DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 796 CS 508 308

AUTHOR Keyton, Joann; Kalbfleisch, Pamela J.
TITLE Building a Normative Model of Women's Mentoring Relationships.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association and the Central States Communication Association (Lexington, KY, April 14-18, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Correlation; *Females; Friendship; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Mentors; Models; Organizational Communication; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Protege Mentor Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the composition of women's mentoring relationships. The traditional male mentoring model is rejected in favor of an alternative model that more closely reflects female mentoring relationships. The paper proposes that women's friendships may serve as a closer match to their mentoring relationships than the traditional male hierarchical model. Both women's mentoring relationships and friendships are examined for similarities and contrasts. Data were collected for 56 pairs of female mentors and female proteges. Relational ingredients considered in the analysis in the paper include relational adjectives (Collins, 1983), relational themes (Burgoon & Hale, 1984, 1987, 1990), emotional intimacy (Williams, 1985), and organizational communication support (Kogler Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos & Rounder, 1989). Relational outcomes were also examined such as feelings of support, happiness, respect, and professional advancement. The paper provides support for building an alternative model for women's mentoring relationships and expanding the study of these professional and interpersonal relationships. Five tables of data are included. Contains 37 references. (Author)

Building a Normative Model of Women's Mentoring Relationships

Joann Keyton, Ph.D.
Department of Theatre & Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152
901-678-3185
JKEYTON@MEMSTVX1

and

Pamela J. Kalbfleisch, Ph.D.
Department of Communication
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506
606-257-1975
PAMELA@UKCC

Running Head: Mentoring Relationships

This research was supported by a University Research Grant from Baylor University awarded to the first author and a Grant from the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Study at the University of Kentucky awarded to the second author. Paper presented to the joint Central/Southern States Communication Association, Lexington, KY, 1993.

Abstract

This paper investigates the composition of women's mentoring relationships. The traditional male mentoring model is rejected in favor of an alternative model that more closely reflects female mentoring relationships. This paper proposes that women's friendships may serve as a closer match to their mentoring relationships than the traditional male hierarchial model. Both women's mentoring relationships and friendships are examined for similarities and contrasts. Relational ingredients considered in this analysis include relational adjectives (Collins, 1983) , relational themes (Burgoon & Hale, 1984, 1987, 1990), emotional intimacy (Williams, 1985), organizational communication support (Kogler Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos & Rounder, 1989). Relational outcomes were also examined such as, feelings of support, happiness, respect, and professional advancement. This paper provides support for building an alternative model for women's mentoring relationships, and expanding the study of these professional and interpersonal relationships.

Building a Normative Model of Women's Mentoring Relationships

"My greatest role as a mentor is to tell a woman she's not hysterical, not a misfit, that what's going on is really what's going on." (a female mentor quoted in Hardesty & Jacobs, 1986, p. 138)

As more women enter the work force and increase their prominence in managerial ranks, the relationships women develop at work are crucial in helping them advance and be successful. Most women are adequately skilled in developing friendships, but many do not build the crucial mentoring relationships that facilitate professional success. This shortcoming is not necessarily related to a woman's relational development skills, but it could be related to a lack of fit between these skills and the development of traditional mentoring relationships. In the past, mentoring has been modeled as a male to male relationship within an organization defined by masculine characteristics and interaction values. Accordingly, females facing different organizational realities may need a different type of mentoring relationship (cf. Ragins, 1989).

Whereas intimate friendships may help women develop socially and interpersonally, women need mentoring relationships to help them develop professionally and advance their careers. Mentors can provide advice, visibility, empathy, and support (Collins, 1983). In its most basic form, mentoring is the relationship between junior and senior colleagues that provides a variety of developmental functions for both partners in the relationship. Collins (1983) specifies that a mentor should be, (a) high up on the organizational ladder, (b) an authority in the field, (c) influential, (d) interested in the protege's growth and development, and (e) willing to commit time and emotion to a mentoring relationship.

From an organizational perspective, Kram (1986) identifies two broad categories of functions the mentor provides, (a) *career functions* (preparation for organizational advancement), and (b) *psychosocial functions* (provision of a sense of self worth, identity and effectiveness). Noe

(1988) validated Kram's two mentoring functions and further suggested that the primary components that distinguish mentoring relationships from other organizational relationships (such a supervisor/subordinate) are (a) the relative power of the mentor, (b) the strong degree of identification between mentors and proteges, and (c) the intensity of emotional involvement.

The literature documents that mentoring relationships are a crucial factor in upward organizational mobility, yet fewer women than men participate in such relationships (cf. Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1991). Whereas numerous reasons have been advanced for this lack of involvement in mentorships (such as relatively few high ranking women in organizations, and relational obstacles in male-female mentorships) it may be that women are in need of a different model of mentoring than the traditional male mentoring model. This paper examines the past experience women have had in mentoring relationships, considers gender differences in the mentoring process, examines female friendships for clues to a model that may be of better fit, and presents an initial female model as an alternative to the traditional male model.

Women's Mentoring Relationships

Whereas the acceptance of hierarchy and task activity predominately characterize the male-to-male mentoring relationship, females appear to need more psychosocial and emotional support in their organizational relationships than their male counterparts. In fact this support is so important to women, that they often rely on their peers for "mentoring" rather than looking further up in the organization for a mentoring relationship (Kram & Isabella, 1985). Consequently, these peer relationships provide essential psychosocial and emotional support, but lack the growth and development available from an influential mentor. Nevertheless, understanding these peer relationships and friendships may provide a new access point or building block for females who want to develop relationships with higher ranking women mentors.

One important aspect that women may not recognize is the importance of mentoring relationships in achieving their professional goals. Nieva and Gutek (1981) note that women may

believe that hard work, perseverance, and talent are the determinants of organizational success and are less likely to form ties with influential superiors. While males have long acknowledged the crucial nature of being mentored for professional success, women have only recently acknowledged this fact of organizational life. To make matters more complex, even when women identify the importance of these relationships they may face extreme difficulty in establishing such relationships (Brown, 1985; Burke, 1984; Farris & Ragan, 1981; Shapiro, Haseltine, & Rowe, 1978), and in using such relationships to their full potential.

The difficulties females experience in developing mentorships are contrary to their experience in establishing friendships. In general, females are able to establish intimate friendships that are useful to them in examining their own motives, needs, and desires (Sherrod, 1989). It seems that women do not transfer their experience in developing and using friendships to the development and use of mentorships. This could be because the traditional mentoring relationship exhibits stereotypical male characteristics.

Women may also need a different model for mentoring because they develop their careers and enter the work force in different patterns than males. Thus, a woman's individual career stage and chronological age may be out of sync (Kram, 1986). Typically, this occurs as women make career decisions in relation to their marital and family situations. A female mentor may be more sensitive to these problems of professional advancement and role conflict than a male mentor. Whereas balancing personal and professional roles is an issue for both males and females, females take greater responsibility (socially and culturally) for marital and family issues. Nelson and Quick (1985) point out that role stress and extra-organizational duties of marriage and children are common stressors for professional women and that mentoring can be an effective antidote. Further, whereas men can serve as general mentors to women, they may not be able to provide a model for the myriad of roles that women must learn to execute in order to effectively accomplish personal and professional goals (Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992).

Females mentoring other females avoid many of the problems associated with cross-gender mentoring. Kram (1986) identifies several of these problems: (a) confusion and anxiety about how to work closely with someone of the opposite gender; (b) the effect of sex role socialization on relationship dynamics; and (c) cross-gender mentoring alliances are more likely to attract notice and scrutiny adding negative pressures to already complex situations. Bowen's (1985) comparison of male/female mentoring dyads to female/female mentoring dyads clearly shows that male mentors and female proteges perceive many problems specifically attributable to the fact that the relationship is cross-gender (jealous spouse, office gossip, family resentment, and others). In addition, women mentors are also somewhat better equipped to help women deal with issues of sexual discrimination and sexual harassment.

Hardesty and Jacobs (1986) provide further argument for females to develop mentoring relationships with females. Beyond the sexual themes that pervade a male-female mentoring relationship, women cannot develop the father-son characteristics of the traditional male mentoring model. Attempts to develop this type of relationship often result in the female protege becoming overly dependent upon the male mentor thereby obscuring her ability to make her own decisions. Even though every male-female mentoring relationship does not become sexual, a "sexual undercurrent, however repressed, is virtually always present" (Hardesty & Jacobs, 1986, p. 123).

Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) articulately argue the need for a female defined model for mentoring:

> We found that the male model did not mesh with the contemporary woman's needs or with her unique place in the work force. Women wished for a female perspective on surviving and thriving in the predominantly male work environment. They longed for a female role model to show them how to combine their career and family responsibilities. In essence they yearned for a broader, more eclectic perspective on mentoring. (p. 192)

Thus, women in organizations may seek a different mentoring model, one which includes women's unique developmental paths, their affinity for relationships, and their minority status in a predominantly male work environment. Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) believe that women can be effective mentors because,

> Women possess within themselves the strength to become mentors. They know intimacy well from their personal relationships. If women use their power and their understanding of intimacy, they can restructure the mentoring relationship to keep pace with women's evolving position in our changing society. (p. 201)

Gender Differences in the Mentoring Process

Research has documented many of the gender differences in male and female mentoring. For example, Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) report that male mentors gave more instrumental assistance and sponsorship while female mentors gave more emotional support and personal advice. These researchers attributed this lack of instrumental assistance and sponsorship to the less powerful positions of women in organizations. In comparing males to females, Reich (1985, 1986) found that females more frequently reported mentors as being responsible for information about company politics, career moves, and personal weakness. Reich (1985, 1986) further found that females more frequently reported their mentors as being responsible for improvements in self-confidence.

After reviewing the mentoring literature, Ragins concludes "male proteges may not only receive different treatment from their mentors, but they may also use their mentors more effectively than female protegees" (Ragins, 1989, p. 57) Perhaps this is reflective of the uncomfortable fit of women trying to use male mentoring strategies. The lack of fit may also be responsible for women not seeking mentors and mentors not selecting female proteges. The development of an alternative model of mentoring that is productive and satisfying for the female mentor and female protege is critical. This is especially true when one considers that a survey

of 500 female managers revealed that half of them perceived minimal or no support from more senior women in their organizations (Warihay, 1980).

Friendship Characteristics in Mentoring Relationships

Sherrod's (1989) research on same-sex friendships suggests that each gender differentially perceives and establishes same-sex friendships. Whereas females use their friendships to talk about feelings and problems, they may also require discussion of feelings and problems in the work place as well as socially. When examined in this light, comparing female friendships to female mentorships may help in developing a more appropriate mentoring model for females, than the traditional male model.

In addition, female friendships have been reported as providing a high degree of support that results in greater emotional and physical well being (Sherrod, 1989). This type of support may be precisely the help women need in the work place since as Ball (1989) suggests "a good mentor . . . is more than a good role model. . . [a mentor is] a teacher, a sounding board, a cheerleader . . . a friend" (p. 135).

There is some evidence that using female friendship is an appropriate developmental model for female mentoring relationships. A recent survey at Honeywell Corporation found that women saw "personal relationships as the key element in upward mobility" (Welcome to the woman-friendly," 1990, p. 53). Likewise, Sands, Parson and Duane (1991) found that a factor identified as "friend" accounted for the most variance in their mentor definition and encompassed socio-emotional, personal and interpersonal qualities.

There has been little research that examines why more women do not actively pursue mentorships. Some suggest that females have not developed mentoring relationships because they have been socially and culturally conditioned to believe that it is their role to provide support and nurturance rather than to accept that behavior from others (Phillips-Jones, 1982). Instead of relying on this justification for explaining the posit of female mentoring relationships, it may be

that this same nurturing characteristic can be used as base of the female-to-female mentoring relationship. Specifically, if female friendships are characterized by closer emotional intimacy and conversation (Sherrod, 1989), the ideal female mentorship may also be characterized by similar components.

Currently females fail as they try to develop mentoring relationships that parallel the male network. Since few women have ever been accepted in this institutionalized form of male bonding and mentoring, women may be trying to emulate an experience for which they have no referent. Simply put, females may be trying to copy a male experience for which there is no female correlate. If gender is responsible for differences in friendships (Sherrod, 1989), it is likely that the mentoring experience will be different as well.

Initial Development of a Female Mentoring Model

The specific objectives of the study presented in this paper are: (a) explore how the communication variables of intimacy and informality characterize female-female friendships, and female-female mentorships, (b) explore what sets of relational needs are met in both types of relationships, and (c) explore how those needs are met. These three objectives are an initial attempt to develop a model for female mentoring relationships.

Scope of the Study. We believe it is necessary to examine mentorships in relation to friendship for two reasons. First, because there are fewer women in positions to be mentors, females may have to rely on one person to serve both mentor and friend roles. Kram (1985) notes that over time some mentorships become friendships. Reich (1986) found that "more women than men noted that their relationships with mentors (67% versus 42%) and proteges (63% versus 44%) developed into close friendships" (p. 54).

Second, it may be possible that some of the same communication variables are important in both mentorships and friendships with differences only in levels of formality and intimacy. In friendships, the qualities of formality and intimacy are expected from both partners (Leatham

& Duck, 1990). In a mentoring relationship, it is likely that these qualities are complementary. For example, the mentor may expect the protege to reveal enough information about herself so that the mentor can provide advice. However, the mentor may retain her more formal position by withholding intimate information.

Women in specific one-on-one female-female mentoring relationships are examined in this study for several reasons. First, there is little systematic research documenting this type of relationship (Hunt & Michael, 1983). Second, by asking respondents to focus on one specific relationship, the study avoids the problem of subjects responding to mentoring in general instead of a specific mentoring relationship (cf. Dreher & Ash,1990). Third, it is time that attention is directed toward the female-female mentorship. As more women enter the work force, newcomers will find more senior women available to them as mentors. Kram (1986) and Hardesty and Jacobs (1986) report that those females who experience a positive mentoring alliance in their early career years are more likely to mentor junior members of their organization or profession. We would like to capitalize on this cycle of mentoring. And, as Hardesty and Jacobs (1986) argue:

> the time has come for women to take the next step and help one another as women, recognizing they must support members of their own sex before they can expect to gain anything approaching the power or influence men in the corporation have obtained. (p. 375)

This is especially important if women are break the barrier between the visible and invisible organizational structure. One aspect of this barrier is the male-dominated corporate culture ("The view from the trenches," 1990; "The gains are slow," 1992). By virtue of their gender and minority status, women are not part of the political shadow of the organization—the arena where action occurs (Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992). While still not equally placed in the work force, women have made significant gains. Statistics from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that women represented 43% of the overall labor force in 1981 and 46% in 1991. While females were only 27% of the managers in 1981, this figure rose to 41% in 1991 ("Corporate women," 1992). It is crucial

that women in the position to mentor other females take more positive steps to help erase this invisible internal glass ceiling ("The gains are slow ," 1992).

Fourth, we believe that the type of mentoring most needed by women is a relationship with another woman. Finally, female interaction models in organizations are not atypical or unrealistic. *Working Woman* reports that "studies and interviews with top executives show that the second wave of women in management do not use the male style of leadership (Dowd, 1991).

Since our ultimate goal is to provide a mentoring model that is more accessible to females, we believe it is important to describe the interaction that exists in that type of relationship and compare it to a familiar female-female relationship of friendship. Crucial to building a model are the basic relational elements such as positive feelings toward the relational partner, satisfaction of relational needs, emotional intimacy, and supportive communication. Each of these variables will be considered in this mentoring model.

Relational Adjectives. Collins (1983) reports that proteges used the following adjective to describe how they felt about their mentors. In order they are: respect, admiration, trust/confidence, loyalty, support, friendship, appreciation, awe, and resentment. In general, these characteristics represent an index of positive feelings about the relational partner.

Themes of Relational Communication. Burgoon and Hale's (1987) relational theme scale should provide a framework for understanding and comparing the relational needs of friendships and mentorships. Previously, Burgoon and Hale (1984) proposed 12 interrelated message themes that were central to defining interpersonal relationships. A validity study (Burgoon and Hale, 1990) demonstrated that participants and observers as well as friends and strangers were able to use the relational message scales discriminately.

After several research studies to perfect the measuring instrument, 41 items representing eight dimensions remained in the measure. The scale is broken into eight sub-scales: immediacy, similarity, receptivity, composure, formality, dominance, equality, and task. This scale

should provide an ideal base from which to describe and compare mentoring relationships to friendships as "variations in the actual communication behavior of dyadic participants produce different relational interpretations by partners on multiple dimensions" (Burgoon & Hale, 1990, p. 39).

Emotional Intimacy. Frequently, women's relationships are characterized by intense emotional intimacy, certainly more than expected in male friendships (Williams, 1985). Intimacy expressed in same sex friendships emphasizes expressiveness and person-oriented qualities. Williams (1985) hypothesized and found that femininity is positively related to emotional intimacy in same-sex friendships. She found that females were more likely to confide in their close friends, openly express feelings of vulnerability, demonstrate affection, emphasize mutual understanding and responsibility, and discuss personal issues with their female friends. Williams measured emotionally intimacy with a 20-item unidimensional measure; 19 of these items were retained for this study.

Emotional intimacy should also be apparent in female-female mentoring relationships as identification between mentor and protege should generate intimacy and bonding. In comparing male to female and female to female mentoring relationships, Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) note that the affective, or emotional quality is more vital for women than for men. More importantly, developing intimacy in a female mentoring relationships yields increased levels of productivity and development for the relationship while avoiding the negative effects of sexual overtones as gauged by those outside the relationship if the relationship was male-female (Burke & McKeen, 1990).

Kram (1986) argues that an individual's attitude toward intimacy is an important factor in successful mentoring. Kram suggests that this characteristic influences the extent to which the dyad will develop an open and enhancing relationship. Greater intimacy, based on sharing,

self-disclosure, listening, and building rapport, is more likely to build strong mentor/protege alliance.

Organizational Communication Support. From their study of mentoring in the academic environment, Kogler Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos, and Rounder (1989) developed a measure of organizational communication support. This measure represents both the formal and informal structures and processes that occur in the organizational setting. In this operationalization, mentoring is an informal organizational communication process that is part of the larger organizational communication support domain. Two dimensions make up this measure. The *support behavior* sub-scale represents the conventional definition of mentoring. The second sub-scale, *collegial social*, represents reciprocal interaction between colleagues (e.g., giving advice, sharing confidences). A third sub-scale of *collegial task* reflects work related communication support that would not apply to interaction outside of the academic context and was not included in this study.

In developing scale items, Kogler Hill and her associates (1989) stated that "care was taken to include one-way, nonreciprocated behaviors as well as two-way, reciprocated behaviors" (p. 360). Factor analysis confirmed that communication support behavior is informal and multidimensional. While the first factor captured the traditional mentoring relationship as a one way-complementary relationship, the second factor was a separate dimension of informal communication support. The two sub-scales produced a correlation of .56.

Relational Outcomes. Five general relational outcomes were developed as semantic differential scales to form a composite relational outcome measure. Four outcomes are indicative of mentorships and friendships (happiness-sadness, support-lack of support, helpful, not helpful, respect, lack of respect). The fifth outcome (professional advancement-no professional advancement) was included to test the effect of the mentoring relationship.

Research Questions

Given the paucity of research focusing on female mentors interacting with female proteges, this study was designed to explore how that interaction is characterized in relationship to female friendships. Thus, the framework questions are:

RQ1: How do women characterize their feelings toward their partner, the satisfaction of their relational need, their level of emotional intimacy, level of communication support, and relational outcomes in their mentoring relationships?

RQ2: How do women characterize their feelings toward their partner, the satisfaction of their relational need, their level of emotional intimacy, and their relational outcomes with their friendship?

Additionally, in order to explore the development of a female based mentoring model based on an existing female relationship,

RQ3: What variables studied provide a model of similarities/differences between female mentoring relationships and female friendships?

Method

The method of obtaining data for this project was a population directed questionnaire. To compare mentorships to friendships it was necessary to find a sample of females who were involved in both types of relationships.

Research Participants

Since friendships were assumed to be a general population variable, the first step was to identify samples of women who were likely to have participated in a mentoring relationship. The mailing lists of several professional women's organizations were used to locate these participants. A total of over 2,300 professional women were contacted in three midwestern and southern metropolitan areas. Out of this group 200 women responded that they had been involved in mentoring relationships with a female mentor or a female protege.

These research participants were asked to identify themselves as either a mentor or a protege. Subjects identifying themselves as a mentor in one relationship and a protege in another were asked to choose only one relationship. Participants were further asked to supply the name and address of their mentoring relational partner. Questionnaires were mailed to each partner of the mentoring relationship in coded format to retain the pair-wise comparison. A cover letter explained the project and requested participation in the mentoring portion of study specifically referencing the respondent's mentor or protege and requesting their responses based on their relationship. Data were also collected from respondents who did not identify their partners in their mentorship.

Questionnaire

To allow the direct comparison of mentor and protege responses, a cover letter accompanying the questionnaire reminded the respondent of the specific individual she selected as her mentoring partner and indicated she should fill out the mentoring portion of the questionnaire with her relationship with that person in mind. Perceptive data was deemed valid for this type of study as Leatham and Duck (1990) comment that the recall of such interaction is important because this is where respondents create a sense of attachment that is independent of the content of the talk.

The questionnaire was composed of two parts. One part requested information on a female-female friendship. To provide a characterization of the friendship relationship, four measures were used: a list of adjectives that characterize the positive nature of the relationship (Collins, 1983); 19-item emotional intimacy scale (Williams, 1985); 41-item relational need scale (Burgoon & Hale, 1987); and 5-item relational outcome measure.

A second part of the questionnaire contained data requests on a female-female mentoring relationship. There two versions of this portion of the questionnaire (mentor version, protege version). Respondents were asked to respond to an eight-item questionnaire to identify the roles

(Phillips-Jones, 1982) the mentor provided. Subjects responded to the same four as above in addition to the organizational communication support measure (Kogler Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos, & Rouner, 1989).

Personal and professional demographic and relational characteristic data were collected for both the friendship and the mentoring relationship.

Results

Mentoring Relationship Demographic Variables

Data were collected for 56 pairs of female mentors and female proteges. Mentors were Caucasian (85%), and employed full time (81%) in the middle (40%) and upper (55%) levels of their organizations. Better than 60% of the mentors made more than $40,000 annually; the mean age was 49.375. Proteges were also Caucasian (82%), and employed full time (91%) in the middle (46%) and upper (37%) levels of their organizations. More than 90% made less than $60,000 annually; the mean age was 37.464.

Approximately 80% of mentoring relationship partners were within the same profession. Although matched pairs were sought for the study, subjects did not perceive their mentoring relationship partner similarly in terms of in/out organizational status. Mentors reported that 87% of their proteges were in their organization while 75% of the proteges reported that their mentors were in their organization. This can be explained by different perceptions of organizational definitions. For example, a protege mentored by someone in the same parent organization who works in a separate office facility may perceive the mentor outside their immediate organization while the mentor perceived her protege within the organization.

There was also some discrepancy regarding perceptions regarding the currency of the mentoring relationship. Approximately 60% of the mentors perceived the relationship as current while 77% of proteges perceived the relationship as current. There was greater agreement

regarding how frequently the mentoring relationship partners talked to one another. Approximately 70% of the mentoring pairs talked on a daily or weekly basis.

There was some evidence that proteges benefitted from the mentoring relationship as most began the relation subordinate to their mentors while approximately half ended the relationship in (or was currently in an) equal position to their mentor. Mentors had more tenure in their profession (19.375 years) than proteges (10.353 years), more years in the organization (13.826 years) than proteges (7.843 years), and more years in the current job position (9.152 years) than proteges (3.980 years).

Mentor Roles

Using Phillips-Jones (1982) mentor role definitions, mentors and proteges perceptions of the mentor role are shown in Table 1. Role 1 is described as the traditional mentor role in which the protege follows the mentor up the organizational ladder. Role 2 is one in which the mentor acts as a teacher, guide, or coach. Role 3 represents the mentor who is part of the top echelon of management. Role 4 represents the type of mentor a protege hires to help them. Role 5 represents the mentor who provides access to power and material clout. Role 6 is the mentor who helps in plan and implement career goals. Finally, role 7 represents the mentor who does favors for her protege and others in similar positions in the organization. There appears to be agreement among mentors and proteges in the roles the mentor played in their relationships; the only significant difference occurred for the rating of role 5 as mentors perceived they had more power and material clout than that perceived by proteges. The teacher, guide, coach description of mentor role was more commonly described; the mentor as a hired agent was least commonly described.

--Table 1 About Here--

Friendship Demographic Variables

Subjects reported on current friendships (90%) in which they interacted on a weekly (37%) and daily (22-33%) basis. Mentors had been in their friendships 17 years while proteges had been in their friendships 10 years.

Communication Characteristic Variables

The interaction variables of positive relational adjectives, relational need, emotional intimacy, and organizational communication support are shown in Table 2 with the outcome variable for both mentoring relationships and friendships. The table displays means, standard deviations, and identifies significant differences between mentor and protege perceptions and differences between perceptions of mentoring and friendship relationships.

Relational Adjectives

The relational adjective scale demonstrates how positively mentors and proteges perceived their relationships. In the mentoring relationship, the internal reliability for mentors was .787 and .899 for proteges; for the friendship, reliabilities were .706 and .797. Relatively, all subjects perceived their mentoring relationships and friendships positively; no differences were found.

Relational Themes

The relational needs measure is presented as a composite index and as its eight sub-scales. For the composite measure, internal reliabilities were high ranging from .909 to .952. At the composite level, a significant difference was found for mentors' perceptions of their mentoring relationship and their friendships with their friendships meeting higher relational needs. Of the sub-scales, internal reliabilities were generally moderate to high (. 615 to .983) with the exception of the task sub-scale which reported internal reliabilities of .276 to .677. On the sub-scales, there where no differences between mentors and proteges as they rated their mentoring relationships. Mentors reported significant differences between their mentoring relationships and friendships on the composure and formality sub-scales. The friendships were perceived as having higher

levels of formality and composure. Proteges reported significant differences between their mentoring relationships and friendships on the formality scale; the friendship was more formal than the mentoring relationship.

–Table 2 About Here–

Emotional Intimacy

In Williams (1985) original study, females delivered mean scores of 57.29 (cross-sex typed females) and 63.53 (sex typed females). In comparison, this sample reported significantly higher values of emotional intimacy in both mentoring relationships and friendships (65.472 to 79.925) with reliabilities ranging from .809 to .904. Subjects reported differences in emotional intimacy at each of the three comparisons. Mentors were less emotionally intimate in their mentoring relationships than proteges. Both mentors and proteges reported being more emotionally intimate with their friends than their mentoring relationship partner.

Organizational Communication Support

Reliabilities for this measure were high ranging from .816 to .916. No differences were reported between mentors and proteges. While Kogler Hill et al.'s study did not differentiate on gender, they did report means for each of the sub-scales. The mean for mentors on the traditional mentoring scale was 29.00 and 19.77 for proteges, which are significantly lower than the values reported here. The means for mentors on the social/collegial scale was 13.41 and 10.40 for proteges which are similar to the values reported here.

Relational Outcomes

The outcome measures reported internal reliabilities of .622 to .864. There was a significant difference between mentors' and proteges' perceptions of relational outcomes in the mentoring relationship.

Predicting Relational Outcomes

Because mentoring relationships are established to assist the protege, we regressed the communication characteristic measures against the proteges' relational outcome measure. Using proteges' measures of relational adjectives, relational need, emotional intimacy, and supportive communication, a significant equation was obtained ($F=17.701$, $p=.001$, $r^2=.567$). Using the same measures of the mentors to predict protege relational outcome did not produce a significant equation.

With the friendship data, measures of relational adjectives, relational need, and emotionally intimacy predicted relational outcome for both mentors and proteges ($F=8.039$, $p=.001$, $r^2=.293$; $f=6.202$, $p=.001$, $r^2=.228$).

Comparing Mentor and Protege Perceptions

Canonical correlation was performed between the set of mentor variables and the set of protege variables with SAS. Both the mentor and protege sets included their respective measures of relational adjective, relational need, emotional involvement, and supportive communication. Increasingly large numbers reflected more positive reports of the relationship, greater satisfaction of relational need, greater emotional involvement, and more supportive communication.

The first canonical correlation was .592 (35.0% of variance). The remaining three canonical correlations were effectively zero. With all four canonical correlations included $F=1.868$, $df=16$, $p=.030$. Subsequent tests were not significant. The first pair of canonical variates accounted for the significant relationship between the two sets of variables. Data on the pair of canonical variates appear in Table 3. Shown in the table are correlations between the variables and the canonical variates, standardized canonical variate coefficients, within-set variance accounted for by the canonical variates (percent of variance), redundancies, and canonical correlations. Total percent of variance and total redundancy indicate that the canonical variates were minimally related.

--Table 3 About Here--

With a cutoff of .3, the variables in the mentor set that was correlated with the protege canonical variate was supportive communication. Of the protege set, supportive communication correlated with the first canonical variate. The first pair of canonical variates indicate that mentors perceiving the mentorship as being high in supportive communication (.974) also tended to report the same finding by the protege (.978).

Comparing Mentors' Perceptions of Mentoring Relationship with Friendship

Canonical correlation was performed between the set of mentor's perceptions of the mentoring relationship and the set of mentor's perceptions of the friendship. sets included respective measures of relational adjective, relational need, and emotional involvement. The first canonical correlation was .673 (45.3% of variance). The remaining two canonical correlations were effectively zero. With all three canonical correlations included F=3.543, df=9, p=.0007. Subsequent tests were not significant. The first pair of canonical variates accounted for the significant relationship between the two sets of variables. Data on the pair of canonical variates appear in Table 4. Total percent of variance and total redundancy indicate that the canonical variate was moderate.

--Table 4 About Here--

With a cutoff of .3, all of the variables in the mentoring relationship set were correlated with the friendship canonical variate. The first pair of canonical variates indicate that mentors perceiving their mentoring relationship as positive (.422), their relational needs as satisfied (.997), and emotionally involved in the relationship (.301) also reported their friendship as positive (.429), satisfying relational need (.976), and emotionally involved (.492).

Comparing Proteges' Perceptions of Mentoring Relationship with Friendship

As above, canonical correlation was performed between the set of protege's perceptions of the mentoring relationship and the set of protege's perceptions of the friendship. The first

canonical correlation was .612 (37.5% of variance); the second was .439 (19.3% of variance). The remaining canonical correlation was effectively zero. With all three canonical correlations included F=4.306, df=9, p=.0001 with the first canonical correlation removed F=3.17, df=4, p=.0173. Subsequent tests were not significant. The first two pairs of canonical variates accounted for the significant relationship between the two sets of variables. Data on the pair of canonical variates appear in Table 5. Total percent of variance and total redundancy indicate that the relationship between the canonical variates was low.

--Table 5 About Here--

With a cutoff of .3, the relational adjective and relational need variables in the mentoring relationship set were correlated with the relational need and emotional involvement variables of the friendship canonical variate. The first pair of canonical variates indicate that proteges perceiving their mentoring relationship as positive (.898) and their relational needs as satisfied (.610) also reported their friendship as satisfying relational need (.733), and negatively emotionally involved (-.452). The second pair indicate that proteges perceiving their relational needs met (.386) and high emotional involvement (.780) in the mentoring relationship also reported high relational need satisfaction (.678) and high emotional involvement (.722) in the friendship. Taken as a pair, these variates suggest that relational need is the most constant variable of the proteges' perceptions of these two important personal relationships.

Discussion

These data are a first step in uncovering a female model of mentoring by characterizing existing female mentoring relationships and female friendships and then comparing the nature of interaction in the two relationships. Paired t-tests revealed few differences in the communication variables measured. As expected, emotional intimacy was significantly greater in friendships than in mentoring relationships and significantly greater for proteges than mentors

in the mentoring relationships. Although greater emotional intimacy is achieved in friendships, the reported values for the mentoring relationships were moderately high. There were surprising significant differences on the formality sub-scale of the relational need measure. Both mentors and proteges reported higher degrees of formality in their friendships than they reported in their mentoring relationships. This suggests that the female mentoring relationship may be more relaxed and casual than previously thought. Finally, proteges achieved higher relational outcomes in their mentoring relationships than did their mentors. These few differences indicate that the underlying nature of mentoring relationships and friendships may not be that different and worthy of exploring in building a female mentoring model. Both relationships are characterized by positive feelings, emotional intimacy, as meeting relational needs, and providing satisfying relational outcomes.

Thus, in answering research questions 1 and 2, we find that these variables may be worthy of exploration in building a female model for mentoring. As a first step toward that effort, we tested three canonical correlations. The first tested the set of mentor variables with the protege variables. Although the overall structure was significant , redundancy (the degree to which the two sets of variables overlap) was very low. It should be noted that supportive organizational communication was the highest loading variable in the variate structure for both mentors and proteges.

More promising were the canonical correlations testing how mentors and proteges perceived their mentoring relationships in comparison to their friendships. For the mentors, a significant structure was uncovered and there was moderate shared variance yet redundancy between the two sets of variables was low. Similar results were found for the proteges. The redundancy values were higher in these two tests than in the test between mentors and proteges suggesting some overlap in how females perceive their mentoring and friendship interaction and

partners. We did not expect that these redundancies values would be high as we were not trying to predict perceptions of mentors or proteges from perceptions of friendships.

Of more value to this study is the variate structure. From the mentors' point of view, relational need loads high with moderate loadings for both relational adjectives and emotional intimacy in both mentoring and friendship relationships. It appears that both types of relations satisfying the relational needs and emotional intimacy needs of these women. A more complex variate structure resulted from proteges' perceptions. On the first factor, relational adjectives and relational need of the mentoring relationships loads highly with relational need of the friendship. Interesting here is the negative moderate loading of emotional involvement. The second factor loads highly for relational adjectives in the mentoring relationship and relational need in the friendship. Once again, emotional intimacy in the friendship has a moderately high negative loading. This could be interpreted as satisfaction of relational need that accompanies some risk in level of emotional intimacy. Further exploration of these concepts are important in the expanded development of an alternative mentoring model.

References

Ball, A. L. (1989, October). Mentors & proteges: Portraits of success. *Working Woman*, pp. 134-142.

Bowen, D. D. (1985, February). Were men meant to mentor women? *Training and Development* Journal, *39*(2), 30-34.

Brown, D. A. (1985). The role of mentoring in the professional lives of university faculty women. *Dissertations abstracts international*, *47*(1), 160A.

Burgoon, J. K., and Hale, J. L. (1984). The fundamental topoi of relational communication. *Communication Monographs*, *51*, 193-214.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1987). Validation and measurement of the fundamental themes of relational communication. *Communication Monographs*, *54*(1), 19-41.

Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. Group and Organization Studies, 9(3), 353-372.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1990). Mentoring in organizations: Implications for women. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *9*(4-5), 317-332.

Collins, N. W. (1983). *Professional women and their mentors: A practical guide to mentoring for the woman who wants to get ahead*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Corporate women: Progress? Sure. But the playing field is still far from level. (1992, June 8). *Business Week*, pp. 74-83.

Dowd, M. (1991, November). Power: Are women afraid of it--or beyond it? *Working Woman*, pp. 98-99.

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.

Farris, R., & Ragan, L. (1981). Importance of mentor-protege relationships to the upward mobility of the female executive. *Mid-South Business Journal*, *1*(4), 24-28.

Hardesty, S., & Jacobs, N. (1986). *Success and betrayal: The crisis of women in corporate America.* New York: Franklin Watts.

Hunt, D. M., & Michael C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(3), 475-485.

Jeruchim, J., & Shapiro, P. (1992). *Women. mentors, and success.* New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Kalbfleisch, P. J., & Davies, A. B. (1991). *Mentors and Proteges: Choices in Partnership.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, Tampa, FL.

Kogler Hill, S. E., Bahniuk, M. H., Dobos, J., & Rouner, D. (1989). Mentoring and other communication support in the academic setting. *Group and Organization Studies, 14*(3), 355-368.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work.* Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Company.

Kram, K. E. (1986). Mentoring in the workplace. In D. T. Hall and Associates (Eds.), *Career development in organizations* (pp. 160-201). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(1), 110-132.

Leatham, G., & Duck, S. (1990). Conversations with friends and the dynamics of social support. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Personal relationships and social support,* (pp. 1-29). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (1985). Professional women: Are distress and disease inevitable? *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), 206-216.

Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B. A. (1981). *Women and work.* New York: Praeger.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 457-479.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). *Mentors & proteges.* New York: Arbor House.

Ragins, B. R. (1989). Barriers to Mentoring: The female manager's dilemma. *Human Relations*, 42(1), 1-22.

Reich, M. H. (1985). Executive views from both sides of mentoring. *Personnel*. 62(3), 42-46.

Reich, M. H. (1986). The mentor connection. *Personnel*, *63*(2), 50-56.

Sands, R. G., Parson, L.A., Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education*, *62*(2), 174-193.

Shapiro, E. C., Haseltine, F. P., & Rowe, M. P. (1978). Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the "patron system." *Sloan Management Review*, *19*, 51-58.

Sherrod, D. (1989). The influence of gender on same-sex friendships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Close relationships*, (pp. 164-186). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

The gains are slow, say many women. (1992, June 8). *Business Week*, p. 77

The view from the trenches. (1990, August 6). *Business Week*, p 54.

Warihay, P. D. (1980). The climb to the top: Is the network the route for women? *Personnel Administrator*, 25(4) 55-60.

Welcome to the woman-friendly company: Where talent is valued and rewarded. (1990, August 6). *Business Week*, pp. 48-5.

Williams, D. G. (1985). Gender, masculinity-femininity, and emotional intimacy in same-sex friendship. *Sex Roles*, 12(5-6), 587-600.

Table 1. Perceptions of Mentor Role

Role	Mentor Perceptions	Protege Perceptions
Role 1	3.852	3.808
Role 2	4.407	4.327
Role 3	3.611	3.538
Role 4	1.481	1.192
Role 5	3.241	3.152
Role 6	3.778	3.962
Role 7	3.444	3.462

Table 2: Means of Communication Variables

	Mentoring Relationships		Friendships	
Variable	Mentors	Proteges	Mentors	Proteges
Relational Adjectives	38.764	39.981	40.019	40.982
Emotional Intimacy (abc)	65.472	69.340	79.925	77.553
Relational Need (b)	149.760	151.811	159.073	148.929
Immediacy	36.370	37.075	37.760	35.464
Similarity	19.037	19.415	20.278	19.089
Receptivity	26.204	25.774	26.204	23.911
Composure (b)	18.444	19.641	21.815	19.375
Formality (bc)	8.630	8.906	12.185	11.125
Dominance	16.574	16.207	15.481	15.018
Equality	10.815	11.151	12.796	12.321
Task	13.685	13.642	12.574	12.625
Outcome (a)	21.148	22.865	20.889	22.345
Supportive	45.151	44.481		
Traditional	33.528	32.308		
Social	11.846	12.173		

a = significant difference between mentors & proteges

b = significant difference between mentors' perceptions of protege & friendship

c = significant difference between proteges' perceptions of mentor & friendship

Table 3. Canonical Correlation of Mentor and Protege Perceptions

	Correlation	Coefficient
Mentor Set		
Relational Adjective	.135	0.241
Relational Need	.210	-0.015
Emotional Involvement	.068	0.038
Supportive Communication	.974	1.024
% of variance	.254	
Redundancy	.090	
Protege Set		
Relational Adjective	.189	-0.086
Relational Need	.270	0.103
Emotional Involvement	.176	0.200
Supportive Communication	.978	0.975
% of Variance	.274	
Redundancy	.100	
Canonical Correlation	.592	

Note: F=1.868, df=16, p=.030

Table 4: Canonical Correlation of Mentors' Perceptions of Mentoring Relationships and Friendships

	Correlation	Coefficient
Mentoring Relationship		
Relational Adj.	.422	0.009
Relational Need	.997	1.023
Emotional Involvement	.301	-0.080
% of variance	.421	
Redundancy	.191	
Friendship		
Relational Adjective	.429	0.059
Relational Need	.976	0.900
Emotional Involvement	.492	0.195
% of Variance	.460	
Redundancy	.208	
Canonical Correlation	.673	

Note: F=3.543, df=9, p=.0007

Table 5: **Canonical Correlation of Proteges' Perceptions of Mentoring Relationships and Friendships**

	Correlation	Coefficient	Correlation	Coefficient
	Factor 1		Factor 2	
Mentoring Relationship				
Relational Adjective	.898	0.842	-.093	0.515
Relational Need	.610	0.426	.386	0.525
Emotional Involvement	.148	-0.110	.780	0.961
% of variance	.400		.255	
Redundancy	.150		.049	
Total % of Variance = .655; Total Redundancy = .199				
Friendship				
Relational Adjective	.291	0.411	-.221	-0.365
Relational Need	.733	0.810	.678	0.589
Emotional Involvement	-.452	-0.635	.722	0.720
% of Variance	.460		.343	
Redundancy	.208		.066	
Total % of Variance = .618; Total Redundancy = .169				
Canonical Correlation	.612		.439	
	F=4.306, df = 9, p = .0001		F = 3.17, df = 4, p = .0173	