desired attitudes, values, and behavior for newcomer to emulate.	Mission: Understand the mission of the university. Catholic identity: Understand the Catholic identity of the university and the implications for faculty and staff. Diversity: awareness of the diversity of the students. Expectations: Understand what is expected of faculty at the university
History: Traditions, customs, myths, and rituals are used to transmit cultural knowledge and thereby perpetuate a particular type of organizational member.	Career related: Enhance newcomer’s exposure and visibility in the organization Psychosocial: Help newcomer with acceptance and confirmation as an organizational member. Psychosocial: Enhance newcomer’s identity as an organizational member.	Expectations: Understand what is expected of faculty at the university

Table 1