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Abstract

The purpose of the study was to explore the nature of a quality mentoring process among athletic administrators in NCAA Division I institutions. Organizational mentoring is regarded as one of the most significant workplace interactions that facilitate development of organizational members (Kram, 1983). The topic of mentoring has enjoyed a considerable amount of attention as an area of scientific inquiry across disciplines; however, the current state of workplace mentoring is relatively in its infancy in general (Ragins & Kram, 2007), and there is a dearth of mentoring studies on the business side of sport in particular (c.f., Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990). Ragins and Kram (2007) pointed out the lack of a mentoring framework to be specifically applicable in an organizational context, which subsequently leads to the conceptual ambiguity and inconsistency in the use of mentoring construct.

Regarding this concern, the CMR model is proposed to advance the mentoring model developed by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999). The CMR model is designed to delineate the nature of high-end quality mentoring relationships in the workplace within sport settings. Stated more precisely, the major tenet of the CMR model posits the idea that highly similar mentor-protégé traits facilitate the process of mutual attraction in establishing relational compatibility, which subsequently leads to the initiation and cultivation of the mentoring relationship. Regarding the target population, the current
study aimed at the athletic administrators who occupy the core level administrative positions. Core level administrative positions refer to the organizational rank in which major job responsibilities are aligned with the leadership skills, and thus these positions are regarded as a “pipe-line” to the top level administrative positions (Lapchick et al., 2013). Given that mentoring is one of the most effective developmental relationships, those athletic administrators in the core level positions would have been involved in quality mentoring relationships with senior members in the organizations (Kram, 1985).

Questionnaires were distributed by using a web-based survey program and 251 useable cases were identified for the data analysis. Results from logistic regression showed that organizationally marginalized groups (i.e., women and administrators of color and/or athletic administrators with a lower level of education, older in age) are more likely to have been involved in the workplace mentoring relationship than their respective counterparts. Additionally, results from the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) supported the empirical and theoretical plausibility of the CMR model. More specifically, athletic administrators high in their organizational based self-esteem tend to enjoy high quality mentoring, which ultimately influence their overall job satisfaction in a positive manner. Findings from the study expands the body of knowledge on mentoring in sport as the CMR model provides a comprehensive scope in understanding the nature of a quality mentoring process. Additionally, the results from the study may guide sport managers who are interested in implementing a formal mentoring program as the study revealed two major sources of relational compatibility (i.e., instrumental and expressive compatibility), which can be used in the matching process of mentoring relationships.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Mentoring relationships have been regarded as one of the most significant developmental relationships that facilitate success of organizational members (Kram, 1985). In a groundbreaking study, Kram (1983) conceptualized the nature of mentoring relationships in an organizational context. It should be noted that her initial conceptualization of mentoring constructs was made in an informal context. Accordingly, she acknowledged that mentoring relationships would be established and effective when both parties (i.e., mentor-protégé) come together spontaneously (Kram, 1983, 1985). With this conceptual presumption, Kram identified two primary mentoring functions: (1) career functions, and (2) psychosocial functions. Career functions provided by mentors such as sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignment are related with the protégés’ career advancements (e.g., promotion or salary raise). In contrast, psychosocial functions refer to role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship, which lead to psychological development for the protégés (Kram, 1983). Her initial work on workplace mentoring has inspired a large number of organizational scholars to explore the multifaceted nature and varying qualities of interactions between mentors and protégés in the workplace. Although the concept of mentoring has enjoyed a considerable amount of attention as an area of scientific inquiry in general, the current state of workplace mentoring is relatively in its
infancy (Allen, Eby, O’Brien, & Lentz, 2008, Ragins & Kram, 2007), and there is a
dearth of mentoring studies in the business side of sport in particular (Weaver &
Chelladurai, 2002). The investigation of workplace mentoring provides us with a
different lens to look into how members within an organization initiate developmental
relationships or networks in an attempt to pursue their own career goals. In a similar vein,
the investigation of mentoring relationships could be beneficial to explore the
underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in the domain of sport.

The lack of available mentors has been regarded as one of the obstacles impeding
the career success of women and racial minorities (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999, 2002;
Young, 1990). In support of this proposition, Ibarra (1993) indicated that lack of
commonalities with superiors, represented by White male heterosexuals, prohibit
minorities from establishing developmental networks (e.g., mentoring relationships)
within organizations. Sport institutions have long been dominated by the White male
groups, in which White males have established and regulated sport institutions in favor of
preserving their domination. Knoppers (1992) used an analogy by describing sport as a
“tug of a rope game” in which “Women devise strategies to pull on the rope within the
rules set by the men but often without many special privileges or resources” (p. 217). The
analogy implies that women and racial minorities have struggled for access to the
positions of power due to the lack of resources such as mentoring relationships with
dominant social groups within the domain of sport (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999, 2002;
Young, 1990).
Mentoring in Sport Administrations

Weaver and Chelladurai (1999, 2002) utilized Kram’s initial mentoring framework and proposed a mentoring model to be suitable in the context of sport (See Figure 1.1.). Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) incorporated the concept of “compatibility” into their mentoring model as an antecedent of the mentoring relationships to be initiated and cultivated. The concept of compatibility has been often emphasized as a significant antecedent for mentoring relationships to be effective and successful (Hardy, 1994). With respect to the importance of mentoring compatibility, Wanberg, Welsh and Hezelett (2003) argued that organizations would develop an effective formal mentoring program through an effective “matching process” in which mentorships are assigned on the basis of similarity between mentors and protégés. Mentoring relationships with a high degree of compatibility would complement the needs of each other more effectively, and lead to producing strong interpersonal ties.

Figure 1.1. Weaver and Chelladurai’s Mentoring Model in Sport Settings
Since the focus of the current study is to delineate the nature of a compatible mentoring relationship, it is worthwhile to further investigate how Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) conceptualized and incorporated compatibility into their mentoring framework (See figure 1.1). Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) conceptualized compatibility as the extent of what mentors and protégés have in common in terms of career goals, work related attributes and attitudes. This indicates that the mentoring partners examine the extent of similarity stemming from their unique set of life values, beliefs or attitudes within the context of workplace interactions. Social psychologists (c.f., Byrne, 1971) and organizational scholars (c.f., Turner, 1987) generally refer to these unique sets of individual traits as deep level characteristics in comparison to surface level characteristics referring to overt biological features of the individuals such as race markers or sex (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turban & Jones, 1988; Turner, 1987). A common example of the deep level characteristics would be personality, self-esteem, or confidence. In line with these examples, Weaver and Chelladurai’s (1999) model posits the idea that similar mentor-protégé deep level characteristics, with respect to career interest and affective attitudes, facilitates the process of mutual attraction in establishing relational compatibility, which subsequently leads to the initiation of the mentoring relationship. The mentoring partners in a compatible relationship exert their efforts to address the needs of each other through the mentoring process by which the exchange of mentoring functions (i.e., vocational and psychosocial) eventually serve to fulfill their own needs.
While the mentoring process serves to establish a mutually beneficial relationship, it should be noted that, traditionally, the primary beneficiary of the mentoring relationships are protégés (Ragins, 2010). This also implies that the mutual interaction between mentors and protégés does not necessarily result in symmetrical benefits for each other as the major purpose of the mentoring is to develop protégés. In a similar vein, the implementation of formal mentoring programs is primarily designed to aid the adjustment of newcomers or the development of existing members within an organizational context (Noe, 1988). This leads to the argument that the effectiveness of the mentoring relationships should be evaluated from the perspective of protégés. A recent meta-analysis conducted by Eby and his colleagues (2013) supported this proposition by providing empirical evidence that the mentoring experience is a distinct phenomenon between mentors and protégés.

The mentoring process flourishes as the relationship reaches its peak in the cultivation stage spurred by a high rate of exchange in terms of career and psychosocial functions between the mentoring partners (Kram, 1985). On the other hand, the mentoring relationships begin to decline in accordance with the extent of mentoring functions (i.e., vocational and psychosocial functions) provided from mentors as protégés become competent and begin to pursue further career needs that would not be fulfilled with current mentors. This points out that the workplace interactions are inherently established in the achievement context. Accordingly, work itself is a critical part of self-concept, and the mentoring relationships provide a safe environment in the formation of a professional identity for protégés in an organizational context (Noe, 1988). This also
reflects the unique nature of workplace mentoring relationships in which the lack of work related similarities or supports could lead to the end of the mentoring relationship.

In order to explicate the exclusive nature of informal workplace interactions (i.e., mentoring), Weaver and Chelladurai’s (1999) mentoring framework introduced intervening variables, that is barriers, which deprive women employees of opportunities for mentoring relationships. The introduction of barriers (e.g., negative stereotyping, limited network opportunities and token status of women) reveal the exclusive nature of workplace mentoring against women in the domain of sport, which has long been a White male dominated domain. While Weaver and Chelladurai’s framework focused on the marginal status of women in the context of mentoring relationships, the framework could also be extended to shed some light on the underrepresentation of minority (i.e., women and racial minorities) groups in general.

The exchange of mentoring behaviors subsequently results in both tangible and intangible outcomes for mentors and protégés. In terms of mentoring outcomes for protégés, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) stated that the protégés would experience positive career consequences (i.e., tangible outcomes) such as a salary raise, promotion, and increased power within organizations. The protégés would also experience personal growth (i.e., intangible outcomes) such as competence, development of a professional identity, and work role effectiveness (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999, 2002). Mentors could have an opportunity to prove their managerial effectiveness, which is required for leadership positions within organizations (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Additionally, mentoring could be a forum for co-learning within contemporary work environments.
Although the mentoring framework developed by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) provides a theoretical foundation for understanding the nature of mentoring relationships by incorporating the concept of “compatibility” in sport settings, there are several limitations as well. First, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) stated that “similar mentor and protégé characteristics lead to mentor-protégé compatibility, which subsequently leads to a mentoring relationship” (p. 26). They clearly recognized the role of compatibility as a major source of the mentoring relationships to be initiated. While it is true that compatibility is a major source of interaction to occur, their definition did not capture the developmental nature of an organizational life. In other words, mentoring relationships are initially oriented toward helping with the transition process of development for protégés (Kram, 1983, 1985; Ragins & Kram, 2007). Interpersonal compatibility, in this regard, could be also cultivated from the moment of its initial establishment as the mentoring partners work together. Accordingly, protégés would establish new sets of expectations or developmental needs based on the changes in the organizational rank or position occurring in the transition period and mentors should be able to anticipate the expectations of the protégés or vice versa. This is because the nature of organizational tasks and job responsibilities would vary to a great extent based on the organizational positions and individual members set unique expectations in accordance with their respective careers goals. If protégés believe that their mentors do not possess the necessary skills or supports that they wish to acquire, the degrees of compatibility would be diminished. Thus, the concept of compatibility should be understood as an ongoing
process determining the relationship to be close or distant as the interpersonal compatibility ultimately decides whether the relationship lasts long or dies.

Secondly, as Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) also acknowledged, it is noteworthy that not all mentoring relationships are established based on a high degree of compatibility. The concept of relational compatibility in human interaction refers to a degree of an interpersonal connection in terms of an emotional bond or relational depth between relationship partners. The emphasis of their framework was that higher degrees of interpersonal compatibility would lead to higher effectiveness and quality in the mentoring relationship. In a similar vein, compatibility is not established in a vacuum and a protégé with certain traits would obtain better access to a rewarding mentoring relationship (Byrne, 1997). This raises the question in terms of which factors (or individual traits) play a role in the cultivation of relational compatibility between mentors and protégés in the initiation of mentoring relationships.

Lastly, the compatibility in their model did not capture the unique nature of workplace interactions that occurs in the achievement context. Individuals are assigned to the work units through the official order of the organization in a manner that the assignments are aligned with their own area of profession. As it turns out, an assignment to the work unit is closely associated with the organizational effectiveness, which subsequently facilitates the individual career success or vice versa. In this regard, work itself is a crucial part of one’s self-concept in the formation of a professional identity within the workplace. Accordingly, individuals are more likely to be attracted with others who are congruent or agreeing upon work related attitudes, beliefs or values. Kram
(1985) already indicated the unique nature of workplace mentoring behavior by conceptualizing mentoring behavior into two distinct functions (i.e., career and psychosocial supports). In a similar vein, the compatibility in mentoring could be also classified into either work related compatibility or affective (emotional) compatibility.

Thus, the mentoring model advanced by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) could be enhanced by further exploring the role of “compatibility” in the mentoring process which in turn aids our understanding of the nature of a compatible mentoring relationship as one of the most effective workplace interactions (Kram, 1983). Before presenting the conceptual model of the study, it is necessary to discuss the theoretical foundation of the model. The current study utilized the similarity attraction paradigm in conjunction with social identity theory in order to further elaborate the nature of a “compatible” mentoring relationship.

Theoretical Background

*Similarity attraction paradigm and social identity theory*

Similarity has long been regarded as one of the powerful sources of interpersonal attraction for mutual interaction to occur (Byrne, 1971). Similarity, in human interaction, refers to the state of mind that an individual perceives to share commonalities with another in mutual interactions (Byrne & Rhmey, 1965). Byrne (1971) believed that the individual traits are stable overtime and consistent against change, and thus these can be measured and compared with a standardized measure in lab settings; this is called actual similarity. The central tenet of the similarity-attraction link posits the idea that similar pairs share a consistent view of their own, which in turn stimulate positive feelings
toward each other (Byrne & Rhmey, 1965). While the similarity attraction paradigm has long been taken for granted as one of the viable theories in predicting human interactions, its functional basis has been the source of academic debate with respect to the classification of the similarity (Condon & Crano, 1988). One of the arguments that has been made against the initial proposition established by Byrne (1971) is the idea that the detection of deep level characteristics tend to be biased as a function of interaction between interactional partners. More specifically, an evaluation of the similarity can be cognitively biased due to the impact of in-group favoritism or out-group derogation (Turner, 1975). As an example, an individual exhibits favoring tendency toward in group members as a function of self-esteem maintenance in the process of similarity evaluation, which is called perceived similarity (Turner, 1975).

Another line of classification of similarity variables is made based on whether individual characteristics are readily observable, (i.e., surface level similarity), or take time to be captured, (i.e., deep level similarity) (Tsui, Egane, & O’Reilly, 1992; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Turner, 1987). The theoretical foundation of this perspective is grounded upon self- categorization and social identity theory in which individuals identify themselves with social groups which facilitate positive self-image (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Oftentimes, simple demographics (i.e., surface level) such as sex or race markers serve to delineate the underlying structure of organizational relationships in terms of group dynamics (Turner, 1987).

While each similarity type addressed above aid our understanding on the role of interpersonal similarity in the cognitive process of human interaction, the multifaceted
nature of human relations leads to conceptual overlap among each similarity construct to some extent. As it turns out, there has been a lack of consistency between theoretical adjustments and empirical evidence among research findings (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). Regarding this concern, the researcher of the current study encompasses four similarity variables by generating the quadrant typology in which each similarity type is placed at the end of each continuum; these are (1) Actual Surface similarity (A.S), (2) Actual Deep similarity (A.D), (3) Perceived Surface similarity (P.S), and (4) Perceived Deep similarity (P.D) (See figure 1.2). A common thread of each category stems from the operational definition of each similarity type. A discussion on each type is presented in the literature review section (i.e., Chapter 2) with greater detail.

Figure 1. 2. Reconceptualization of Similarity Types
In short, actual surface similarity refers to the similarity in overt biological features of individuals that are quickly and intuitively detected (e.g., demographics), while actual deep similarity is an individual trait as a reflection of attitudes, values, and/or beliefs that are not visually observable, and thus need enough time to detect. Perceived surface similarity indicates the degree of comparative demographics on the basis of regular interactions that individuals are involved in (Harrison et al., 1998). Tsui and O’Relly (1989) referred to the level of perceived surface similarity as “relational demography” which takes into account the importance of the regular interaction within the work groups. Perceived deep similarity can be defined as the extent to which interactional partners are perceived, but are not actually similar in the deep level characteristics. Drawing upon the similarity typology, a compatible relationship can be conceptualized as the interactional process by which individuals who are perceived to be similar in deep level characteristics with their partners experience a high level of affinity, liking, and sympathy that in turn, evokes a strong interpersonal tie. Thus, the current study further elaborates the concept of “compatibility” in conjunction with the “perceived deep similarity” which takes a significant amount of time and effort to be developed. Further discussion on the compatible mentoring relationships is provided next.

A Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model

A compatible mentoring relationship model is proposed to delineate the nature of high-end quality mentoring relationships in the context of sport administrations (see figure 1.3.). The current model was designed to improve Weaver and Chelladurai’s mentoring model by elaborating on the conceptual issues previously addressed above. In
essence, the major thrust of the model is that the quality mentoring relationships hinges largely on relative degrees of interpersonal compatibility (i.e., perceived deep level similarity), while the types of compatibility would be also critical in deciding the magnitude of the mentoring quality.

Additionally, the researcher proposes that a protégé with desirable traits (i.e., actual surface or deep level) would acquire better access to a rewarding mentoring relationship as the traits attract potential mentors. In other words, the proposed model depicts the nature of quality mentoring relationships established in an informal context. Inclusion of compatibility, as an ongoing developmental property, is noteworthy given the suggestion that the extant mentoring studies have generally failed or ignored the relational aspects of the mentoring process such as trust, empathy, and emotional bond between mentoring partners (Eby et al., 2013). The omission of the relational process
hinders scholars from understanding the unique characteristics of quality mentoring relationships, which distinguish it from other workplace interactions such as supervisor-subordinate, leader-follower, sponsor-protégé and/or formal mentorships (Eby et al., 2013). There are three major features of a compatible mentoring relationship model.

First, the mentoring model emphasizes the informal nature of mentoring relationships in which mentors and protégés get along spontaneously (Kram, 1985). Mentoring relationships have been commonly classified as either formal or informal based on how the relationship is initiated. One of the distinct features of the informal mentoring relationships is that this type of mentoring is established based on mutual liking between two parties while formal mentorships are often assigned by the authority figure or the program of the focal organization. In other words, the model is designed to explore the nature of quality mentoring relationships by incorporating the concept of compatibility in the mentoring process. The compatibility in the current model is considered as an ongoing developmental process that requires a significant amount of time and effort to be cultivated in accordance with the mentoring lifespan. This is a key to understand the quality mentoring relationships in which both mentoring partners are actively engaged in addressing the needs of each other. Sometimes members in a quality mentoring relationship are willing to sacrifice the needs of themselves in order to address the needs of their partner. This is because quality mentoring relationships help members fulfill one of the fundamental needs of human nature, belongingness (Eby et al., 2013).

Many organizations implement formal mentoring programs in an attempt to reap the benefits of informal mentoring relationships while many of them are not as effective as
the informal mentoring relationships (Noe, 1988). One of the major reasons for the failure of formal mentoring programs is that the program did not consider the importance of a compatible matching between mentoring partners in the design of the programs (Hardy, 1994).

Second, the model is developed from the perspective of protégés as a primary beneficiary of the mentoring relationship. The mentoring relationships are initially geared toward facilitating goal attainments of protégés and thus, it is necessary to investigate the perceptions of protégés (Kram, 1985). Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis conducted by Eby et al. (2013) also found that the reports from mentor and protégé did not show a significant correlation, indicating that the mentoring experience is a distinct phenomenon for each party. Accordingly, the model identifies several characteristics (i.e., actual surface and deep level) of protégés in an attempt to identify the profile of the preferred protégés by mentors. This is because of the hierarchical nature of the organizational structure, usually, that there are relatively fewer mentors available for the protégés within an organization. In other words, it is the mentor who actually holds the decision whether the mentoring relationships is to be initiated or not.

Third, the model includes the initial filtering phase in order to delineate the exclusive nature of mentoring relationships against women and racial minorities. This stage emphasizes the role of a mentor as an informal agency of organizational socialization in terms of culture, practices, or norms. Especially, early in the tenure with the organization, members shape an impression in terms of how to get things done through the interaction, observation, and experience with their superiors (i.e., potential
mentors). The institutionalized norm of White male dominance within the domain of sport has long been utilized to marginalize the members with minority status (i.e., women and racial minorities). The next section further discusses the model with greater detail.

Antecedents of Mentoring Compatibility

Protégé characteristics (Actual surface: demographics and Actual deep: OBSE)

Given the fact that the compatibility is not established in a vacuum, protégés with socially desirable traits are more likely to be engaged in a quality mentoring relationship than others who do not (Noe, 1988; Ragins & Kram, 2007; Turban & Jones, 1988). This raises the question in terms of what factors play a role in the cultivation of relational compatibility between mentors and protégés in the initiation of mentoring relationships. While there are many actual surface (e.g., sex or race markers) and actual deep level characteristics (e.g., personality, motivation, self-esteem) believed to attract mentors, the current study focuses on the impact of demographics and the organization based self-esteem (OBSE) as primary sources of interpersonal attraction in the initiation of mentoring relationships.

Demographics, as actual surface characteristics, are included in an attempt to explore the mentoring experiences of women and racial minorities. Gender has been one of the most extensively researched variables in the mentoring literature though there has not been a consistent finding with respect to the impact of gender on the mentoring outcomes (Ragins, 2007). In a similar vein, race of protégés has been also widely explored with respect to interracial mentoring relationships within the domain of White male dominant organizations as racial minorities often reported that they have difficulties
in building close and trusting relationships with majority groups (Ibarra, 1993; Thomas, 1990). Although gender and race have been thoroughly explored (e.g., Noe, 1988; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990), findings about the impact of gender and race in mentoring is mixed at best. Regarding this empirical inconsistency, Eby et al. (2013) suggested that the investigation of deep level characteristics would be more beneficial in identifying the cognitive process of favoring tendency on others, and the current study included OBSE as a desirable characteristic of protégés.

*Actual Deep level characteristics: Organization based self-esteem (OBSE)*

Individual traits are stable over time and resistant against change which plays an important role in the formation of self-concept (Byrne, 1997; Condon & Crano, 1988). Conceptually, this category of individual characteristics fits into the actual deep level characteristics classified above. If individuals acquire socially desirable attributes, they are more likely to obtain access to rewarding social relations (Byrne, 1971). In the context of mutual interactions, self-esteem has been recognized as one of the significant variables in the prediction of organizational behavior (Campbell, 1990; Pierce & Gardner, 2004). A central tenet of the similarity attraction paradigm and social categorization theory also posits the idea that individuals tend to exhibit favoritism toward similar others as a function of self-esteem maintenance (Byrne, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In other words, self-esteem plays an important role in human interaction as an important part of self-concept.

According to Pierce and Gardner (2004), the concept of organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) is defined as “the degree to which an individual believes him/herself to
be capable, significant, and worthy as an organization member” (p. 594). This reflects the individuals’ perceptions about on themselves in terms of competence, efficacy, and capacity within their employing organizations. In an organizational context, the formation of an individual’s OBSE is, in part, influenced by the one’s interpretation of environmental factors such as reputations, rumors, messages transmitted from significant others such as supervisors, peers, and subordinates (Campbell, 1990). This implies that an individual with high OBSE perceive oneself to be liked, supported, and accepted by others. Accordingly, individual with high OBSE is more likely to be engaged in mentoring relationships. Mullen (1998) already investigated the effect of OBSE on organizational mentoring and found that the OBSE has a significant positive impact on mentoring. While these protégé characteristics play an important role in the initiation of mentoring relationships, the decision about mentoring would be held by mentors (Ibarra, 1993; Kram, 1983). Thus, it is necessary to explore how mentors, as an organizational agency, consider protégé characteristics in the organizational context.

Initial filtering stage

Instead of barriers, the researcher of the current study used the term “initial filtering” in depicting the role of mentors as a primary decision maker in the initiation of mentoring relationships. This reflects the hierarchical nature of the organizational structure that there are relatively fewer mentors available for the protégés (Higgins & Kram, 2001; Ibarra, 1993; Kram, 1983). In this stage, mentors would establish a set of expectations with respect to the desirable attributes of protégés. Given that informal
interactions are less influenced by the organizational roles or policies, mentors have high level of discretion in the choice of protégés.

While the term “initial filtering” implies a negative connotation, it is used in order to stress the exclusive nature of mentoring relationships against women and racial minorities. The initiation of a mentoring relationship is likely to be influenced by the mentors’ subjective perceptions due to the informal nature of the relationship. For this reason, the choice of protégés tends to rely more on the interpretation of socially constructed images about protégés (e.g., gender stereotype, cultural comfort, etc.). This indicates that the selection of protégés could be influenced by simply observable characteristics of protégés (i.e., demographics). Regarding this, Ibarra (1993) stated that “interaction dynamics operate to heighten or exaggerate perceptions of social differences between majority and minority group members, thus diminishing the first basis for the formations of network relationships” (p. 70). Given the fact that the top level managerial positions, such as athletic directors in the NCAA, are almost exclusively filled by White males, Women and racial minorities working in predominantly White male organizations would have fewer mentoring opportunities (DeHass, 2007). This could be a partial reason for the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in mentoring relationships as they feel a great sense of isolation and disconnection (Hilliard, 1990; Ibarra, 1993; Thomas, 1990).

Mentoring Compatibility

The types of compatibility could also vary based on the nature of the interactions. More specifically, there are certain traits for the workplace mentoring relationships to be
effective and successful. A large number of mentoring studies have substantiated the conceptual distinction between career and psychosocial support in empirical settings since Kram’s initial classification of mentoring behavior (Eby et al., 2013). The researcher of the current study argues that the types of compatibility can be also classified in a similar manner. In line with this argument, the current framework conceptualized workplace mentoring compatibility as a bi-dimensional construct encompassing two types of mentoring compatibility. Given the relational nature of the “compatibility”, the current paper utilized the classification of workplace interactions proposed by Ibarra (1993). He stated that organizational relationships are distinguished by instrumental or expressive ties. The relationships centered on instrumental ties focus more on work role performance, which involves the exchange of job related resources and expertise. In contrast, expressive network relationships tend to be established at higher levels of closeness and trust than those relationships which are exclusively instrumental (Ibarra, 1993). The central tenet of this distinction is parallel with the workplace mentoring behaviors (i.e., career and psychosocial functions). Thus, two types of compatibility can be identified; these are (1) instrumental and (2) expressive.

Instrumental compatibility refers to the degree of perceived-deep level similarity cultivated on the basis of work attitudes and career interest between mentors and protégés. Subordinates (i.e., protégés) would acquire work related skills, knowledge, or abilities, and establish their own career path through the interaction with their respective supervisors (i.e., mentors). Accordingly, instrumental compatibility is important as work itself is critical in the formation of professional identity within the organization (Kram,
1985). If the subordinates believe that their supervisors possess desirable traits or similar work behaviors, they would be more likely to be attracted with their superiors, as the congruent work attitudes or values with interactional partner facilitate the obtainment of individual career goals, subordinates, or protégés.

In contrast, the concept of expressive compatibility refers to the degree of emotional or affective similarities in determining interpersonal closeness between mentoring partners. As Byrne (1997) reiterated, sometimes people feel in the first place before considering the degree of cognitive congruence with their relational partners. This indicates that individuals are intuitively inclined toward others rather than basing on the systematic (or cognitive) evaluations on others. As the relationship goes further, individuals are even willing to undergo varying degrees of incongruence stemming from dissimilarities in individual characteristics as a function of mutual trust, liking and affinity that have been cultivated for a long time. As discussed in the previous section, existing mentoring literature has generally ignored the relational process of the quality mentoring relationships (Eby et al., 2013). It is stressed that the relational experiences are one of the distinct features of the workplace mentoring relationships (Avery et al., 2008). In this regard, inclusion of expressive compatibility is beneficial in distinguishing mentoring relationships from other workplace interactions such as supervisor-subordinate or formal mentoring relationships.

Outcome of Mentoring Compatibility

One of the misunderstandings in the conceptualization of informal mentoring relationships is that the existing mentoring literature often treated the mentoring behavior
(i.e., career support and psychosocial support) as an outcome variable (Kahn, 2007). Such fashion did not capture the affective reactions and experiences to the mentoring relationships. The recent meta-analysis conducted by Eby and his colleagues (2013) also supported this proposition as they found that the mentoring behaviors and the perceived mentoring quality are distinct constructs. Furthermore, the patterns of associations with antecedent variables differ to some extent based on which factors are served as outcome variables (Eby et al., 2013). Thus, current study includes the protégés’ perceived mentoring quality as an outcome variable of the mentoring behavior.

Mentoring behavior

As already discussed, there are two major functions of workplace mentoring: (1) career function and (2) psychosocial functions. These two distinct mentoring behaviors have been widely substantiated in empirical settings (Eby et al., 2013). More specifically, Noe (1988) employed exploratory factory analysis (EFA) to investigate underlying structure of the mentoring scales and found that the Mentoring Function scales (MFSs) are valid in measuring two primary mentoring functions (i.e., career and psychosocial functions) as Kram identified. Pellegrini and Scandura (2005) conducted multiple group confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) to investigate the reliability and stability of the Mentoring Function Questionnaires (MFQs). In a similar vein, Ragins and McFarlin (1990) also created a Mentoring Role Instrument in accordance with the mentoring functions proposed by Kram (1985) and established the construct validity of the scales by conducting a similar analytic procedure.
Mentoring quality

Perceived relationship quality has been emphasized as an indicator of mentorship effectiveness in the mentoring process (Eby et al., 2013). Eby et al. (2013) defined perceived relationship quality as “the protégé’s evaluative feelings toward the mentor or to the relationship as a whole” (p. 443). It evaluates the protégé’s overall attitudes toward the mentoring relationships including the extent of satisfaction with the mentoring relationship, the mentor, and the overall relationship quality. Given that the purpose of the study was to examine the mentoring experiences on behalf of the protégés, inclusion of the perceived relationship quality from the protégés perspective was appropriate. Additionally, the concept of relational mentoring in the context of work related interactions also emphasizes that the workplace mentoring phenomenon should be understood as high-quality interaction (Eby et al., 2013). However, as Ragins (2010) asserted, the extant literature on mentoring has not fully touched on the high-quality end of mentoring relationships. Omission of the investigation on high-quality mentorships could mask our understanding of the nature of effective/productive mentoring relationships in which developmental functions flourishes for both parties. Substantial empirical evidence also supports that the relationship quality is conceptually distinct from the mentoring support while only limited studies addressed this aspect (Eby et al., 2013).

Statement of the Problem

It seems that, at least, there is no blatant discrimination on the basis of surface level diversity (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). It is partially due to the apparent social concerns and pressure with respect to the value of diversity (Fink & Pastore, 1999). In the
context of intercollegiate athletics, however, several researchers have pointed out the fact that women and racial minorities are over represented in the peripheral positions, which limit their upward mobility to the top level administrative positions (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). Males continue to occupy the role of managerial positions through the exclusive developmental relationships in which women and racial minorities are initially denied in their access to the top level administrative positions within organizations.

Thus, it is necessary to explore the cognitive and emotional aspect of work related interactions (i.e., mentoring relationships), which subsequently aid our understanding on the process of marginalization in the leadership positions in sport settings. In support of this, Sartore and Cunningham (2007) pointed out that the current research in the field of sport “do not address the emotional and cognitive processes of women as they encounter disparate acceptance and treatment within the male-dominated sport domain” (p. 245). It is important to explore how individual members, minorities in particular, respond with respect to the discriminatory practices embedded in the culture of sport organizations. In this regard, it is worthwhile to investigate an organizational inner mechanism of interaction among members within sport organizations (i.e., intercollegiate athletics) in order to understand the reality of current states about the status of diversity management. Current study examines the workplace mentoring relationships to explore the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in sport organizations.

While the issue of developmental relationships (e.g., leader-follower, supervisor-subordinate dyads) has been addressed by several scholars in the domain of sport (e.g.,
Burton & Peachey, 2009; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001), very limited attention has been given with respect to mentoring relationships on the business side of sport except for a couple of notable studies (i.e., Bower & Hums, 2007; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990). One of the obvious shortcomings in this fashion is that the major focus of the previous studies was primarily on the group level, not the individual level per se. In order to address this gap, the current study investigates the workplace mentoring practices from the perspective of protégés.

Previous studies have been predominantly focused on the top level managers while limited attention has been given to the lower level administrators such as senior associate/associate athletic directors (Ads), assistant athletic directors (Ads) (Parks, Russell, Wood, Robertson, & Shewokis, 1995). The major limitation is that the top level administrative positions, such as athletic directors, are exclusively filled with White males (Parks et al., 1995; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004). Thus, it is hard to capture the perspectives of women and racial minorities within intercollegiate athletic departments.

The current study, in this regard, is aimed at exploring the nature of mentoring relationships among athletic managers in the core administrative positions in intercollegiate athletics. Core administrative positions refer to the employees in the intermediate or senior administrative position of a hierarchical organization (Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). In other words, they are subordinate to the top level managers, but also accountable for the lower level staffs. The core administrative positions (associate and assistant athletic director positions) are regarded as the “pipeline” to the top managerial positions because the major job responsibilities of these positions entail
various degrees of skills or abilities required for the top leadership position. Additionally, those people in the core administrative positions work very closely with their respective athletic directors.

The demographic make-up of these positions are very similar across Divisions that Whites occupied over 85% of senior administrative positions (i.e., assistant and associate athletic directors) excluding Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) (Lapchick, Agusta, Kinkopf, & McPhee, 2012). Within this category, women held 27.9 %, 38.4 %, and 37.1 % of the assistant athletic directors in Division I, II and III respectively. Acosta and Carpenter (2012) also provided a great deal of statistics associated with gender status in intercollegiate athletic administration. According to their annual report, women hold 20.3% of athletic director positions compared to their male counterparts (79.7%). Such gender bias at the managerial level seems worse in Division I than its lower Division counterparts. One of the interesting findings is that 9.2% of athletic departments appeared to have no women in athletic administration positions. In terms of race, African Americans held less than 10 % of all administrative positions in the NCAA excluding HBCU. Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans found to be the least representative racial groups of these positions by occupying less than 2 %. According to the annual report by Lapchick and his colleagues (2012), the total percentage of people of color in administrative positions is 17.7 %. Whites are occupying associate athletic director positions by 87.5 %, 89.4 % and 95.3 % of the total populations at Division I, II, and III respectively.
Finally, the extant studies on mentoring have been geared toward the consequences or mentoring outcomes, while relatively fewer have given attention to the mentoring process. Given the paucity of knowledge and suggestions on mentoring, it is necessary to explore the effect of antecedents which subsequently lead to the formation of the mentoring relationship (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). This study was designed to address this gap. More specifically, three major purposes were addressed in accordance with the Compatible Mentoring Relationship (CMR) model to be tested in an empirical setting (See Figure 1.3.).

First, the study explored the impact of individual characteristics on mentoring experience, by comparing demographic differences between athletic administrators with and without mentoring experience. The central tenet of the first purpose was based on protégés who possess socially desirable characteristics would gain better access to rewarding workplace relationships. In this particular context of sport, that is intercollegiate athletics, which is predominantly ruled by White males, women and racial minorities may be denied access to mainstream organizational positions. As shown in Figure 1.3., women and racial minorities are initially filtered in the mentoring selection process as a function of homologous reproduction practiced by White male dominant organizational members (DeHAss, 2007). It was important to examine the mentoring selection process of women and racial minorities. This would aid our understanding on the characteristics of mentored administrators as compared to their non-mentored administrator counterparts. Thus, the current study examined the impact of demographic
variables (i.e., age, race, gender, educational level, and organizational rank) on organizational mentoring experiences.

Second, the study explored the psychometric properties of theoretical constructs used in the construction of the CMR model. More specifically, the CMR model incorporated various theoretical constructs in which the construct validity and reliability have not been established within intercollegiate athletic administration: The constructs include (1) Organization based self-esteem, (2) relationship compatibility consisting of instrumental and expressive compatibility, (3) mentoring support incorporating career and psychosocial supports, (4) mentoring quality, and (5) job satisfaction. While some of these constructs were examined separately in the studies conducted in organizational science, the psychometric properties of the study constructs have not been collectively and simultaneously examined. Especially the concept of relational compatibility (i.e., instrumental and expressive compatibility), which was newly introduced in the CMR model as an antecedent of quality mentoring, and thus it was required to establish the validity of each construct before testing the structural model.

Last, the study tested the CMR model in order to identify cognitive and emotional aspects of developmental relationships (i.e., mentoring relationships) and its consequences to the productivity and quality of the mentoring relationships in terms of career success in the context of intercollegiate athletic administration. Again, the central tenet of the CMR model posited the idea that the protégés with a high level of organization based self-esteem would receive high level of mentoring support, which subsequently influences the quality of mentoring in a positive manner. Furthermore, the
study explored the role of relational compatibility as a mediator between OBSE and mentoring support. Research questions are guided by the purpose of the study.

Research Questions

1. Are there any differences between mentored and non-mentored athletic administrators with respect to their individual characteristics?

2. Are the psychometric properties of the study constructs plausible to be tested in an empirical setting?

3. To what extent, is the mentoring model supported by the data gathered?

Definition of the Terms

1. Workplace mentoring: An organizational practice that is oriented toward developing protégés both personally and professionally by mentors, who are generally older in age and higher in ranking (Kram, 1985; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

2. Informal organizational mentoring: a workplace mentoring relationship initiated spontaneously between mentors and protégés as a function of interpersonal attractiveness (Kram, 1985).

3. Core level managers: the employees in the intermediate or senior administrative position of a hierarchical organization (Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002).

4. Organization-Based Self-esteem (OBSE): “the degree to which an individual believes him/herself to be capable, significant, and worthy as an organization member” (Pierce & Gardner, 2004, p. 594).
5. Actual surface similarity: the extent to which individuals are similar in terms of overt biological features (e.g., demographics) or explicit social status (e.g., socioeconomic status) that tends to be persistent and stable overtime. (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998)

6. Actual deep similarity: the unique set of individual traits such as beliefs, values and attitudes, such as personality or self-esteem, which have been established and constructed overtime as a core part of self-concept (Byrne, 1971, 1997).

7. Perceived surface similarity: “the comparative demographic characteristics of members of dyads or groups who are in a position to engage in regular interaction” (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989, p. 403).

8. Perceived deep similarity: The degree to which interactional partners are perceived (or biased), but not actually, to be similar in deep level characteristics such as beliefs, values, or attitudes as a function of in-group favoritism or interpersonal bias (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Tidwell, Eastwick, & Finkel, 2013).

9. Compatibility: a major source of interpersonal attraction which enable two different parties get along together in the context of mutual interaction (Ickes, 1985).

Overview of Remaining Chapters

Chapter 2, the review of the literature, provides a thorough review of previous literature pertaining to workplace mentoring, diversity management on sport
administration, as well as the foundational theoretical models on mentoring in the business side of sport with great detail. Furthermore, the chapter explicates a “compatible mentoring relationship model” proposed in the previous chapter and discusses how the measurement model can be tested in empirical settings.

Chapter 3 primarily deals with a description of the research design employed in the study. More specifically, the chapter clarifies the type of empirical methods to be applied with respect to the strengths and weaknesses of the design. This chapter provides a rationale for the selection of the sample and instrument. Finally, statistical methods applied in the study are discussed by focusing on the establishment of internal and external validity.

Chapter 4 presents the major findings of the current study. The chapter is divided into five sections including (1) Initial Screening and Data Cleaning, (2) Demographics, (3) Research Question 1, (4) Research Question 2, and (5) Research Question 3. Chapter 5 further discusses the major findings of the study by exploring the nature of informal workplace mentoring. More specifically, the chapter explicates the Compatible Mentoring Relationship (CMR) model in a theoretical standpoint and provides suggestions for scholars and practitioners who are interested in the workplace mentoring.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The chapter is aimed at providing readers with a thorough review of previous studies on workplace mentoring and explains the proposed mentoring framework for the study. This chapter is divided into four sections: (a) overview of the current state of diversity management in intercollegiate athletics, (b) a review of mentoring theories and models, (c) a discussion of the theoretical background used in the construction of the current conceptual framework, and (c) explanation and rationalization of the proposed conceptual model.

Diversity in the Intercollegiate Athletics

The marginal status of women and ethnic minorities in leadership positions in the context of sport has been well documented (e.g., Cunningham, 2009; Fletcher, Gies, & Hodge, 2011; Hardy, 1994). As an example, Cunningham and Sagas (2004) examined the negative impact of discrimination among NCAA Division I-FBS football coaching staffs. The study identified both access discrimination and treatment discrimination as antecedents of negative consequences in terms of career related outcomes such as turnover intention, job satisfaction, and career advancement aspiration. In a later study, Cunningham and Sagas (2005) found that the proportion of Black coaches against the proportion of Black-student athletes drastically decreased as a function of White head coaches since White head coaches exhibited tendency toward having all White coaching
staffs. They suggested a remedy that the establishment of affirmative action programs would mitigate the effect of discriminatory practice in the entry level. However, we have already observed that such an endeavor did not bring about fruitful results in increasing the diversity of the institutions. As a well-known example, Title IX of the education amendments of 1972 caused a drastic decrease in the number of women in the coaching positions while the enactment of the Title IX mandated educational institutions, intercollegiate athletics in particular, to make numeric balance of students in terms of gender (Acosta & Carpenter, 2001). Besides, breaches of Title IX still occur frequently, law suits of sexual harassment are increasing in number, and homophobia is still a pervasive phenomenon in the context of intercollegiate sports.

Moreover such discriminatory practices have not ended for minorities after overcoming the initial barriers established against them (Fink, Pastore, & Reimer, 2001, 2003). Borland and Bruening (2010) found that female coaches in Division I women’s basketball felt a sense of isolation, experienced a lack of support, and sex stereotyping as obstacles impeding their career advancement. This implies that passage of anti-discrimination legislation and organizational “one-shot” policy cannot be successful without organizational ongoing commitment in order to create an inclusive work environment for diverse employees (Borland & Bruening, 2010; Fink et al., 2001). Regarding this concern, Sartore and Cunningham (2007) urged that it is necessary to delineate the underlying causal psychological construct of social integration and interaction to better understand the current status of minorities working for NCAA, that are predominantly White male dominated domain.
One medium that has been ignored in this regard is the nature of developmental relationships in the domain of intercollegiate athletics. Logistically, the investigation of developmental relationships in sport settings will provide a unique lens to understand how members within the organization initiate developmental relationships or networks in an attempt to pursue their own career goals. An examination of the organizational inner mechanism with respect to developmental relationships could delineate the organizational practice in which the norm of dominant social groups (i.e., White male) are manifested and institutionalized through the exclusive informal and formal networks. In this regard, the current study utilizes the mentoring construct evolved from the business literature (c.f., Kram, 1983) since mentoring relationships have been regarded as one of the most effective developmental relationships in work settings.

Mentoring

While there is no universal consensus on the definition of mentoring relationships, a mentor could be defined as an individual with better knowledge or more experience, who is willing to transfer his or her knowledge or offer psychological support for other members (i.e., protégés) lacking in experience and knowledge (Noe, 1988; Pastore, 2003; Watson, Clement, Blom, & Grindley, 2009; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). In a similar manner, protégés could be defined as any individual receiving special assistance to fulfill their professional or psychological needs from others (i.e., mentors) within organizations (Kram, 1983, 1985; Noe, 1988). Workplace mentoring relationships, in this regard, can be defined as an organizational practice oriented toward developing protégés both personally and professionally by mentors, who are generally older in age and higher in
ranking (Kram, 1983, 1985; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; 2002). This conceptualization on mentoring can be directly applied to the business side of sport in general, the NCAA in particular.

Traditional perspective on mentoring (informal context)

Kram’s (1983) initial conceptualization on mentoring has enjoyed a considerable amount of attention among organizational scholars (Dreher & Cox, 1996; Hezlett 2005; Hezlett & Gibson 2005; Noe, 1988; Parker, Hall, & Kram, 2008; Ragins & Kram, 2007). Kram (1983) conceptualized the nature of mentoring relationships in an organizational context. It should be noted that her initial conceptualization has been made in the informal context. That is, she acknowledged that mentoring relationships would be established and effective when both parties (i.e., mentor-protégé) come together spontaneously (Kram, 1983, 1985). With this theoretical presumption, Kram identified two primary mentoring functions: (1) career functions and (2) psychosocial functions. Career functions provided by mentors such as sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignment are related with the protégés’ career advancements (e.g., promotion or salary raise). In contrast, psychosocial functions refer to role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship, which lead to psychological development for the protégés (Kram, 1983).

In accordance with this, she proposed a conceptual framework in an attempt to delineate how a mentoring relationship could be established and developed over time in organizational settings. Specifically, her conceptual framework clarified the phases of a mentoring relationship in which psychological development and career advancement take
place as the mentoring relationship moves from one phase to the next. She asserted that
the nature of a mentoring relationship should be understood as a developmental process
which takes a significant amount of time and effort. Table 2.1 summarizes a mentoring
lifespan based on the developmental stages of the mutual interaction in the context of
dyadic mentoring relationships by Kram (1983).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Turning Pointsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>A period of six months to a year during which time the relationship gets started and begins to have importance for both managers.</td>
<td>Fantasies become concrete expectations. Expectations are met; senior manager provides coaching, challenging work, visibility; junior manager provides technical assistance, respect, and desire to be coached. There are opportunities for interaction around work tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td>A period of two to five years during which time the range of career and psychosocial functions provided expand to a maximum.</td>
<td>Both individuals continue to benefit from the relationship. Opportunities for meaningful and more frequent interaction increase. Emotional bond deepens and intimacy increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>A period of six months to two years after a significant change in the structural role relationship and/or in the emotional experience of the relationship.</td>
<td>Junior manager no longer wants guidance but rather the opportunity to work more autonomously. Senior manager faces midlife crisis and is less available to provide mentoring functions. Job rotation or promotion limits opportunities for continued interaction; career and psychosocial functions can no longer be provided. Blocked opportunity creates resentment and hostility that disrupts positive interaction. Stresses of separation diminish, and new relationships are formed. The mentor relationship is no longer needed in its previous form. Resentment and anger diminish; gratitude and appreciation increase. Peer status is achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Phases of the Mentoring Relationship by Kram (1983)
Women and racial minorities, as socially marginalized groups, have long been excluded from access to the mainstream social networks occupied by White male dominant social groups (Sage, 1990). In a similar vein, there has long been a grave concern for the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in managerial positions in organizational settings (Catalyst, 2004; Ibarra, 1993; Wasburn, 2007).

Several organizational scholars have attributed the underrepresentation to the lack of mentors available for women and racial minorities (Acosta & Carpenter, 2001; Noe, 1988; Thomas, 1990).

According to Noe (1988), women were less likely to build a mentoring relationship due to sociocultural constraints against them such as gender-based stereotyping or limited network opportunities within male-dominated occupations. Lyness and Thompson (2000) also found that male groups tend to experience more positive career advancement with the mentors than their female counterparts. Lack of available mentors inhibits female workers from understanding the reality of male-dominated organizational culture and, as it turned out, they are not able to move up the career path despite their aspiration for achieving career goals (Noe, 1988; Wasburn, 2007). In the context of race, Thomas (1990) found that Black managers had more organizational relationships in an attempt to pursue their career needs which could not be fulfilled by the relationships with their White managers. Ibarra (1992) indicated that women and racial minorities are structurally constrained from establishing developmental networks. However, Ibarra (1993) also stressed that the official denial to accessing
developmental networks of women and racial minorities led them to seek alternative forms of developmental networks with their peers or members from outside of the organizations in similar identities in the ideologies of race and gender.

In the context of sport, there has been similar academic concern as those in business with respect to the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in the position of power (Avery, Tonidandel, & Phillips, 2008; Cunningham, 2009; Doherty, & Chelladurai, 1999; Fink & Pastore, 1999). Because sport organizations are also influenced by the socio cultural changes toward diversity, it seems inevitable for sport managers or administrators to create and establish favorable workplaces to attract a diverse workforce. Sport organizations would be able to maximize the benefits from embracing a diverse workforce in terms of organizational effectiveness. With this in mind, several scholars pointed out the weakness of a culture of similarity by which a diverse workforce is forced to assimilate to the dominant organizational culture represented by White male dominance (Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999; Fink & Pastore, 1999). This perspective is consistent with the primary problem which lies in developing mentoring networks for women and racial minorities. In addition, scholars asserted that the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in managerial positions would be resolved by the creation of an inclusive mentoring culture (Avery et al., 2008; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; Young, 1990).

The paucity of knowledge and suggestions on mentoring, which emerged from the business literature (c.f., Kram, 1983) in the context of work related interactions, application to the business side of sport has been scarce at best, except for Weaver and
Chelladurai (1999, 2002). Thus, it is necessary to address this gap by further exploring and modifying the mentoring model in the context of sport advanced by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999). Their mentoring model provides insight into understanding the role of compatibility as a significant antecedent for the mentoring relationships to be productive for both parties in the interactional dyads while there are some limitations on the framework also (limitations are to be further discussed in the section below). Thus, the mentoring framework proposed in this study is a logical extension of the mentoring model proposed by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) by elaborating the concept of compatibility in conjunction with the similarity-attraction paradigm.

**Weaver and Chelladurai’s Mentoring Model (1999)**

Weaver and Chelladurai’s model was conceptualized within the domain of sport in an attempt to address the underrepresentation of women in the positions of power by utilizing workplace mentoring framework proposed by Kram (1983, 1985). The central tenet of the model posits the idea that the lack of commonalities with the leaders lead to the lack of available mentors for women, which subsequently hamper the growth of women employees by limiting their upward mobility to the top level administrative and leadership positions. The concept of compatibility has been emphasized as a significant antecedent for mentoring relationships to be effective and successful among mentoring scholars (Hardy, 1994). Wanberg, Welsh, and Hezelett (2003) also argued that organizations would develop an effective formal mentoring program through an effective ‘matching process’ in which mentorships are initiated on the basis of similarity between mentors and protégés. Mentoring relationships with a high degree of similarity would
complement the needs of each other more effectively through strong interpersonal ties, which ultimately lead to the cultivation of strong workplace developmental relationships. Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) acknowledged the nature of sport as a White male dominated domain in which the dominant culture, cultivated in favor of preserving the prestige of White male groups, has been institutionalized, embedded, and legitimatized as a core part of organizational process in which women are denied their access to the rewarding informal networks.

With this theoretical proposition, Weaver and Chelladurai incorporated two intervening variables; these are (1) compatibility as an interpersonal level of constraint and (2) barriers as a structural level of constraint against women in establishing informal mentoring relationships. Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) defined compatibility as the extent of what mentors and protégés have in common in terms of career goals, work related attributes and attitudes. Accordingly, women employees would hinder by a lack of compatibility with their White male supervisors as compared to their male counterparts, which subsequently result in the lack of mentors. In a structural level of constraint, the model incorporated the intervening variable, which is “barriers”, against women such as negative stereotyping, limited network opportunities, and token status of women which explicate the exclusive nature of the workplace interaction (or mentoring) against women in the domain of sport, which has long been a White male dominated domain.

The framework posits the idea that similar mentor-protégé characteristics with respect to career interest and affective attitudes facilitates the development of compatibility in establishing interpersonal attraction, which ultimately leads to the
initiation of the mentoring relationships. Mentoring partners in a compatible relationship exert their efforts to address the needs of each other in the mentoring process by which the exchange of mentoring functions eventually serve to fulfill their own needs. The exchange of mentoring behaviors results in both tangible and intangible outcomes for mentors and protégés. In terms of mentoring outcomes for protégés, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) stated that the protégés would experience positive career consequences (i.e., tangible outcomes) such as salary raise, promotion, and increased power within organizations. The protégés would experience personal growth (i.e., intangible outcomes) such as competence, development of a professional identity, and work role effectiveness (Weaver & Chelladura, 1999, 2002). In a similar vein, the mentors receive intrinsic benefits by assisting their respective protégés since serving as a mentor could challenge their own managerial capacity as being an organizational nurturer. Mentors could have an opportunity to prove managerial effectiveness, which is one of the critical requirements for leadership positions.

_Limitations of Weaver and Chelladurai’s Framework_

Their framework provides a theoretical foundation for understanding how mentoring relationships could be established as a function of compatibility, nonetheless, there are several limitations. Specifically, Weaver and Chelladurai’s model did not capture the developmental nature of the human interaction which takes a significant amount of time and effort to be fully cultivated. Following section detailed the limitations of Weaver and Chelladurai’s model in this regard.
First of all, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) stated that “similar mentor and protégé characteristics lead to mentor-protégé compatibility, which subsequently leads to a mentoring relationship” (p. 26). They pointed out the role of compatibility as a major source of a mentoring relationship to be initiated. While it is true that compatibility is a major source of interaction to occur, their definition did not capture the developmental nature of the compatibility which takes a significant amount of time and effort to be fully cultivated along the mentoring life span. In other words, the concept of compatibility should be understood as an ongoing process determining the relationship to be close or distant as it ultimately decides whether the relationship lasts long or dies. The point of the current argument is that, rather than focusing on the antecedent role of the compatibility, it is desirable to investigate mediating effect of compatibility in the mentoring process by which the nature of high-end developmental relationships can be identified.

Secondly, as Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) also acknowledged, it is noteworthy that not all mentoring relationships are established based on a high degree of compatibility. The emphasis of their framework was that higher degrees of compatibility would lead to higher effectiveness and quality in the mentoring relationship. In other words, the success of the mentoring relationships would be largely affected by the relative degrees of compatibility between mentors and protégés. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that the initial compatibility is not established in a vacuum and individuals utilize their unique traits in order to form a set of expectations about their potential partners as to evaluate whether they are compatible that in turn decides whether they initiate the mentoring relationship. This leads to the argument that a protégé with
desirable traits would obtain better access to a rewarding mentoring relationship. In this regard, it is necessary to investigate what factors play a role in the cultivation of relational compatibility between mentors and protégés in the beginning of the mentoring relationship.

Lastly, the compatibility in their model did not capture the unique nature of workplace interactions that occurs in the achievement context. Individuals are assigned to certain work groups through the official order of the organization so as to maximize the organizational effectiveness. To that end, an assignment to the work group is closely associated with the area of individual specialization, which subsequently facilitate the individual career success or vice versa. In this regard, work itself is a crucial part of one’s self-concept in the formation of a professional identity within the workplace. Accordingly, individuals are more likely to be attracted with others who are congruent or agreeing upon the work related attitudes, beliefs, or values. Kram (1985) indicated the unique nature of workplace mentoring behavior by conceptualizing mentoring behavior into two distinct functions (i.e., career and psychosocial supports). In a similar vein, the compatibility in mentoring could be also classified into either work related compatibility or affective compatibility.

Thus, the mentoring model advanced by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) could be enhanced by further exploring the role of “compatibility” in the mentoring process which in turn aid our understanding on the nature of compatible mentoring relationships as high-end developmental relationships in an organizational context. The researcher of the current study modified the mentoring framework developed by Weaver and Chelladurai
(1999) in order to explicate structural constraints against women and racial minorities in the context of mentoring relationships in the business side of sport, which is historically a White male dominated domain. The mentoring framework was proposed in conjunction with the similarity attraction paradigm (c.f., Byrne, 1971) and social categorization theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Finally, the researcher tested the validity and reliability of the proposed model in an empirical setting.

Theoretical Background

*Similarity Attraction Paradigm*

The similarity attraction paradigm posits the idea that there are positive linear relationships between the extent of similarity and the magnitude of attraction, which subsequently lead to the initiation of relationships (Byrne, 1971). Having the similarity proposition in mind, Byrne (1971) believed that attraction would be a central aspect of human behavior. The similarity attraction paradigm offers meaningful insight into understanding the lack of mentors available for women and racial minorities in sport organizations. In support of this, Ibarra (1993) stated that lack of similarities with supervisors (i.e., mentors), represented by White males, prohibits women or ethnic minorities from establishing developmental networks within organizations. Given the fact that the domain of sport has long been a White male dominant field, it is reasonable to conclude that women and racial minorities have been excluded from establishing developmental relationships (e.g., mentoring relationships) as compared to their White male counterparts (Cunningham, 2009).
While there is a general consensus on the positive impact of similarity in establishing mutual attraction, there has been an ongoing debate in terms of its functional basis spurred by conditional effects of similarity variables (Condon & Crano, 1988). More precisely, it has been argued that the effect of similarity could vary based on the context of the relationship and research settings. This line of argument directly leads to the diversification of similarity variables. Thus, it is beneficial to discuss each type of similarity variable as it facilitates our understanding of the conceptualization of attraction paradigm. The following section introduces each type of similarity in an attempt to make conceptual distinctions among similarity variables.

**Actual Similarity vs. Perceived Similarity**

Actual similarity refers to the state of mind that individuals perceive to share commonalities with another in the context of interactional relationships (Byrne, 1971). Byrne and Rhmey (1965) proclaimed that the similarity effect is one of the most powerful antecedents in establishing attraction for interactional relationships to occur. The rationale behind this perspective is that an individual exhibits tendency to hold consistent views of the world congruent with one’s own attitudes, values, and/or beliefs. This perspective treats the concept of similarity as a pre-existing trait that has been cultivated overtime, and thus established as a stable trait resistant against change (e.g., personality, beliefs, or attitudes). Accordingly, one brings it to form a set of expectations toward interactional partners. Byrne (1971) believed that similar pairs share a consistent view of their own, which in turn stimulates positive feelings toward each other. With this theoretical proposition, Byrne (1971) asserted that actual similarity could be assessed
with a standardized measurement (e.g., personality assessment) in comparison with potential relational partners in empirical settings. Ever since the (actual) similarity attraction paradigm was introduced, it has enjoyed a significant amount of attention from behavioral scholars in organizational settings. However, as with any theory, the actual similarity attraction paradigm is not exempt from its critics.

While there is a general consensus on the positive effect of similarity on attraction, there has been an ongoing debate about the application of classical conditioning of actual similarity in the context of existing relationships. Some scholars argued that the examination of similarity could be cognitively biased as a function of in-group favoritism in the process of self-esteem maintenance (e.g., Condon & Crano, 1988). In other words, individuals are convinced to believe that interactional partners are assumed, but are not actually similar with them. A line of this argument posits the idea that the magnitude of attraction on the relational partners could be mediated by the degrees of interpersonal liking established prior to the evaluation of attitude similarity. Stated more precisely, one of the major concerns on the application of actual similarity to social science is that the effect of actual similarity tends be attenuated or even eliminated in the context of “existing relationships”. It is because individuals tend to evaluate in-group members in a positive manner, which in turn prevent the individuals from evaluating the extent of similarity in a favorable manner. Thus, proponents of the perceived similarity urge that the effect of the actual similarity can be objectively measured only in lab settings focusing on the hypothetical relationship with strangers (Ross, Greene, & House, 1977). From these critics, similarity variables can be
distinguished by the extent to which the similarity is evaluated by one’s objective traits (i.e., actual similarity) or subjective beliefs (i.e., perceived similarity) to another.

Recently, Montoya, Horton, and Kirchner (2008) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the impact of actual and perceived similarity on interpersonal attraction. They found that actual similarity was salient for investigating the short-term interaction with strangers while perceived similarity well predicted long-term, existing relationships. They concluded that perceived similarity is a better predictor on attraction than actual similarity in field settings. Although it seems that actual similarity loses some of its merit in terms of applicability to existing relationships, the conceptional aspect of actual similarity still provides us with some insight into understanding the importance of individual traits as stable and consistent over time. Accordingly, individual unique traits serve to form a set of expectations in the evaluation of a relational partner considering that the similarities are not established in a vacuum. It is inferred that the effect of actual similarity could be powerful to predict the initiation of the relationships while perceived similarity is a significant variable in the prediction of sustainability of the existing relationship.

Furthermore, the results from Montoya et al. (2008)’s study provide us with some methodological insights into understanding the nature of similarity variables. More specifically, results from Montoya et al. (2008)’s work imply that actual similarity is a salient antecedent on attraction for initial relationships to occur; in contrast, attraction could lead to increased perceived similarity which in turn facilitate mutual liking (i.e., attraction). This indicates that there is a reciprocal correlation between perceived
similarity and attraction by which two variables affect each other in a positive manner. From this presumption, another conceptual distinction could be made between actual and perceived similarity, which is a condition of interaction for attraction to occur. More specifically, the actual similarity is treated as pre-existing characteristics that individuals bring to form expectations about their potential relationship partners. Accordingly, an evaluation of actual similarity does not assume interaction for attraction to occur while perceived similarity is cultivated only when actual interaction is involved.

In statistical terms, actual similarity would be regarded as an exogenous variable that is not influenced by any other variables (i.e., unidirectional) in the theoretical model while perceived similarity is treated as the endogenous variable that perceived similarity facilitates interpersonal attraction and, as a result, attraction reinforce to increase perceived similarity (i.e., bidirectional). The major thrust of the current argument is that perceived similarity would be a better predictor on attraction for long-term existing relationships due to the aforementioned reasons (e.g., cognitive bias, perceived beliefs and self-esteem maintenance process). In contrast, according to Byrne (1971), the magnitude of actual similarity would be examined based on the pre-existing traits that individual use as a standard to form a set of expectations to another before they initiate relationships.

Self-Categorization and Social Identity Theory

Another line of classification of the similarity constructs can be made based on whether individual characteristics are readily observable, (i.e., surface level similarity), or takes time to be captured, (i.e., deep level similarity) (Tsui, Egane, & O’Reilly, 1992;
Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Turner, 1987). The theoretical foundation of this perspective is grounded upon self-categorization and social identity theory in which individuals identify themselves with social groups which facilitate positive self-image by reflecting social identity of the group memberships (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). According to self-categorization and social identity theory, oftentimes, simple demographic variables (i.e., surface similarity) such as sex or race markers serve to delineate the underlying structure of organizational relationships in terms of group dynamics (Turner, 1987). Tajfel and Turner (1979) focused on the “subjective” social process by which individuals exhibit tendency to hold positive views of the group that they are involved without rationalization by exhibiting in-group favoritism and out-group derogation. In its intense form of adaptation of social behavior, individuals display prejudiced attitudes and/or discriminatory behavior (e.g., socio cultural stereotypes of specific races or gender) against out-group members so as to preserve favorable in-group identity.

**Surface Level Similarity: Categorical Demography vs Relational Demography**

Heterogeneity at a surface level can indicate overt biological differences which generally reflect physical features of individuals (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). With the ease of its measure in terms of reliability and validity, these characteristics (i.e., surface level) have been one of the most frequently utilized variables among behavioral researchers (Harrison et al., 1998). This is because of the fact that the demographic characteristics can be a cue to explain cognitive aspects of individual characteristics such as perceptions, attitudes, or work related outcomes. As explained previously, the extreme form of its adaptation of social behavior could lead to social prejudices and
discrimination against underprivileged, negatively stigmatized groups such as racial minorities or women (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1987).

In the realm of organizational science, the effect of categorical demographic variables has been often utilized to delineate underlying structure of organizational network such as a negative relationship between age and performance (Waldman & Avolio, 1986), the effect of gender stereotyping on work relations (Noe, 1981) and underrepresentation of racial minorities in managerial positions (Thomas, 1990). While an investigation of simple demographic variables could effectively explicate the nature of work related outcomes, sole investigation of simple demographics does not readily capture the dynamic nature of organizational behavior which consist of multiple facets of relationships. More specifically, simple demographic characteristics as a categorical analytic tool do not clearly explain the compositional or relational aspects of such variables. This suggests that the existing literature which used the demographic category did not take into account the importance of interaction, communication, and/or integrations among members of organizations (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989).

Knowing that organizations consist of a variety of interactional groups in both formal and informal context, the distribution of the relational properties could be critical in understanding the “real” effect of organizational demography (Tsui et al., 1992). The concept of relational demography emphasizes the relational aspects of demographic variables which could vary based on the composition of ones’ interactional networks within organizations (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). As an example, perceptions of one’s age could be a function of a group composition in terms of age distribution among members.
since the perception of “being older” would vary based on the relative difference in age within the work groups (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). In a similar manner, the impact of race would be determined by the relative position of racial groups within work groups in terms of power dynamics.

Deep Level Similarity

Deep-level similarity has been conceptualized as internal and cognitive aspects (e.g., attitudes, beliefs and values) of individual traits which require careful observation to obtain background information on others. Harrison et al. (1998) stated that “information about these factors is communicated through verbal and nonverbal behavior patterns and is only learned through extended, individualized interaction and information gathering” (p. 98). This implies that the measure of deep level similarity surmise mutual interactions among people. As it turned out, the concept of deep-level similarity is similar with the operational definition of perceived similarity used in the field of social psychology.

Although relatively few empirical investigations have been conducted as compared to the surface similarity, the positive effect of deep-level similarity on both individual and group level outcomes has been widely supported (Harrison et al., 1998). More specifically, scholars acknowledged that the effect of deep level similarity becomes a major source of attraction as individuals acquire more information on others throughout the interaction, which in turn replace the surface similarity used in the generation of impressions on others basing on the socially constructed images attached to the specific demographic category to promote categorization process (Jackson, Stone, & Alvarez,
A line of argument supporting the role of deep-level similarity is also theoretically plausible considering that the surface variables are utilized as a cue to generate impressions based on stereotypical images, which is a conceptually deep-level trait, on others due to the lack of enough time to get to know each other. This reasoning leads us to the conclusion that surface similarity is significant at the beginning stage of human interactions though its effect would fade away as interactional partners get along together over time through frequent interaction and communication (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002).

Reconceptualization of Similarity Types

Four types of similarity variables have been discussed in conjunction with their own theoretical orientation. While each similarity type can explicate the nature of social processes of individual interaction, organizational behavior and intergroup relations in its own right, these constructs are neither mutually exclusive nor sufficiently inclusive (Byrne, 1997). Multifaceted nature of human relations leads to the conceptual overlap among each similarity construct to some extent. As it turns out, there has been a lack of consistency between theoretical adjustments and empirical evidence (Harrison et al., 1998).

The impact of categorical demography (i.e., surface level) has been well researched as it generates an impression of others in the absence of explicit information on them (Hogg et al., 2006). The positive impact of surface similarity has been taken for granted as it facilitates the categorization process in the context of human interaction. However, the empirical evidence supporting this proposition have been mixed at best,
which lead to the two contrasting perspectives on diversity in an organizational science (Harrison et al., 1998). Generation of information on others is commonly based on the cultural stereotypes attached to the specific demographic category. In this regard, an investigation of the categorical demography is only plausible in its relation to the cognitive, affective, and attitudinal aspects of human behavior.

This indicates that the concepts of surface and deep level characteristics are not mutually exclusive. In other words, surface level similarity itself does not have anything to do with the social cognitive process while it becomes a significant aspect of social behavior when its relation to the deeper level characteristics is taken into account in the process of self-identification. One of the common examples in the sport context would be the sex segregation in coaching (Knoppers, 1992). In the process of socialization, individuals internalize which jobs are appropriate and inappropriate in terms of gender. Both male and female internalize the gendered norms or behaviors at least to some extent. As it turns out, coaching in sport has long been regarded as a male appropriate career by which women candidates are initially filtered (Knoppers, 1992). Such masculinized culture inherent in the domain of sport has long been a source of discrimination and/or marginalization of women.

In a similar vein, the impact of surface similarity would become less important or even eliminated as a function of the amount of time and interaction, by which interactional partners perceive each other not basing on the stereotypical images but through the lens of features that define their relationship (Montoya et al., 2008). However, it is likely that the preference for surface similarity remains based on the extent
to which individuals endorse low ascribed status within the category of gender and race (Ibarra, 1993). As discussed previously, there is a possibility of individuals’ values being readily conveyed without regard to the amount of interaction between relational partners. This is because of the impact of both internalized pre-existing traits (e.g., masculine personality) and socially constructed perceptions (e.g., gender-role stereotyping in sport) in the formation of interpersonal preference. The point is that the association among similarity types is dynamic and simultaneously existed in real interaction, which could hinder our understanding of the complex associations among the similarity types when focusing exclusively on the specific category in the design of research. Regarding this concern, the current study proposes a broad level of similarity typology in an attempt to facilitate our understanding on the dynamic nature of similarity variables, which ultimately identify the nature of “compatible” mentoring relationships. The researcher encompasses four similarity variables into the theoretical framework with more precision on each type of similarity variable than has been in the past; these are (1) Actual Surface similarity, (2) Actual Deep similarity, (3) Perceived Surface similarity, and (4) Perceived Deep similarity (See Figure 2.1). A conceptualization of each category is oriented from combining the operational definition of each similarity type.
Actual Surface Similarity (Categorical or Compositional Demography)

Actual surface similarity can be conceptualized as the extent to which individuals are similar in terms of overt biological features or explicit social status that tend to be persistent and stable over time. This category includes individual characteristics that are quickly detectable (e.g., SES, religion etc.) or overtly visible (race markers, gender, ethnicity etc.). Gathering information on this category may facilitate cognitive processes of human interaction because individuals would form a set of expectations on others on the basis of socially constructed characteristics attached to a specific demographic category. In consequence, similarity in surface category facilitates the initiation of interactions.
In the context of organization, Hogg et al. (2006) found that organizational members utilize the demographic category in order to generate information on leaders in the absence of explicit information about them. In its extreme form of adaptation in social behavior, demographic stereotypes often play a role as an ideological tool to marginalize specific demographic groups as to preserve social privilege held by the dominant social group. In contrast, several scholars found that the effect of demographic category tends to be attenuated through the frequent interaction between interactional partners (Montoya et al., 2008; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). These scholars have emphasized the relational properties of this category that the real effect of demographic category can be more thoroughly understood by taking into account demographic makeup or interactional properties of individuals as the meaning of being different is a relative term.

Perceived Surface Similarity (Relational demography)

A central tenet on the conceptualization of perceived surface similarity is established by taking relational aspects of human interaction into account. That is, the extent of salience about the surface similarity could be considerably influenced by the demographic composition of group members. Perceived surface similarity, in this regard, would be conceptually congruent with the relational demography proposed by Tsui and O’Reilly (1989). Relational demography refers to “the comparative demographic characteristics of members of dyads or groups who are in a position to engage in regular interaction” (p. 403). Zimmer (1988) pointed out the different treatment of tokenism at the workplace in which a male in a female dominated occupation takes advantage of his token status while a female in a male dominated profession does not. Williams (1989)
further confirmed this by showing that a male nurse was more welcomed by their female nurses as compared with skeptical attitudes exhibited by male marines to their female counterpart.

*Actual Deep Similarity (Traits)*

Actual deep-level characteristics of individuals refer to the unique set of individual traits that have been established and constructed over time in the process of socialization. Researchers from social psychology have long been interested in the examination of this category as a powerful medium for exploring human interaction (c.f., Byrne, 1979). One of the merits in the investigation of this category is that the actual deep-level characteristics provide reliable and valid measures in the prediction of human behavior as individual characteristics in this category are believed to be stable and consistent over time, which in turn play a significant role in the initiation of interactions. The rationale behind this reasoning stems from the classical conditioning of attitude similarity paradigm initiated by Byrne (1971), in which individual attitudinal traits serve as a gauge in the formation of expectations about relational partners. There are varying ranges of individual traits in this category such as cognitive style, personality, self-esteem, and so forth.

While it is plausible that the individual characteristics in this category are stable over time and resistant to change, it should be also noted that individual actual deep-level characteristics are not immune to change or irrevocable once established. Individuals are perceived to be similar with their interactional partners without taking actual differences into account when they believe to be similar with others as a function of interaction. As it
is fully explained about the role of interaction, this is an important condition for mutual attraction to be further developed since involvement of interaction could produce cognitive bias toward others in the process of self-esteem maintenance, which in turn prevents ones from acquiring “objective” traits on others (Harrison et al., 1998). In a group level, Turner (1975) termed “in-group favoritism” in explaining the tendency of maintaining favorable attitudes toward individuals with in-group membership status.

On the other hand, it is also necessary to discuss about the social process of “depersonalization” in which individuals do not completely change or abandon ones’ own traits; instead, individuals depersonalize their own identity in order to adopt social identity of the group. Interaction convinces individuals to believe that others are similar with the interactional partners which hinder individuals from detecting “actual” similarity of another. This leads to the consideration for next similarity category, which is perceived deep similarity.

*Perceived Deep similarity (Compatibility)*

A central tenet in the conceptualization of the perceived deep level similarity posits the idea that individuals exhibit tendency to hold positive views of interactional partners in an attempt to maintain a positive self-concept without regard to the extent of “objective” similarity with others. In a similar vein, it has been proven that individuals are willing to conceal or alter their own identity through the process of “depersonalization” by convincing themselves as being similar with others who are “actually” not (Alabastro, Rast, Lac, Hogg, & Crano, 2013). These seemingly contradictory cognitive processes of human interaction can be explicated with a social
identity maintenance mechanism by which individuals strive for balance between a positive self-concept and social identity (Alabastro et al., 2013). This particular social process can be applied in the context of dyadic relationships.

Interactional parties in the dyadic context could make a decision whether the heterogeneity at the surface or actual level similarity could be overcome by the extent to which they are perceived to be similar. As a conventional example, individuals exhibited a high level of dissimilarity in attitudes between themselves and newcomers of another race due to the impact of a surface characteristic, which is race markers, serving as a cue to detect deep-level characteristics. However, the effect of attitudinal dissimilarities stemming from racial stereotypes or individual cultural comfort decrease as they have more time and interaction with another of different race (Byrne, 1971).

Overall, four types of similarity variables were re-classified in an attempt to bridge the conceptual gap between similarity variables, that in turn facilitate our understanding on the nature of the perceived deep similarity as the desired end state of mutual attraction in human interaction by which relational processes are operated with mutual trust, empathy, respect, and strong emotional connectedness. In an organizational level, cultivation of perceived deep level similarity among members could serve in creation of an inclusive workplace environment in which heterogeneity at surface level is effectively accepted by organizational members and negotiated in the group process as organizational members share a higher level of commonalities in terms of perceived deep level similarity such as values, beliefs, and attitudes.

Relational compatibility and the nature of compatible relationships
The cognitive processes of favoring tendency toward similar others are attributed to the underlying need for self-esteem in which individuals desire to be a part of an entity highly evaluated (Byrne; 1979, Turner, 1975). The proposed similarity typology is designed to cast this aspect of interactional process by which individuals who are perceived to be similar with their partners experience a high level of affinity, liking, and sympathy that in turn evoke a strong interpersonal tie and relational satisfaction. Drawing upon the similarity typology, the interactional partners could be seen as compatible in accordance with the level of perceived deep-level similarity. The compatibility, in this regard, can be conceptualized as the extent to which interactional partners are perceived to be similar in terms of deep-level characteristics in the interactional process of mutual identity confirmation.

The point is that each individual in a compatible relationship is involved in the process of depersonalization to some extent in which evaluation of the relational partner is less based on stereotypical or actual similarity but, based more on the perceived beliefs or shared values as a function of mutual identity developed overtime (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Another important facet of a compatible relationship is that the term “compatibility” should be understood as an ongoing developmental process which takes a significant amount of time and exertion of efforts between interactional partners (Kram, 1985). This emphasizes the mutually beneficial nature of a compatible relationship in which interactional partners not only enjoy a high level of self-congruency by engaging in the relationship, but also exert their efforts to address the needs of each other.
More specifically, individuals in a compatible relationship facilitate their efforts to obtain interpersonal satisfaction through mutual understanding and a close interpersonal rapport. By implication, the members in a compatible relationship share a deeply embedded sense of mutual identity stemming from the commonalities in attitude, values, and/or beliefs, and more importantly, the relational partners are actively and intentionally engaged in the maintenance of the relationship by accommodating needs of each other. Common examples of the compatible relationships are often observed in close relationships such as parental, romantic, and mentoring relationships, though not all close relationships enjoy a high level of compatibility (Ickes, 1985). From the conceptualization on the compatibility, it becomes clear to explicate the nature of compatible relationships.

In the book edited by Ickes (1985), he defined compatible relationships as “ones in which the members of a relationship “get along” with each other, whereas incompatible relationships are ones in which the members do not “get along” together (p. 1)”. The meaning of “get along” is inferred as the level of “compatibility” in the context of mutual interactions. He further clarified the meaning of compatible relationships by stating that the interactional partners are “congruous (fit together)”, “accordant (in harmony)”, or “agreeing (share common attitudes, goals, feelings etc.)” in many aspects of lives.

Literally, the nature of a compatible relationship encompasses the meaning of similar pairs with respect to the similar traits, but more importantly, the partners tolerate the dissimilarities to some extent by embracing the extent of differentials existed between
interactional partners. By implication, compatible relationships can be seen as end state of cognitive and affective chemistry by which dyadic interactional partners share a strong sense of connectivity toward each other in terms of emotion, bond, and/or feelings. Individuals involved in a compatible relationship enjoy a strong sense of mutual trust, rapport, and reciprocal intimacy toward each other as the compatibility has been cultivated over time through frequent interaction, which is conceptually fit into the “perceived deep-level similarity” in the similarity classification above.

The nature of compatible relationships has been conceptualized by explicating the role of similarity and social identity in human interaction. However, the concept of compatibility is still too complex due to the multifaceted nature of human interaction varied to a great extent on the basis of the needs that individuals desire to fulfill from the relationship (Ickes, 1985). Partners in a compatible relationship are essentially concerned with the mutual fulfillment of the partners’ needs as a basis for their compatibility. It is because of the nature of the compatible relationship that individuals are able to predict their partners’ needs in the process of mutual identity confirmation. In this regard, prediction of the needs is primarily dependent upon the purpose of the relationships and thus, the compatibility (or the level of perceived deep similarity) could be more readily clarified when the context of relationships are specified.

In the context of mentoring relationships, the nature and quality of interaction between mentors and protégés would vary subsequently based on the expectations that mentors and protégés bring to the relationship. This also implies that the quality of mentoring relationships would largely hinges on the “perceived” supports or benefits that
mentors or protégés recognize. The nature of compatible mentoring relationships in this regard would be examined in accordance with their perceived (or subjective) relational quality. Accordingly, the following section further discusses by identifying two sources of compatibility hypothesized to be significant in the development of workplace mentoring relationships.

The Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model

The compatible mentoring relationship model is proposed to delineate the nature of high-end quality mentoring relationships in the workplace within sport settings (see figure 2.2.). The current model was designed to improve Weaver and Chelladurai’s mentoring model by elaborating on the conceptual issues previously addressed above. The major thrust of the model is that the quality mentoring relationships hinges largely on relative degrees of interpersonal compatibility (i.e., perceived deep level similarity), while the types of compatibility would be also critical in deciding the magnitude of the mentoring quality. Additionally, the researcher proposes that a protégé with desirable traits (i.e., actual surface or deep level) would acquire better access to a rewarding mentoring relationship as the traits would attract potential mentors. In other words, the proposed model depicts the nature of quality mentoring relationships established in an informal context. Inclusion of compatibility, as an ongoing developmental property, is noteworthy given the suggestion that the extent mentoring studies have generally failed or ignored the relational aspects of the mentoring process such as trust, empathy, and emotional bond between mentoring partners (Eby et al., 2013). The omission of the relational process hinders scholars from understanding the unique characteristics of
quality mentoring relationships, which distinguish it from other workplace interactions such as supervisor-subordinate, leader-follower, sponsor-protégé and/or formal mentorships (Eby et al., 2013). There are four major features of a compatible mentoring relationship model.

First, the mentoring model emphasizes the informal nature of mentoring relationships in which mentors and protégés get along spontaneously (Kram, 1985). Mentoring relationships have been commonly classified as either formal or informal based on how the relationship is initiated. One of the distinct features of the informal mentoring relationship is that this type of mentoring is established based on the interpersonal attractiveness between two parties while formal mentorships are often assigned by the authority figure or the program. In other words, the model is designed to explore the nature of quality mentoring relationships by incorporating the concept of compatibility in the mentoring process. The compatibility in the current model is considered as an ongoing developmental process that requires a significant amount of time and efforts to be cultivated in accordance with the mentoring lifespan. This is a key to understand the quality mentoring relationships in which both mentoring partners are actively engaged in addressing the needs of each other. Sometimes members in a quality mentoring relationship are willing to sacrifice the needs of themselves in order to address the needs of their partner. This is because quality mentoring relationships help members fulfill one of the fundamental needs of human nature, belongingness (Eby et al., 2013). Many organizations implement formal mentoring programs in an attempt to reap the benefits of informal mentoring relationships while many of them are not as effective as
the informal mentoring relationships (Noe, 1988). One of the major reasons for the failure of formal mentoring programs is that the program did not consider the importance of a compatible matching between mentoring partners in the design of the programs (Hardy, 1994).

Second, the model is developed from the perspective of protégés as a primary beneficiary of the mentoring relationship. The mentoring relationships are initially geared toward facilitating goal attainments of protégés and thus, it is necessary to investigate the perceptions of protégés (Kram, 1985). Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis conducted by Eby et al. (2013) also found that the reports from mentor and protégé did not show a significant correlation, indicating that the mentoring experience is a distinct phenomenon for each party. Accordingly, the model identifies several characteristics (i.e., actual surface and deep level) of protégés in an attempt to identify the profile of the preferred protégés by mentors. This is because of the hierarchical nature of the organizational structure, usually, that there are relatively fewer mentors available for the protégés within an organization. In other words, it is the mentor who actually holds the decision whether the mentoring relationship is to be initiated or not.

Third, the model includes the initial filtering phase in order to delineate the exclusive nature of mentoring relationships against women and racial minorities. This stage emphasizes the role of a mentor as an informal agency of organizational socialization in terms of cultures, practices, or norms. Especially, early in the tenure with the organization, members shape an impression in terms of how to get things done through the interaction, observation, and experience with their superiors (i.e., potential
mentors). The institutionalized norm of a White male dominance within the domain of sport has long been utilized to marginalize the members with minority status (i.e., women and racial minorities). The next section further discussed the model with more detail.

Figure 2.2. A Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model

Potential Antecedents of Mentoring: Preferred Characteristics of Protégés

Demographics (Actual Surface variables)

Demographical variables have been regarded as one of the significant antecedents in the prediction of human interaction and mentoring is not different from this proposition. Typical findings with respect to the gender difference in mentoring are that female protégés tend to receive less career support, while they receive greater psychosocial support (Allen et al., 2008). In a similar vein, female mentors provide more
psychosocial support than career support (Eby et al., 2013). In terms of race, it has been widely supported that racial minorities within the White dominant domain report receiving less mentoring support than their White counterparts in general (Eby et al., 2013). While Eby et al. (2013) found that there is no significant surface level impact in their meta-analysis of mentoring studies, the current researcher decided to investigate the impact of surface level similarity considering that there are few studies on mentoring in the context of sport administrations.

**Organization Based Self-Esteem as a Desirable Trait for Mentoring (Actual Deep level)**

The concept of mentoring “compatibility” is an ongoing developmental process in which various cognitive and attitudinal variables come into play in the development of initial compatibility between mentors and protégés. In other words, the compatibility is not established in a vacuum and individuals form a set of expectations about their potential partners before they decide the relationship can be further developed (Byrne, 1997). As already discussed, actual deep-level characteristics refer to the individual unique traits that have been created and established for a long time and thus, these traits are stable over time and resistant against change. This raises the question in terms of what factors play a role in the cultivation of relational compatibility between mentors and protégés in the initiation of mentoring relationships. As an example, individuals would establish their own criterion in deciding which acquaintances will become friends and the individuals would have more choices if their attributes are socially desirable as being a good friend. Individuals possess a certain value set that are socially desirable in the initiation of certain relationships (Reis, 1985). If individuals acquire socially desirable
attributes, they are more likely to obtain access to rewarding social relations. Mentoring relationships are not different from this proposition, and it is expected that a protégé with certain attributes believed to be desirable for the quality mentorship would obtain better access to the rewarding mentoring relationships than others who do not.

While there are many deep level psychological traits in the formation of one’s self-concept, the current paper focuses on the impact of self-esteem as a significant antecedent in the cultivation of mentoring compatibility, that in turn lead to the quality mentoring relationships. Given that the focus of the study is to explore the workplace mentoring relationships, the current paper utilizes the construct of organization-based self-esteem rather than the global scale of self-esteem. Utility of the OBSE construct has been well addressed by Pierce and Gardner in which they stated the OBSE is one of the reliable and valid construct in the prediction of organizational behavior as the OBSE is a context specific trait of organizational members.

According to Pierce and Gardner (2004), the concept of organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) is defined as “the degree to which an individual believes him/herself to be capable, significant, and worthy as an organization member” (p. 594). This reflects the individuals’ perception on themselves in terms of competence, efficacy, and capacity within their employing organizations. In an organizational context, the formation of an individual’s OBSE is, in part, influenced by one’s interpretation of environmental factors such as reputations, comments, messages transmitted from significant others such as supervisors, peers, and subordinates (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). This implies that an individual with high OBSE perceive oneself to be liked, supported, and accepted by
others. Accordingly, an individual with high OBSE is more likely to be engaged in the mentoring relationships. Mullen (1998) investigated the effect of OBSE on organizational mentoring and found that OBSE has a significant positive impact on mentoring.

One of the critiques regarding the utility of the OBSE has been centered on the application of the concept to the newcomers as they have yet to build a sense of self-esteem within an organizational context. This indicates that OBSE is a state of mind that is unstable feelings about self-regard in the case of newcomers or early in tenure with the organization (Campbell, 1990). On the other hand, with increasing tenure, an individual employee’s sense of OBSE tends to be less changeable and thus becomes a highly stable self-concept. As the population of the current study is middle level administrators in athletic departments, it is expected that the level of OBSE among middle level administrators would be stable and consistent due to their high level of tenure status within the athletic department.

*Initial Filtering*

Instead of barriers, the researcher of the current study used the term “initial filtering” in depicting the role of mentors as a primary decision maker in the initiation of mentoring relationship. This reflects the hierarchical nature of the organizational structure that there are relatively fewer mentors available for the protégés (Higgins & Kram, 2001; Ibarra, 1993; Kram, 1983). In this stage, mentors would establish a set of expectations with respect to the desirable attributes of protégés. Given that informal interactions are less influenced by the organizational roles or policies, mentors have high level of discretion in the choice of protégés.
While the term “initial filtering” implies a negative connotation, it is used in order to stress the exclusive nature of mentoring relationships against women and racial minorities. The initiation of a mentoring relationship is likely to be influenced by the mentors’ subjective perceptions due to the informal nature of the relationship. For this reason, the choice of protégés tends to rely more on the interpretation of socially constructed images about protégés (e.g., gender stereotype, cultural comfort, etc.). This indicates that the selection of protégés could be influenced by simply observable characteristics of protégés (i.e., demographics). Regarding this, Ibarra (1993) stated that “interaction dynamics operate to heighten or exaggerate perceptions of social differences between majority and minority group members, thus diminishing the first basis for the formations of network relationships” (p. 70). Given the fact that the top level managerial positions, such as athletic directors in intercollegiate athletics, are almost exclusively filled by White males, Women and ethnic minorities working in the predominantly White male organization would have fewer mentoring opportunities (DeHass, 2007). This could be a partial reason for the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in mentoring relationships as they feel a great sense of isolation and disconnection (Hilliard, 1990; Ibarra, 1993; Thomas, 1990).

In terms of organizational practice as a source of constraint against women and racial minorities, Doherty and Chelladurai (1999) urged that the organizational culture dictates the effect of diversity in which the degrees of task interdependence and complexity serve as moderators. The basic premise of their framework is that the matter is how diversity is managed in accordance with organizational culture. More specifically,
they urged that diversity could be beneficial for organizations to generate creative resolutions through open communication and sincere interaction among members in situations where the organizational culture is diversity supportive (Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999). Members in this type of organization share deeply embedded values or common beliefs in which diverse workforces (i.e., great diversity at surface level) are allowed to express unique perspectives stemming from their own cultural backgrounds in the process of problem solving and decision making without any pressure or stress. Accordingly, greater diversity could be either a source of conflict or competitive advantage based on how organizations treat such diversity in terms of organizational culture. This organizational practice could have direct impact on the initiation of developmental relationships (i.e., mentoring relationships). More specifically, demographically similar work groups could be seen as “compatible” when the nature of tasks is independent and routinized while diversity would be beneficial for those organizations in which the complex tasks and cooperation among the members are essential in the process of decision making. In other words, high level of compatibility is always preferred; however, the contents of compatibility (i.e., similarity) would vary based on the nature of the organizational practices.

*Types of Compatibility in the Mentoring Relationships*

As emphasized in the previous section, the notion of compatibility should be clarified in accordance with the benefits or purpose of the relationship. Types of compatibility could be classified in accordance with the major criteria of mentoring functions, career and psychosocial support. A large number of mentoring studies have
substantiated the conceptual distinction between career and psychosocial support in empirical settings (Eby et al., 2013). The notion of mentoring compatibility, in this regard, can be classified into either career or psychosocial support. Given the concept of “compatibility” is relational in nature, the current paper utilized the classification proposed by Ibarra (1993). She stated that organizational relationships are distinguished by instrumental or expressive ties. The relationships centered on instrumental ties focus more on work role performance, which involves the exchange of job related resources and expertise. In contrast, expressive network relationships tend to be established at higher levels of closeness and trust than those relationships which are exclusively instrumental (Ibarra, 1993). The central tenet of this distinction is parallel with the primary mentoring functions, which are career and psychosocial functions. Thus, two types of compatibility can be identified; these are (1) instrumental and (2) expressive.

Instrumental compatibility

Instrumental compatibility refers to the degree to which mentoring partners are congruent in work related attitudes or career interest which facilitate the exchange of work related resources and information. Available career functions provided by mentors could vary on the basis of the mentors’ experience, knowledge, skills or organizational rank in work settings (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). At the same time, it is also assumed that the career needs that stem from protégés would vary based on their respective career goals. In this regard, instrumental compatibility between mentors and protégés plays as a mediator in the initiation and the cultivation of mentoring relationships. Weaver and
Chelladurai (1999) also stated that the common career interest or goals could be important considering the fact that organization is an achievement context.

In the choice of their protégés, mentors would examine the instrumental compatibility on the basis of the protégés’ relative skills, knowledge, and competence in accordance with the career functions that they could possibly provide (Kram, 1985). Allen, Poteet, and Russell (2000) also found that mentors make their judgment on the basis of the protégés’ relative ability or potential rather than the protégés’ aspiration or need. In addition, mentors would desire to prove their managerial capability by making positive career progress for their protégés so that the mentors could also be recognized as effective leaders by their superiors (Noe, 1988). Thus, mentors would not establish mentoring relationships if the protégés did not seem to be coachable or competent within the context of work related interactions (Kram, 1983; Noe, 1988).

From the protégés’ perspective, although they have little discretion in the selection process, instrumental compatibility with potential mentors is significant in establishing mentoring relationships since the primary purpose of the protégés’ entry to the organization is to move up the organizational ladder and to be recognized with career advancement in terms of extrinsic career success. Considering the complex nature of organizational relationships, it is not reflective of a viable mentoring relationship, if the mentor does not appropriately support the career-related functions of her or his protégé. In other words, insufficient developmental support provided by the mentors would lead to the suspension of the mentoring relationships and the protégés would seek alternative mentors who will appropriately provide developmental support. Accordingly,
mentorships will be established if both parties believe that the relationships would bring positive rewards (i.e., benefits) which overwhelm anticipated time or efforts (i.e., costs) to be expanded in the development of mentoring relationships (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1958).

Expressive compatibility

Expressive compatibility refers to the degree to which dyadic partners are compatible in emotional or affective aspects within the social context. The exchange of social support or friendship would be important for protégés’ psychosocial adjustment and growth within the organization. Psychosocial benefits drawn from the expressive compatibility would facilitate the formation of a professional identity for protégés. The concept of expressive compatibility would be assessed by the subjective perception in terms of deep level similarity traits. As discussed in the previous section, mentors would engage in mentorships based on the ability or potential of protégés. However, it is possible that mentors would evaluate the ability in a biased manner since individuals are attracted to others who are similar with them (Byrne, 1971; Higgins, 1993).

In the early phase of mentoring relationships, the degree of emotional attraction would be assessed on the basis of directly and/or intuitively detectable personal traits (i.e., surface similarities) such as gender and/or race/ethnicity. As many scholars indicate, demographical similarities would facilitate attraction and identification, and result in the formation of interaction networks with identical characteristics (Allen, 2003, 2004; Avery, Tonidandel, & Phillips, 2008). However, the impact of surface similarity becomes less significant through frequent interaction. Attitudinal similarity (i.e., deep level
similarity) would become salient in the assessment of expressive compatibility in the later stage of mentoring relationships as both parties obtain enough time to get to know each other (Bozionelos, 2006). In other words, the degree of expressive compatibility should be measured on the basis of attitudinal similarities between mentors and protégés in the later stage of the mentoring relationships (Avery et al., 2008). Although mentorships are established on the basis of high degree of surface similarity, the relationships would not be sustained if the mentorships turned out to be incompatible in terms of attitudinal traits (e.g., life values, attitudes or beliefs).

Once a mentoring relationship is established, both parties in the mentoring relationship cultivate their relationship as the mentoring phase moves to the cultivation phase (Kram, 1985). Transition could be made as a function of time and interaction as discussed previously. Mentors and protégés can build their relationships through the exchange of friendship and mutual trust. Accordingly, the concept of expressive compatibility should be understood as an ongoing developmental process in nature since it requires significant amount of time in building a sense of friendship and mutual trust through frequent interaction (Hardy, 1994). Unlike instrumental compatibility, expressive compatibility tends to be less influenced by the organizational structure or practice considering the fact that individuals are more flexible in the selection of their friends (Ibarra, 1993). This indicates that the once formal organizational relationships (e.g., supervisor-subordinate) would be transformed toward informal settings as a function of expressive compatibility. In other words, expressive compatibility offers meaningful
insight into understanding organizational underlying structure of which delineates how formal relationships could be transformed toward informal mentoring relationships.

The concept of expressive compatibility is essential in distinguishing mentoring relationships from other similar developmental relationships, which can be established regardless of expressive compatibility such as sponsor-protégé or supervisor-subordinate relationships. In other words, such relationships (i.e., sponsor-protégé or supervisor-subordinate relationships) with exclusively instrumental purposes should not be confused with mentoring relationships. In workplaces, the relationships can be maintained without cultivating expressive compatibility if members of the organizations establish their relationships on the basis of high degrees of instrumental compatibility as compared with the informal interactions such as friendships or romantic relationships. It is because of the fact that organizations are regarded as achievement contexts. Accordingly, supervisor-subordinate or coaching relationships could be established regardless of the expressive compatibility as a boss can assign members to work together. Regarding this, the difference between formal and informal relationships is further discussed to address the major shortcomings of the formal mentoring relationships practiced by many sport organizations in order to deal with diversity issues.

Outcomes of Mentoring Compatibility

One of the misunderstandings in the conceptualization of informal mentoring relationships is that the existing mentoring literature often treated the mentoring behavior (i.e., career support and psychosocial support) as an outcome variable (Kahn, 2007). Such fashion did not capture the affective reactions and experiences to the mentoring
relationships. The meta-analysis conducted by Eby and colleagues (2013) also support this proposition as they found that mentoring behaviors and perceived mentoring quality are distinct constructs. Furthermore, the patterns of associations with antecedent variables differ to some extent based on which factors are served as outcome variables (Eby et al., 2013). Thus, the current study includes the protégés’ perceived mentoring quality as an outcome variable of the mentoring behavior.

**Mentoring Behavior**

As already discussed, there are two major functions of workplace mentoring; career function and (2) psychosocial functions. These two distinct mentoring behaviors have been widely substantiated in empirical settings (Eby et al., 2013). More specifically, Noe (1988) employed exploratory factory analysis (EFA) to investigate underlying structure of the mentoring scales and found that the MFSs are valid in measuring two primary mentoring functions (i.e., career and psychosocial functions) as Kram identified. Pellegrini and Scandura (2005) conducted multiple group confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) to investigate the reliability and stability of the MFQs. Ragins and McFarlin (1990) also conducted a similar analytic procedure to establish construct validity.

**Mentoring quality**

Perceived relationship quality has been emphasized as an indicator of mentorship effectiveness in the mentoring process (Eby et al., 2013). According to Eby et al. (2013), perceived relationship quality is defined as “the protégé’s evaluative feelings toward the mentor or to the relationship as a whole” (p. 443). It evaluates the protégé’s overall attitudes toward the mentoring relationship including the extent of satisfaction with the
mentoring relationship, the mentor, and the overall relationship quality. Given that the purpose of the study was to examine mentoring experiences on behalf of protégés, inclusion of the perceived relationship quality from the protégés perspective seemed adequate. Additionally, the concept of relational mentoring in the context of work related interactions also emphasizes that the workplace mentoring phenomenon should be understood as high-quality interactions (Eby et al., 2013). However, as Ragins asserted (2010), the extant literature on mentoring has not fully touched such high-quality end of mentoring relationships. Omission of the investigation on high-quality mentorships could mask our understanding on the nature of effective/productive mentoring relationships in which developmental functions flourish for both parties. Substantial empirical evidence also support that the concept of the relationship quality is distinct from perceptions of mentoring support while only limited studies addressed this aspect (Eby et al., 2013).

Research Gap in Mentoring Studies

The purpose of the study is to investigate the nature of a quality mentoring relationship in conjunction with the concept of compatibility in the mentoring process within the domain of sport, intercollegiate athletics specifically. While mentoring research has flourished within two decades, there is a significant research gap in the operationalization of the nature or quality of mentoring relationships (Eby et al., 2013). It is because of that the existing mentoring studies place little emphasis on a relational property inherent in the initiation and cultivation of mentoring relationships (Eby et al., 2013).
One of the shortcomings from this fashion is that the extant research has failed to distinguish the unique nature of mentoring relationships with other types of workplace associations. More precisely, previous mentoring studies did not recognize the nature of informal mentoring as a close relationship. This is a partial reason why the impact of surface similarity has not been supported in mentoring studies because the impact of surface similarity tends to be attenuated or even eliminated in the context of close relationships as a function of mutual affinity and trust cultivated between interactional partners (Eby et al., 2013). Regarding this, mentoring scholars suggested that the investigation of deep level similarity would be beneficial for the investigation of quality mentoring relationships rather than focusing on surface similarity. The current study is designed to close the research gap addressed above by investigating workplace mentoring relationships among middle level managers in intercollegiate athletic departments.
Chapter 3: Method

This chapter discusses the methodological procedures used to assess workplace mentoring relationships among core level managers within the domain of Division I intercollegiate athletic departments by utilizing the conceptual model developed for the study. This chapter is organized into six sections: (a) overview of research methodology, (b) population characteristics and participant description, (c) validity, (d) instrumentation and reliability (e) study variables, and (f) data collection procedure and analysis strategy.

Overview of the Research Methodology

Type of Research to be Conducted

The current study featured quantitative research, which allows researchers to induce empirical reasoning to infer certain characteristics of the population from the data gathered (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). Specifically, the researcher employed a non-experimental (or descriptive) design by utilizing a survey to explore the psychometric proprieties of workplace mentoring among core level managers in intercollegiate athletic departments. The choice of survey design was associated with the purpose of the study and the methodological constraints imposed by the nature of the population of the study. More specifically, a non-experimental design is adequate in the situation where random assignment of participants is not allowed. Secondly, a non-experimental design is plausible when the manipulation in the predictor variables (i.e., independent or
endogenous variables) is impossible. Given that this study targets existing (mentoring) relationships in a field setting (i.e., intercollegiate athletic administrators), employing a non-experimental design was appropriate due to the following reasons, which were the implausibility of (1) manipulation of the treatment variables (e.g., the level of self-esteem) and (2) random assignment of the participants as the membership status of the participants were pre-determined. In terms of statistical procedures implemented for data analysis, the researcher employed Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) that “incorporated causal paths and collective strength of multiple variables” (p. 13, Creswell, 2013). More specifically, a proposed model was designed to test mediation effect in order to explore the role of “compatibility” in the mentoring process (Baron & Kenny, 1986). SEM allows researchers to investigate the nature of relationships among observed variables, which subsequently provide a statistical platform for a quantitative test of a theoretical model hypothesized by the researchers (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010).

Survey design

The survey was designed to garner information from core level managers in intercollegiate athletic departments with respect to their mentoring experiences. The survey is one of the most frequently utilized data collecting methods in the paradigm of quantitative research with several advantages such as the economy of the design and rapid turnaround in data collection (Creswell, 2013). In terms of the form of data collection, participants were asked to answer a series of self-administered questionnaires available through on-line. The survey for the current study was cross-sectional, with the data collected at one point in time via the internet. There are several advantages of a web-
based survey. First of all, a web survey reduces costs incurred from paper printing, postage, package mail-out process, and data entry. Secondly, the usual turnaround for the data collection is relatively rapid as compared to the traditional mail survey (Crewsell, 2013). Third, a web survey allows researchers to reach broad ranges of groups geographically dispersed from each other.

In spite of the aforementioned advantages on web surveys, there are several drawbacks which require careful attention in the process of data collection. Most of all, it should be noted that certain populations are less likely to have internet access. If a population of research interest does not have enough internet access, the study sacrifices representativeness of the data to some extent, which subsequently results in biased conclusions in terms of generalizability. Fortunately, the population in the current study (i.e., core level NCAA administrators) had their own workplace email accounts available from websites and a handbook (i.e., 2013-2014 National Directory of College Athletics) and thus, the concern for a coverage error was lessened.

Secondly, web surveys tend to have low response rates compared to traditional mail surveys (Couper, 2000). Regarding this concern, the researcher employed three contact strategy in order to encourage participation in the survey as recommended by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009). Basic principle of three contact strategy guided by Dillman et al. (2009) posits the idea that repeated and appropriate contact with respondents improve response rates. Following the suggestion by Dillman et al. (2009), target population of the current study (i.e., core level administrators) received three invitation emails in a three different time frame. The initial invitation letter included a
survey with a cover letter to inform the significance of the study. Follow-up letters to non-respondents were distributed after 4 weeks from the initial invitation email. The non-respondents from the first and second invitations were contacted 3 weeks after the previous invitation letter distributed. The invitation letters including survey with a cover letter were shown in Appendix B.

Lastly, final data were compared in terms of early and late respondents in controlling for non-response error. Early respondents were those respondents who participated and completed the survey when receiving the initial invitation letter while late respondents participated the survey with the second and third invitation emails. The online survey system automatically opted out the early respondents from receiving follow-up emails so that the list of respondents in the second email did not contain the contact information of the early respondents. In terms of the statistical techniques, $t$-tests and Chi-square statistics were employed to compare the means and/or categories of early to late respondents with respect to their major characteristics.

Population Characteristics and Participant Description

*Structure of the NCAA*

Intercollegiate athletic departments are classified at different levels, Division I (Division I-AA and I-A), Division II, and Division III, based on their respective affiliation status within the NCAA. Especially, Division I is further divided into Division I-A and Division I-AA based on the size of the football program. In 2006, Division I-A and Division I-AA were renamed as Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) respectively (NCAA, 2013). There are several factors
used for classification such as the number of required sports and the ability to provide financial aid for their student athletes. In short, the classification of each division is largely based upon the size of the athletic program, rather than the size of the university.

The institutions at the Division I level have to sponsor a minimum of 7 sports for both men and women student athletes (or 6 for men and 8 for women). They are also required to provide financial aid for the student athletes while there are maximum limits of the amount of financial aid that the institutions cannot exceed (NCAA, 2013). Athletic departments complying with the minimum requirements are eligible to compete at the Division I level. In a similar manner, but to a lesser degree, institutions at Division II must provide 5 sports for both men and women student athletes (or 4 for men and 6 for women). While athletic departments at this level are allowed to provide financial aid to recruit student athletes, there is no explicit requirement about the amount of athletic-related financial aid as it is in Division I. Division III institutions also provide at least 10 sports as a minimum requirement, however, there is no requirement in terms of athletic-related financial aid (NCAA, 2013). This means that the student athletes at Division III receive no athletic-related financial aid.

Due to their high level of visibility on the national scene, Division I institutions are geared more toward spectator-oriented in their operation of the athletic programs than other Divisions as it is also explicitly stated in their mission statements (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001; Eitzen & Yetman, 1972). In contrast, lower Divisions focus more on the overall quality of the educational experience for the student athletes in congruent with the overall organizational objective as educational institutions. For this reason, athletic
departments at Division I level tend to be managed as an independent organizational unit within the institution while lower Divisions integrate athletic departments as a part of the whole (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001). This also leads to the structural variation in the operation of each Division, in which Division I institutions are structured with diversified and specialized organizational units while an organizational structure of lower Divisions are specialized to a lesser degree.

*Characteristics of the Core Administrators*

The core administrative positions (associate and assistant athletic director positions) are regarded as the “pipeline” to the top managerial positions because those people in the core administrative positions work very closely with their respective athletic directors. The demographic make-up of these positions are very similar across Divisions where Whites occupied over 85% of core administrative positions excluding Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) (Lapchick, Agusta Kinkopf & McPhee, 2012). Within this category, women held 27.9 %, 38.4 %, and 37.1 % of the assistant athletic directors in Division I, II, and III respectively. Acosta and Carpenter (2012) also provided a great deal of statistics associated with gender status in intercollegiate athletic administrations. According to their annual report, females holding athletic director positions are 20.3% as compared to their male counterparts (79.7%). Such gender imbalance at the managerial level seems severe in Division I as compared to lower Divisions. One of the interesting findings is that 9.2% of athletic departments appeared to have no female staff in administrative positions.
In terms of ethnicity, African Americans held less than 10% of all administrative positions in the NCAA excluding HBCU. Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans were found to be the least representative racial groups of these positions by occupying less than 2%. According to the annual report by Lapchick and colleagues (2012), the total percentage of people of color at the administrative positions is 17.7% (Lapchick et al., 2012). Whites are occupying associate athletic director positions by 87.5%, 89.4% and 95.3% of the total population at Division I, II, and III respectively.

Professional administrative positions (or first line managers) encompass a broad range of specialized jobs including academic advisor/counselor, compliance coordinator/officer, sports information director and assistant directors, and so forth. Jobs in this category are also regarded as a good starting point to the leadership positions within universities or athletic departments (Lapchick et al., 2012). Similar trends are found that Whites occupy these positions almost 90% across all Divisions (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick et al., 2012). In terms of gender, women are relatively well represented (approximately 50%) in the positions of academic advisor/counselor, life skills coordinator and business manager. However, as Sagas and Cunningham (2004) indicated, the opportunity for upward mobility in these positions (e.g., academic advisors) is limited in its scope as compared to the other professional positions such as marketing directors or sports information directors, that are predominantly occupied by males. The annual report by Lapchick and colleagues (2012) confirmed this fact by showing that White men represent 84.1%, 86.7%, 86.3% in the sports information director positions in the Division I, II and III respectively. These reports clearly show the
current status of women and people of color in the NCAA in that they are significantly less represented as compared with their White male counterparts.

Description of the Participants

The study participants were those who were in potentially top-level administrative positions (i.e., core level managers) as addressed above. According to Acosta and Carpenter (2012), there are 4,203 administrative positions including both administrators and professional jobs. The current study delimited the participants working for Division I institutions to those holding core-level administrative positions such as associate athletic directors, assistant athletic directors, or senior associate athletic directors. This delimitation was because of the structural differences inherent in the operation of each division level in which Division I is oriented more toward spectator-oriented than its lower division counterparts.

A list of participants was available via the NCAA’s official website (NCAA.org) including names, affiliations, positions, and contact information (e.g., email addresses). Additionally, the researcher used the 2013-2014 National Directory of College Athletics to obtain the names of administrators at each institution. As of total, there were 5,188 core-level administrators found in college athletic departments without regard to the Division status. There were several reasons for the exclusion of top-level managers (i.e., athletic directors) in the study.

First of all, the majority of the extant research on intercollegiate athletic administrators has focused more on top level athletic administrators, while relatively limited attention has been given to the organizational behavior of core level
administrators (Parks, Russell, Wood, Robertson, & Shewokis, 1995; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). Given that these core level managers would be potential candidates for top-level management positions, an examination of emotional and cognitive patterns of work related interactions with their respective supervisors (i.e., mentors) could provide us with meaningful insight into understanding the current status of developmental relationships in general, mentoring relationships in particular within the domain of intercollegiate athletic departments.

Secondly, it was critical to collect data from women and racial minorities within sport administrations with respect to cognitive and behavioral patterns in the context of workplace interactions. Since athletic directors were almost exclusively occupied by White males, the choice of core level managers was plausible in accordance with the purpose of the study. The information garnered from this population allowed us to understand how women and racial minorities initiate developmental relationships with their respective supervisors who are dissimilar in terms of demographic characteristics.

Finally, the informal nature of mentoring relationships was considered. According to the definition of informal workplace mentoring by Kram (1983), a mentor is a senior member within the organization who is willing to transfer one’s skills and knowledge by offering both career and psychosocial support in order to expedite career advancement and psychosocial growth of their respective protégés in need. Individuals in lower hierarchical positions (i.e., core level managers) would attempt to establish a close relationship (e.g., mentoring) with their direct supervisors in an attempt to facilitate career success. That is, one of the distinct features of the traditional mentoring
relationship is that the effectiveness of the mentoring relationships would be significantly associated with the degrees of interpersonal closeness or affinity between mentoring partners (Kram, 1983). The focus of study was to reveal the emotional and cognitive aspects of workplace interactions via the lens of mentoring framework from the perspective of protégés. In this regard, the selection of core level managers was plausible as employees in this hierarchical level were likely to be engaged in informal mentoring relationships with their respective or direct supervisors (Young, 1990).

In recent years a great deal of attention has been paid to the multidimensional aspects of developmental relationships in which individuals strive for establishing a developmental network in order to better fulfill career needs by engaging in several mentoring relationships. The discussion was inspired by Higgins and Kram (2001) in which establishment of multiple developmental relationships or networks could be more beneficial for individuals than having one primary mentor (i.e., traditional mentor) in the pursuit of career success. While the argument on the developmental networks is plausible given the turbulent organizational circumstances, it ignores the nature of “mentoring” relationships which takes a significant amount of time and effort to be fully cultivated (Ibarra, 1993; Kram, 1983). In this regard, the nature of mentoring relationships could be better understood in the context of close relationships in which relational partners share deeply embedded sense of mutual identity and interpersonal trust. Again, this does not deny the benefits of having multiple mentors, but the point of the current argument is that having multiple mentors seems not viable in reality due to the constraints such as time and effort for the relationships to be fully cultivated.
Sampling Method

A sample is defined as consisting of a subset of a population (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). In the process of sampling, the most critical and challenging task is to ensure the representativeness of the sample collected from the population so that the results driven from the sample could be more readily generalized. Sampling methods can be classified into two broad types based on the purpose of the study and the nature of the population: These are (1) probability sampling and (2) non-probability sampling. Probability sampling is a sampling technique in which every individual or case in the population has an equal chance of being selected into the sample (Thomas & Nelson, 2001). Accordingly, researchers could ensure the representativeness of the sample through the probability sampling method. In contrast, non-probability sampling is preferred in an empirical situation where the access to the entire population is not viable in terms of economy such as cost and time constraints. One of the major concerns in the use of non-probability sampling is that certain groups or members in the population would have a greater chance of being sampled, and thus, representativeness of the sample could not be guaranteed (Thomas & Nelson, 2001).

The current study employed a census sampling method, as one of the probability sampling techniques, to draw a representative sample congruent with the major characteristics of the population (i.e., core-level managers in Division I institutions). The population of the current study was delimited to Division I core level managers in accordance with the purpose of the study. The major concern associated with the use of a census method is the accessibility to the target population since it takes a significant
amount of time and effort to reach to large numbers of individuals in the target population. The target population of the current study, however, was relatively easy to be reached as the full contact information was available at the commercial website and the researchers was able to contact every member in the target population via email.

Correspondingly, there were 3,020 athletic administrators in the college athletic departments according to the National Directory of College Athletics 2013-2014 in which all contact information (e.g., email address) of core-level administrators (i.e., athletic director, associate directors, assistant athletic directors and senior athletic directors) were available.

The researcher also employed a series of statistical techniques to justify the representativeness of the sample, which is referred as a post hoc justification in an attempt to confirm that the sample resembles the major characteristics of population (Thomas, Nelson, & Silverman, 2005). As an example, descriptive statistics (e.g., average age, salary, the portion of respective demographic categories) of the sample was compared with the population parameters available from the annual reports by several scholars (e.g., Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick et al., 2012). Gathering a feasible amount of participants is also a critical and challenging task in the process of data collection. In this regard, the researcher utilized several strategies in an attempt to overcome low response rates expected as a major shortcoming of web surveys. Further discussion on this issue is addressed in the following section (See Data Collecting Procedure).

Sample size
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A sample size was determined based on (1) the magnitude of sampling error, (2) the population characteristics, and (3) the population size (Thomas & Nelson, 2001). As conventional wisdom, the amount of sampling error decreases as the sample size increases because the mean from one random sample would not be significantly different from another random sample (Thomas & Nelson, 2001). In a similar vein, smaller sample would be needed as the size of the population decreases. While it is always desirable to generate the largest sample possible, constraints such as access to the population or limited resources (e.g., lack of time and money) make obtaining large sample difficult. Regarding this concern, power analysis is employed to identify the optimal sample size for the study.

Power analysis was rendered to identify the optimal sample size to correctly test the measurement model specified for the current study. Statistical power, by definition, refers to the probability of not making Type II error. More specifically, a Type II error occurs when a researcher fail to reject a false null hypothesis. In contrast, a Type I error refers to the test result that reject a true null hypothesis (Thomas & Nelson, 2001). Cohen (1988) guided researchers by proposing a default power set of .8 at a set of .05 alpha level as treatment of a Type I error would be more important than controlling for a Type II error. As the relationship between Type I and II errors are at odds, it really depends on the purpose of the study and the nature of the population. For the current study, the researcher adopted a default setting suggested by Cohen (1988) to identify the optimal sample size. Additionally, MacCallum, Browne, and Sugawara (1996) further guided researchers for determining the proper sample size necessary to achieve adequate power when using SEM for testing the research hypotheses. MacCallum et al. (1996) adopted the suggestion of
Cohen (1988) and provided a set of minimum numbers of respondents to test a model fit in conjunction with the degrees of freedom. In consequence, approximately 300 participants are necessary to obtain 80% of power at .05 alpha level according to the suggestions by Cohen (1988) and MacCallum et al. (1996).

Validity

*Internal and External Validity*

It is critical for researchers to control a source of threats against both internal and external validity while the relationship between internal and external validity are at odds in quantitative research designs (Thomas & Nelson, 2001). In other words, imposing empirical specifics (e.g., treatment conditions) to control internal validity would decrease the generalizability of the results in terms of external validity. This indicates that there is a trade-off between internal validity and external validity. For the current study, ensuring external and ecological validity is more important than controlling for internal validity because the purpose of the study is to explore the nature of existing mentoring relationships in a real world setting.

In terms of internal validity, it is an indicator of the extent to which cause-and-effect relationships are established as a function of manipulation in the treatment variables (Thomas & Nelson, 2001). Ensuring internal validity is a particular concern in experimental design in which cause-and-effect relationships are tested by manipulating the level or magnitude of independent variables. In this regard, researchers need to control potential extraneous variables affecting outcome variables so that the changes in outcome variables are purely attributed to the changes in the level or magnitude of
independent variables manipulated by the researchers. A source of threats to internal validity is effectively controlled with (1) random selection, (2) random assignment, and (3) reliable instruments (Thomas & Nelson, 2001).

The current study employed census sampling and the concern about the internal invalidity was lessened, though the participants of the study were not randomly assigned to the groups due to the preexisting membership status of the population. Additionally, analytic procedures were implemented without manipulating independent variables. The conclusions of the current study were inferred on the basis of correlations/covariances among variables, and thus the results allowed for lesser degrees of internal validity. This indicates that the results should not be interpreted in terms of a causal relationship. Instead, the researcher gained more confidence in terms of external validity about the results. Reliability of the instruments was further discussed in the instrumentation section.

External validity is a particular concern for the study attempting to generalize the results drawn from the study (Thomas & Nelson, 2001). In quasi-experimental and non-experimental group designs, ensuring ecological and external validity would be critical for the researchers while still attempting to control sources of invalidity threatening internal validity as much as possible. The current study was designed to investigate existing relationships (i.e., mentorships) in real world settings (i.e., college athletic administrators). Thus, enhancing external validity was more important than internal validity in the research design focused on explaining real world phenomena by generalizing the results.
Thomas et al., (2005) provided overall guidelines to increase external validity by stating that “external validity is generally controlled by selecting the participants, treatments, experimental situation, and tests to represent some larger population” (p. 329). The current study employed a random sampling method to increase the representativeness of the data. Additionally, descriptive statistics such as the demographic make-up of the participants were compared with the population characteristics available from several sources such as annual reports by Lapchick et al. (2013), Acosta and Carpenter (2013), and the NCAA.

Instrumentation and Scale development (Reliability)

*Mentoring Provision*

The study featured a survey design exploring the psychometric properties of the participants with mentoring experiences from the perspective of protégés in the intercollegiate athletic departments. In terms of mentoring functions, Ragins and McFalin (1990) developed the Mentor Role Instrument (MRI), which measures two primary mentoring functions (i.e., career, and psychosocial support) as subscales of the instrument corresponding to the latent variables of mentoring functions conceptualized by Kram (1983). The internal consistency of MRI appeared to be reliable as the reliability coefficients ranged from .66 to .94 (Ragins & McFalin, 1990). In the context of sport, Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) utilized MRI scale and modified it to be applicable in sport settings. They also reported the Cronbach’s alpha scores ranged from .77 to .92 for male participants and .67 to .83 for female participants. These scores indicate that the instrument is internally consistent and thus, should be used in the current study.
Mentoring Compatibility Scale

The researcher of the current study modified the Mentoring Compatibility Scales (MCS) by incorporating a variety of deep level similarity variables addressed in the previous section. More specifically, there were two subsets consisting of the MCSs. First, instrumental compatibility intended to measure the degree to which mentors and protégés perceive to be compatible in terms of work related values, attitudes, and/or perspectives. The instrumental compatibility scales were developed by incorporating and modifying varying ranges of deep-level similarity scales developed by several scholars as it is associated with work perceptions (e.g., Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002). For instance, experiential similarity is conceptually categorized as a facilitator of instrumental compatibility since it measures career related traits of each other. As it turned out, the researcher modified the scales to be applicable in the context of work-related interactions (i.e., mentoring relationship). Example items assessing the instrumental compatibility were stated as “My mentor and I analyzed problems in a similar way” and “My mentor and I have similar values about work”. Additionally, two items in assessing the instrumental compatibility were created as the existing items did not fully capture the instrumental nature of the compatibility type. These were “My mentor possess skills and knowledge that I wish to acquire” and “My mentor possess such professional identity that I wish to acquire”.

The expressive compatibility scales intended to measure perceived affective, emotional, and cognitive (i.e., deep-level) similarities from the perspective of protégés such as the general beliefs, life values, and/or attitudes. Key feature of the expressive
compatibility involve the exchange of friendship and social support, which lead to the high level of interpersonal closeness and trust as compared to the instrumental compatibility. Expressive compatibility encompassed varying ranges of perceived deep-level similarities, which subsequently facilitate mutual attraction/identification of each other. As an example, two items from Turban and Jones (1988) stated that, “My mentor and I see things in much the same way” and “My mentor was similar in terms of our outlook, perspective, and values” and two items from Ensher, Grand-Vallone, and Marelich (2002) stated that “My mentor and I have similar values about life in general” and “My mentor and I are more similar than dissimilar in important ways”.

All items were assessed on the basis of a seven point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”. That is, high mean scores on each items indicated high level of perceived similarity with the mentor. Prior to testing the internal reliability of each subset of items, the researcher of the current study invited two panels of experts in the mentoring study to confirm the content and face validity of the scales. After the feedback from the experts was incorporated, internal reliability of each subset items were explored with several statistical techniques.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General information on mentoring</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring status</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring duration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring types</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous mentoring experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protégé’s Information</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Part VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in athletic department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at current department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational position</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor’s Information</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Part VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with a protégé</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protégé’s OBSE</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Part II – OBSE items #1-#10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Compatibility</td>
<td>Endogenous (Mediator)</td>
<td>Part IV- Relational Compatibility items #1-#10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Support</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Part III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Career support items #1-#15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychosocial support items #16-#27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Part V – Mentoring quality items #1-#10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Part VI – Job satisfaction single item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. 1. List of Independent Variables

**Independent Variables (Exogenous variables)**

An exogenous variable is defined as a predictor variable influencing the direction and magnitude of changes to its respective outcome variables. In other words, an exogenous variable is an independent variable, which is not influenced by any other variables.
variables in the testing model. Use the term of exogenous, rather than independent, is adequate since the study utilized a path analysis in which several variables are related in a chained fashion (See Figure 3.1). In other words, as compared to the typical regression model, there were endogenous (often termed as mediators) variables that are bi-directionally related to its respective antecedent and outcome variables.

![Compatibly Mentoring Relationship Model](image)

Figure 3. 1. A Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model

**Protégé Characteristics: Demographics (Actual Surface level)**

Actual-surface level characteristics served as a set of independent variables for the current study. Constitutively, actual-surface characteristics refer to the overt biological features or the explicit social/organizational status of individuals that tend to
be persistent and stable and thus, the information on this category can be intuitively detected and quickly obtained (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turban & Jones, 1988). The extant research on diversity management within the domain of sport, including mentoring, has generally utilized surface level characteristics in order to reveal cognitive and attitudinal differences among organizational members with respect to the varying ranges of organizational outcomes such as turnover intention, career advancement, and overall satisfaction (e.g., Fink et al., 2001; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990). These studies have found consistent results that people, who are different from White colleagues, tend to experience negative work related outcomes. In accordance with these findings, the current study investigated the mentoring experiences among members within intercollegiate athletic administrations based on surface level characteristics. It should be noted that surface characteristics encompass various individual characteristics beyond demographics such as tenure status, hierarchical positions, years in the department, the level of education, and so forth.

Protégé Characteristics: OBSE (Actual Deep Level)

The current study included Organization-Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) as an indicator of actual deep level characteristics of protégés, which served as an antecedent for the perceived deep level similarities between protégés and mentors, which ultimately influenced on the magnitude of the mentoring provision. According to Pierce and Gardber (2004), the OBSE refers to “the degree to which an individual believes him/herself to be capable, significant, and worthy as an organization member (p. 54)”. The selection of the OBSE construct was associated with the unique nature of
workplace interactions that occurs in the achievement context. Accordingly, members who are perceived to be competent would obtain better access to the rewarding work interactions in a given cohort, and the mentoring relationships are not different from this proposition (Ibarra, 1993). Noe (1984) also found that women employees are regarded as incompetent as compared to their White cohort counterparts due to the negative stereotyping within the male dominated occupations. As the construction of OBSE is significantly influenced by the perceptions or reputations from significant others (e.g., supervisors, coworkers), it is expected that women and/or racial minorities would be lower in their OBSE than their counterparts.

Endogenous Variables (intervening variables)

Endogenous variables play a role as both independent, predicting corresponding variables, (i.e., dependent variables) and dependent variables, predicted from independent variables. This is a key feature of path analysis model in which theoretical variables are related in a chained fashion. The mentoring model in the current study was framed by utilizing the mediation model in which “compatibility” plays a role as a mediator in the mentoring process.

Compatibility (Perceived deep-level)

Compatibility (i.e., perceived deep-level similarities) served as endogenous variables considering their bidirectional association with antecedent and outcome variables. The current study defined workplace mentoring compatibility as the extent to which protégés are perceived to be congruous, accordant, or agreeing in many aspects of work related (i.e., instrumental) or non-work related (i.e., expressive) attitudes, values,
and beliefs with their respective mentors. The deep level similarity with mentors predict mentoring outcomes such as the extent of mentoring provision and the quality of mentoring relationships, at the same time, antecedent variables such as protégés’ demography or the OBSE predict magnitude of the perceived deep level similarity (i.e., compatibility) between mentoring partners. The researcher developed items assessing the level of compatibility in accordance with the conceptual framework. Further discussion on the items assessing the compatibility is presented in the instrumentation section.

Furthermore, dimensionality of the “compatibility” was also tested in order to explore whether the concept of relational compatibility is a unidimensional or multidimensional construct. The current study argues that the types of compatibility can be classified as either instrumental or expressive based on the needs of protégés desired to be fulfilled by the mentoring relationships whereas extent studies have treated the compatibility (commonly known as the similarity) as unidimensional.

**Dependent Variables**

*Mentoring Provision*

Mentoring provision is operationally defined as the magnitude of the career and/or psychosocial functions provided by the mentors (Kram, 1983). There are three commonly used mentoring scales with respect to the provision of mentoring support in organizational mentoring studies; these are (1) the Mentor Role Instrument developed by Ragins and McFarlin (1990), (2) the Mentoring Function Scales (MFS) developed by Noe (1988), and (3) the Mentoring Function Questionnaire (MFQ-9) developed by Pellegrini and Scandura (2005). Each mentoring scale measures primary mentoring
functions in a conceptually similar manner as these scales were theoretically drawn from the Kram’s initial conceptualization of the mentoring function. These scales have been found to be valid instruments by their own properties. More specifically, Noe (1988) employed exploratory factory analysis (EFA) to investigate underlying structure of the mentoring scales and found that the MFSs are valid in measuring two primary mentoring functions (i.e., career and psychosocial functions). Pellegrini and Scandura (2005) conducted multiple group confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) to investigate the reliability and stability of the MFQs.

Ragins and McFarlin (1990) also conducted a similar analytic procedure to establish the construct validity. Given that these three scales intend to measure the same latent variables (i.e., instrumental and psychosocial functions) as subsets of the mentoring function, it is necessary to explore the extent to which each instrument measures the latent variable (i.e., mentoring functions) in a conceptually appropriate manner. The current study primarily utilized the Mentor Role Instrument (MRI) developed by Ragins and McFarlin (1990) since the instrument was used in the sport context by Weaver and Chelladurai (2002). The current study explored the construct validity of measurement properties in the context of intercollegiate athletic departments.

Mentoring Quality

Perceived relationship quality has been emphasized as an indicator of mentorship effectiveness in the mentoring process though extant mentoring literature has generally ignored the relational aspect of the quality mentoring practice (Eby et al., 2013). According to Eby et al. (2013), perceived relationship quality is defined as “the protégé’s
evaluative feelings toward the mentor or to the relationship as a whole” (p. 443). It evaluates the protégé’s overall attitudes toward the mentoring relationships including the extent of satisfaction with the mentoring relationship, the mentor, and the overall relationship quality. Given that the purpose of the study is to examine the mentoring experiences on behalf of the protégés, inclusion of the perceived relationship quality from the protégés perspective is adequate. Additionally, Eby et al. (2013) proposed the concept of relational mentoring to emphasize the emotional and affective aspects of workplace mentoring relationships as one of the distinct features of workplace interactions (Eby et al., 2013). However, as Ragins asserted (2010), the extant literature on mentoring has not fully touched such high-quality mentoring relationships. The omission of investigations on high-quality mentorships could mask our understanding of the nature of informal mentoring relationships as the most effective and productive developmental relationships compared to the other workplace interactions. Eby et al. (2013) also substantiated that the concept of the relationship quality is distinct from perceptions of mentoring support while only few studies addressed this aspect.

Data collection procedures

A list of participants, containing name and email addresses, was compiled and entered into the survey system available from the institution that the researcher was involved in. Prior to the data collection, the researcher obtained approval for the study through The Ohio State University’s Institutional Review Board in order to ensure the protection of human subjects. The participants were contacted via email and invited to participate in the study. Specifically, the participants were pre-notified by email prior to
the distribution of the final survey. If a participant did not respond to the pre-notification email, a follow-up email was sent in an attempt to encourage participation to the survey (Dillman et al., 2009). Data were stored on the researcher’s individual computer.

Data Analysis Procedures

There were two statistic procedures used for data analysis, which were (1) descriptive statistics, and (2) inferential statistics. For the statistical level of significance, an alpha value of .05 was set as it is commonly accepted in the behavioral science (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005).

Descriptive Statistics

As a preliminary step to proceed inferential analysis, descriptive analysis was delivered in order to tabulate, summarize, and depict a nature of collected data in an abbreviated fashion. Descriptive statistics would facilitate our understanding on the major characteristics of the collected data in an organized fashion by producing several figures, tables, and graphs corresponding to the key features of the data. Descriptive information about the data was investigated by utilizing SPSS 20.0. Additionally, reliability was also calculated for diagnosis of the measurement criteria to ensure internal consistency of the subscales used for the study. Alpha coefficients above .70 are generally considered as an acceptable value for internal consistency in the field of social science (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012).

Inferential Statistics

Inferential statistics are analytic techniques which allow researchers to infer the properties of a population of interest from the data (i.e., sample) by employing inductive
reasoning (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012). First of all, Pearson product correlation coefficients were used to examine the degree of association between variables. Kline (2005) advised researchers that correlations above .85 should be avoided due to the lack of discriminant validity unless there are strong theoretical supports justifying such high correlations between variables.

Secondly, the study employed the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) technique to examine the degree to which a measurement model is applicable in explaining a series of structural models of the study. Schumacker and Lomax (2010) introduced a logical sequence in terms of the basic building blocks of SEM analyses, which follows five steps: (1) model specification, (2) model identification, (3) model estimation (4) model testing, and (5) model modification. Following suggestions by Schumacker and Lomax (2010), a single confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted in order to investigate the extent to which the measurement items (i.e., observed variables) were feasible in defining smaller sets of corresponding constructs (i.e., latent variables).

One of the distinct features of the latent variable models (i.e., CFA) is that the latent variables are measured with the observed variables as a set of manifest variables explain its respective construct. This indicates that the measurement properties of the latent variables are not directly observed, but rather indirectly obtained by their respective manifest variables (i.e., observed variables). Accordingly, the CFA method involves latent factor models in which concerns associated with measurement errors in the model using only observed variables is effectively controlled (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010). While reliability and validity issues in observed variables could be addressed by
testing internal reliability statistics (Cronbach alpha) or relying on the previous studies to some extent, measurement errors cannot be handled with these analytic procedures. The impact of measurement error could cause serious consequences such as biased parameter estimates and inflated significant level (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010). This is a key feature of the latent variable analysis in which measurement errors in the observed variables are controlled when measuring the latent variables, and thus researchers could obtain reliable and valid theoretical models (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010). Given that there is no global scales in measuring mentoring constructs, employment of a CFA was beneficial for addressing reliability and validity concerns associated with the existing scales. As a last step, the measurement model was tested by establishing paths connecting the constructs in accordance with the study hypotheses, which subsequently led to the conclusions in terms of whether the mentoring model was plausible in explaining the population parameters.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of the chapter is to present the major findings of the current study. The chapter is divided into five sections including (1) Initial Screening and Data Cleaning, (2) Demographics, (3) Research Question 1, (4) Research Question 2, and (5) Research Question 3.

Initial Screening and Data Cleaning

Procedure

Questionnaires were distributed by using a web-based survey program (i.e., Qualtrics). An invitation e-mail with the URL of the survey link was sent out to the target population ($n = 3,020$). After the initial invitation e-mail was distributed, a number of e-mails bounced back, which indicated some e-mail addresses in the database were not deliverable or no longer usable. This left a final sample of 2,979. A total of 305 (10.24\%) responses out of 2,979 were returned. Among the 305 cases, unengaged responses (i.e., answered all questions with identical values), unreasonable outliers, and cases with more than 50\% of missing values were discarded from the analysis. More specifically, unengaged responses were detected by computing the standard deviation of each case in comparison to the cut-off value of .05. Outliers which had scores that clearly deviated
from the expected ranges of score were removed. As it turned out, 251 useable cases (8.4 %) were identified for the data analysis.

Non response bias

There were no known-risks for respondents as it relates to the contents of the scales used for the study. Additionally, the survey included an “opt-out” option in order to eliminate the active-non respondents from the population of interest. Thus, the patterns of non-respondents in the study could be seen as passive in nature, indicating that the respondents were willing to participate in the study. From an empirical standpoint, the potential nonresponse bias of the current data set was examined by utilizing several statistical methods such as independent t test and chi-square test statistics (Jordan, Walker, Kent, & Inoue, 2011). Specifically, we compared early and late respondents on their responses to the two most valid constructs (i.e., OBSE and Job Satisfaction). Results of t tests on both OBSE (t(252) = -1.16; p = .45) and Job Satisfaction (t(252)= .80; p = .78) demonstrated no statistically significant differences between early and late respondents.

Additionally, the sample was compared with the population parameters in terms of gender and race composition as the population characteristics were available from the annual report by Lapchick and colleagues (2013). A chi-square goodness-of-fit test was conducted to determine if the sample proportions of athletic administrators at Division I institutions in terms of gender and race were in the same proportions in the reports by Lapchick and colleagues (2013). In the case of race/ethnicity, African American, Asian American, Latino and Native Americans were merged into a racial minority category in
comparison to their White counterparts in order to meet the assumption of an expected frequency of at least 5 per cell. The null hypothesis of proportions to be tested for gender and race/ethnicity is .3 and .15 respectively. This indicates that there are 30% women and 15% athletic administrators of color (Lapchick et al., 2013). The test statistics for gender was non-significant ($\chi^2 = .21$, $df = 1$, $p = .64$) while the test statistic statistics for people of color was significant ($\chi^2 = 1.98$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). Thus, the sample did not significantly differ from the population in terms of gender while there were more people of color in the current sample ($n = 70$, 27.9%) as compared with the population characteristic in terms of race/ethnicity. Following the suggestion by Miller and Smith (1983), the sample characteristics resemble the population characteristics in terms of gender as the non-significant result of chi-square test statistics provided a rationale that the sample did not significantly differ from the population in terms of gender composition. However, the racial composition of the sample was not similar to the racial composition of the population. In sum, the sample resembled the major characteristics of the study population according to the test statistics from early to late respondents and chi-square except for the race/ethnicity composition.

Demographics

Of the 251 cases used in the analysis, 70.1% ($n = 176$) were comprised of male while females comprised 29.1% ($n = 73$). The average age of the sample was 44 years ($SD = 7.74$) and the majority age group of the sample ranged between 28 and 49 years (73.4%, $n = 192$). It should be noted that the current study used a mix of race and ethnicity in the demographic section. Regarding this concern, the current study followed
the suggestion by Hodge and colleagues (2007) in that the non-specific terms such as White, Black, and Hispanic should be used as indicators of race. This means that the athletic administrators in the African American category are referred as “Black” hereafter in the report. The largest racial group consisted of White (70.9 %, $n = 178$) followed by Black (25.5 %, $n = 64$), Hispanic (1.6 %, $n = 4$), and Asian American (0.8 %, $n = 2$). In terms of education level, the majority of the respondents held a Master’s degree (64.5 %, $n = 162$) followed by a Bachelor’s (14.3 %, $n = 36$) and a Doctoral degree (10.4 %, $n = 26$). On average, athletic administrators in the current sample had approximately 17 years of administrative experience in intercollegiate athletics, and the mean of the years with the current department was 12 years. The majority of the respondents (67.3 %, $n = 156$) indicated their current position as either Assistant Athletic Director (31.5 %, $n = 79$) or Associate Athletic Director (35.5 %, $n = 89$), followed by Senior Athletic Director (17.5 %, $n = 44$), and Senior Women Administrator (2.8 %, $n = 7$). A summary of the descriptive statistics is reported in Table 4.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – 39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Athletic Director</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Athletic Director</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Associate Athletic Director</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Women Administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Athletic Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of Rec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Descriptive Characteristics of Athletic Administrators

Research Question 1

The first research question was to explore the differences between mentored and non-mentored athletic administrators with respect to their individual characteristics. The
research question drew from the idea that employees possessing socially desirable characteristics may gain more opportunities to be involved in mentoring than those who do not. In order to answer Research Question 1, the current study examined the impact of demographic variables (i.e., age, race/ethnicity, gender, educational level, and organizational rank) on organizational mentoring experiences.

*Mentored vs. Non-mentored respondents*

The survey included a screening question in order to focus exclusively on the respondents with mentoring experience. At the beginning of the survey, the respondents were asked if they currently had a mentor (i.e., Question 1) or if they had a mentor in the past (i.e., Question 2). If participants answered yes on Question 1, then Question 2 was skipped and led them to the remaining questions. Those respondents who answered no on the first question were asked to answer Question 2. When participants said no on both Question 1 and 2, the remaining mentoring questions were not displayed except for the demographic information session. This way, it was expected that the participants answering the remaining questions had been involved in workplace mentoring relationships during their tenure in the athletic departments.

145 participants (58 %) had been involved in a workplace mentoring relationship while the remaining participants (n = 106, 41 %) had no mentoring experience during their tenure in the athletic department. With regard to gender, 35.9 % of the male respondents (n = 90) and 21.8 % of the female respondents (n = 55) answered that they have had mentors (See Table 4.2). In terms of race, 39 % of White respondents (n = 96) have or had been mentored while 18.8 % of Black respondents (n = 47) have been
involved in workplace mentoring (See Table 4.3). A cross tabulation of gender and race categories with respect to their mentoring experience is shown in Table 4.4. On average, White males \((n = 56, 22.5\%)\) were more likely to be mentored followed by White females \((n = 40, 16\%)\), Black males \((n = 32, 12\%)\), and Black females \((n = 14, 5.6\%)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have a Mentor</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have a Mentor</td>
<td>59 (23.5%)</td>
<td>46 (18.3%)</td>
<td>105 (41.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a Mentor</td>
<td>31 (12.4%)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
<td>40 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mentored</td>
<td>86 (34.2%)</td>
<td>18 (7.1%)</td>
<td>104 (41.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176 (70.1%)</td>
<td>73 (28.9%)</td>
<td>251(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Gender X Mentor Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Mentor</td>
<td>71 (29%)</td>
<td>32 (12.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had Mentor</td>
<td>25 (10%)</td>
<td>15 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mentored</td>
<td>82 (33%)</td>
<td>17 (6.4%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. Race X Mentor Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>Non-mentored</td>
<td>Mentored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56 (22.5%)</td>
<td>70 (28.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77 (33.2%)</td>
<td>68 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Cross Tabulation of Gender by Race on Mentoring Experience
Logistic regression was used to investigate the impact of age, gender, race, educational level, and the organizational rank on mentoring experiences (mentored vs. non-mentored). Variables of interest were transformed for conducting logistic regression analysis. In generating the dependent dummy variable (i.e., mentoring experience), those participants with mentoring experience were coded with 1 so that the value of 0 indicated non-mentored serving as a reference category. In a similar manner, male respondents were coded with 1 as female respondents, coded with 0, served as a reference group. All racial groups, except for White, were coded with 0 in representing the respondents of color group in comparison with their White group counterpart; it was because there were very little cases in other racial categories. The measurements of educational level and the organizational position were ordinal scales in which relative position of each scale was rank-ordered according to the relative size of each category.

A non-statistical significant result of the Hosmer-Lemeshow test ($\chi^2 = 10.22, \text{df} = 8, p = .25$) provided evidence of a good model fit in distinguishing mentored versus non-mentored participants on the basis of five predictors above, while a small effect size (Nagelkerke $R^2 = .18$) raised some concerns about the plausibility of the model. These results suggest that the model is marginally supported in predicting the mentorship status among the participants. Of the five predictors in the model, age (Wald = 3.71, $df = 1, p = .05$), gender (Wald = 13.04, $df = 1, p < .001$), race (Wald = 4.22, $df = 1, p = .04$), and educational level (Wald = 7.38, $df = 1, p = .007$) were statistically significant predictors of mentorship status.
For each unit increase in years of age, the odds of being mentored declined by 0.96. The odds ratio of Male athletic administrators having mentoring experience was .3 times the odds of their female counterparts having mentoring experience. The odds ratio of White athletic administrators who were mentored is .5 times the odds of mentored administrators of color counterparts. In other words, Whites were .5 times more likely to be mentored than their administrators of color counterparts. For each unit increase in education, the odds of being mentored were increased by 2 times in odds. Organizational position was not a statistically significant predictor, which implies that the odds for being mentored were similar regardless of organizational position. The non-significant effect of organizational position does make sense as the current study focuses on the specific group of athletic administrators in the core level administrative position. Table 4.5 summarizes the results for the model including the regression coefficients, Wald statistics, odds ratios, and 95% CIs for the odds ratios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Odds</th>
<th>95% C.I. for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.927 - 1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male)</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.156 - 0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.263 - 0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.21 - 3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.95 - 1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Logistic Regression Results on Mentoring Status
Overall, the logistic regression model accurately predicted 70.5% of the mentoring status in the study, with mentored participants slightly more likely to be classified correctly (77% for mentored and 62.2% for non-mentored athletic administrators). To account for chance agreement in classification, the Kappa coefficient was computed and found to be .40, a medium value, and thus, the logistic model on mentoring status was moderately supported. Results suggest that organizationally marginalized groups (i.e., women and administrators of color) and/or athletic administrators with a lower level of education, in older age are more likely to have been involved in the workplace mentoring relationship than their respective counterparts.

Mentored Individuals

Participants with mentoring experience \( (n = 145, 58 \%) \) were further explored with respect to their mentoring relationship. On average, the mentored participants were (a) 44 years of age, (b) in their current position for 11 years, (c) experienced for a total of 17 years as athletic administrators, and (d) educated with 13.3 % holding an undergraduate degree \( (n = 17) \), 73.4 % holding a master’s degree \( (n = 94) \), and 11.2 % \( (n = 14) \) holding a doctoral degree. There were 52 (35.9 %) participants indicating their current position as an associate athletic director followed by a senior associate athletic director \( (n = 43, 33.6 \%) \), an assistant athletic director \( (n = 30, 23.4 \%) \), and a senior women administrator \( (n = 3, 2.3 \%) \). Athletic administrators answered that they meet with their mentors for 7 hours on average per week while 24.5 % \( (n = 35) \) indicated that they do not meet their mentors on a regular basis, and the workplace mentoring relationship lasts for 10 years on average.
In terms of mentors’ demographics, 71.7% of the mentors \((n = 76)\) were White males followed by White females \((n = 17, 16\%)\), Black males \((n = 9, 8.5\%)\) and one Hispanic male \((1\%)\). A summary of mentors’ demographics is presented in Table 4.6. Additionally, a cross tabulation of mentors’ demographics as compared with protégés’ characteristics are summarized in Table 4.7.

Table 4.6. A Mentor Gender X Race Cross Tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76 (72.3 %)</td>
<td>17 (16.2 %)</td>
<td>93 (88.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9 (8.5 %)</td>
<td>3 (3 %)</td>
<td>12 (11.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 (1 %)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85 (81.8 %)</td>
<td>20 (19.2 %)</td>
<td>105 (100 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. Cross Tabulation of Mentors’ vs. Protégés’ Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protégé</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

The second research question investigated the psychometric properties of the study constructs in terms of testing their empirical plausibility. In order to answer the second research question, the exploratory analysis was rendered to test both construct validity and reliability before testing the structural model.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was carried out using SAS 9.4 in order to investigate the psychometric properties of the study variables before proceeding to the SEM analysis. In handling the missing values, the Expectation Maximization (EM) was implemented as an imputation method since the test of missing patterns showed no systematic missing patterns; the missing patterns were examined by performing the Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) test, and the test result was non-significant ($\chi^2=920.2, df = 894, p = .264$), indicating that the missing patterns were completely at random (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010).

Additionally, the normality assumption was assessed by calculating the skewness and kurtosis of the observed variables. Schumacker and Lomax (2010) suggested the acceptable ranges of +2.0 and -2.0 in the skewness and kurtosis. An examination of the normality test showed that the most items fell within the accepted range of +2.0 and -2.0 while several items in the OBSE exhibited moderate departure from the normality. Rei and Lomax (2005) conducted a simulation study to investigate the impact of non-normality and found that the SEM with Maximum likelihood estimation is relatively
robust to the moderate departure from the normality, and thus we decided to proceed with the analysis without transforming those items.

There were two purposes of Exploratory Factor Analysis. First of all, the structural model of the current study incorporated several variables that have not been introduced in the mentoring study in sport management such as MCS, MRI, and MQ. Although the reliability and validity of the scales such as MRI and MQ have been explored in the domain of organizational science, the dimensionality of the given set of items has not been explored systematically in the field of sport management. Furthermore, the current study generated a battery of items in measuring the extent of relationship compatibility (i.e., instrumental and expressive compatibility) between a mentor and a protégé by modifying relational similarity scales (i.e., Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Turban & Jones, 1988). This raises concerns about the plausibility of the underlying factor structure as there is no substantial empirical evidence with respect to the dimensionality among the variables. In this regard, EFA is a useful analytical tool as all indicators in EFA freely load on all possible factors, and the rotated solution provides the most plausible factor structures in accounting for the pattern of relationships between factors and indicators by maximizing the magnitude of target factors and minimizing the magnitude of cross-loadings (Brown, 2014). While CFA could also provide empirical evidence in deciding the acceptability of the factor structure by controlling for measurement errors like EFA, CFA imposes empirical constraints by fixing all cross-loadings to zero in the factor structure, which do not allow researchers to examine the magnitude of the cross-loadings; this could mislead
researchers in deciding the fundamental underlying structures among the given variables of interest (Cudeck, 2000).

Secondly, EFA is effective in determining the optimal number of latent factors in accounting for the correlations among the variables without making specifications in regard to the patterns of association between indicators and underlying dimensions. This allows researchers to test the magnitude of common method bias and the dimensionality among the items simultaneously. As Cudeck (2000) stated the goal of EFA is “to summarize complicated patterns of correlations between variables into a simpler explanatory framework” (p. 294). This implies that the EFA helps to reduce the number of variables based on the factor structure and loadings. Given that the study included many parameters to be estimated in comparison to the sample size, it is desirable to reduce a number of variables that are intercorrelated to a great extent. Thus, it is necessary to examine the extent to which the selected battery of the measures on each latent factor is successfully loaded onto their respective factors specified a priori.

In terms of cut-off criterion, factor loading scores lower than .30 or the loadings that were cross-loaded to a great extent were deleted from the analysis (Cudeck, 2000). As a result, 5 out of 10 items from OBSE, 7 out of 28 items from MRI, and 4 out of 10 items from MCS were eliminated. It should be noted that most of the MQ items were cross loaded onto either MRI or Global Measure of Job Satisfaction to a great extent, and thus we decided to discard the entire MQ items from the model. This led to the modification of the testing model in which Job Satisfaction was used as an ultimate dependent variable while MRI served as an endogenous variable connecting the path
between MCS and Job Satisfaction. Theoretical justification of the model modification is addressed in the discussion section.

Upon the removal of the cross loaded items and the items with a cut-off value less than .30, EFA was re-conducted. Estimates and fit measures with direct quartimin rotation among the indicators are presented in Table 4.8. As shown in Table 4.8, it is important to note that the common factor model was not supported by the data set, indicating concern that the common method bias was lessened (Brown, 2014). In other words, the items used to measure each target construct was empirically plausible.

As it turned out, 11 factors were found to be the most plausible structure in explaining the psychometric properties of the given data set as the measured items were loaded onto their respective target constructs while one of the items (i.e., instrumental compatibility) from the MCS (Mentoring Compatibility Scales) were cross-loaded onto both instrumental and expressive compatibility. As both instrumental and expressive compatibility were compounded by their overarching construct of relational compatibility (i.e., MCS), the factor structure was still conceptually plausible and empirically valid.

Thus, confirmatory analysis could be followed by the EFA. The entire EFA results including mean and standard deviation among the variables are attached in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>$\chi^2_m$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>$Pr(\chi^2 &gt; \chi^2_m)$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2989</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
### Table 4.8. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>$\chi^2_m$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>$\text{Pr}(\chi^2 &gt; \chi^2_m)$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 8. Fit measures for Workplace Mentoring Variables. m: number of factors

**Measurement Model**

CFA was rendered to measure the magnitude of strength in explaining the target latent construct in association with their respective manifest variables. Maximum likelihood (ML) estimation was chosen because initial examination of the data did not show the evidence of excessive non-normality. One of the distinct features of CFA in comparison to EFA is that the researcher is able to dictate the number of factors and the pattern of factor loadings between indicators and factors in advance (Brown, 2014; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010). Accordingly, the factor structure obtained from the result in EFA was used to confirm the factor structure in terms of empirical and theoretical reasoning.

As for the cut-off criterion of the model fit measures, the current study used the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), comparative fit index (CFI), goodness of fit (GFI) and chi-square test of exact fit and the chi square adjusted for degrees of freedom ($\chi^2/df$). For CFA and GFI, values higher than .90 reflect a good model fit. For RMSEA, values less than .06 indicate a good model fit, values less than .08 reflect an acceptable fit, and values more than .10
indicates a poor fit. For SRMR, values less than .10 are generally considered as a good fit of the model. Recently, researchers insist that a more liberal criterion of RMSEA should be considered as there is no single universal measure of the model fit. Lastly, a non-significant result of the chi-square test or and adjusted chi-square values less than 3.0 are considered as a good model fit.

The measurement model incorporating 11 factors extracted from the EFA were examined using LISREL 9.1. More specifically, an 11 factor model was posited whereby the manifest variables were conjectured to load on their respective latent dimensions; the underlying constructs were Organizational Based Self-esteem (5 items), Career Mentoring function consisting of Sponsorship (3 items), Exposure (3 items), Protection (3 items), and Challenging (3 items), Psychosocial Mentoring function including Role modeling (2 items), Acceptance (3 items), and Counseling (3 items), Relational Compatibility incorporating Instrumental Compatibility (3 items) and Expressive Compatibility (3 items) and a Global measure of Job-Satisfaction measured with a single item; in handling the identification issue underlies in CFA, one of the factor loadings in each scale was fixed to 1.0. In a similar manner, the variance of the job-satisfaction was fixed to 1.0 as the scale is measured with a single item.

As a result, the measurement model with 11 factors were marginally supported as there was an inconsistency among the fit measure criteria ($\chi^2 = 1657; p < .001, df = 452; \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 3.67; CFI = .94; SRMR = .09; GFI = .66; RMSEA = .11$). More specifically, the SRMR and CFI indicated that the model was acceptable at an absolute level while the RMSEA revealed a lack of parsimony (Brown, 2014). A significant result of the chi-
square test of exact fit also indicated that the model did not fit very well and the adjusted chi-square also exceeded the cut-off value of 3.0.

However, as several statisticians explicitly stated (e.g., Barrett, 2007), there is no single universal measure of fit in SEM analysis except for the chi-square test and thus, it is not a prudent approach to judge acceptability of the model solely by the fit indices (Brown, 2014; Cudeck, 2000; Kenny, 2014). The current study would be one of the cases in this regard. The fit indices of the current study marginally supported the measurement model. On the other hand, the residual correlations were uniformly small suggesting that the model performed fairly well in explaining the population covariance matrix (See Appendix D). The merit of the measurement model was also supported by the parameter estimates in which magnitude of the factor loadings for all the scales ranged from .80 to .97, indicating that the observed measures of items successfully loaded onto their respective underlying dimensions (See Appendix E). Furthermore, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (α = .83 – .95), and AVE values (.67 – .90) provided a good evidence of both internal consistency of the variables and construct validity of the proposed factor structure (See Table 4.9.). In addition, convergent validity was also established as all AVE values exceed .50. Through the examination of the correlation matrix among extracted factors, none of the factor correlations were above .85, providing an evidence of discriminant validity. Drawing a conclusion based on parameter estimates, the factor model performed well in explaining correlations among the items (See Table 4.9.).

This contradictory result carried the debate. In the current study, there was no hesitation in determining the acceptability of the measurement model on the basis of the
residuals and parameter estimates, while it seemed necessary to modify the measurement model to improve the overall model fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance (Psychosocial)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging (Career)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect (Career)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Compatibility</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role modeling (Psychosocial)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure (Career)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling (Psychosocial)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor (Career)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive compatibility</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 9. Inter-Factor Correlations

Measurement Model Modification

Goodness-of-Fit measures rely largely on the number of parameters to be estimated and the sample size. In this regard, a poor estimate of model fit could be attributed to the use of a small sample relative to the number of parameters to be estimated. This is because many indicators could decrease the common variance as a function of either the impact of cross-loadings or un-modeled secondary factors (Bagozzi & Edwards, 1998). Given that the measurement model of the current study used 32 items, the required sample size in SEM should have been over 170 by following the 5 to 1 ratio of sample size to observed variables suggested by Bentler and Chow (1987). As it turned
out, the model fit of the measurement model could be enhanced by reducing the number of parameters to be estimated since increasing the sample size was not a viable option. Furthermore, it did not seem to be appropriate to reduce the paths in the structural model as such modification could lead to the distortion of hypothesized associations posited in the specification of the structural model. As noted previously, SEM is a theory based analytic procedure in which the specification of the model should be grounded upon the substantive empirical and theoretical rationales (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010).

Alternatively, Bagozzi and Edwards (1998) suggested to modify the measurement model by collapsing the items into a fewer sets of composite variables referred as item parcels. In the social sciences, it is not uncommon to have multiple manifest variables in accounting to the latent construct of interest as the construct tends to be broadly defined (Hall, Snell & Foust, 1999). One of the biggest challenges in the use of multiple factors, in this regard, is associated with the number of subjects that should be significantly larger than the number of variables to obtain a good estimate of model fit. The use of item parceling has gained popularity among scholars in social and behavioral sciences as an effective way in handling the small sample size with complex model without sacrificing the complexity of the structural model. There are three major advantages in the use of item parcels in SEM (Bagozzi & Edwards, 1998). First of all, as discussed previously, an item parceling strategy keeps the measurement model to a reasonable size by reducing the number of parameters to be estimated. Secondly, researchers do not need to change the hypothesized associations among the variables as it only modifies the measurement model (Marsh, Antil, & Cunningham, 1989). Lastly, item parceling could effectively
handle the violation of normality as the distributions of item parcels are more likely to be normally distributed than the distributions of individual items.

However, item parcels should be carefully formed as there are potential problems lies in the use of item parcels in SEM. A serious problem occurs when the parceled items are not unidimensional in relation to their underlying construct (Gerbing & Anderson, 1988). In a similar vein, small sample sizes should not be the sole motivation for the use of item parcels as reducing the number of indicators could lead to the underrepresentation of the target construct (Hall, Snell, & Foust, 1999). Researchers need to pay close attention in the creation of item parcels as different procedures can yield different parameter estimates which, in turn, lead researchers to draw wrong conclusions about the structural relationship among the variables (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2012). Marsh, Hau, Ball, and Grayson (1988) found that four or more indicators per factor were necessary with sample sizes larger than 100 in their simulation study. That is, the most important issue to be taken into account in the use of item parcels is the representativeness of the construct (Bagozzi & Edwards, 1998).

This indicates that the creation of item parcels should be grounded upon both substantive empirical and theoretical rationales. In the field of sport management, item parceling is increasingly used while most of the studies did not specify the procedures used to form item parcels (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2012). Thus, those researchers interested in the use of item parcels are encouraged to compare the model fit between the initial model used entire items as indicators and the model used parcels.
Item Parceling

The current study followed item parceling procedures suggested by Rocha and Chelladurai (2012) as their study was conducted in the field of sport management using real data. In their study, Rocha and Chelladurai (2012) examined the impacts of different parceling procedures on fit indices and parameter estimates in the context of sport administration. Specifically, they compared three different levels of aggregation; (1) total disaggregation model, (2) partial disaggregation model, and (3) total aggregation model. The total disaggregation model used entire items as indicators for the target factor while total aggregation model form composite scores using average of all items in a certain scale for representing a construct. In the case of partial disaggregation model, items were assigned into a fewer parcels, and there were several ways in assigning the items to a smaller sets of parcels. Accordingly, partial disaggregation model was found to be the most plausible approach in creating a set of parcels (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2012).

Among the various approaches in forming item parcels, the current study utilized the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) method. The EFA method is useful as this approach allows researchers to determine the number of parcel and items per parcels on the basis of empirical properties (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2012). Additionally, the EFA method also provides a theoretical justification of the item parcels to some extent as researchers could examine the patterns of relationship between the measured items and the factor (Cudeck, 2000). Item parcels were created by using the average of items in each parcel.

In the total disaggregation model reported above, the internal consistency of all items in each of eleven factors were high as ranging from .83 to .96, and the AVE values
for all scales exceed a cut off value of .05 indicating good convergent validity for all
factors while goodness-of-fit indices showed that the model is not acceptable (See Table
4.9.). In dealing with unidimensionality issue, single factor model was tested for a set of
items in each scale.

**Unidimensionality**

One factor model was tested on a set of items in each scale in dealing with the
unidimensionality of the scales. In the case of OBSE, results emerged in the EFA showed
that the factor loadings ranged from .86 to .94, factor determinacy was .95 and the first
two eigenvalues were 16.40 and -0.05. In the Career Mentoring scales, factor loadings
ranged from .66 to .94, factor determinacy was .96 and the first two eigenvalues were
29.30 and 1.99. In the Psychosocial Mentoring scales, factor loadings ranged from .58 to
.95, factor determinacy was .96, and the first two eigenvalues were 28.88 and 1.34. In the
Mentoring Compatibility scales, factor loadings ranged from .70 to .89, factor
determinacy was .93 and the first two eigenvalues were 14.03 and 0.55. These results
support the unidimensionality of each scale, and thus item parceling could be formed
based on the results from the EFA.

A set of item parcels were formed on the basis of the EFA results. Specifically, a
single parcel was created in OBSE as the factor structure and the pattern of factor
loadings in relation to their indicator items were both empirically and theoretically
justified. In the case of the MRI scales, parcels were created based on the hierarchical
relationship between mentoring functions (i.e., career or psychosocial functions). In the
case of Career mentoring function, four parcels representing each career function were
formed: (1) Sponsor, (2) Exposure, (3) Protect, and (4) Challenging and three parcels were created for Psychosocial mentoring function: (1) Counseling, (2) Role modeling, and (3) Acceptance. In a similar manner, MC scales were classified into two sub parcels representing (1) Expressive Compatibility, and (2) Instrumental Compatibility respectively.

**Measurement Model with Item Parceling and Model Comparison**

The measurement model emerged from the item parcels fitted the data significantly better than the total disaggregation model as all criteria in the fit indices showed that the model performs very well, except for the RMSEA; however, the RMSEA value also fell down to the acceptable range (See Table 4.10.). The results showed that the item parceling produced a better fitting model when the parcels were formed by substantive empirical and theoretical ground.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disaggregation</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Disaggregation (EFA)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10. Goodness-of-fit indices for the measurement model

**Second order factor model**

A hierarchical relationship posited in the conceptualization of mentoring behavior was examined with a second order factor model. More specifically, each mentoring function was classified into either career or psychosocial functions whereby career functions were composed of sponsor, exposure, protect, and challenging while psychosocial functions consisted of role modeling, acceptance and counseling. The
results revealed that the second-order factor model was marginally supported by the data ($\chi^2 = 100.14 \ p < .001, \ df = 39; \ \chi^2/df = 2.56;\ CFI = .97; \ SRMR = .17; \ GFI = .89; \ RMSEA = .10$). We decided to keep the second order model to test the structural model for theoretical plausibility.

Research Question 3

The third research question was to test the extent to which plausibility of the CMR model was supported by the data gathered. Again, the CMR model posited the idea that a protégé with socially desirable characteristics would receive high level of mentoring support, while the quality of mentoring is mediated by the level of relational compatibility between mentoring partners. In order to test the model, the current study fitted the structural model using LISREL 9.1 based on the associations among the study constructs in the CMR model.

Structural Model

We fitted a second order factor model in testing the acceptability of the hypothesized structural relationships imposed in the specification of the model. The structural model was well supported by the fit indices ($\chi^2 = 85.73 \ p < .001, \ df = 40; \ \chi^2/df = 2.14; \ CFI = .97; \ SRMR = .05; \ GFI = .91; \ RMSEA = .09$). The result showed that all the multiple equations in the model were significant ($p < .001$). More specifically, a level of OBSE had a significant positive impact on both relational compatibility and the magnitude of mentoring behavior. OBSE and Compatibility collectively explained a significant amount of variance in explaining the MRI (87 %), which in turn explained variance of Job Satisfaction by 45 %. In other words, those athletic administrators high in
their organizational based self-esteem tended to enjoy high quality mentoring, which ultimately influenced their overall job satisfaction. The structural model is displayed in Figure 4.1. We examined the model fit indices and the standard residuals in order to investigate the impact of mis-specified relationships.

Figure 4.1. The Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model

Model Modification

According to the suggestions from model modification indices, residuals of Challenging, Protection and Acceptance mentoring functions were allowed to be correlated. The rationale behind the modification drew from the conceptual associations
among the variables by which these variables are hierarchically nested onto their higher order factor, mentoring. We chose to make this modification as the modification on these variables did not lead to the change in the structural model. After letting error variance between Challenging, Protection, and Acceptance free, the structural model was re-examined. The fit indices suggested that the model fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 66.06, p = 0.03, df = 38; \chi^2/df = 1.74; CFI = .98; SRMR = .05; GFI = .93; RMSEA = .07$). All path coefficients were significant and functioned as expected directions (See Figure 4.2.).

Figure 4.2. The Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model (Modified)
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of the study was to explore the nature of informal workplace mentoring among athletic administrators in NCAA Division I institutions. As a theoretical framework, the study proposed the Compatible Mentoring Relationship (CMR) model, which posits the idea that the quality of mentoring hinges largely on the extent to which mentoring partners are compatible inside and outside of the workplace. The current study tested the plausibility of the CMR model in an empirical setting using SEM. This chapter discusses the major findings of the study and is divided into six sections: (a) Mentored vs. Non-mentored athletic administrators (Research Question 1) (b) The Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model: Construct validity and Reliability of Instruments (Research Question 2), and (c) The Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model: The Nature of Informal Mentoring (Research Question 3), (d) Implications, (e) Limitations, and (f) Suggestions for Future Study.

Mentored vs. Non-mentored Athletic Administrators: Research Question 1

One of the important research questions to be answered was to explore the differences between mentored and non-mentored athletic administrators with respect to their individual characteristics. The research question drew from the idea that employees who possess socially desirable characteristics may gain more opportunities to be involved in mentoring than those who do not.
The descriptive statistics showed that 145 (58 %) athletic administrators had mentoring experiences during their tenure in the athletic department. In terms of demographics, White males \((n = 56, 39 \%)\) were found to be the largest group having mentoring experiences followed by White females \((n = 40, 27 \%)\), Black males \((n = 32, 22 \%)\), and Black females \((n = 14, 10 \%)\). The mentoring rate among athletic administrators in terms of demographics is consistent with previous findings that traditionally underrepresented groups are disadvantaged from a lack of mentoring relationships in the workplace (Noe, 1988; Thomas; 1990).

In the context of sport organizations, a lack of mentoring has been often cited as one of the obstacles prohibiting women and racial minorities to obtain leadership positions (Bower, 2008; Bower & Hums, 2007; Knopper, 1992; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; Young, 1990). The result of the current study also confirmed the fact that the lack of access to the mainstream network, such as mentoring, as organizational barriers prohibiting women and racial minorities to obtain leadership positions. Several scholars reiterated this assentation and pointed out the importance of organizational mentoring for resolving the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities (e.g., Bower & Hums, 2007; Weaver & Chelladura, 2002; Young, 1990).

Logistic regression was followed to scrutinize the profile of mentored administrators as compared with non-mentored administrators in terms of demographics. The result from logistic regression showed a seemingly contradictory result, in that traditionally underrepresented athletic administrator groups (i.e., women and racial minorities) were more likely to be involved in workplace mentoring relationships in
comparison to their White male counterparts. Additionally, those athletic administrators who were older and/or lower in their education level were more likely to have mentoring experiences than their counterparts. The result is intriguing given that the proportion of White males in core level position is significantly higher ($n = 126, 50.1\%$) than either women administrators or administrators of color regardless of mentoring experiences. In order to explore this seemingly contradictory result, we need a different framework in understanding the pattern of workplace mentoring process among the athletic administrators.

The result from logistic regression may imply that White males are relatively less likely to rely on the workplace mentoring in pursuit of their career progress, while workplace mentoring seems critical for organizationally marginalized groups as a means to facilitate career success within athletic departments. This finding leads to the inference that White males would have more options in succeeding their career without being involved in mentoring since the development of quality mentoring requires a significant amount of time and effort (Kram, 1985). In support of this inference, Young (1990) highlighted that White males would make use of the opportunity network established in favor of advancing their career such as “Good old boys” network and the majority of women in the intercollegiate athletics (84\%) perceived the existence of such an exclusive opportunity structure in the profession. Acosta and Carpenter (2012) reiterated this assertion by attributing the failure of Good old girls’ network to the underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in leadership positions. This leads to the conclusion that organizational mentoring seems critical for traditionally underrepresented groups due to
the scarce networking opportunity within athletic departments. Additionally, Young (1990) conducted a study to explore the nature of opportunity network through the lens of mentoring in intercollegiate athletics and found that women were found to be actively involved in mentoring relationships. A decade later, Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) confirmed this fact by showing that no significant difference of mentoring rate in terms of gender. In sum, women and racial minority groups rely more on informal mentoring than their White male counterparts due to the limited networking opportunity.

A Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model: Construct Validity and Reliability

Research Question 2

The second research question investigated the psychometric properties of the study constructs used in the CMR model. In order to answer the second research question, the exploratory analysis was rendered to validate theoretical constructs prior to testing the structural model. The following section discusses each theoretical construct in the CMR model in terms of its empirical and theoretical plausibility: these are (1) Organization Based Self-Esteem, (2) Relational Compatibility, (3) Mentoring Role Instrument, and (4) Job Satisfaction.

Organization Based Self-Esteem

Given the fact that mentoring is established on behalf of protégés in need, oftentimes, the decision about the initiation of mentoring is made by mentors (Allen et al., 2008; Ragins & Kram, 2008). Mentors would be reluctant to initiate the mentoring relationship as there are not tangible benefits from the relationship and, sometimes, the ineffective mentoring relationship could possibly hurt their reputation within organization
since the concept of “mentoring” itself is considered as one of the skills required to be an effective leader. According to Raings (2010), mentors should be highly motivated for the mentoring relationship to be initiated regardless of the protégés’ desire. This implies that the protégés with socially/organizationally desirable characteristics would be more likely to be selected by their potential mentors (Allen et al., 2004).

In an organizational setting, mentors would like to serve protégés when mentors believe that they are capable of helping protégés and/or the protégés are competent in the given context of tasks. This means that mentors would be inclined to serve protégés when the protégés seem to be coachable. Thus, the level of self-esteem could be one of the desirable characteristics for protégés to be selected by potential mentors (Noe, 1988). According to the definition by Pierce and Gardner (2004), OBSE refers to “the degree to which an individual believes him/herself to be capable, significant, and worthy as an organizational member” (p. 593). The current study utilized OBSE as a desirable characteristic of protégés in mentoring. The result from EFA indicated that 5 out of 10 items were found to be the most reliable set of items in measuring the OBSE in the data, and the CFA provided evidence in support of internal consistency reliability, discriminant, and convergent validity.

In the White male dominant organization, women and/or racial minorities have been stigmatized to be incompetent, which subsequently deprive them of networking opportunities with their White male supervisors. By implication, women and racial minorities who are high in their OBSE could overcome such perceptual barriers. The current study showed evidence in support of this assertion as mentored administrators
were all high in their OBSE ($M = 6.2, SD = .84$). Furthermore, there was no mean differences between male and female administrators in terms of OBSE ($t(99) = 3.98, p = .69$) while administrators of color were found to be lower in their OBSE than their White counterparts ($t(99) = -2.02, p = .04$). However, the mean of OBSE for administrators of color were still high $5.9 (SD = .82)$, supporting the proposition that organization members high in OBSE would gain better access to a rewarding mentoring relationship.

**Relational Compatibility**

One notable finding in this study pertained to the measurement of “relational compatibility” from the perspective of protégés. Mentoring scholars have explored the role of similarity between mentoring partners and investigated many similarity types ranging from surface level (e.g., demographics) to deep level similarity (e.g., personality) measures. As noted previously, the concept of relational compatibility was initially introduced in the mentoring model advanced by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) as an antecedent of quality mentoring. The central tenet of compatibility posits the idea that the extent of what mentoring partners have in common in terms of life values, attitudes, career goals, and/or work behaviors would have a significant impact on the mentoring quality. In this study, two different aspects of relational compatibility were further identified as a subset of overall relational compatibility including (1) instrumental compatibility, and (2) expressive compatibility. Instrumental compatibility is defined as the extent to which mentoring partners are compatible in an aspect of work related attitudes, values, and/or approach to problem solving. In contrast, expressive compatibility is conceptualized as the extent to which mentoring partners are compatible
in terms of life values, attitudes, and/or beliefs. A common thread of expressive compatibility is that the mentoring partnering is established in an informal context as a function of mutual liking and attraction while instrumental compatibility take into account the nature of workplace interactions, which is initially bound to the formal achievement context.

The current study modified similarity scales to generate a battery of items for each relational compatibility measure. From the initial pool of the compatibility items in which each compatibility is measured with 5 items respectively, 3 items from each compatibility type were found to be a reliable measure of latent instrumental and expressive compatibility constructs respectively. Results from the EFA and CFA provided evidence in support of two factor model in which two major sources of compatibility (i.e., instrumental and expressive compatibility) were extracted as a distinct factor, while a high factor correlation between two compatibilities \( r = .48 \) led us to consider an overall relational compatibility which encompasses instrumental and expressive compatibility. The result pertaining to the second order factor model confirmed that instrumental and expressive compatibility are regarded as subsets of an overall relational compatibility. The structural model showed that the relational compatibility has a significant positive impact on the magnitude of mentoring support. By implication, the structural model suggested the importance of work partners to be compatible in the mentoring process.

*Mentoring Behaviors/ Supports (Mentor Role Instrument - MRI)*
The study utilized MRI developed by Ragins and McFalin (1990) as a measure of mentoring behaviors and the results from the factor analysis confirmed a typical two factor mentoring behavior model, which consists of (1) Career support, and (2) Psychosocial support. More specifically, Career support emerged from four specific functions including Challenging, Protection, Exposure, and Sponsor; and Psychosocial mentoring included Acceptance, Role modeling, and Counseling. A high factor correlation between these two mentoring functions led us to test the second order factor model. Consistent with the previous findings on mentoring behaviors (e.g., Mullen, 1998; Noe, 1988; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002), the second order factor analysis confirmed the plausibility of the higher order structure of mentoring support in the current data. In other words, mentoring supports encompass both career and psychosocial functions and each function emerges from its respective subsets of mentoring behaviors.

Recently, more researchers have tried to use a simple version of mentoring behavior scales because the MRI includes too many items. A typical pitfall associated with many items in the survey is low response rate due to the fatigue from answering too many questions, which subsequently affect the generalizability of the results (Thomas, Nelson, & Silverman, 2005). While we agree to use a simple version of mentoring scales, oversimplification of the mentoring behavior could hinder our understanding of the nature of quality mentoring. One of the distinct features of workplace mentoring is that organizational mentoring provides a full array of developmental support as compared with other developmental relationships such as leader-follower relationships, supervisory relationships, and/or peer relationships (Allen, 2004).
In other words, the mentoring relationship is unique as it is oriented toward the fulfillment of the protégé’s unique needs by the mentor serving as a role model and providing tailored personal/professional supports. Others may insist that other relationships could also provide the components in mentoring behaviors. However, mentoring is unique as it encompasses them all, and that is the reason why organizational mentoring is one of the most significant and effective developmental relationships (Eby, et al., 2013). Results of the current study also confirmed that the mentoring behaviors encompass a wide variety of functional components including career mentoring (i.e., challenging, protection, exposure, and sponsor) and psychosocial mentoring (i.e., acceptance, role modeling, and counseling).

**Mentoring Quality**

We found limited empirical support regarding the role of mentoring quality (MQ) in the mentoring process. As the result showed, the EFA failed to establish the unidimensionality of the MQ measures as most of the MQ items were cross-loaded onto either MRI or Global measure of Job Satisfaction to a great extent. This indicates that the athletic administrators in the study did not distinguish the mentoring quality from either mentoring behaviors or overall job satisfaction. In other words, athletic administrators in the current study recognized mentoring behaviors as an outcome of organizational mentoring. The mentoring quality, at a conceptual level, refers to the evaluative feelings about the mentoring relationship from the perspective of protégés. It encompasses overall satisfaction with the mentor and/or mentoring relationship, magnitude of liking, and perceptions of relationship quality (Eby, et al., 2013). The central tenet of the mentoring
quality captures the relational processes such as trust, belief, respect, and emotional bond as outcomes of the mentoring process. According to Fletcher and Ragins (2007), the extant mentoring literature has generally failed to address the relational aspects of mentoring. Inclusion of mentoring quality was intended to address this concern while the result did not support the validity of the MQ items.

Although the concept of mentoring quality shed some light on the relational aspect of mentoring process, there have not been many studies testing the validity and reliability of the mentoring quality in an empirical setting. In other words, limited empirical support exists with respect to the construct validity of MQ measures while the mentoring quality is conceptually distinct from mentoring behavior. Additionally, the use of a global measure of job satisfaction could lead to the conceptual overlap between the mentoring quality and the job satisfaction. The present study used one single measure job satisfaction which evaluated the overall evaluative perceptions about the job in general. As several items in MQ can be interpreted in a manner that the job satisfaction was stated, the respondents could not distinguish these two constructs. However, the results from the current study should not be interpreted in a manner that the concept of mentoring quality is unnecessary. Instead, it is required for mentoring researchers to clarify the concept of mentoring quality in the mentoring process.

A Global Measure of Job Satisfaction

The current study used a single item in measure of overall job satisfaction which encompassed various workplace outcomes such as job security, rate of pay, amount of responsibility and so forth. The question was intended to ask overall feelings about the
job. The result from factor analyses showed that the single measure of job satisfaction is highly reliable.

The Compatible Mentoring Relationship: Research Question 3.

The third research question was to test the extent to which plausibility of the CMR model is supported by the data gathered. Again, the central tenet of the CMR model posits the idea that the protégés with socially/organizationally desirable characteristics would receive high levels of mentoring support while the magnitude of mentoring supports is mediated by the relational compatibility between mentoring partners. The structural equation model revealed concurrent positive relations between OBSE and relational compatibility, which in turn predicted a significant amount of variance in the mentoring behaviors. The result pertaining to the structural equation model was consistent with the understanding of the impact of similarity between mentoring partners as a significant antecedent of mentoring outcome. Thus, the overall pattern of our results provides general support of the nature of quality mentoring as a function of relational compatibility between mentoring partners.

Compatible Mentoring Relationship Model

In the context of human interaction, those individuals who possess socially desirable characteristics tend to obtain better access to the rewarding relationship. However, once such relationship is established, relational partners are involved in the process of mutual identification, which refers to the “compatible relationship”. A compatible relationship could have a different mechanism to maintain the relationship as compared to exchange relationships. One of the notable features of the compatible
relationships is that the exchange norms do not adequately explain helping behavior exhibited between relational partners without expecting any returns.

By applying this logic to the current study, it was posited that the protégés with organizationally desirable characteristics were more likely to lure the attention of potential mentors. Once the relationship is established as a function of mutual attraction, the relational parties are involved in the process of mutual identification as a function of relational compatibility. In this sense, the compatible relationship can be seen as an “assimilating version” of dyadic relationships in which various individual characteristics of relationship partners, including both similarities and dissimilarities, are intertwined into a pot by which unique relational contexts are created. In the current study, we examined the impact of OBSE as a desirable protégé’s characteristic and the result indicated that the high level of OBSE has a significant positive impact on the magnitude of relational compatibility, which in turn explained the significant portion of variance (92%) in mentoring behavior. Additionally, a chain of interactions among the theoretical constructs in the CMR model also found that the mentoring process has a significant positive impact on job satisfaction ($\beta = .43$, $p < .001$).

Implications

The purpose of the study was to explore the nature of quality mentoring process among athletic administrators in NCAA Division I institutions. Underrepresentation of women and racial minorities in core administrative positions is apparent and continues to lure academic interest among organizational scholars in the field of sport management. While diversity issues in the domain of sport has been scrutinized with a variety of
theoretical frameworks (e.g., feminist, critical theory, leadership, role-congruency), mentoring theory has not been well applied (Bower, 2008; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002).

The study was designed to address this gap by investigating the nature of informal mentoring in intercollegiate athletics. More specifically, the current study examined the nature of mentoring relationships in order to delineate the organizational inner mechanism of interactions among members within intercollegiate athletic departments. There are theoretical and practical implications associated with the results of the study.

**Theoretical implications**

The study expands the body of knowledge on mentoring in the field of sport management. More specifically, the current study investigated relational aspects of informal mentoring in sport administrations. There are several theoretical implications in this regard.

First of all, the current study established a clear conceptual boundary of the informal workplace mentoring. Allen et al. (2008) found that almost 40% of mentoring studies that they reviewed did not specify types of the mentoring relationships. Additionally, Criz and Cruz (2009) revealed that there are more than 50 definitions on mentoring. As already stated, mentoring relationships could take various forms based on the relational duration, emotional strength, and mentoring functions (Higgins & Kram, 2001). Such conceptual ambiguity embedded in the definition of mentoring led researchers to use their own definitions on mentoring and conclude without any further insights in terms of the definitions (Ragins & Kram, 2007). However, recent articles have continuously provided evidence of different benefits associated with different mentoring
types (Kammeyer-Mueller, & Judge, 2008). Treating a mentoring construct in a general manner could lead to potential interpretative problems and misunderstanding on the nature of mentoring relationships. Kram (1988) acknowledged that her conceptualization cannot cover a wide variety of developmental relationships which occur in organizational settings due to the changes in workforce relationships and market conditions (Higgins & Kram, 2001).

Secondly, the current study tested mentoring model by incorporating the concept of relational compatibility in the context of sport administrations. While Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) guided sport management scholars to conceptualize the nature of quality mentoring, their model has not been tested and applied in an empirical setting among sport management scholars since its emergence. Given that a field of sport management is still struggling to gain a unique identity as an independent area of discipline, it is inevitable for sport management scholars to develop its own theoretical foundation by re-visiting, modifying, and advancing the knowledge structure theorized by sport management scholars (Cunningham, 2013). As Chelladurai (2013) urged, sport management would not obtain a unique identity as an independent discipline without its own discipline based theoretical foundations.

Thirdly, the study identified two types of compatibility (i.e., instrumental and expressive) as antecedents of quality mentoring. Furthermore, the study developed Mentoring Compatibility Scale (MCS) to measure the extent to which interactional partners are compatible inside and outside of the workplace. The scale would guide other scholars interested in exploring developmental relationships (i.e., mentoring) in the
workplace interactions in sport settings. The compatibility typology made in accordance with the major mentoring functions, however, does not intend to insist that two compatibilities are mutually exclusive but these compatibility types are inclusive as subsets of overall relational compatibility in real world interactions. The utility of compatibility classification facilitate our understanding about the nature of quality mentoring as a compatible relationship.

Lastly, the framework identified initial filtering as an indicator of a degree of organizational culture toward diversity, which could offer meaningful insight into understanding structural barriers against women and racial minorities in the establishment and cultivation of informal developmental relationships. As notified, the initial filtering phase is conceptualized from the perspective of supervisors (i.e., mentors) as an organizational agency. Superiors play a significant role in the organizational socialization in which newcomers or subordinates acquire the necessary organizational skills, knowledge or behaviors in terms of organizational practices by involving in the regular interaction with their respective superiors. As Doherty and Chelladurai (1999) stated, organizational culture valuing the similarity could coerce members to adapt the culture of dominant social groups through the verbal and non-verbal connotations embedded in the regular organizational practice. Women and racial minorities within the White male dominated occupations, such as sport organizations, would exhibit self-limiting behaviors in an attempt to hide their unique characteristics as their traits are seen as abnormal and troublesome. In the mentoring selection process, women and racial minorities are initially
filtered as a function of homologous reproduction practiced by White male dominant social groups (Stanle & Kane, 1991).

**Practical Implications**

It is critical for mentoring scholars to address the gap between research and practice so that the research could provide practical implications for practitioners interested in implementing formal mentoring programs (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006). The framework proposed in the current study provides practical implications for sport managers and administrators who are concerned with diversity management.

First of all, the study showed that women and racial minorities rely more on the traditional mentoring than their White male counterparts. This indicates that the design of a mentoring program should target women and racial minorities rather than targeting the general athletic administrator population. In support of this, Bower (2008) found that a quality mentoring program is required to resolve the underrepresentation of women in the context of sport organizations. Eby and his colleagues (2013) also emphasized the importance of specifying target organizational groups for formal mentoring programs to be effective.

Secondly, the current study showed the importance of mentor-protégé compatibility in the mentoring process. The importance of mentor-protégé matching has long been emphasized as one of the significant factors in the design of the effective formal mentoring program. Regarding this, the current study identified two sources of relational compatibility (i.e., instrumental and expressive compatibility) that should be taken into account in the matching process. Additionally, the practitioners should also
realize that the development of compatibility require a significant amount of time and effort. The typical time frame of the formal mentoring program ranges from several months to one year due to the lack of organizational resources. As Kram (1985) stated, the development of informal mentoring require several years and this is why formal mentoring is generally less effective than informal mentoring. This implies that the benefits of mentoring cannot be easily achieved in a formal context and requires on-going commitment to cultivate mentoring culture within organization.

Third, in a similar vein, the success of mentoring initiatives in a formal context requires supports from top level administrators. Fink and Pastore (1999) emphasized the importance of strong support from top management in dealing with diversity management. Since organizational members are directly influenced by the top manager’s beliefs or philosophy, the organizational culture could be transformed from the top manager’s effort to embrace the value of diverse work forces within organizations. Thus, it is critical for top level administrators in sport organizations to be aware of the pattern of workplace interactions among the members.

Limitations

Several limitations were recognized in association to our research design. First of all, the study had small cases from women and racial minority groups. Unfortunately, as in our study, mentoring researchers typically are faced with limited accessibility to minority mentoring dyads. We collapsed administrator of color groups to create a minority subgroup due to the small numbers of minorities. However, the small sample size did not allow us to deliver further data analyses such as the test of measurement
invariance across groups in terms of gender and/or race. Furthermore, the current study made an error in grouping the administrators of color as the current study used a mix of race and ethnicity in categorizing the athletic administrators. While the improper interchange of race and ethnicity is a common error in the literature, it is critical to use a proper category in grouping the persons of color (Hodge, Kozub, Robinson, & Hersman, 2007).

Secondly, the present study failed to confirm the construct validity of mentoring quality. The concept of relational mentoring has captured attention from notable mentoring scholars as relational mentoring emphasizes the emotional properties of informal mentoring. Perceived mentoring quality plays a key role in understanding the nature of informal mentoring in the context of relational mentoring.

Finally, the study was designed from the perspective of protégés, which did not capture the dyadic nature of organizational mentoring. While the present study was intentionally designed to examine mentoring from the perspective of protégés, exclusion of mentors’ perspectives in the mentoring process could limit our understanding about the full array of workplace mentoring process.

Suggestions for Future Study

Informal mentors play a significant role in developing organizational members while we know little about them in the context of sport organizations. Especially, there have not been many studies investigating the effectiveness of formal mentoring program in association to the informal mentoring. Given that the purpose of the formal mentoring program is designed to reap the benefits from informal mentoring, it is critical for
researchers to explore the quality of a formal mentoring program. One needed line of research in this regard is to evaluate the effectiveness of formal mentoring in the context of sport administrations.

Another line of research inquiry is that the organizational mentoring process should be examined in a longitudinal research setting in an attempt to fully understand the ongoing process of the mentoring process rather than relying solely on the cross-sectional design (Eby et al., 2013). Furthermore, a qualitative research would be appropriated in dealing with limited access to the women and racial minorities in order to explore the reality of women and racial minorities in the organizational mentoring process in conjunction with a longitudinal research setting.

Lastly, a cross validation of the CRM model is required as the establishment of the validity is an ongoing process. As mentioned, the importance of mentor-protégé similarity has long been taken for granted as one of the powerful predictor of quality mentoring. However, relatively little is known about the types of relational compatibility in the mentoring process. Current study identified two seemingly distinct sources of relational compatibility and provides evidence in support of two factor structure in explaining to relational compatibility.
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Appendix A: Emails for Final Sample
Dear Colleague:

We are conducting a study that examines the mentoring experiences and quality among intercollegiate athletic administrators. Mentoring is a key topic of study in many fields (e.g., business, education, engineering, and physical education) while its application to the sport context has been scarce at best. As an athletic administrator, your background and experiences are of great importance to the successful completion of this study. We request your assistance by completing the survey: An evaluation of Mentoring Behavior Scales. The survey was developed by Ragins and McFarlin (1990) and Pellegrini and Scandura (2005). The data were collected from employees within the United States. In applying the study to sport administrations, a web-based survey with four parts will be used. Section I asks for responses to items related to mentoring roles and functions. Section II asks for responses to items related to quality of the mentoring. Section III asks for demographic information. It is estimated the survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Survey Link: https://www...........

There are no known physical or psychological risks associated with completing the survey. You may refuse to answer any questions and may withdraw from completing the survey at any time. By completing this survey, you consent to participate. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses in any published and reported results of this study.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would complete the survey by April 1, 2014. Feel free to contact either of us if you have any questions. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Youngho Park
Ph.D. Student
park.1447@osu.edu
618-303-2079

Donna Pastore
Professor
pastore.3@osu.edu
614-940-2058
Second email

Dear Colleague:

We recently sent you an email asking you to respond to a brief survey about the mentoring experiences and its quality of intercollegiate athletic administrators. The survey is short and should only take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Your response is important in helping to us understand the role mentoring contributes to research productivity.

Survey Link: https://www..........

Thank you for your help by completing the survey.

Sincerely,

Youngho Park
Ph.D. Student
park.1447@osu.edu
618-303-2079

Donna Pastore
Professor
pastore.3@osu.edu
614-940-2058
Appendix B: Survey
Mentoring in Intercollegiate Athletic Administration

We request your participation in this study designed to investigate the perceptions and experiences of intercollegiate athletic administrators regarding the mentoring process, its benefits, and the quality of the mentoring in intercollegiate athletics. Mentoring is defined as a process in which an individual of high status, experience, and knowledge within a field helps a younger person’s (i.e., protégé’s) professional development and career mobility.

Please respond to all the items as instructed within the questionnaire. There are no right or wrong answers. It is your personal perceptions that count. Therefore, your spontaneous and honest response is important for the success of the study. Please do not discuss the items with others.

Your answer will remain anonymous and confidentiality is assured. All data will be analyzed and reported on an aggregate basis, and not on an individual basis.

Thank you for your kind cooperation
PART I– Following are some statements that ask about the general information about your mentoring relationships. Please use the following definition of mentor when answering the following questions.

- Mentor: A mentor is an individual of high status, experience, and knowledge within your field who is committed to helping a younger person’s (protégé’s) career mobility

- IMPORTANT: In the case that you have not been involved in the mentoring relationships, please answer the questions based on the relationship with your direct supervisor. Thus, all the following questions are about the relationships with your current supervisor.

1. Do you have a mentor? YES ____ NO ____
2. Did you have a mentor? YES ____ NO ____
3. Average number of hours spent together each month in person-to-person

4. How long have you and your mentor been together since the mentoring relationship started

5. How did you meet your current mentor?
   A. The relationship occurred spontaneously
   B. The relationship was self-selected
   C. The relationship occurred by the mentoring program
   D. The relationship was assigned by others
   E. Etc., Please specify the situation ___________________________
6. Have you ever had a mentor or mentors before you met your current mentor?  
YES ___ NO __

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organization Based Self-esteem</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I count around here (your work place)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am taken seriously around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is faith in me around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am trusted around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am helpful around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am a valuable part of this place</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am efficient around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am an important part of this place</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I make a difference around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am cooperative around here</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART III** – Please note the following questions are in the form of ratings scales, ranging from the lowest score of 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to highest score of 7 = *Strongly Agree*. Click the button for the one best answer reflecting your opinion for each question on the topic of mentoring functions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Functions You have received</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  My mentor helps me attain desirable positions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  My mentor uses his/her influence in the organization for my benefit.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  My mentor uses his/her influence to support my advancement in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  My mentor helps me be more visible in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  My mentor creates more opportunities for me to impress important people in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  My mentor brings my accomplishments to the attention of important people in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  My mentor suggests specific strategies for achieving career aspirations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  My mentor gives me advice on how to attain recognition in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  My mentor helps me learn about other parts of the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 My mentor “runs interference” for me in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 My mentor shields me from damaging contact with important people in the organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 My mentor protects me from those who are out to get me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My mentor provides me with challenging assignments.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My mentor assigns me tasks that push me into developing new skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My mentor gives me new tasks that require me to learn new skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My mentor serves as a role model for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My mentor represents who I want to be.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My mentor is someone I identify with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My mentor accepts me as a competent professional</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My mentor thinks highly of me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My mentor sees me as being competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>My mentor guides my personal development.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My mentor serves as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My mentor guides my professional development.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>My mentor is someone I can confide in.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My mentor provides support and encouragement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My mentor is someone I can trust.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART IV** – Please note the following questions are in the form of ratings scales, ranging from the lowest score of 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to highest score of 7=*Strongly Agree.*
Click the button for the one best answer reflecting your opinion for each question on the topic of mentoring functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Compatibility</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 My mentor and I see things in much the same way</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 My mentor and I are similar in terms of our outlook, perspective, and values</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 My mentor and I alike in a number of areas out of work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 My mentor and I thought alike in terms of coming up with a similar solution for a work or project</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 My mentor and I analyzed problems in a similar way</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 My mentor and I have similar values about work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My mentor and I have similar values about life in general</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 My mentor and I are more similar than dissimilar in important ways out of work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 My mentor possess skills and knowledge that I wish to acquire</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 My mentor possess such professional identity that I wish to acquire</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART V** – Please note the following questions are in the form of ratings scales, ranging from the lowest score of 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to highest score of 7 = *Strongly Agree*.
Agree. Click the button for the one best answer reflecting your opinion for each question on the topic of mentoring functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Quality</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The mentoring relationship between my mentor and I was very effective.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am very satisfied with the mentoring relationship my mentor and I developed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I effectively utilized my mentor as a protégé</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 My mentor and I enjoyed a high-quality relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Both my mentor and I benefited from the mentoring relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I learned a lot from my mentor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My mentor gave me a new perspective on many things</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 My mentor and I were “co-learners” in the mentoring relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 There was reciprocal learning that took place between my mentor and I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 My mentor shared a lot of information with me that helped my own professional development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I like my mentor very much as a person</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I think my mentor would make a good friend</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART VI– Please note the following questions are in the form of ratings scales, ranging from the lowest score of 1 = \textit{Strongly Dissatisfied} to highest score of 7=\textit{Strongly Satisfied}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Strongly Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Strongly Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taking everything into consideration (e.g., job security, rate of pay, amount of responsibility etc.), how do you feel about your job as a whole?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part VII: Please answer for the following questions. There will be two separate parts within the demographic information section of this survey. In the first section (from 1 – 9). In the second section (from 10 – 13) you will be answering a couple of questions regarding information on your mentor.

1. AGE: _____ Years
2. Gender: a. Male _____ b. Female _____
3. Race:
   a. White
   b. African American
   c. Hispanic
   d. Asian American
e. Native American
   f. Others (please specify)
4. Nationality
5. Number of years experience in intercollegiate athletic administration: _________
6. Number of years at current intercollegiate athletic department:___________

7. Level of position in current intercollegiate athletic department (Check one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant Athletic Director</th>
<th>Associate Athletic Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Senior Associate Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Education Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is your institution considered to be a historically black college or university (HBCU)?
   YES ____   NO ____

10. Current Mentor’s Gender (Check one):
    Male ____   Female ____

11. Current Mentor’s Race (Check one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Others (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Level of position of your Mentor in current intercollegiate athletic department
   (Check one):
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Senior Associate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Assistant Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Associate Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Is your **Mentor** direct supervisor in your department?

YES _____  NO _____

Thank you for participating in this survey!
Appendix C: Results of EFA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>F8</th>
<th>F9</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>F11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obse5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obse8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obse9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obse7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obse6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyac1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyac2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyac3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carch2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carch3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carch1</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp3</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcin1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcin2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyrole2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyrole1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counsel1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counsel3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counsel2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cars2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cars3</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cars1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crce3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rce1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcin5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rce2</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Factor loadings are sorted by largest value on each factor, rounded to two digits. Values > 10 marked by *
Appendix D: Results of EFA

(Unique Variance on the Diagonal, Values are rounded to two digits)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obse5</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obse6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obse7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obse8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obse9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cars1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cars2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cars3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careh1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careh2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careh3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc11</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyc19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rce1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rce2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rce3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rein1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Results of CFA
### Factors and Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Based Self-Esteem (OBSE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am helpful around here</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a valuable part of this place</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am efficient around here</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an important part of this place</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make a difference around here</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring Relationship Instrument (MRI) – Career Functions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor helps me attain desirable positions.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor uses his/her influence in the</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization for my benefit. (Sponsor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor uses his/her influence to support my</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement in the organization. (Sponsor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor helps me be more visible in the</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization. (Exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor creates more opportunities for me to</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impress important people in the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor brings my accomplishments to the</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention of important people in the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exposure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor “runs interference” for me in the</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization. (Protect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor shields me from damaging contact with</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important people in the organization. (Protect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor protects me from those who are out to</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get me. (Protect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor provides me with challenging</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignments. (Challenging assignments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor assigns me tasks that push me into</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing new skills. (Challenging assignments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor gives me new tasks that require me to</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn new skills. (Challenging assignments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring Relationship Instrument (MRI) – Psychosocial Function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor serves as a role model for me. (Role</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor represents who I want to be. (Role</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors and Items</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>r²</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor accepts me as a competent professional. (Acceptance)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor thinks highly of me. (Acceptance)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor sees me as being competent. (Acceptance)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor guides my personal development. (Counseling)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor serves as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor guides my professional development. (Counseling)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relational Compatibility – Instrumental Compatibility**

| My mentor and I thought alike in terms of coming up with a similar solution for a work or project | 5.4 | .88 | .86 | .74 | .67 | .83 |
| My mentor and I analyzed problems in a similar way                                   | 5.3 | .96 | .90 | .81 |     |    |
| My mentor possess such professional identity that I wish to acquire                   | 5.4 | 1.1 | .67 | .45 |     |    |

**Relational Compatibility – Expressive Compatibility**

| My mentor and I see things in much the same way                                       | 5.4 | .84 | .89 | .79 | .73 | .88 |
| My mentor and I are similar in terms of our outlook, perspective, and values          | 5.8 | .77 | .81 | .66 |     |    |
| My mentor and I alike in a number of areas out of work                                 | 5.3 | 1.0 | .86 | .74 |     |    |

**Global Measure of Job Satisfaction**

| Taking everything into consideration (e.g., job security, rate of pay, amount of responsibility etc.), how do you feel about your job as a whole? | 5.8 | 1.1 | 1   |     |     |    |

Note. Factor loadings (β), squared multiple correlation (R²), alpha coefficient (α), and average variance extracted values (AVE)