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ABSTRACT

Mentoring has been used as a tool by organizations for over four decades. Mentoring addresses organizational needs such as socialization, education and training. The mentoring relationship between the mentor and protégé has proven especially beneficial for women and minorities.

While negative mentoring experiences have been addressed, little had been done to identify specific reasons for the unsuccessful mentoring relationship. Further, the long-term effects of negative mentoring relationships also lacked attention.

From a survey conducted, possible factors of negative mentoring relationship are identified as well as the effects on the women’s careers and personal lives. There were five major findings from the data collected.

First, those reporting an unsuccessful relationship were a minority, only five of the 22 respondents (22.7%). Second, when looking at factors in the unsuccessful relationships, sexual harassment or involvement were not identified, contrary to previous literature. Third, factors that were identified as issues in the unsuccessful relationship include “Unmet expectations”, “Communication” and “Distance”. Fourth, those who were part of an unsuccessful relationship were 80% more likely to leave the organization within two years. Fifth, having an unsuccessful experience did not deter the individuals from continuing to be part of mentoring relationships.

While the sample size was small, the data collected is fundamental in addressing the issues that surround unsuccessful mentoring.
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“At the heart of the mentoring relationship is more than a simple exchange of information and accomplishment of ability. At the center of this relationship is the human connection of two people: one more advanced in a particular area, one less advanced; both joined in a common commitment to achieving success” (Kalbfleisch, 2002, p. 64).

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When discussing mentoring, Appelbaum, Ritchie and Shapiro (1994) noted it is an “unselfish process” (p. 93). Others have used words like intense, close and complex to describe mentoring relationships (Blackwell, 1989; Feist-Price, 1994). Appelbaum et al. went on to refer to mentoring as having multi-facets and being an “extremely diverse process” (1994, p. 99).

Mentoring became a popular research and discussion topic in the 1970s. Yet the use of mentoring existed long before. The term mentoring has been traced back to such origins as Homer’s Odyssey. When Odysseus left home to fight the Trojans, his trusted friend Mentor was left in charge of the household and the education of Odysseus’ son (Appelbaum et al., 1994; DeWine, 1994; Friday & Friday, 2002; Merriam, 1983; Wilson & Elman, 1990). The friend’s name was Mentor, and he has been “immortalized by the attachment of his name to this widespread form of intergenerational knowledge-sharing” (Wilson & Elman, 1990, p. 88).

Other examples of famous mentoring relationships include Socrates and Plato, along with Hayden and Beethoven (Merriam, 1983). The Middle Ages was full of mentoring programs in the shape of master-apprenticeships in areas such as arts, goldsmithing and crafts. Mentoring has now developed into employee-employer relationships.
While mentoring has taken place for decades, the excitement over mentoring can be traced to an article published in a 1979 issue of the *Harvard Business Review*. It discussed a survey that found those with mentors were, among other things, better paid and happier with their jobs (Merriam, 1983). From there, mentoring has become a renowned subject and an instrumental part of organizations throughout the world.

Used throughout organizations from businesses to hospitals to academic institutions, mentoring has brought positive results to both individuals and organizations. One group that benefits the most from mentoring is women (Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1991). Once a marginal part of the workforce, women have increasingly entered the job market. In fact, in 2002 women constituted 47 percent of the total work force (Women’s Bureau, 2002).

Even with women showing stronger numbers in the workplace, barriers and difficulties still exist. Mentoring is a tool that enables women to overcome such obstacles. While much has been said and researched about the positive aspect of mentoring, negative relationships and their long-term effects have been overlooked. The purpose of the following study is to review previous research on the topic, analyze survey data to begin to learn why mentoring relationships go wrong and the possible effects, and finally to suggest further research opportunities.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Mentoring research has focused on three main areas: minorities, business and academia. Throughout these areas, topics are similar and include: definitions, functions, components, level of formality, advantages, disadvantages, and negative experiences. These will now be examined.

Definitions

Even before diving into the complicated world of mentoring, the issue of how one defines mentoring has its own complexities (Blackwell, 1989; Brown, 1990; Kram, 1985; Merriam, 1983; Murray, 2001). Scholars offer their own definition as do major dictionaries (e.g., Merriam-Webster 2003). Blackwell’s (1989) definition widely as a basis for all other definitions of mentoring, and is the definition used for this research project. Blackwell’s definition of mentoring, influenced heavily by the work of Kram (1985), is as follows:

a process by which persons of special rank, special achievements and prestige instruct, counsel, guide and facilitate the intellectual and/or career development of persons identified as protégés (p. 9).

Other important definitions include that of the two participants in the mentoring relationship, the mentor and the protégé. Mentor is a term used to represent “an individual with some tenure in the organization” (Pepper, 1995, p. 131). Kalbfleisch (2002) referred to mentors as the “sophisticated” member of the relationship (p. 63). Wilson and Elman (1990) used “older” and “more experienced” to describe a mentor (p. 88).
Protégé is a term used to represent “a junior member who is willing to be guided by the knowledge accumulated by the mentor” (Pepper, 1995, p.131). Kalbfleisch (2002) referred to protégés as being “less advanced” (p. 63). The word mentee is sometimes used instead of protégé, and has the same meaning.

Misconceptions

Just as important as understanding mentoring is the appreciation of what mentoring is not. According to Hunt and Michael (1983), other terms are incorrectly used interchangeably with mentoring. These words include sponsor, coach, friend, co-worker, guide, and associate (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Merriam, 1983; Murray, 2001). While each of these may be a part of a mentoring relationship, alone they do not make what is a mentor-protégé relationship.

Functions

With an understanding of the terms used with mentoring, the next step is determining the various roles a mentor plays in the relationship. Mentors serve many purposes. According to Blackwell (1989), mentors have ten main functions. Providing training, stimulating learning, and supplying information about programs just scratch the surface. Offering emotional support and encouragement, socializing as far as role requirements and expectations, and presenting an understanding of politics are also part of being a mentor.

In addition, showing a value system and ethics by example, demeanor, etiquette, helping to build self-confidence, and defending/protecting the protégé all fall within the
responsibilities and roles of being a mentor. Levinson et al. (1978) summarized the functions of a mentor by saying, "and this is developmentally the most crucial one: to support and facilitate the realization of the Dream" (p. 98).

Components

The various factors of mentoring can be broken down by their characteristics. Mentoring is composed of two main components: the career aspect and the psychological aspect (Bahniuk & Hill, 1998; Feist-Price, 1994; Gaskill, 1991; Hill, 1989; Kram, 1983; Noe, 1988; Schockett, 1985). The career portion deals with skills and knowledge. Activities falling under the career category include nominating a protégé for special projects, providing feedback, and protecting the protégé’s reputation.

The psychological aspect looks at emotional aspects such as offering support, caring, and empathy, and helping the protégé to develop an identity, enhancing self-esteem and an increasing level of competence (Feist-Price, 1994). Additional psychological aspects beyond being a mentor include being a friend and a counselor.

Level of Formality

Mentoring can be further divided by whether or not it is formal or informal. Studies have delineated numerous benefits that protégés receive through both formal and informal mentoring (Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988; Roche, 1979). For example, Friday and Friday (2002) stated that mentoring could occur successfully through either formal or informal methods.
Informal mentoring is spontaneous and happens naturally (Friday & Friday, 2002; Ragins & Cotton, 1991). Informal mentoring relationships have been known to start as acquaintances. There is an attraction on the part of one or both parties based on perceived similarities. The relationship can then develop into a friendship and/or mentorship. While the match between the mentor and protégé is stronger with a naturally occurring relationship, issues such as termination and unmet expectations may arise.

Formal mentoring programs are established and conducted by the organization. The two individuals are purposely paired together, sometimes with the use of tests and computer programs. With a formal mentoring program, barriers such as communication problems and access issues are overcome (Bahniuk & Hill, 1998; Feist-Price, 1994; Wilson & Elman, 1990). For example, a shy person is not forced to approach a possible mentor, as the program would establish the relationship for her or him.

Formal programs are not without their difficulties. Much like an arranged marriage, a forced relationship in a formal program is more often unsuccessful if personalities, gender, goals and other issues are not taken into consideration (Wilson & Elman, 1990). As Wilson and Elman (1990), stated, it is “easier to communicate with those with whom they (protégés) most closely identify” (p. 90).

Advantages

Whether part of a formal or informal program, those in mentoring relationship can receive a number of advantages. Advantages of mentoring are well documented for both the organization and the individual (Kram, 1985). For instance, organizations reap rewards as mentoring provides an avenue through which newcomers adapt. One
organizational role mentoring plays is that of socialization (Bahniuk & Hill, 1998; Louis, 1980; Wilson & Elman, 1990). Part of this adaptation is the understanding of the organizational culture and how, as an individual, they fit into the organization. Both of these activities are stimulated through mentoring (Louis, 1980). As Louis argued: “mentor links between junior and senior members offer other models of relationships through which information, perceptions and interpretations of events in the organization can be exchanged” (1980, p. 247).

In addition, an organization has been shown to reduce its costs by less employee turnover and decreased training needs via mentoring relationships (Wilson & Elman, 1990). Also, employee motivation and job satisfaction has been found to be higher (Appelbaum et al., 1997; Bahniuk & Hill, 1998). Job performance, which includes productivity and quality of service, noticeably increased as well (Bahniuk & Hill, 1998; Elman & Wilson, 1990; Murray, 2001; Stallworth, 2003).

Organizational communication can be improved through mentoring (Matthes, 1991; Murray 2001). Employers have reported better ability to recruit new employees. Further, less absenteeism has been documented along with a higher level of commitment to the organization (Appelbaum et al., 1997).

Mentoring is beneficial not only for the organization but also for the individuals involved. For protégés, early career advancement, enhanced leadership, and increased influence in the organization are just a few of the benefits (Bahniuk & Hill, 1998). According to Collins (1983), the “greatest thing a mentor does is to provide upward mobility to your career” (p. 22). Studies have also found that mentoring results in the
protégé earning more (Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1992) and being promoted faster (Peluchette & Jeanquart, 2000).

According to Ragins (1996), “mentors can make the difference between getting on the inside track and trailing the field” for protégés (p. 37). Additionally, an in-depth understanding of the organization, along with its corporate values and political system gained through mentoring are of great use to the protégé (Friday & Friday, 2002).

Fagenson’s research discovered that “individuals who were mentored were found to report having more overall power than individuals who were not mentored” (p. 190). Friday and Friday (2002) also concurred that the protégé gains a sense of empowerment from the mentoring relationship.

Individual gains are not limited to the protégé, as mentors are also shown to benefit through the mentoring relationship. Advantages for mentors include showing a rejuvenated interest in the organization. In addition, the role of mentor provides the individual with an increased feeling of worth as if they are creating a personal legacy through the protégé (Kalbfleisch, 2002; Murray, 2001).

Beyond individual gains, groups that benefit most from the mentoring experience are minorities and women (Burke & McKenn, 1990; Noe, 1988; Ragins, 1989). Even though the number of women in the workforce has been steadily increasing, barriers still exist for the gender. Mentoring helps women overcome obstacles like the infamous glass ceiling.

For example, mentoring is known to help women break through the “good-ole boy” club. Men enjoy networking activities such as sporting events and men’s clubs that
block out women. Lahtinen (1994) claimed that women through mentoring could access the “in-group” and be in “stronger positions to break into the ‘old boy networks’ ”(p. 18).

Disadvantages

While the benefits of mentoring have been discussed at length, researchers have mentioned that problems, conflicts, and negative mentoring experiences occur. Kram noted the possibilities of negative outcomes: “under certain conditions, a mentor relationship can become destructive for one or both individuals” (1985, p. 101). Hunt and Michael (1983) stated: “regardless of the degree of success of the mentor-protégé relationship, outcomes will result that may be positive or negative for the mentor, the protégé, and the organization or profession” (p. 478).

During the 1999 European Mentoring Conference, one of the primary issues was referred to as “dysfunctional mentoring” (Magginson, 1999, p. 257). As stated in a conference summary, dysfunctional mentoring includes “addressing the dark side of mentoring” (Magginson, 1999, p. 257). The summary continued: “much discussion of mentoring treats it as an unquestioned good. Reminders of the dark side can lead to more judicious relationship and scheme design” (Magginson, 1999, p. 257).

One area that signals possible conflicts deals with the gender make-up of the protégé/mentor. Within female-female relationships, the issue of competition arises because some women do not want to help other females advance (Murray, 2001).

Negative mentoring experiences are possible no matter what the gender makeup of the mentor and protégé, but there is increased risk of conflicts with cross-gender mentoring. According to Clawson and Kram, “cross-gender mentoring relationships
have raised additional issues that are absent in the female-female or male-male relationship” (1984, p. 25).

Kram (1985) established five categories of complexities in cross-gender mentoring relationships. The five sortings are stereotypical roles, public scrutiny, peer resentment, intimacy/sexual concerns, and limitation of role modeling (Kram, 1985). When looking at issues presented by other scholars, two categories emerge: internal and external.

Internal issues that are potentially problematic include personality clashes, dependency, communication problems and unmet expectations. Further issues exist such as sexual harassment, attraction, and sexual involvement, all of which are more prevalent in cross-gender relationships (Albrecht, 1997; Kram, 1985; Murray, 2001).

With respect to cross-gender mentoring, Merriam (1983) stated that the potential issue in the “formation of such a relationship” would be the “potential sexual problems inherent in male mentor/female protégé relationships” (p. 166).

Even approaching a male to initiate a mentoring relationship is difficult for women, as they fear it may be interpreted as a sexual advance (Clawson & Kram, 1984; Hurley, 1996; Ragins, 1996). Because of this worry about perceived sexual involvement, “male managers are generally more comfortable sharing knowledge with males than females, particularly in informal settings” (Ehrich, 1994 p. 6). Hurley (1996) went as far as to state that men do not want to mentor women at all because they are afraid of being charged with sexual harassment. Hurley (1996) also claimed that the sexuality and intimacy in cross-gender mentoring relationships is impossible to eliminate.
Possible troublesome external issues to the relationship include rumors from co-workers and other outsiders, and gossip (Albrecht, 1997; Murray, 2001). Fagenson (1993) stated that a drawback to mentoring is the “resentment from individuals who do not have mentors” (p. 192). Jealousy is another issue as it can lead co-workers to deliberately create rumors and perceptions of inappropriate relationships to discredit those involved (Bowen, 1985; Hurley, 1996).

While the above-mentioned issues deal mainly with the physical and mental arenas, there are those dealing with the psychological component, including emotional support and empathy. According to Feist-Price (1994), cross-gender relationships usually lack the psychological part of the relationship (i.e., lack of empathy for the conflicts females face with expectations at work and at home.) According to Pepper (1995), “It is a simple fact that men don’t experience life in the same terms as women” (p. 132).

Studies have found that the psychological aspect is more prevalent in female-female relationships (Burke, McKeen & KeKeena, 1990; Noe, 1988).

One psychological issue is the different avenues between the lives of men and women. Men may have a difficult time being empathic to a woman’s need to balance being a mother, wife, and worker. It maybe more difficult for a man to appreciate the struggle a woman has when she must leave work to care for a sick child or other similar responsibilities. While a man may understand, it may be difficult for him to be empathic.

Psychological issues extend into the difference between how men and women communicate. Men tend to communicate with the purpose of instruction or information, while women tend to communicate for maintenance (Kalbfleisch, 2000). The potential
difference may create difficulties in the psychological area as women are missing needed conversation that they would usually have with a female mentor.

Due to all the aforementioned issues (external, internal, and psychological), Kalbfleisch found that “male mentors prefer male protégés and that female mentors prefer female protégés” (2002, p. 67).

Because there is a scarcity of female executives and an overload of mentoring requests upon the few that do exist, most mentoring relationships are male-female (Brown, 1985; Burke, 1984; Burke & McKenn, 1994; Merriam, 1983). One intriguing statement made by Ragins was that “women may experience a negative cycle of mentoring that inhibits future relationships” (1996, p. 39).

What causes these problems? A starting point may be that “these unfortunate occurrences often have their beginnings in poor matching or improper or incompetent behavior on the part of either the mentor or mentee” (Wilson & Elman, 1990, p. 93). Another possible cause revolves around the fact that “mentoring is, without doubt, time-consuming, and it is often neither appreciated nor adequately rewarded” (Blackwell, 1989). Whatever the causes, “like any close involvement, the relationship between the mentor and protégé has the potential to become personal and emotionally charged” (Murray, 2001, p. 192).
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Having looked at the previous literature involving the advantages, disadvantages and possible negative mentoring experiences, research questions were developed to examine possible reasons that can lead to an unsuccessful mentoring experience and potential negative effects that may affect women.

Women were chosen as the subject of the study based on the focus of literature being on the effect that mentoring relationships have on women. It serves as a foundation for the study of unsuccessful mentoring relationships.

While negative experiences have been mentioned in the literature written on mentoring, little has been done to focus on specific factors accounting for unsuccessful mentoring relationships. The existence of such relationships was addressed, but its occurrence was never investigated.

Throughout the literature, possible instigators of the negative experience have been raised, but no factors have been singled out to account for the majority of failed mentoring attempts.

In turn, no research has been conducted to see how unsuccessful mentoring relationships affect women in these relationships. Further, whether or not women continued to be part of a mentoring relationship after having a negative experience is also unknown.
Because these questions are appropriate for mentors and protégés, the research areas apply to both parties of the relationship. This study investigates three primary questions:

RQ1: What portion of subjects will report having a negative (unsuccessful) mentoring relationship?

RQ2: What reasons will be identified as factors for a negative (unsuccessful) mentoring relationship?

RQ3: What effects do negative (unsuccessful) mentoring relationships have on women?
CHAPTER 4
METHODS

With these research questions in mind, I created a survey and distributed it in order to obtain data. The following chapter describes the survey creation, the specific questions asked, and the distribution of the survey.

Creation

After a thorough literature review, I devised questions and statements based on previous articles and readings. The five categories of complexities (e.g. peer resentment, intimacy/sexual concerns) discussed in Kram (1985) were a foundation for possible causes of negative experiences. In addition, Feist-Price (1994) echoed similar potential causes.

Further, Murray (2001) discussed the pitfalls of mentoring including unrealistic expectations and jealousy/gossip from outsiders. Noe brought up issues with sexism, sex roles, and stereotyping (1988). Sexual involvement between mentor and protégé was addressed in Ragins (1989). Hurley raised the issue of sexual harassment (1996). With these studies as a basis, the survey was created.

Survey

Using previous research as a foundation, the survey (see Appendix C) was then divided into four major sections: demographic, organization information, factors of negative mentoring, and effects of negative mentoring. Section I served as a screening section and began with demographic questions. Even though all participants are female,
the question was asked as a safety measure. Current age, marital status, and education level provided demographic information about the participants. Section I then asked specifics about mentoring relationships in which the participants had taken part. The questions include the number of relationships, whether the participant was the mentor or the protégé, if the relationship was formal or informal, and finally whether or not the participant ever had a relationship that was unsuccessful. A definition of an "unsuccessful" mentoring relationship was provided for the respondents.

Section II onward was only for those who had been part of an unsuccessful (negative) mentoring relationship. Specific information about the organization in which the unsuccessful relationship took place was included in the first segment. From there, the survey moved into demographic information about both the mentor and the protégé in the unsuccessful relationship. In addition, the survey asked for the number of mentoring relationships the respondents had been part of and how much experience each had in the role of mentor or protégé.

The third part of Section II divided the possible factors of unsuccessful mentoring relationships (from previously mentioned research) into two categories: (a) those internal to the mentoring relationship, and (b) those external to the mentoring relationship. Using a five-point Likert scale, respondents were asked to rank from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) what level each issue played in the relationship. Any number given a 4 or 5 was to be detailed further in an open-response area.

Section III was adapted from the Mentoring and Communication Support Scale (Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos, & Rouner, 1989). The scale is helpful in that it can identify whether or not any of the typical mentoring behaviors existed in the relationship. The
career mentoring, coaching, collegial social, and collegial task. There are two sections for the participant to choose from, depending on if they had been the mentor or the protégé in the relationship.

Section IV focused on the effects of the unsuccessful relationship. The questions allowed the participants to compare the outcomes of their unsuccessful experience with both the career and the personal aspect. The section continued by asking if more mentoring experiences happened after the unsuccessful one and whether or not those experiences were successful. The final part is an area for participants to add anything they felt was missed or wanted to discuss further.

Sample

Participants in the survey were elicited through a presentation at a meeting of the local chapter of the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM). Attendants were asked to discuss with co-workers and women who had been in mentoring relationships if they would be interested in participating (see Appendix A). Those at the meeting were later contacted and addresses of volunteers were collected. In addition, women participating in the Department of Labor’s mentoring program in Montana were sent surveys after agreeing to participate in the survey. Then surveys were distributed to 31 participants who met the requirements of being a woman who had a mentoring experience. All those taking the survey did so voluntarily.

The female participants were located mainly in a small, college town with a few distributed to surrounding areas. Surveys were dropped off or mailed to the participant’s workplace. A cover letter (see Appendix B) containing the definition of mentoring (as previously noted in the literature review) and directing the respondent through the survey
process was sent with the survey (see Appendix C). Also included was a stamped return envelope, which helped to maintain the level of confidentiality. All identities were kept anonymous, as promised to the respondents.

Participants were not told that the survey’s purpose was to discuss unsuccessful experiences. Because the respondents were from a small town, I was concerned respondents would be hesitant to participate for fear of supervisors or co-workers finding out. Participants only knew they were taking a survey about their mentoring experiences. Also, while many of the academic articles use the word “negative” in respect to the type of experience in question, the survey used “unsuccessful”. It was decided “negative” carried a harsh connotation and could scare the respondents. In turn, “unsuccessful” was used and specific examples were given to make the message clear to the participants.

It is important to note that as surveys were received, each was given a number by which to identify it (SR#). SR is for survey response and the number is the order in which each was received. References to surveys use this code throughout the remaining chapters.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

Of the 31 surveys distributed, a total of 22 surveys were returned. Thus, the response rate was 70.9%. From these surveys, data concerning demographics, mentoring experiences, and possible factors in unsuccessful relationships was collected. Please refer to Appendix D for charts and graphs for all survey data.

Demographics

Section I provided demographics about the participants. All participants were female. Of the 22 survey participants, the largest majority fell between the ages of “51-55” with five, 22.7%. The ages of “41-45” and “46-50” each had four responses while “56-60” had three. The groups of “26-30”, “31-35”, and “36-40” each received two responses. The youngest age category of “21-25” and oldest of “60+” both had zero responses.

Most of the women were married, at 81.8%. Divorced was the only other category that was chosen, with four responses. With respect to education, those with Bachelor degrees (Science and Art) were the majority with a combined total of 14, or 62%. High school degree was the second highest response group with six, or 27%. Master’s received two responses, 9%, while no respondents had a doctorate.

Mentoring Relationships

The second part of Section I addressed the numbers of mentoring relationships in which they have participated. A majority of 17 participants (77%) had been involved in
“2 to 4” mentoring relationships. “Once” and “8+” both had two responses. The category of “5-7” only had one while “Never” had zero responses.

The position of mentor was also chosen the most in the “2 to 4” category at exactly 50% (11 participants). The category of “Once” came in second with eight, or 36%. The other three categories received one response each.

The position of protégé showed a tie between the category of “Once” and “2 to 4”. Both received eight responses, or 36%. The category of “Never” received four responses while “8+” 2 and “5-7” had zero responses.

With respect to formal mentoring programs, the largest group was those who had never taken part in one, at 45%, or 10 respondents. The rest of the respondents were divided between “Once” and “2 to 4” at 23% (five responses) and 32% (seven responses) respectively. All of those partaking in formal programs had done so voluntarily.

In the open area discussing how pairing worked within the formal mentoring relationships, methods varied. A program called DISC was referred to four times. DISC is used to match mentor and protégé using “a difference in strength and competences needed to explore” (SR5). Other comments about the pairing included being assigned (SR22), preselected (SR21), personality styles (SR1), picked each other (SR3) and Air Force program (SR11). An interesting note with the Air Force program is that they had “checklists” in which “an item could not be checked off until it was completed with a positive outcome” (SR11).

With respect to informal mentoring relationships, 12 respondents (55%) reported having taken part in such a mentor relationship. In the open section concerning how they were paired in the informal relationship, responses covered a number of areas. SR5
stated that she “developed on my initiative by identifying competences which I needed to grow – with people I admired and respected”. Others stated they “made a connection” (SR6), were selected (SR2) and (SR7), by request (SR13) and (SR15), job definition (SR19) and asked by a superintendent (SR22).

**Unsuccessful Relationships**

The final part of Section I addressed unsuccessful mentoring relationships. This section dealt directly in answering the Research Question 1 (What portion of subjects will report having a negative (unsuccessful) mentoring relationship?). Of the 22 respondents, only five, or 22.7% reported having experienced an unsuccessful mentoring experience. Although small, the five surveys provided a base by which to begin exploring the direct causes and effects of unsuccessful mentoring relationships. The rest of the data is from these five surveys.

**Organization Information**

The first part of Section II reflected specifics about the organization in which the unsuccessful mentoring experience took place. As far as type of organization, three of the five were government (two specified state government). The other two organizations listed were medical health and fast food companies.

Length of time at the organization before the mentoring relationship ranged from 2 to 26 years. Part of the answer to Research Question 3 (What effects do negative (unsuccessful) mentoring relationships have on women?) was how long they remained at the organization after the unsuccessful experience.
For four of the five individuals, they stayed at the organization for only zero to two years after the unsuccessful mentoring experience. The fifth stayed for another seven years.

When looking at whether or not the unsuccessful relationship was part of a formal program or was informal, three of the five responses were informal relationships. In the open section concerning how the mentor and protégé were informally paired, one was in the supervisor role, while another stated she worked with the person. The third respondent was selected to mentor a new hire because of her “level of skills and knowledge” (SR12).

The other two responses were participants in formal mentoring relationships. In the open section concerning how in formal programs the mentor and protégé were paired, one said by DISC style and the other was unsure.

**Mentor/Protégé Information**

The second part of Section II looked at characteristics of the mentor and the protégé. Regarding the gender make-up of the relationships, both male-female and female-female relationships were reported. Three of the mentoring relationships were cross-gender, with the mentor being female in two of those cases. The other two relationships were female-female.

When looking at the racial composition of the individuals, the race for both the mentor and the protégé in all five relationships was white.
With the age category, there was variation in the age, but in all cases the mentor was older than the protégé. Difference in ages between the mentor and the protégé ranged from 4 years to 20 years.

With respect to marital status, three of the five relationships involved a single person paired with a married person. Another relationship was between two married individuals and the other between a married mentor and a divorced protégé.

When looking at the number of children, there was one relationship where neither the mentor nor the protégé had any children. With all other relationships, the number of children for the mentor and the protégé was two or less.

When comparing the length of time at the organization between mentors and protégés, the mentors had been at the organization for five to 23 years longer than the protégé.

In three of the cases the mentor was of higher status within the organization than the protégé. One case did not specify ranking while in the other the protégé (executive management) was of higher rank than the mentor (middle management).

Responses to whether or not the unsuccessful mentoring experience was their first mentoring relationship were a resounding no. All five had previous mentoring experiences prior to the unsuccessful relationship. Four had been in “2-4” previous mentoring relationships, with the remainder having one previous relationship.

When looking at whether or not the respondents were the mentor or the protégé, three of the five were the mentor in the unsuccessful relationship. Of those three mentors, all had previous experience (“2-4” times) as a mentor prior to the unsuccessful
relationship. For the two that were the protégé in the unsuccessful relationship, both had “2-4” previous relationships in which they had been in the position of protégé.

Internal Issues

The third part of Section I broke down internal and external issues of the mentoring relationship. These sections were to address Research Question 2 (What reasons will be identified as factors for a negative (unsuccessful) mentoring relationship?) When looking at the internal issues, two factors were ranked high in four of the five surveys: “Communication” and “Unmet Expectations”.

“Communication” received a 3, 4, or 5 in three of the surveys. The open sections used to describe those issues given a 4 or 5 shed light on the communication issues. For example, SR12 stated: “This gentleman (the protégé) had great difficulty taking any direction from a woman.”

“Unmet Expectations” received a 3, 4, or 5 in four of the surveys. One female expected to be promoted and the mentor had “implied I would be (promoted)” (SR10). In addition, SR18 stated that “I had expectations and the person did not have the same expectations.”

“Competition” was given a 3, 4, or 5 in two surveys. Explanations were not given. Further, “Personality clashes” was an issue receiving a 3, 4, or 5 in two cases. For instance, a female mentor had difficulty with her male mentor because he felt she had “nothing of value to share” (SR12).

Interestingly, several factors received low ranking from most respondents. “Sexual harassment” was not identified as an issue in any of the mentoring relationships.
“Over-dependence” was also low, receiving it highest number of 3 in only one of the responses. “Sexual involvement” was a factor in only one, receiving a 5. The sexual involvement was not between the mentor and the protégé, however.

“Other” was used once and ranked a 5. The explanation offered was that the mentor and protégé were 250 miles apart, which created difficulty: “mentoring by mail was less than satisfactory” (SR8).

External Issues

When looking at external issues, the results were mixed. Three survey respondents reported no external issues. With respect to the other two, “Rumors/gossip” received a four in one of the responses. No explanation was given.

“Jealousy” received a four in one mentoring experience. Again no details were given in explanation.

“Other” was used, and ranked a 5, in SR4. “Distance” (which was raised in a separate survey as an internal issue) was written in. The respondent went on to explain that it was hard to find “face time and phone calls and e-mails didn’t happen” (SR4).

As with internal, there were external issues that were not identified as major factors in the unsuccessful relationship. “Disapproval from peers/co-workers” along with “mentoring having effects on outside relationships” played only minor roles in one of the cases.
Mentoring Behaviors

The range of mentoring behaviors that were present in the mentoring relationship was judged using the Mentoring and Communication Support Scale (Hill, et al). All five of the surveys showed the mentoring relationships containing two or more of the four categories. Thus, all five relationships reported for this study met the criteria for containing mentoring behaviors. Therefore, the relationships are that of mentoring, not coaching, friendship, etc.

Outcomes

Section IV was devoted to individual outcomes, both career and personal. The results were mixed.

Career

When looking at the effects of the unsuccessful relationship on their jobs, two stated the experiences had no effect. For instance, SR12 wrote there were no effects on her job but there were on the organization as a whole. In fact, the organization went on to later fire the protégé.

Three respondents did report effects on their jobs. For example, SR10 described her career outcome from her negative experience:

I did not get considered for an administrator opening – even though it was understood I would be – was being groomed – she (the mentor) filled the administrator opening with an external political appointee – and when I questioned her about it she would not be truthful – It ended our friendship and damaged our professional relationship (SR10).
Personal

With respect to personal outcomes, there was a continuum. Effects ranged from minimal to serious. When looking at the minimal side of the spectrum, SR18 wrote that she “cannot take this personally – it is part of my job.” SR4 showed a slightly increased effect: “Really, just a temporary sense of deflation from not getting the in-depth career guidance I had hoped for from the relationship.” Showing similar affect, SR8, whose major issue was distance, wrote that she had “frustration that it wasn’t something more feasible logistically.” SR12 showed an increased level of effect and took the failure personally. She began by being angry at the male protégé for “not recognizing the importance of doing our job correctly”, but then “I blamed myself for not connecting in such a way that he could learn.” SR10 showed the greatest personal effects: “I struggled with her (the mentor’s) decision a lot – I lost respect for her – I changed careers – moved to another Department after 27 years of working hard to attain that level. My self confidence suffered…”

Further Experiences

The third part of Section IV asked if the women had further mentoring experiences after the unsuccessful one. If so, they were asked if those relationships were successful. These answers addressed Research Question 3 (What effects do negative (unsuccessful) mentoring relationships have on women?).

The majority (four) reported that they have taken part in further mentoring experiences. For instance, one female stated that, “I learned from my situation (the
unsuccessful experience) and built it into my mentoring” (SR10). Only one female had yet to be involved in another mentoring relationship.

Open Section

The final section of the survey was an opportunity for the women to add anything they felt had not been covered previously in the sections. Two women made additional comments. SR12 stated, “it was a bad experience for all involved.” SR10 added a lengthy statement describing how the friendship between her and the protégé developed over the years. In addition, she worked on “high level projects” that in her opinion could not have succeeded without her. It took the respondent’s “result-orientated style” and her (the respondent’s) vision to succeed.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

Having completed the tabulation and reporting of the data from the study, the results can now be discussed and compared to previous literature.

Demographics

Entire Sample

When looking at the whole group of 22 respondents, demographically they covered a range of ages and education levels. Since there were no respondents in the youngest age category of 20-25, youthfulness was not factors. Further, the majority of respondents were married. Because of the variety of responses to each of these categories, there was no significant standout.

One very important statistic came in the amount of experience with mentoring. If individuals had never taken part in a mentoring relationship, that inexperience could have played a factor in the unsuccessful relationship. When looking at the numbers, a vast majority of the women had been part of more than one mentoring experience. Further, the women had been previously in the same position (mentor or protégé). Therefore, they were not in an unfamiliar situation. In fact, a majority had been in mentoring relationships 2-4 times with two women having even been in eight or more relationships. These numbers support that mentoring is used in today’s workplace and is a prevalent issue. In turn, inexperience is not an issue, at least on the part of the respondents.
When looking at informal and formal programs, responses were split. There are also those that had taken part in both. Because there were experiences in both formal and informal experiences, the data was not focused in one direction alone.

The first significant finding came in the number of individuals that experienced a negative mentoring relationship. In their 1991 study, DeWine, James and Hale found that most participants remembered their mentoring experiences positively (DeWine, 1994). With only five women out of 22 reporting unsuccessful experiences, the conclusion from the 1991 study is reaffirmed with these results. It was surprising that only five of 22 women had an unsuccessful relationship, especially with the amount of experience in mentoring relationships of the women.

Unsuccessful Sample

When looking at the five unsuccessful relationships, three were from government, but there was no connection to those three being all part of informal or formal relationships. In turn, it is difficult to maintain that within government there are increased levels of unsuccessful relationships. Through previous literature (Murray, 2001; Ragins & Cotton, 1991), cross-gender relationships would be expected to have a higher rate of unsuccessfulness as would informal. Yet within the negative relationships, there was a fairly even balance between formal and informal, cross-gender and female-female relationships and those who were the mentor/protégé. Therefore, any one of those factors could not be isolated as a possible cause of unsuccessful relationships.

It is interesting to note that in previous discussion cross-gender relationships were said to be a majority, but in these findings the number of cross-gender and femalefemale
was close. Further, it is important to note that there was no representation of any racial minorities. Additionally, those involved in the unsuccessful relationships had previous experience with mentoring, once again removing inexperience as a possible reason for the unsuccessful relationship.

Successful vs. Unsuccessful

To see if there was any significant difference between those who were in successful and unsuccessful relationships, the data from the five unsuccessful was removed from the 22. From there, the statistics from the five were compared to the statistics from the remaining 17. There were no significant differences between those with successful and unsuccessful mentoring experiences as far average experience and being part of formal/informal mentoring relationships. Further, means of age, marriage, and education were similar. Therefore, by looking at demographics it would have been impossible to predict which relationships would be unsuccessful.

Internal and External Issues

When looking at potentially problematic internal and external issues within the five unsuccessful relationships, there are three main issues isolated. “Communication,” “Unmet Expectations,” and “Distance” were the most commonly identified issues.

While “Communication” was discussed in previous literature (Albrecht, 1997; Murray, 2001) as mainly an issue within cross-gender relationships, the data proved differently. “Communication” was a selected issue in both male-female and female-female relationships. Similarly, “Unmet Expectations” was identified in both types of
relationships. When looking at the issue of “Distance,” it is important to note that it was not an issue discussed in previous literature and was not on the list, but added by respondents.

Surprisingly, “Sexual involvement” and “Sexual harassment” between mentor and protégé was not reported. This was unexpected as previous literature (Albrecht, 1997; Kram, 1985; Murray, 2001) identified those two as major issues within mentoring.

Time remaining at the organization in which the negative experience happened was low, with four of the five staying zero to two years. Therefore, there was a correlation between having a negative experience and the departure from the organization in which the unsuccessful mentoring happened. This finding indicates that an unsuccessful mentoring relationship can be damaging to the organization as individuals are leaving the workplace soon after the negative experience.

When looking at the effect that unsuccessful mentoring had on career and personal life, results were on a continuum for both. There were those that reported little effect to those with extreme effects with respect to both job and personal life. This data indicates that unsuccessful relationships do have some permanent effects on both the career and on the individual at various levels. For some it was worse than others, but more importantly was that there was lasting fallout from the unsuccessful relationship.

Unlike previous literature (Ragins, 1996), the women in this study with unsuccessful experiences did not have a cycle of negativity. Four of the five continued to be involved with mentoring, and only one of the women had another negative experience. In turn, even a negative experience was not enough to prevent the women from continuing to be involved with mentoring. It can be inferred that mentoring was
considered to be too valuable for the women to exclude themselves from further experiences.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS

Summary

In Chapter 1 mentoring was introduced and its origin described. Further, Chapter 1 looked at the current uses of mentoring in the workplace, especially as a tool for women. Chapter 2 discussed the literature surrounding mentoring, including its definition, misconceptions, functions, components, level of formality, advantages, and disadvantages. Chapter 3 described the three research questions that will be addressed throughout the study.

Chapter 4 addressed the methods of survey creation, the specific questions asked and the survey distribution. Chapter 5 looked at the findings from the survey about the individuals, their mentoring relationship and outcomes of unsuccessful relationships. Main factors in the cause of the unsuccessful relationship were identified as ‘Unmet Expectations”, “Communication” and “Distance”. Chapter 6 discussed the results and examined similarities and differences with previous research.

Chapter 7 will look at recommendations, limitations and opportunities for future research.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from this small study, several tentative recommendations can be made to organization practitioners. First, while negative (unsuccessful) relationships were not reported as often as previous research has cited, they do exist.
Thus, businesses must take the risk of an unsuccessful mentoring relationship seriously. Second, it may be possible to minimize the chance of an unsuccessful relationship by paying attention to the factors that were identified: “Communication”, “Unmet Expectations” and “Distance”. Through the use of proper training and other proactive measures, it may be possible to prevent an unsuccessful relationship or lessen its impact. It is important to note that since both female-female and female-male reported communication as a factor, it is an issue covering all gender make-ups of mentoring relationships.

In addition, “Unmet Expectations” can create an environment in which relationships are not successful. By clearly outlining goals and maintaining open communication between the parties, issues involving unmet expectations can be subdued, if not entirely alleviated. Further, while not an issue discussed in mentoring literature, distance between the mentor and protégé can increase problems. It may not always be possible to have the mentor and protégé within the same physical location. Accordingly, measures such as a travel budget should be allotted to compensate for distance.

Limitations

As with any study, there are limitations. First, as stated by Merriam, “a greater incidence of mentoring shows up in studies where the subjects are interviewed in depth, rather than surveyed by questionnaire” (p. 167). Due to time and access limitations, interviews were not possible. More specific information could have been gathered through interviewing. Second, sample size was an issue. While the study did receive a solid response rate, conclusions might be stronger with a larger sample size. In addition,
further results may have surfaced. Third, only the northwest area of the United States was covered. Thus, a broader area would increase chances of higher educated responses and a more diverse population. Fourth, the information was one-sided because the other half of the mentoring relationship (the other person in the relationship) was not part of the study. Hearing both sides of the story may result in a clearer picture of the situation and factors in the unsuccessful relationship for both members of the relationship.

Future Research

Taking into consideration results and limitations, further research is recommended. This study focused on females and included (by chance) no minorities. Therefore, male-male mentoring relationships and along with minority groups should be studied to see what major findings can be identified. Surveying both parties of an unsuccessful relationship to compare differences in what is reported as issues could shed light on difficulties in mentoring relationships. Additionally, with government using mentoring often in federal to local agencies, a study looking at the success rates of mentoring relationships over a period of time may prove interesting.
Dear Human Resource Professional:

Thank you for your interest in helping with my honors thesis survey. Mentoring was a huge research topic in the late 70s and early 80s, but has received less attention recently.

I need to find women who have been part of a mentoring experience, either as the mentor or as the protégé. It does not matter if the experience was at their current job or at a previous employment. Company size is also not a factor nor is the length of the relationship. Whether the women were part of a formal or informal mentoring program is not an issue.

In order to judge if their relationship would be considered mentoring, the following definition can be used: a process by which persons of superior rank, special achievement and prestige instruct, counsel, guide and facilitate the intellectual and/or career development of persons identified as protégés.

I am aware of the sensitive nature of the information that the women will be sharing with me. The survey is anonymous (names are not required) and confidentiality will be stressed throughout the process. The participants will receive a stamped envelope by which to mail in their survey in order to maintain confidentiality.

I will be contacting you on Tuesday, November 25th, to find out how many potential participants are at your company. On Monday, December 1st I will deliver the surveys to you for distribution to the participants. If the women are more comfortable with a personal delivery, I would be more than happy to do so.

The women will receive a letter of introduction from me along with the survey and stamped mailing envelope. The survey should take about fifteen to twenty minutes to complete. I will ask for surveys to be returned to me by December 15th, 2003.

Again, thank you for your assistance. If you, or any potential participants, have questions please contact me at (406) 799-4139 or jsaunder@carroll.edu.

Best Regards,

Jessica Saunders
Dear Survey Participant:

Thank you for your willingness to take part in this survey.

Please fill out the attached questionnaire, which should take 15 to 20 minutes to complete. The open section at the end is for you to add any information that you feel was not covered in the survey.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Also, the term mentoring is used throughout the survey. The following definition of mentoring can be used as a reference if clarification is needed: “a process by which persons of superior rank, special achievement and prestige instruct, counsel, guide and facilitate the intellectual and/or career development of persons identified as protégés”.

Once finished, please put the survey in the envelope provided and drop it in the mail by December 15th. Thank you again for your participation!

If you have any questions please feel free to call me at (406) 799-4139.

Jessica Saunders
Communication & Business Administration Departments
Carroll College
1. Personal Information
Please answer the following questions about yourself:

A. Gender: Male Female
B. Current Age: 20-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41-45 46-50 51-55 56-60 60+
C. Current Marital Status: Single Married Divorced Widowed
D. Highest Degree Received: H.S. Diploma B.A. B.S. Master's Ph.D.

2. Mentoring Relationships
Please answer the following questions about your mentoring relationships:

A. How many times have you been part of a mentoring relationship? Never Once 2-4 5-7 8+
B. How many times have you been in the position of the mentor? Never Once 2-4 5-7 8+
C. How many times have you been in the position of the protégé? Never Once 2-4 5-7 8+
D. How many times have you been part of a formal mentoring program? Never Once 2-4 5-7 8+
   (The term formal is used to represent the organization having an established mentoring program.)
   Were you voluntarily part of the formal mentoring program? Yes No
   If you have been part of a formal program, how were you paired with the other individual?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

E. How many times have you been part of an informal mentoring program? Never Once 2-4 5-7 8+
   (The term informal is used to represent the organization not having an established mentoring program.)
   If you have been part of an informal program, how were you paired with the other individual?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

F. Have you been part of a mentoring relationship that was unsuccessful? Yes No
   (Aspects of an unsuccessful relationship may vary. Examples may include: unmet expectations, a sexual
   relationship, disapproval from boss and/or coworkers, stereotypical roles, harassment, rumors, jealousy,
   high level of dependency, communication problems, etc.)

If you have had an unsuccessful mentoring relationship, please continue to the next sections.
If you have not, thank you for your participation in the survey and follow previously described instructions for returning the survey.

Confidentiality will be kept at highest priority.
SECTION II

The remaining sections are in reference to the mentoring relationship that was unsuccessful. If you have had more than one unsuccessful mentoring experience, please pick one in order to answer the next sections.

1. Organization Information
Please answer the following questions about the organization in which the unsuccessful mentoring experience took place:

A. Type of Organization (ex. retail, military, technology, insurance) ______________________
B. Length of time at organization before mentoring experience __________________________
C. Total time at organization (before and after mentoring experience) ____________________
D. Did the organization have a formal mentoring program or was it informal? _____________
   If formal, how were you paired? (Randomly assigned, social gathering, etc.)
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   If informal, how did the mentor/protégé relationship develop?
   _____________________________________________________________________________

2. Mentor/Protégé Information
Please answer the following questions about the mentor and the protégé in the relationship to the best of your knowledge:

A. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Protégé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Single, married, divorced, widowed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time at Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(During mentoring experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position within Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Entry level, middle management, senior management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Was this your first experience in a mentoring relationship? Yes  No
   If no, how many mentoring relationships had you been in previously? 1  2-4  5-7  8+

C. Were you the mentor or the protégé in this relationship? Mentor  Protégé
   If the mentor, was this your first experience as a mentor? Yes  No
   If No, how many times had you been a mentor previously? 1  2-4  5-7  8+
   If the protégé, was this your first experience as a protégé? Yes  No
   If No, how many times had you been a protégé previously? 1  2-4  5-7  8+
SECTION II

3. Issues Internal to the Mentoring Relationship
Please indicate whether or not you agree that the following issues were a part of your relationship. Circle the number which best describes your feelings. For example, if there were strong personality clashes between you and the other individual, circle five. If clashes were nonexistent, circle one.

5 = Strongly Agree    4 = Agree    3 = Neither    2 = Disagree    1 = Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Clashes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-dependency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide further details on any issue that you ranked a 4 or 5:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

4. Issues External to the Mentoring Relationship
Please indicate whether or not you agree that the following issues were a part of your relationship. Circle the number which best describes your feelings.

5 = Strongly Agree    4 = Agree    3 = Neither    2 = Disagree    1 = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumors/Gossip about your mentoring relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer /Co-worker disapproval</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring relationship affecting relationships outside the office</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy on the part of those outside the relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide further details or any issue that you ranked a 4 or 5:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
SECTION III

IF YOU WERE THE MENTOR: The questions below are to focus on some specific activities in which you may have participated during the unsuccessful relationship. For the following situations, please indicate whether or not you agree that you have engaged in the following activities. Circle the number that best describes your feelings with respect to the relationship described above.

5 = Strongly Agree  4 = Agree  3 = Neither  2 = Disagree  1 = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being of higher rank, I placed her/him in important assignments or positions.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being of higher rank, I frequently devoted extra time and consideration to her/him.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being of higher rank, I showed a parent-like interest to her/him and their career.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gave special attention to her/him, who was in a lower position.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I taught her/him the informal rules of my organization.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I taught her/him strategies for influencing group or departmental meetings.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I coached her/him about office politics.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I were friends as well as coworkers.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I frequently listened to each other’s personal problems.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I shared confidencies with each other.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I frequently exchanged constructive criticism.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I assisted each other in accomplishing assigned tasks.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I frequently exchanged compliments and positive evaluations.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked jointly on major projects or cases with her/him.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently exchanged ideas with her/him.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YOU WERE THE PROTEGE: The questions below are to focus on some specific activities in which you may have participated in the unsuccessful relationship. For the following situations, please indicate whether or not you agree that you have engaged in the following activities. Circle the number that best describes your feelings with respect to the relationship described above.

5 = Strongly Agree  4 = Agree  3 = Neither  2 = Disagree  1 = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She/He (being of higher rank) placed me in important assignments or positions.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He (being of higher rank) frequently devoted extra time and consideration to me.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He (being of higher rank) showed a parent-like interest in me and my career.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received special attention from her/him.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He taught me the informal rules of my organization.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He taught me the informal rules of my organization.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had been coached about office politics.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I were friends as well as coworkers.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I would frequently listen to each other’s personal problems.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I shared confidencies with each other.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I frequently exchanged constructive criticism.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I assisted each other in accomplishing assigned tasks.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She/He and I frequently exchanged compliments and positive evaluations.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked jointly on major projects or cases with her/him.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently exchanged ideas with her/him.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV

Personal Outcomes
Please answer the following questions about how the unsuccessful experience personally affected you:

1. What outcomes did the unsuccessful mentoring experience have on your job? (Quit, loss of promotion, problems with coworkers, etc.)

2. What outcomes did the unsuccessful mentoring experience have on you personally? (Lowered self-esteem, change of careers, difficulties working with others, loss of respect/credibility, etc.)
SECTION IV

3. Were you involved in any further mentoring experiences? If no, was it by your choice that you were not and why? If yes, was it difficult to be involved in another relationship? Was it successful?

Below is an open area for you to add information you wish to share about the unsuccessful relationship that you feel was not covered previously. Please use more paper if needed.

Thank you for your participation.
Please follow previous instructions for returning the survey.
APPENDIX D

Survey Results

*Overall*

| Number Sent | 31 |
| Number Returned | 22 |
| Rate of Return: | .709677 |

*Personal Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Age</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
<th>56-60</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.0909</td>
<td>.0909</td>
<td>.0909</td>
<td>.1818</td>
<td>.1818</td>
<td>.2273</td>
<td>.1364</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.8182</td>
<td>.1818</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest Degree Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>.2727</td>
<td>.2273</td>
<td>.4091</td>
<td>.0909</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Current Marital Status**

- **Number of Individuals:** 20
- **Status:** Single, Married, Divorced, Widowed

**Highest Degree Received**

- **Number of Individuals:** 9
- **Degree:** HS, BA, BS, M, PhD
### Mentoring Relationships

#### Times Total in Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times Total in Mentoring</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages of Responses</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
<td>0.7727</td>
<td>0.0455</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the number of individuals in mentoring relationships](chart1.png)

#### Position of Mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of Mentor</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages of Responses</td>
<td>0.0454</td>
<td>0.3636</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0454</td>
<td>0.0454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the position of mentors](chart2.png)

#### Position of Protégé

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of Protégé</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>0.1818</td>
<td>0.3636</td>
<td>0.3636</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing the position of protégés](chart3.png)
### Formal Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>.4545</td>
<td>.2273</td>
<td>.3181</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Informal Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>.1364</td>
<td>.1364</td>
<td>.5455</td>
<td>.0455</td>
<td>.1364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unsuccessful Mentoring Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Responses</td>
<td>.2273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unsuccessful Experiences

- Yes
- No
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