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The purpose of this research was to determine the extent to which mentoring affected the careers of community college administrators. The study was undertaken to determine if there was a difference between the perceptions of men and women regarding the importance of mentoring on career advancement and if there was a difference in the perceived impact that mentors made on the careers of male and female administrators. Additional comparisons were made between the assistance provided by male and female mentors. The influence of role models in early life on mentoring relationships during the careers of men and women administrators was also studied.

Data were collected from 15 women and 16 men (97%) administrators who held the top three administrative positions in public community colleges in Michigan. No difference was found in the perceptions of men and women regarding the importance of mentoring on career advancement, nor was a difference found in the mean rating of the perceived impact that mentoring had made on the careers of men and women. Men and women mentors were not
found to provide a difference in assistance to proteges. It was found that women who had role models in early life had a greater incidence of mentoring in their careers than men who had role models in early life.

Mentors are believed to be an asset in the attainment of upper level administrative positions. While both genders value mentors equally, women tend to be the recipients of a greater number of mentoring experiences. The results of this study also include information regarding other factors to which administrators attributed their career success.
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Philosopher Herbert Spencer once stated that "absolute or relative infertility is commonly produced in women by mental labor carried to excess" (Diamond, 1978, p. 58). Contrary to Spencer's opinion, women have proven themselves to be quite adept at intellectual pursuits as evidenced by their academic accomplishments. Without having impaired their reproductive capabilities, women today make up more than 50% of the college and university undergraduates. They receive more than 55% of all two-year higher education degrees. In 1977, women accounted for 93% of the enrollment growth in the nation's higher educational institutions. Furthermore, women represent more than 40% of the population in institutions offering doctorate degrees. Their numbers have tripled since 1965 in law and medical schools, and women have joined the ranks as prestigious Rhodes scholars (McDonald, 1979).

Yet, those institutions which have been so impacted by the swelling ranks of women as students show laggard progress in appointing women to leadership positions. A study by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges in 1979 indicated that only 2.3% of the administrative positions in the 106 major public
universities nationwide were held by women. The Office of Women in Higher Education of the American Council on Education found that in 1980, 14 women were chief executives in public colleges and 33 women held similar posts in public universities. As evidenced in the Higher Education Publication (hep), Michigan does not seem to fare better than national norms. Examination of the hep: 1984 Higher Education Directory (1984) revealed that of the 23 public two-year educational institutions in the state of Michigan, 161 positions were listed at and above the dean's level; 16 of those positions were held by women.

Many authors and researchers have studied the reasons for the underrepresentation of women in the top leadership positions, some concluding that the structure and size of the organization may have been important considerations. The rise of women in the hierarchy was much more rapid in large corporations and universities (Halcomb, 1980).

Others believe that women do not have the political adroitness necessary for a rapid ascent up the corporate ladder. Grabiner (1983) suggested that there are so few women in top level administrative positions in higher educational institutions not because women do not have the experience or the qualifications, but rather that they lack support systems and do not have clear access routes. Affirmative Action legislation and changes in
employment trends resulting from the Women's Movement have not changed the fact that women are still greatly underrepresented in top administrative levels in institutions of higher learning.

Many factors aid in the career advancement of professionals. Fallon (1983) believed that in higher education these factors are competence, drive and determination, knowledge, personality, luck, and fate. Eighty-nine percent of those surveyed also believed that having a mentor was important to career advancement. Ray (1983) in her study of the perception of school administrators in the state of California listed the significant factors for advancement as management performance, models/mentors, attitude, and on-the-job training.

Most studies on mentoring were conducted with executives and administrators who had succeeded in their careers. Moore's (1983) study of women administrators in the top three administrative levels in community colleges in California found that the higher the rank of the position held by a woman in her study, the higher that women ranked the importance of mentors. In concurrence with the studies of Kram (1980) and Misserian (1980), Moore found that women administrators had two to three mentors who significantly influenced their careers. Vaudrin (1983), in studying the upward mobility of women managers, discovered that 75% of the subjects had mentors and 97%
identified someone who had significantly influenced their careers. Farris and Ragan (1983) recommended that the upward mobility of women in management could be enhanced through corporate politics and connections and, more specifically, through mentoring relationships. McLane (1981) found that executives who have had mentors were better educated, earned more at an early age and were more likely to follow a career plan. Harragan (1977) believed that finding a mentor was a matter of luck. If found, a mentor could increase the chance of winning the corporate politics game one-hundred-fold. While mentoring has been associated with the successful career, a 30 year longitudinal study conducted by Vailant (cited in Collin, 1979) was concerned with those who had not succeeded in their careers. Vailant found that those who were not successful had not discovered mentors until their early 40s; those who had succeeded, found no further need for mentors after the age of 40.

Statement of the Problem

Josefowitz (1980) stated that, "Very few people ever make it alone. We all need someone to lead the way, to show us the ropes, to tell us the norms, to encourage, support, and make it a little easier for us" (p.93). Josefowitz, like many other theorists, realized the im-
portance of having a mentor in a person's career development. The importance of mentoring in the career advancement for both men and women has been established in literature. Salimbene (1981) examined the careers of college and university chief executives and concluded that this group of men was highly educated and had identified having a mentor or mentors as an important key to career advancement.

Institutions that advocate equal opportunities in education for both men and women do not seem to provide that same equal opportunity in promotional practices. Numerous studies that have been conducted suggest that mentoring is one of the practices which have provided men with opportunities for advancement. Is it a lack of mentoring relationships that has prevented women from obtaining similar advancement opportunities? The answer is of particular interest in the state of Michigan where women administrators do not average even one upper level administrative position per institution.

Although the career paths of women administrators are of particular interest, it is believed that by studying the impact of mentoring on the careers of both men and women, an accurate picture of the importance of mentoring can be obtained. By comparing how men and women differ in their mentoring relationships, the steps women could take to receive the fullest benefits of the men-
toring relationship may be clarified. The problems addressed in this study are concerned with the importance of mentoring in the career paths of college administrators in two year public post-secondary educational institutions in Michigan.

Literature was examined in terms of the following questions:

1. Do role models in early life influence the number of incidences of mentoring during the career?
2. Is there a difference in the perception by men and women of the impact that mentoring has made on their careers?
3. Do men and women value the importance of mentoring differently?
4. Is there a difference in the assistance received from a male mentor and a female mentor?

Significance of the Study

Henning and Jardim (1977) stated that women have the same goals as men upon entry into the work world, but their assumptions and approaches to goal attainment differ. Women are not privy to the socialization process in the work place and, therefore, are at a disadvantage when striving for managerial positions. The socialization process includes the informal "old boys network," member-
ships in formal social organizations outside of the work environment which aid in advancement, and mentoring.

Association by a protege with a respected superior aids in the positive perception that others have of the protege as capable. An article in *Marketing News* advised that one way to encourage higher levels of drive is to be associated with those who rise in the organizational hierarchy. ("Neither a doormat," 1978). Halcomb (1980) stated that a mentor was particularly important during the early career stage since the mentor not only provided the stimulus to ascend in organizational rank but also provided the protege with that seal of approval and legitimacy. Fitt and Newton (1981) supported this by stating that mentors provided legitimacy and insured that proteges received credit for their work.

The significance of this study lies in increasing the understanding of mentoring as a vehicle for advancement for women in educational institutions. While mentoring has been proclaimed as a catalyst for advancement, those who currently hold positions of power have the sagacity to inform others regarding the influence of mentoring on career goal attainment. Secondly, information provided by both men and women with mentoring experience can be an asset to those aspiring to administrative positions in higher education. Additionally, the results of this study should provide insight into the mentor/mentee
relationship, reveal organizational advancement strategies, and provide some realistic expectations to those aspiring advancement to the upper administrative level in higher education.

Furthermore, there seems to be some indication that the mentoring process is much more prevalent in business and in universities than in community colleges. This study provides some insight as to why mentoring relationships are not more common at the community college level. Finally, a new school of thought has emerged which considers the impact of mentoring overrated, if not an irrelevant part of the career advancement process. Although these speculations are not yet supported by documented research such allegations merit consideration.

Overview

This study investigated the influence of mentoring relationships in the upper administrative level of two year public educational institutions. The intent was to determine the extent to which the mentoring relationship has influenced the careers of these administrators. It was believed that the most comprehensive investigation would include both women and men who hold equal positions in these institutions.

The following chapter contains a review of relevant
literature. The methodology utilized for this study is detailed in Chapter III. The analysis of the results is contained in Chapter IV. A summary with conclusions drawn from the analysis comprise Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, research on mentoring is examined. The basis for this investigation is presented, that is, the background and problem and a rationale for the development of the hypotheses are explored (Tuckman, 1978). The following sections of this chapter provide a general understanding of mentoring as it occurs in both business and education. Literature regarding each research question is investigated. A background on mentoring, as well as the terminology of mentoring, is also provided.

Role Models

The first research question asks if role models in early life influence a greater incidence of mentoring relationships during the adult career. Literature cites stages in mentoring from childhood to the mature career stage. The mentoring process is believed to be evolutionary; those who have utilized mentors have had role models in childhood or in at least one of the precareer stages (Henning, 1970; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978; Sheehy, 1976).

Henning (1970) believed that ease or comfort with a mentoring relationship was due to an introduction to
mentoring in one or more of the developmental stages. In addition, role models may have been one vehicle which provided an introduction to mentoring. Henning divided her data into five periods of the subjects' lives: childhood, adolescence, college, first career decade, and career maturity. She did so because she believed that the childhood and adolescent period influenced a career, particularly in terms of gender identification and role modeling. College years were important because they influenced early career years and a link between mentoring and role modeling was believed to exist.

During a woman's career, according to Diamond (1978), role models may be more difficult for women to obtain than mentors because, unlike role models, mentors can be of the opposite gender. Although role models do not function as mentors, mentors can act as role models (N.W. Collins, 1983). This suggests, therefore, that role modeling plays an important part in the mentoring process. In fact, the mentoring process has been considered an important enough influence in academic and career development that mentoring programs have been instituted and studied throughout all levels of academia.

Childhood

Obtaining a mentor is a critical factor in the emotional transition to adulthood (Levinson et al., 1978).
Mentoring was believed by some to be of such importance that formalized mentoring programs have been established in the primary and secondary grades. Sheehy (1976) introduced the term polestar indicating one who serves as a type of mentor during childhood while the mentoring relationship is reserved for adulthood. The polestar has a major impact upon the protege, fulfilling needs throughout life from teachers to fullfledged mentors.

The concept of mentoring has been formally introduced to children in elementary school years. Training should begin early in life since, according to Purcell (1981), the inadequate education of today results in the unprepared labor force of tomorrow. Formal mentoring programs have become part of career readiness training for school children since mentoring programs can have a positive impact on the career awareness and future careers of students (Purdy, 1981).

Dettmer (1983) emphasized the importance of experiencing a mentor relationship to meet the needs of gifted children, citing that the mentor relationship is too valuable to be left to chance. A mentor program provided community experience for gifted and talented students in grades K-12 in the Springfield Massachusetts school system uniting business and education through a volunteer mentoring program. Digenakis and Miller's (1979) study of third through fifth graders provided students with opportunities to visit, observe, and discuss occupations with
individuals from the community who acted as mentors. A study by Bridges (1980) also cited the benefits of mentors in the introduction to careers for fifth and sixth graders; the program's success assured its continued permanence in the school curriculum. Booth (1980) explained a program for seventh and eighth grade gifted children whereby the student identified some personal goals and was matched with a willing individual whose career best paralleled the students' interests, reporting positive results for the student, the mentor, and the community.

The College Years

Mentoring during this stage is considered by many as important in insuring the success of the college career as well as careers after college. Henning (1970) stated that the college years were very important in terms of shaping the early career. Lynch (1980) considered the mentor relationship to be an essential developmental task for the young adult which should be nurtured during the college years to be of optimum advantage in the development of a woman's career. Programs by which alumni acted as mentors to assist in career exploration and development have been successfully implemented at a small number of universities. (Combs & Tolbert, 1980; Gillespie, 1983; Lynch 1980).

Although only a relatively few universities have
actually implemented formalized mentoring programs, Melillo (1981) found that the typical woman had a mentor by the time she was in graduate school. Talbot (1982) concluded that a woman seeking an administrative career in higher education needs at least one mentor while in graduate school who will act as a role model, teacher, and counselor to help her define her initial job goals into a career in higher education.

Role models play an important role in career development, whether their influence occurs during childhood or in the career stages, or whether or not they are a prelude to the mentoring process. In fact, Freeman (1983) profiling top level women administrators in higher education, concluded that one third of the women who had role models aspired to become president. Those who did not have role models did not share that aspiration.

The relationship between role models in early life and mentors during the career stages has been established in literature, and a difference in the role modeling experiences of boys and girls has also been suggested. Diamond (1978) stated that older boys and girls act as role models for the younger ones while game playing, and it was at that time that boys began to learn about team effort while girls learned to nurture. Henning (1970), in her study of 25 female chief executive officers (CEO), found that their fathers acted as early role models for these successful women. While Diamond believed role mod-
eling to be gender specific, Tyler (1979) asserted that there was no significance in the gender of the role model. These diverse theories have prompted the question of whether role modeling experiences and their influences on the mentoring relationship differ for men and women.

Introduction to the Mentoring Process

Although formalized mentoring programs are in existence from the primary school to the workplace, mentoring is thought to be solely a part of the informal organizational structure. According to Collin (1979), young people in an organization should have a senior person guide them for the purpose of ensuring the successful inception of junior members' careers. Collin (1979) and Thompson (1976) believed that mentor relationships develop naturally and can't be forced. Melillo (1981) also believed that obtaining a mentor is a matter of chance. While the majority of authors and researchers believe that having a mentor provides an impetus to one's career, a few do speculate on the necessity of having a mentor. Clawson (1985) suggested that fitting a mentor into the activities of career planning may be like "searching for the Holy Grail" (p. 39); the mentor is not essential, and energies spent in seeking one should be more constructively redirected.

Granted, problems can emerge in a mentoring rela-
tionship. Any close, emotional involvement has a potential for stress (Bowen, 1985). The protege may have difficulty being recognized as anything more than an assistant to the mentor, thus later career advancement may be dependent on the mentor ("Taking sexism," 1978). Furthermore, mentors may select proteges in their own image (Parkham, 1982; Thompson, 1976) severely limiting the mentors available to women since most high level executives are males. If a woman is fortunate enough to find a male mentor, there is a good chance that their relationship will be beset with gossip and innuendoes (Bowen, 1985).

In spite of its potential problems, mentoring can be advantageous to the protege's career advancement. Mentoring can provide intrinsic rewards and recognition for the mentor, and it can be of benefit to the organization which can draw from a cadre of trained leaders.

The Need to Study the Male Mentoring Relationship

While this study focused on the effects of the mentoring relationship on the careers of women administrators, men were included in this study. At the time of this study, there were too few women holding upper level administrative positions in higher educational institutions to constitute a statistical population. Consequently, it was decided that comparisons between men
and women might elucidate the subject of mentoring more so than a statistical analysis of a very limited number of subjects.

Men and Their Mentoring Relationships

Historically mentoring has been primarily a male experience. Men have always occupied the upper echelon of most organizations, and those who sought positions to the upper administrative levels were usually male. As a result, those who sought mentors were male and those who benefited from the mentoring relationship were male.

Levinson et al. (1978) regarded by many as the forerunner of studies on mentoring believed that the mentor relationship was "one of the most complex, and developmentally important" (p.97) relationships a man can have. The relationship usually exists in the work setting and exists "to support and facilitate the realization of the Dream" (p.98). The importance of a mentoring relationship for career advancement has long been recognized by Levinson et al. and many other researchers.

In a study of college and university chief executives, Salimbene (1981) found that the group was dominated by white, highly educated males who credited mentors for playing an important role in their career advancement. Hobbs (1982) believed that a mentoring relationship was successful because it was a collaborative
not competitive relationship between men. Levinson et al. (1979) and Hobbs acknowledge that the mentoring relationship is a paternal one implying, of course, a relationship where the elder is male.

Although usually part of the informal organizational structure, the positive effects of mentoring have always been appreciated. Salimbene (1982) stated:

Presidents are often given the latitude of selecting their own replacements. By identifying bright young executives in the organization, assisting them in their professional development, and promoting them through the ranks, a chief executive officer has the opportunity to groom his successor and, possibly, other future leaders. (p.11)

Cook (1979) agreed that promotions and upper level positions were frequently filled on the basis of personal relationships effected through mentoring situations.

Levinson et al. (1979) and Hobbs (1982) concluded that the mentoring relationship was a transient one. Parkham (1982), in studying the stages of mentoring, agreed that the male mentoring relationship, after having passed through certain stages, comes to a predictable demise. The end of a mentoring relationship, although predictable, may not be a pleasant experience for mentor and/or mentee, but the lack of a mentoring experience can be a developmental handicap (Levinson et al., 1979; Sheehy, 1976). Hobbs (1982) who studied men who have made career changes in mid-life, found that the subjects' mentoring relationships had been insufficient,
interrupted, or absent. Hobbs concluded that the disturbance of a man's mentoring relationships may be associated with career change. The importance of the mentoring relationship on the career paths of successful males has, over time, found strong support in literature.

Women and Their Mentoring Relationships

Studies regarding women and their mentors are much more recent. Affirmative Action legislation has been credited for opening the doors to women in the workplace and acting as a catalyst for women in management (Barnier, 1981). Unfortunately, executive gains for women have been slow. A 1973 study conducted by the American Council on Education, as cited in Bernay (1978), demonstrated that only 6% of the more than 2,500 accredited institutions of higher education had women presidents and 75% of those held their positions at church related colleges. Another study by the American Association of University Women (AAUW), as cited in Bernay (1978), estimated that 95% of the institutions which enroll first year students have men in the top three (president, chief academic officer and dean) administrative positions.

The rise of women in educational administration is far from meteoric, paralleling the percentage of women administrators in the 1950s. Those women currently in the
management positions most often hold positions at the middle management level. Yet, interest in studying this group of women has risen in the past decade. These studies often trace a woman's relationship throughout her lifetime, and there is evidence that mentoring relationships for women begin early in life.

Sharon (1982) stated that initial career choice is directly related to female role models in childhood. Fallon (1983) concluded that female teachers were the most influential in the careers of women; 89% of the women in her study agreed that having a mentor was helpful in the beginning stages of their careers. Melillo (1981) discovered that the typical woman had a mentor by the time she was in graduate school. Talbot (1982) also believed that mentors were important to women in graduate school and on the job to aid in career development and upward mobility. She suggested that in order for a woman to redefine her initial job goal into a career in higher education, she needed at least one mentor while in graduate school, a professional in higher education to act as a role model, teacher, and counselor to promote her career. But, Rowe (cited in Hall & and Sandler, 1983) went one step further to say that, "Women need mentors and role models not only of their own race and sex but of the race and sex that commands the environment in which they are trying to be competent" (p. 8).
Like men, women aspire to advance in their careers, but unlike men, women consider high level positions less attainable (Kuk, 1981). A mentor, although often unaware of his or her subtle influence, is an influential factor in encouraging women to believe that they can succeed. Villani (1983) found a relationship between success in overcoming internal and external barriers and the existence of mentoring relationships. Encouragement by the mentor to pursue career in administration coincided with the mentee's belief in his or her own ability to succeed in administration.

Davis (1983) studied 28 executive women who viewed their jobs as careers due to the influence of other people or events, most having identified mentors. Moore (1983), in a study of women presidents, deans, and associate deans, determined that these women each averaged 2.7 persons who influenced their careers as sponsors, mentors, role models, teachers, or trainers. Melillo (1981) concluded that mentoring was highly valued by women, and having a mentor was facilitative in achieving career goals. A study conducted by Shelton (1982) found that those who had mentors were more likely to be promoted. "Perhaps the first and most important strategy involves the finding of a mentor or someone who takes a professional interest in your professional growth" (Scott, 1978, p. 39). Once the doors to upper
management were opened, women, too, learned the impor-
tance of the mentoring relationship in their climb up the
managerial ladder.

The Institute for Leadership Development

One organization whose purpose is to improve the ca-
reer skills and opportunities for women who are inter-
ested in rising to positions in upper administration at
community colleges is the Institute for Leadership
Development. The Institute is sponsored by the American
Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges
(AAWJCJ) and the Maricopa Community Colleges District.
Since its inception in 1981, the Institute for Leadership
Development has become nationally recognized for its
leadership training program. Originally entitled as the
"Leaders for the 80's," the program is now known as the
"Leaders Project." The purpose of the project is to
improve career skills and opportunities for women who
aspire to become community college administrators. The
project's organizers report that 100% of the project's
first year participants in 1981 were promoted. Innovators
of the project have recognized the importance of
mentoring in the career advancement of women and have
made the selection and cooperation of an institutional
mentor and the sponsorship of the institution's CEO two
of the criteria for selection of the participants in the workshop (Desjardins, 1985).

The Importance of Mentoring for Both Men and Women

The benefits of mentoring are not gender specific, but do men and women perceive the importance of mentoring differently? Holt (1981) asserted that mentoring, for both males and females, may be the single most important factor in administrative career advancement. Erikson and Pitner (1980), who viewed a mentor to be a significant contributor to the career progress of the protege, suggested that a mentor's advocacy furthers cognition, motivation, and career preparation for all who seek advancement in administration. Barnier (1981) stated that mentoring was a must for men and women who aspire to management positions and that mentoring was beneficial if not necessary to career development. McLane (1981) and Roche (1979) in separate studies found that two thirds of all subjects in their studies had mentors, and all of the women in both studies had at least one and an average of three mentors. Studies of male and female executives and administrators support the importance of the mentoring role in career advancement.

While both men and women perceived mentoring to be important to career advancement, the impact that men-
toring had made on their careers was similarly perceived by both men and women. Walker (1981) stated that males and females have similar levels of professional socialization, and correspondingly, mentoring has contributed to the administrative appointment of both genders. Fowler (1980) concluded, in his study of assistant professors, that males and females did not differ in their mentoring relationships. Arbetter (1980) concurred that mentor relationships were proportionately pervasive for women as for men. Dickson (1983) cited the following statistics in a study of mentoring relationships. Of the 258 male and female administrators, 53.5% had mentors; 54.7% were mentors; both received and gave the same amount of mentoring, and 42% of both genders stated that having a mentor reduced the amount of time that it took to advance from one managerial level to another.

Other studies of male and female mentees found differences in the incidence of the mentoring relationships. Robinson (1981) found that women were mentored more often during their careers than men, but according to Weigand (1982), men had more contacts, influential persons who could assist them with career moves. Arbetter (1980) reported that men were more concerned about a mentor's infringement on their autonomy than women, while Quinn (1980) found that women with male mentors made a greater number of positive statements regarding the mentoring.
influences and were viewed by fellow employees as being assertive and independent and as having leadership potential. The importance of mentors and the positive impact that mentors have on the careers of both men and women are firmly supported in literature. The questions that are not adequately addressed are whether there is a difference in the importance of mentors on career advancement between men and women and whether mentoring has impacted the careers of men and women differently.

The Mentor

Studies dealing with mentoring most often provided the perspective of the protege; perhaps it is because it is easier to measure an impact when the subject is the recipient of the treatment. Thompson (1976), whose interest centered on the mentor, described mentors as extremely secure in their jobs, ambitious, risk takers, and relatively young managers who considered themselves mavericks. Such mentors carefully select their proteges. Although they may select proteges of either gender, they select women less frequently.

The mentor...personifies the company's psychosocial structure and acts as the midwife in the process of socialization. His, therefore, is a key role in the organization, for he develops the type of manager the company needs, whilst recognizing and respecting the individuality of the younger man. (Collin, 1979, p.13)
Formally, only a very limited number of organizations acknowledge the needs and benefits of mentors to the point of taking steps to implement sanctioned mentoring programs. With the exception of informal student/professor mentoring relationships, there is very little evidence that educational institutions encourage one to assist in the development of others. The only rewards for the mentor in education are intrinsic.

The Mentor and the Protege

Women have only recently begun to gain a very small membership in the upper managerial echelon and they still do not share the same ceiling positions (Josefowitz, 1980). As a result, there are few women who can act as mentors. If the theory of the Queen Bee Syndrome is true, even fewer women choose to be mentors. Yet, Blackburn, Chapman, and Cameron (1981) found that male mentors had a disproportionate number of female proteges. Wakefield (1983), on the other hand, found a greater incidence of mentoring among males, and Fowler (1980) found no difference in the incidences of mentoring relationships between men and women. Evidence regarding which gender provides a greater degree of mentoring assistance is not conclusive.

Wiegand (1982) believed that mentoring is gender
specific, that is, women tend to mentor women and men tend to mentor men more than one gender mentors another. Because of men’s hesitancy to mentor women, men’s inclination to select proteges most like themselves, and because there are so few women available in the upper administrative echelon of organizations to mentor their fellow women, it is believed that men are the greater benefactors of the mentoring experience (Vazant, 1981). Seven in 10 of women’s mentors were male and 1 in 50 men had female mentors (Roche, 1979). Blackburn et al. (1981), too, found not only gender specificity but in a study from the mentor’s perspective, also found that mentors nominated as their most successful proteges those whose careers were identical to their own. Robinson (1981) found that while women helped both sexes, men provided substantially less help for women.

Alleman (1982), on the other hand, believed mentors and proteges to be the ideal dyad; they tend to choose opposites rather than those more like themselves, and, therefore, women tend to be the greater benefactors. Roche (1979) found that women averaged three mentors and men only two. Ryan (1983), Melillo (1981), Bottoms (1982), and Robinson (1981) concluded that women were said to provide more mentoring to other women than to men. Therefore, because women provide more mentoring and more intensity in their mentoring to other women, it was
believed that women are the greater benefactors.

While disagreeing about which gender derives the greater benefit from the mentoring process, it is agreed that both benefit. Does one gender benefit more because the type of assistance rendered is more beneficial to one sex than to the other? According to Kelly (1982) and Robinson (1981), women mentors provide more emotional support than men. Robinson further found that women received more help in terms of motivation and emotional support and that women acted as mentors for both sexes more than men. McNeer (1981) found that women act as role models and mentors rather than just mentors. Conversely, like Fowler (1980), Quinn (1980) found no difference in the degree of assistance provided by male and female mentors, but the women with male mentors in Quinn's study reported a greater need for a more personal aspect in mentoring. When mentoring women, males were said to have lightened the workload more than women. According to Ryan (1983), "Women expect more from other women than men do" (p.118).

The problems of cross-gender mentoring have been quite popular in literature. Although problems may occur when the mentor is male and the protege a female, mentoring can be a detriment as well as a benefit to both the protege and the mentor. Bowen (1985) stated that mentoring had a potential for stress and disaster because of
emotional involvement. George and Kummerow (1981) cited the male and female relationship as a potential hazard. Romantic involvements and related social expectations are potential problems in a mentoring relationship involving a mentor and protege of opposite sexes (Harris, 1980). N.W. Collins (1983) suggested that the result of a sexual relationship can not only affect the parties involved but also the perception of others who may believe that sexual favors, not performance, are the key to advancement. One of every five women in Collins's study admitted to having a sexual relationship with her mentor. Women who did admit to having this kind of relationship overwhelmingly advised others against it. Pitt and Newton (1981) concluded that there was a risk of social entanglement and, as a result, a risk to the reputation of both parties. Perhaps, it is this risk that makes men hesitant to mentor women or that influences male mentors to withhold intensity in a cross-gender mentoring relationship, and therefore, even though women mentors are not as readily available, they provide greater assistance than male mentors.

Conclusions regarding the benefits, influence and contributions of mentoring and whether they are more beneficial to one gender than to the other are divided. This has prompted the question whether there is a difference in the degree of mentoring received from a male and a
female mentor.

The Negative Aspect of Mentoring

Support in favor of the positive aspects of mentoring on career development is overwhelming but not unanimous. The potential problems inherent with cross-gender mentoring, as previously mentioned, are among them. The mentor/protege relationship requires a shared value system, shared feelings, the disclosure of personal information, and confessions. Even a confirmed male risk taker may be discouraged by such intimacy with a potential female protege. Furthermore, the mentor also risks rejection if the protege chooses to ignore the advice of the mentor (The Woodlands Group, 1980). The mentor may also suffer humiliation by selecting the wrong person as a protege since the protege's deeds or misdeeds will be a reflection on the mentor (Uris, 1981). Halatin and Knotts (1982) listed the disadvantages to the mentor and/or the protege as: excessive time demands, emotional involvement, infringement on the tasks or territory of another supervisor, blackmail as a result of shared intimacy, embarrassment at professional failure, a shift in loyalty, and the need to impress one another.

Blotnick (1984) believed that only those who are already on the verge of success get mentors. Blotnick specu-
lated that pressure to have a mentor causes many people to lie about the mentoring relationship. He found that only 1% of the mentoring relationships succeeded, and in nearly 40% of the cases studied, the mentor fired the protege. It was not mentioned how data regarding lies were obtained, nor was the inevitable separation of mentor and protege documented. Virtually all relationships have times of harmony and times of discord; the mentoring relationship is no exception.

The Terminology of Mentoring

Mentoring occurs when a senior person (the mentor) in terms of age and experience undertakes to provide information, advice and emotional support for a junior person (the protege) in a relationship lasting over an extended period of time and marked by substantial emotional commitment by both parties. If opportunity presents itself, the mentor also uses both formal and informal forms of influence to further the protege. (Bowen, 1985, p. 31)

Virtually all studies concurred that mentoring is a multi-facetted relationship. Writers often used different labels for mentors, such as, role models, helpful peers, sponsors, rabbis, coaches, godfathers, patrons, and teachers to represent the facets of the mentoring relationship.

Although the term mentoring seems to include a plethora of synonyms, the definitions of mentoring shared similarities. Subjects in Henning's (1970) study likened
mentors with their fathers and explained that mentors supported, encouraged, and taught while proteges learned, admired, and helped. Moore (1983) stated that a mentor protected, sacrificed, took risks and cared for another. According to Boston (1976), a mentor transmits a tradition or value system for which he or she is willing to serve as a conduit and speaker and acts as a channel for guidance and wisdom which comes from beyond him or her.

Many writers indicated at least a duality in the mentoring relationship. McEnery (1982) believed that a pure form of mentoring occurs much less frequently and a more common form of mentoring provides tangible help in regard to career progression. Misserian (1980) and Phillips (1978) discussed mentoring in terms of primary and secondary mentors. According to their studies, primary mentors were altruists and risk takers who are willing to hazard for the sake of the protege. Secondary mentors were more businesslike, less caring, less willing to take risks, and their relationship had strings attached. The difference between primary and secondary mentors depended entirely upon the perception of the protege. Levinson et al. (1979) referred to a "good mentor" who was an amalgamation of a good father and a good friend. A "good enough mentor", according to Levinson was a transitional figure serving as a guide, teacher, and sponsor and "represents skill knowledge, virtue, and ac-
complishment—the superior qualities a young man hopes to acquire" (p.333). Clawson (1985) found little need for mentors, but he cited a number of alternate situations which had the qualities of mentoring as defined in other studies.

**Mentors vs. Sponsors**

Authors have used different labels to define the functions of a mentor. The most popular comparisons occurred between the definitions of mentors and sponsors, although other studies, such as Levinson et al. (1978) treated them synonymously. Misserian (1980) stated that sponsoring was an administrative function in which one person literally and figuratively promoted another. Mentoring, on the other hand, was an emotional involvement in which "Each partner in such a relationship invests so much of self that each becomes vulnerable to the other" (p.142). Josefowitz (1980) made the distinction that a sponsor promotes the suitability of the aspirant, while a mentor acts as a wise and trusted teacher. A sponsor has a protege while a mentor has an apprentice. The difference cited was one of function. Robinson (1981), in comparing the functions between the two, stated that mentors are involved in the provision of psychosocial support while sponsors assist with career
advancement. While literature distinguishes between mentors and sponsors, most writers seem to agree that a mentor can be a sponsor although a sponsor is not usually a mentor. "The mentor-protege relationship is far deeper than that of the sponsor-protege. Sponsors are press agents; mentors are everything implied in the definition of...trusted counselor guide" (The Woodlands Group, 1980, p. 920).

Definitions of Terms

"Mentoring is not a simple all-or-none matter" (Levinson et al., 1978, p. 100). Mentoring varies in form and degree and with the perception of the protege or person of whom mentoring questions are asked. Furthermore, it is believed that most administrators have had some form of mentoring, maybe not in its purest form, but certainly enough to have influenced a career choice or path. It is for these reasons that the terms mentoring and mentors are comprehensive enough to include most aspects of the terms as defined in literature and the perceptions of the subjects of this study.

Mentor is a management superior who takes a personal interest, guides, teaches, influences another's career, and/or facilitates another's advancement. A mentor may or may not act as a role model and/or a sponsor.
Mentee or protege is the recipient of the mentor's assistance.

Sponsor is one who provides the promotion and visibility of another to upper management but makes no emotional commitment and may or may not be responsible for a person's literal promotion.

Role model is one whose position and traits are worthy of emulation but who does not make a personal commitment to another's career and may not even be aware of the existence of the follower.

Hypotheses

Background information for the four hypotheses has been provided in the preceding literature review. The hypotheses are as follows:

1. There is a difference in the mean number of mentors between women who had role models in earlier years and men who had role models.

2. Men differ from women in their perception of the impact that mentoring has made on their careers.

3. There is a difference in the perceptions of men and women administrators as to the importance of mentoring on career advancement.

4. There is a difference in rating by respondents of the degree of assistance provided by male and female mentors.
Summary

The background of mentoring has been provided in the preceding review of the literature. This included the influences of role models and mentors in early life, the importance as well as the impact of mentoring on the career advancement of both men and women in public and private sectors.

The methodology in the collection and the analysis of the data are detailed in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to determine participants' perceptions of the mentoring relationship and to determine whether these perceptions differ between men and women. While a number of studies concentrated on the effects and perceptions of mentoring relationships, those studies were concerned with the mentoring relationship after it had exerted influence on the subjects. Those studies and this one are defined by Borg and Gall (1983) as causal comparative or ex post facto studies.

According to Kerlinger (1965), ex post facto research is important when research problems do not lend themselves to experimentation such as problems in the social sciences and in education. Although some of the mentoring experiences may be ongoing, it is assumed by this researcher that the mentoring has already exerted its influence on the careers of these administrators.

Population

The population for this study included men and women who held positions in the top three administrative
levels of community colleges in the state of Michigan. These positions included president, vice president, and dean. All women who held these positions were included in this study. The men in this population were selected on the basis of the positions which paralleled those of the women administrators. A preliminary list of these positions as well as a list of all postsecondary two year public institutions in the state of Michigan was obtained from the *1984 Higher Education Directory* (1984). This reference also provided the address and telephone number of each institution, as well as a partial list of names of each institution's administrators. Unfortunately, the positions cited in the directory were not common to all institutions. All institutions listed their presidents and vice presidents; thereafter, there was no consistency. Deans were listed only occasionally.

In an effort to obtain consistency and compatibility in the identification of the administrative positions to be used in this study, members of the American Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges (AAWCJC) and the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (NAWDAC) were contacted to provide names of women who occupied positions as deans or higher in each institution. The sources were able to provide names of potential subjects (both male and female) or contact persons for most institutions. In cases where
the information was not known, names were obtained via telephone contacts with the president's office of that institution. The contact person or the president's office for each institution was also asked to provide information regarding the institutional hierarchy. Smaller institutions where faculty members performed administrative responsibilities particular to this study were not included.

This investigation revealed the names of 18 women who occupied the positions of presidents, vice presidents, and deans. The position of provost at one community college was also included since investigation revealed the position to be of equal responsibility as that of vice president. The position of associate provost, originally believed to be part of the population, was later found to be below the position of dean and a union position in an institution in which administrators were not unionized. This position was, therefore, excluded. The position of director, although a vital position in some institutions, does not hold equal importance in all colleges or within institutions, and therefore, was not included in this study. A population of 18 women was originally identified for this study, but at the time of the mailing of the questionnaires, one president had retired, and a vice president had obtained a presidency in another state bringing the final count of the female
population for this study to 16.

Top level male administrators are much more numerous. In order to get a comparable match from the male population, as many of the male subjects as possible were selected on the basis of the positions they held which paralleled the positions of the women administrators in the same institution. The position of dean, for example, most readily lent itself to an institutional match; if a female dean was identified within an institution, a match of a male dean was made in that same institution. This selection process was not viable for all positions included in this study. Each institution has only one president, and some smaller institutions may have only one vice president. A positional match in such cases was made by selecting a male administrator with the same or similar title in an institution of similar size. Institutional size was determined by the number of students as listed in the *HEP: 1984 Higher Education Directory* (1984).

**Population Limitation**

The position of director, while in some institutions was in the upper administrative levels of these institutions, was below or equal to the position of a dean in other institutions. Certain community colleges
had different levels of directors within their institutions. The way in which the importance of some directors' positions were identifiable is through an in-depth study of each director's responsibilities and job description. This was not considered to be practical or even a feasible task to be undertaken for every community college in the state of Michigan. Yet, its omission could conceivably have excluded a small number of administrators who, by virtue of their responsibilities could have been included in the population for this study.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire was specifically designed for this study. Questions were inspired by the studies of Misserian (1980), Henning (1970), and Jaksen (1985). The questions were designed to ascertain the following:

1. Demography and career path, including current title, academic background and factors which have contributed to the respondent's career success.
2. The presence of role models.
3. The presence and effects of sponsors.
4. General perceptions regarding the importance of mentoring.
5. Perceptions regarding the impact of mentors on the respondents' careers.
Those questions which were intended to ascertain perceptions utilized a Likert-type response. A response width of 5 possible choices was selected, since a "not sure" option was desired and the questions were not considered to be particularly complex for persons included in this population (Balian, 1982).

Content Validity

Balian (1982) suggested that the majority opinion of a panel of judges who are experts in the field was the strongest form of content validity. While a panel of experts on mentoring was difficult to identify, two persons were recognized as being knowledgeable and experienced in mentoring relationships.

The two content experts are Mildred Bulpitt and Carolyn Desjardins, founders of the Institute of Leadership Development. Since its inception, the Institute had been underwritten by the nationally recognized and highly respected American Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges (AAWCJC) and Maricopa Community Colleges District. The project's continued success has recently resulted in its financial independence. Bulpitt and Desjardins make the selection and utilization of mentors a requirement for applicants in their leadership training program. As a result, they witness the men-
toring relationship from the perspective of the mentors and the proteges since both are an active part of the Institute's ongoing leadership training experience. Since Bulpitt and Desjardins interact with an average of .160 participants and their mentors per year, their expertise on the mentoring relationship is believed to be most comprehensive.

It was believed that two nationally recognized experts would be more reliable than a panel with questionable expertise; therefore, Hambelton's (cited in Borg and Gall, 1983) procedure for establishing validity was selected.

Each expert was given specific definitions of the content domain and a 4-point rating scale to rate the relevance of each questionnaire item. An average relevancy rating of 2.0 and below was considered to be too low and the point at which the question or item was deleted. The rating scale and measure of relevancy for each expert appear in Appendix A.

Pilot Study

A pilot study, according to Borg and Gall (1983), is an introduction to the techniques and research measures, which may aid in the improvement of data collection, scoring techniques, and appropriateness of
measures. Balian (1982) considered the pilot test of original instruments mandatory.

The potential problem in the execution of the pilot study was the size of the population in the study. Since a total population of 34 was already considered to be small, a pilot study employing members of the identified population would have decreased the number of subjects in the actual study even further. A review of positions among community colleges revealed that the position of personnel director shared similarity in importance and responsibilities in the institutions considered. Furthermore, it is also a position held by women as well as men. The pilot study was, therefore, conducted with matched pairs of male and female personnel directors in community colleges.

Ten questionnaires were mailed to an equal number of male and female personnel directors. The mailing of the questionnaire was preceded by a personal telephone call to each personnel director requesting his or her participation in the pilot study. All 10 (100%) of the questionnaires were returned. The questionnaire for the pilot study provided blank spaces when a numeral response was required, but descriptive adjectives which could not be quantified were sometimes provided as responses. It was, therefore, decided that a range of numbers which could be circled would be preferable to providing blanks.
in which a response could be written. The second change involved the request for greater detail in the section on educational background. The pilot study revealed that no change in the questions was necessary.

Pilot Study Limitation

Although personnel directors perform similar functions in educational institutions, there are certain limitations to using a position other than that of the actual population. Because the position is lower on the hierarchical scale than the positions to be used for this study, the incidents of mentoring may have been fewer, and the perceptions on mentoring may have differed from those persons in the actual population. Furthermore, deans, provosts, and to a lesser extent, presidents and vice presidents are usually promoted from the academic ranks. This may be the exception rather than the rule for personnel directors who may have been engaged for their expertise in the personnel field, not their experience in education. A letter confirming consent to participate and the questionnaire utilized for the pilot study are included in Appendix B.

Mailings

A questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope were sent by first class mail to the
office of each administrator identified for the study. This was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the study and the reason for the administrator's selection as a participant. The letter and questionnaire were also accompanied by a note of understanding which respondents were asked to sign and return. The note stated that the undersigned respondent understood the purpose of the study and was cognizant that responses would be treated confidentially (Appendix C).

Thirty-four questionnaires were sent and 73% responded to the first mailing. Because such a small number of women represented the entire population for the study, it was believed that an assertive approach was necessary and feasible for all nonrespondents. Each nonrespondent was contacted by telephone and follow-up letter (Appendix B). All 16 of the men and 15 of the women, a total of 97% of the population in the study, returned the questionnaire.

**Questionnaire Limitations**

While the questionnaire and the definitions for mentoring were influenced by a number of other studies, no universal definition of mentoring has been adopted and no formalized test on mentoring has been accepted. As a result each study on mentoring defines the subject according to the researcher's perceptions, and question-
naires, if they are constructed for the purpose of the study, elicit responses which only the researcher perceives to be significant.

Hypotheses and Data Analysis

Described in this section are the data analysis and treatment for each hypothesis. Each conceptual hypothesis has been restated in operational terms. An alpha level of .05 was used to test each hypothesis. Coded data from the questionnaires were compiled into a computer file and analyzed using the SAS User's Guide: Statistics (1985).

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis is operationally stated as: The mean number of mentoring relationships is greater for female administrators who had role models in earlier years than for male administrators who had role models during this time. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean number of mentors for women who had role models in earlier years and for men who had role models. Question 13 provided the number of role models for each respondent, and Question 21 provided the number of mentors. A t test for independent means was used in testing the null hypothesis.
Hypothesis 2

The second operational hypothesis states that: The mean rating of the perceived impact of mentoring on the careers of women administrators will be greater than the mean rating of the perceived impact of mentoring on the careers of men administrators. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the means of the perceptions of men and women as to the impact that mentoring had on their career advancement. Respondents rated the impact of their mentoring relationships by their rating response of items K, L, M, N, and O for each mentoring relationship. The section was repeated to accommodate each mentoring relationship that subjects may have had. A mean of these items was obtained for each individual respondent with more than one mentor. A t test for independent means was used to test the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis is thusly operationalized: The mean rating by women of the perception of the importance of mentoring on career advancement will be greater than the mean rating by men of the importance of mentoring. The null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the mean rating by men of the perception of the importance of mentoring and the mean rating by women of the
perception of the importance of mentoring. (To have had a mentor is not a prerequisite to rating the importance of the mentoring relationship.) Questions 23 through 27 on the questionnaire elicit a response rating the perceived importance of mentoring on career advancement. A $t$ test for independent measures was used in the testing of the null hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 4**

The last operational hypothesis states: The mean rating of respondents regarding the degree of assistance provided by women mentors will be greater than the mean rating regarding the degree of assistance received from male mentors. A null hypothesis states that there is no difference in the means of the degree of assistance received from women or men mentors. Questions G, H, I, J, and O required a rating of the perception of the assistance received. Only men and women who had both male and female mentors were used in the testing of this hypothesis. Question E revealed whether the rating was of a male or female mentor. These sections were repeated for each mentoring relationship respondents may have had. A $t$ test for independent means was used to test the null hypothesis.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Presented in this chapter are the results of the questionnaire. Demographic information is included, as well as profiles of respondents, attitudinal responses, and the results of the hypotheses. The formulation of the hypotheses and the analytical procedures used for the testing of the hypotheses were outlined in Chapters II and III respectively.

The Population

The population of this study consisted of male and female administrators who held positions of president, vice president and its position equivalent, and dean in community colleges in the state of Michigan. All of the women who held these positions at the time of the mailing of the questionnaires were included in the study. The men included in this study were matched with the women based on the positions which they held. Of the 34 questionnaires mailed, 33 (97%) were returned. All questionnaires were usable although a few respondents did not answer all questions in the instrument.
Profile of Respondents

Age

Although the mean age of both male and female administrators differed only 0.23 years, the age range of the men was greater than that of the women. As indicated in Table 1, there were six age ranges for men and only four for women.

Table 1

Age of Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Male Frequency</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female Frequency</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N_m = 16 \). \( N_f = 15 \). \( \bar{x}_m = 49.5 \). \( \bar{x}_f = 49.27 \).

Education

Table 2 represents the educational attainment of
both groups of administrators. Faculty in academic disciplines in community colleges are required to have a minimum of a master's degree and the administrators, whether they are promoted from the faculty ranks or not, also hold at least a master's degree.

Table 2
Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate in progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.56 0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N_m = 16 \). \( N_f = 15 \).

Experience

Two questions addressed the length of administrative experience. Question 5 requested the number of years and months in the current position, and Question 6 sought the total number of years of administrative experience.
Position Experience

As indicated in Table 3, which exhibits the experience in the position held at the time of the completion of the questionnaire, the mean length of position experience differed 3.89 years between the men and the women.

Table 3
Position Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years experience</th>
<th>Men Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.16-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $X_m = 6.29$. $X_f = 2.4$.

Administrative Experience

The second question sought the total number of years of administrative experience. While the years of experience for men were dispersed more uniformly, the number of years of experience for women were concentrated predominantly in the 5.1 to 15 year range. As depicted in Table 4, the mean number of years of experience between men and
women differed 2.3 years.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 to 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 to 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 to 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1 to 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( X_m = 14.72 \) \( X_f = 12.42 \)

Position Prior to Administrative Position

In order to ascertain the progression of the administrative careers, respondents were asked to identify the positions held just prior to their first administrative appointment. Table 5 outlines these preadministrative positions. It is important to note that some administrators listed the position of department chairperson as administrative, and other administrators listed it as a nonadministrative position. Follow-up investigation
revealed that some institutions classified the department chairperson as an administrator, and other institutions remunerate faculty members who are elected to the position by their departments without making any changes in the faculty classification. The position of department chairperson, because of its inconsistency in definition, was excluded from Table 5. Two of the responses to this question were not usable.

Table 5
Preadministrative Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Men Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical technician</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutions of Preadministrative Positions

Related to the previous questions of the position held prior to the assumption of an administrative position, the next question regarded the type of institutions in which the nonadministrative positions were held. Of the 16 male respondents, 13 (81%) held their preadministrative positions in educational institutions. Community colleges were listed in 9 cases; one man held a position in a university and 3 listed K-12 school systems. Three (19%) men held positions in the private sector; advertising, industry, and business were the institutions in which these respondents held their preadministrative positions.

Thirteen of the 15 women (86%) held their preadministrative positions in education. Seven of these positions were held in community colleges, 4 in universities, and 2 in K-12 school systems. The 2 (13%) female respondents who did not hold positions in educational institutions listed a federal agency and a hospital as institutions in which their preadministrative positions were held.

Perceptual Responses

The next group of questions dealt with perceptions regarding factors which have contributed to respondents' decisions to become administrators and factors which they
perceived to have contributed to the success of their careers.

Factors Which Have Contributed to Career Success

The purpose of this question was to elicit respondents' perceptions as to which three main factors they credit for the success of their careers. No three factors impended. Only one element was repeated for each gender. The factors with the most common frequencies for males and their corresponding frequencies for females are indicated in Table 6, and the factors with the most common frequencies for females with the corresponding frequency for males are listed in Table 7. Included are items listed once by both men and women, and those elements listed only per gender. Terminology which seemed alike, but was expressed by different terms, was considered as the same only if listed as synonyms in the Merriam-Webster Thesaurus (1978).

The following factors were mentioned once by each gender as having contributed to career success: desire, flexibility, intelligence, perseverance, and preparation.

The following factors were mentioned by men only: heredity, childhood experience, support from advisor, ability for accomplishment, love of education, skill, experience, personality, interest, ambition, willingness to assume responsibility successfully, professional
involvement, initiative, integrity, honesty, loyalty, leadership, and understanding of the political arena.

Table 6
Factors Which Have Contributed to Career Success
(In the order of primary importance for males)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Men Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People skill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These percentages reflect the percentage of respondents who listed these factors as having contributed to their career success.

The following factors were mentioned by women only: good health, geographic flexibility, continuous employment, planning, determination, work habits, long hours, task orientation, self development, job satisfaction, caring about people, attitude, self confidence, networking, and mentors.
Table 7
Factors Which Have Contributed to Career Success
(In the order of primary importance for females)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Women Frequency</th>
<th>Women %</th>
<th>Men Frequency</th>
<th>Men %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing more than expected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These percentage reflect the percentage of respondents who listed these factors as having contributed to their career success.

Factors Which Have Influenced Administrative Careers

Question 11 consisted of five parts. Part A, which prompted a yes or no response, asked if the respondents' first administrative aspirations were a result of the encouragement of someone else. A space was provided where the precise relationship to such person could be identified. Parts B, C, and D sought to ascertain whether the respondents' administrative careers were planned or a matter of chance. Table 8 quantifies the responses and
Table 9 lists those who were identified as having provided encouragement.

### Table 8

**Entering Administration Because of Someone's Encouragement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9

**Relationship of Those Who Provided Encouragement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For Women</th>
<th>For Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of the organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** \( N_f = 11 \). \( N_m = 11 \).
Parts B, C, and D also required yes or no responses to elicit information regarding career planning of the administrators in this study. Section E of Question 11 provided the opportunity to write factors which the respondents believed contributed to their decision to enter administration. Table 9 identifies the results of parts B, C, and D. This is followed by a listing in Table 10 of the factors which were identified as having contributed to the decision to enter administration.

Table 10
Career Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%Yes</td>
<td>%No</td>
<td>%Yes</td>
<td>%No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being at the right place at the right time</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned and pursued an administrative position</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A series of unplanned events</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following list identifies other factors which were listed by women as having contributed to their
decision to enter administration: organizational need, programs for women students, college influence, inability to obtain faculty position, need to support a family, better training than incumbent, visibility, advanced degrees, desire to contribute, desire to improve organization, success at administrative tasks, and family expectations.

The following list identifies other factors which were named by men as having contributed to their decision to select a career in administration: financial rewards (listed three times and the only response mentioned more than once), ability to influence events, non-teaching leadership roles, desire for change, knowing the right people, being asked, parental role model, respondent believed that he could do a better job.

Sponsors

The purpose of the section on the questionnaire regarding sponsors was two-fold. Since some literature includes sponsoring as part of the mentoring function, and the activities of mentoring and sponsoring frequently overlap, the inclusion of sponsors in this study was vital. Furthermore, it was believed that a separate section on sponsoring would distinguish it from mentoring, and respondents would not be inclined to confuse or coalesce the two functions for this study. Table 11 depicts the
incidents of sponsoring.

Table 11
Sponsors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N_m = 16 \). \( N_f = 15 \).

The Importance of Sponsors

Table 12 identifies the response to the question regarding the importance of sponsors on career advancement. One male administrator did not respond.
Table 12
Sponsors and Career Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Impact of Sponsors

Respondents were asked to rate from 1 to 5 on a Likert-type scale the impact that sponsors had on their career advancement. The same number of men and women (15) rated the impact of sponsors. The mean rating by women of the perceptions of the impact that sponsors had on their careers was 3.4. Men gave the impact of sponsors a mean rating of 2.81. The mean rating for women was .59 greater than the rating by men.

Mentors as Sponsors and Role Models

Question C, which was repeated for each mentor, asked if the mentor under consideration also acted as a sponsor and a role model. Data obtained from these questions are included in Table 13.
Table 13

Mentors as Sponsors and Role Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Role models</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male mentor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female protege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male mentor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male protege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female mentor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female protege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female mentor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male protege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question B provided space for respondents to list the kinds of assistance the mentor provided. Mentors of both genders provided encouragement and advice to both male and female proteges.

Female proteges also credited their male mentors with providing the following: financial support, coaching, example, political savvy, more responsibility, moral support, opportunity, sharing, permitting failure, praise, balance, direction, humor, open communication, strategic planning, challenge, and protection.
Male proteges credited their mentors of the same gender with these factors: political savvy, example, financial support, encouragement, training, nurturing, guidance, moral support, permitting failure, more responsibility, visibility, insight to community college operations, and friendship.

Female mentors provided female proteges with: friendship, companionship, intellectual stimulation, sharing, a friendly voice, literal promotion, visibility, and goal setting.

Encouragement was the only factor which was listed as having been provided for male proteges by their female mentors.

Hypothesis Testing

To test for a statistical difference between the means, a $t$ test for independent groups was the data analysis procedure used with all four hypotheses. The alpha level to determine significance and avoid a Type I error (the rejection of a null hypothesis when it is correct, and the means are indeed equal) was set at .05. Prior to the evaluation of the significance of the $t$ test, an $F$ test of variance was applied by the SAS System. The $F$ test determined which variance assumption (equal or unequal variance) was to be used in selecting the $t$ test. An alpha level of .25 was selected for the $F$ test in
order to reduce the probability of committing a Type II error.

**Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis addressed the research question regarding the influences of role models in early life on the frequency of mentoring relationships during the career stages. The null hypothesis stated that no difference would be found in the mean number of mentors from those women who had role models in early life and the men who had role models in early life. The alternate, directional hypothesis stated that there would be a difference; the women who had role models would have a greater mean number of mentors than the men who had role models. A t test for independent groups was utilized.

Table 14 demonstrates a probability of F at 0.069; this is less than the selected alpha level of .25 and violates the assumption of equal variances. The estimate of unequal variances was therefore used for the analysis of the t test. The probability of the t test (0.022) was less than the alpha level of .05. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was considered to be tenable.

The difference between the mean number of mentors for the women who had role models (2.18) and the mean number of mentors (1.00) for the men who had role models
Table 14

Hypothesis 1: t Test for the Difference Between the Means of the Number of Mentors for Men and Women Who Had Role Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.*</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Prob.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.181</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.25

**p<.05
was statistically significant. While literature contends that role models influence the mentoring relationship, this influence appears to be more prevalent for women than it does for men.

**Hypothesis 2**

The research question regarding the perceived importance of mentoring on career advancement was investigated by the second hypothesis. The null hypothesis stated that no difference exists in the mean perception rating of the importance of mentoring to male and female administrators. The alternate hypothesis was directional indicating that the mean rating by women of the importance of mentoring was greater than the mean rating by men.

As demonstrated in Table 15, a $t$ test of independent groups revealed an $F$ test probability of 0.671. Since this exceeded the alpha level of .25, the estimate of equal variance was used for the $t$ test. A $t$ test probability of 0.089 exceeded the .05 alpha level previously set. The null hypothesis of no difference failed to be rejected at the .05 level but would have been significant at the .10 level.

A female population of 15 had a mean perception rating of 4.12. The mean rating of the male administrators was 3.65. A difference in the mean of 0.47 was
Table 15
Hypothesis 2: $t$ Test for the Difference in the Means Between the Perception Rating of Men and Women Regarding the Importance of Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F Prob.*</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Prob.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.120</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>1.768</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p>.25

**>.05
insufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis explored the research question regarding the impact that mentoring made on the careers of men and women administrators. The null hypothesis stated that there was no difference in the mean rating of the perceptions that men and women had regarding the impact that mentors made on their careers. The alternate hypothesis which was directional stated that there was a difference and that the mean rating by women of the impact that mentoring made on their careers would be greater than the mean rating by men.

As exhibited in Table 16, an examination of the homogeneity of variance revealed the probability of $F$ to be .530. This exceeded the preset alpha level of .25; the assumption of homogeneity of variance was made, and equal variance was used in selecting the $t$ test. The $t$ test resulted in a probability of 0.664 which was greater than the alpha level of .05 and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

**Hypothesis 4**

The final hypothesis deals with the question of who provided more mentoring, male or female mentors. The null


Table 16

Hypothesis 3: t Test for the Difference Between the Means of the Perception Rating of Men and Women Regarding the Impact of Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob.*</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Prob.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.613</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.753</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .25

**p > .05
hypothesis stated that there was no difference in the mean rating of the assistance received from a male and female mentors. The alternate hypothesis which was directional stated that female mentors received a greater mean rating of the assistance than male mentors. Out of the entire population for this study, 4 women and 2 men had both male and female mentors.

An F probability of 0.495 exceeded the alpha level of .25, and the assumption of equal variance was made in the selection of the t test for independent groups. A t test probability of 0.98 well exceeded the preset alpha level of .05, and the null hypothesis of no difference was not rejected.

Table 17 indicates that the mean rating for female mentors was 4.08 and for male mentors the mean rating of the assistance provided was 4.07. The difference of 0.01 was much too small to make a statistical difference and did not support the hypothesis that female mentors provided a greater degree of assistance.

Summary

This chapter was divided into three major presentations. The first section provided a demographic profile of the two groups of respondents, including work experience. The second division provided attitudinal responses as well as data not directly related to the
Table 17
Hypothesis 4: t Test for the Difference Between the Means of the Assistance Provided by Male and Female Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F Prob.*</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Prob.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .25

**p > .05
research hypotheses. Finally, the results of the testing of the four hypotheses were presented. Chapter V presents the conclusions drawn from this study, the limitations of this study and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of this study is presented in this chapter. Conclusions, as a result of the data analyses, are drawn. Implications resulting from the findings are made, and recommendations for further study are also presented.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent to which mentoring affected the career paths of top level administrators in Michigan public junior and community colleges. The primary interests were the career advancement of women administrators and the influences of mentoring on the careers of these women. The inclusion of male administrators was important because it provided the strength of a comparison and a larger sample.

Four questions were raised regarding the mentoring relationship. The first regarded the early influences of role models on later mentoring relationships. The second and third questions were concerned with the differences in the perceptions between men and women regarding the mentoring relationship. The last question regarded the difference between the assistance provided by male and
female mentors.

Literature on mentoring, particularly as it related to these questions, was examined in detail. Most literature heralded mentoring as an influential factor in the career advancement of professionals in the private and public sector. Studies dealing with mentoring in higher education were less prolific. Not all literature was supportive of mentoring. Some recently published articles stated that mentoring was overrated in its importance to career advancement. The literature review prompted the development of four hypotheses incited by the research questions.

A questionnaire was developed and used as the primary means of data collection. The questionnaire was validated by a panel of two experts on the subject of mentoring. A pilot study was conducted with 10 community college personnel directors.

The study was ex post facto in nature and surveyed the entire population of 16 female administrators who held the top three administrative posts. The 16 men were matched to the women by virtue of the comparable positions which they held in the same educational institution or in an institution of similar size. Thirty-one (97%) of the subjects responded to the mailing. One follow-up letter and/or telephone call was required for some of the respondents.
Four research hypotheses were developed and tested against null hypotheses. A t test for independent means was used for the analysis of each of the hypotheses.

Additional background data were collected to provide a profile of the respondents. These data provided additional information regarding the career paths and attitudes of the respondents and a means of further comparison of the male and the female respondents in this study.

Population Profile

The average age of both men and women in this study was 49 years. Their educational attainment was also notably similar; 56% of both groups had their doctorates and no one had less than a master's degree.

Both men and women had a similar number of years of administrative experience, differing only an average of 2 years. Eighty percent of the women had held their current position for 1 to 5 years while 75% of the men held those positions from 1 to 10 years; 13% of the male population held these positions up to 15 years. This would indicate that while both groups had been administrators for a similar length of time women have only recently begun to share the upper administrative level.

Prior to their administrative appointments, 81% of the men and 86% of the women held faculty and faculty
related positions in educational institutions from the elementary level through college. The remaining percentage of the males held professional positions in the private sector while women held support positions such as secretary, administrative assistant, and medical technician.

Conclusions

Many of the conclusions drawn resulted from responses in the questionnaire not directly related to the hypotheses. These were attitudinal responses designed to provide an understanding of factors related to career advancement in addition to mentoring.

Career Success

In response to the listing of three factors to which subjects attribute their career success, the most frequent response for men was "performance" and for women was "hard work." Performance would suggest output, while hard work suggests input. Women, for the large part, listed factors which were oriented toward interrelationships, while men listed factors more individualistic in nature. Similarly, women attributed their decisions to enter administration to the influence of others. Men's decisions to enter administration tended to be self-imposed and self-directed, confirming the premise held.
by Josefowitz (1980), that women need the approval of others.

Women attributed their success to factors involving interrelationships in a greater number of cases than men, and women selected their support from higher administrative ranks. While the supervisor appeared as the person who provided the most encouragement for men, presidents of the organization were listed only by women. Either women must be recognized by their chief executive officers (CEO) in order to secure promotions in the upper administrative levels, or perhaps affiliation with presidents provides women with the legitimacy necessary for ascent up the administrative ladder. It is also a possibility that women are following the advice of authors such as Harragan (1977) who counseled women to set their aims high. There may well be other explanations for this phenomenon, but the fact remains: women in this study stated that they were encouraged by CEO's; men in this study did not.

Men and women were quite similar in giving credit to their advancement by being at the right place at the right time and as a result of a series of unplanned events. Yet, 43% of the women and only 25% of the men stated that the entry to administration was carefully planned and actively sought. This contradicts theories
that men rather than women are the planners of careers (Sheehy, 1976). It is particularly interesting to note that only the men who hold the top three administrative positions in community colleges were studied; Yet, only 25% of these top level male administrators reported that they planned their careers.

Role Models, Sponsors, and Mentors

The one hypothesis in this study which found a difference between men and women administrators concerned the influence of early role models on the mentoring relationships during the career stages. Women who had a greater number of role models in childhood had a greater number of mentors during their careers. This finding provides support for the theory that there is a connection between role modeling and mentor relationships (Henning, 1970; Levinson et al, 1978; Sheehy, 1976), but that connection exists for women more than it does for men. Cultural factors may be influential as may the need that women have to interrelate and acquire the approval of others (Cook, 1979; Harragan, 1977; Henning & Jardim, 1977; Josefowitz, 1980). Furthermore, the results of this study would provide support for the validity of those programs which have implemented role model and mentoring programs for children during their precollege school years.
Sponsors, who according to literature do not make an emotional commitment to their proteges nor do they take risk or commit time to the career development of another received a higher mean impact rating on the careers of the respondents than did mentors. The difference in the mean rating by women between sponsors and mentors was 0.21, but men gave sponsors a mean rating of 1.34 higher than the mean rating of mentors. Men apparently see greater benefits in a sponsoring relationship than a mentoring relationship. Perhaps, it is because women require the approval of others; whereas, men see interrelationships as another vehicle to goal accomplishment and find little need for the intensity of a mentoring relationship. Henning and Jardim (1977) summarized this appropriately,

From a very early age men expect to work to support at least themselves. Instead for the individual woman the emphasis, expressed or implied, is placed on the need to find someone to support her. The difference in mind-set that develops from this crossroad of childhood's expectations and ambitions is enormous. (p.33)

Cook (1979), who asked if mentoring is primarily a male experience, found that women in the upper corporate levels had very few mentors. This is not the finding of this study. Although men and women in this study were been found to appreciate the importance of mentors equally, women had a greater number of mentoring relationships (36) than males (14), and women benefited
from the mentoring of either gender. It is true that one reason women may not have a greater number of mentors of the same gender because there are so few women in the upper administrative ranks. Women may not have the availability of numerous female mentors, but men are not as adverse to acting as mentors as literature would have one believe. Quite the contrary, the women in this study had 25 male mentors while men had only 14 mentors of the same gender.

Cross-gender mentoring has received so much adverse publicity when the mentor is male and the protege female. The potential dangers in this type of relationship have not prevented women from entering such a relationship or from benefiting from it. Cross-gender relationships where the mentor is female and the protege is male were much more rare and much less intense. If women were available to be mentors, they were more inclined to help those of their own gender. Only 2 of the 16 men in this study had female mentors. The mean assistance rating by the men of their female mentors was 3.4.

The mentoring relationship also does not appear to be as comprehensive for men as it does for women. An average of 85% of the women's mentors of both genders also acted as sponsors and an average of 90% acted as role models. The mentors of both genders for the men, on the other hand, acted as sponsors in an average of 57% of
the cases and as role models on an average of 61% of the time.

Diamond (1978) believed that role models are gender specific, and the reason role models are so difficult for women to obtain is that there are so few women to act as role models. One hundred percent of the female mentors also acted as role models for their female proteges, and 80% of the male mentors also acted as role models for their female proteges. Perhaps, women have had no option but to select men since the number of "successful" women was so limited, but the theory of role model gender specificity was not apparent in this study.

Without a significant difference between groups, respondents of both genders in this study admitted to the importance of mentoring, and both men and women credited mentors as having impacted their career. While mentors have proven to be important to career advancement, having a mentor is no guarantee of getting into administration and not having a mentor does not keep one out.

Limitations and Recommendations

The size of the population in this study was a definite limitation. In spite of the fact that the women in this study comprised the entire population of women holding positions in the top three administrative levels, it is believed that a larger population could provide
greater understanding of the mentoring relationship. A study surveying women who hold upper administrative positions in community colleges nationwide or regionally could provide the added population.

This study considered only administrators in community colleges. Since mentoring has been believed to be more prevalent in universities and business, a study comparing the mentoring relationships of female administrators in community colleges, universities, and business would not only provide a greater understanding of the mentoring relationship but also of the nature of the difference of such relationships across institutions. Furthermore, such a study could clarify the influence of institutional size on mentoring relationships.

No significant difference was found in the rating of the respondents regarding the assistance received by male and female mentors. Although respondents listed the specific functions performed by mentors, these functions were not investigated in detail. Misserian (1980) suggested that there was a difference in the type of mentoring provided for men and women. An investigation, from the mentor's perspective, regarding the type of assistance provided for proteges may reveal whether or not men and women are treated differently in their mentoring relationships.

Blotnick's (1984) and Clawson's (1985) concerns re-
garding the negative aspects of mentoring merit some consideration. Has the need for mentors been overrated? What are the long term effects of the mentoring relationship? A study of those who have been appointed to high level administrative or executive positions but have not experienced the mentoring relationship could provide answers to these questions.

It was the finding of this study that early role models influence the incidences of mentoring during the career. Therefore, this study supports those programs which have instituted mentoring programs during the elementary and secondary school years. These types of programs would be of particular benefit for young girls in terms of shaping their careers as women. Yet, the nature of the difference in role modeling experiences and the effect that role models may have on mentoring or other interrelationships during the career merits further investigation.

This study also discovered that while both men and women value the benefits of the mentoring relationship equally, men gave the sponsor relationship a higher impact rating. Further investigation could reveal whether it is the perception between men and women that differ or if sponsors have indeed been more beneficial to men's careers than mentors.

While Blotnick (1984) and Clawson (1985) defer
their praise for the mentoring relationship, this study
has found mentoring to be held in esteem by upper level
community college administrators. It is important to re-
member that mentoring has never been regarded as the sole
stimulus but rather one of a number of factors which may
aid in a person's career advancement. Mentoring has been
of particular interest in the study of the career
advancement of women, since literature has affirmed the
need for women to have interrelationships. Mentoring is,
after all, an interrelationship in the work place.
Appendix A

Content Validity Rating Scale With Board of Expert's Rating Results
Content Validity Rating Scale

The following represents the rating scale for the content validity and appropriateness of each questionnaire item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Low Relevancy</th>
<th>High Relevancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name (optional)</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Current title</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No. of years in this position</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No. of years of administrative experience</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Position prior to first administrative position</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Type of institution in which you held this position</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. List credential granting institutions, major, degree, and year</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. List three main factors which have contributed to your career success</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Consider how you first became an administrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Because of someone's encouragement (identify relationship)</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Being at the right place at the right time</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Carefully planned and actively sought to obtain an administrative position
   1  2  3  4

d. Through a series of unplanned events
   1  2  3  4

e. List other factors which may have contributed to your decision to become an administrator
   1  2  3  4

Role Models

12. At any time during your preschool years, did you have a role model
   1  2  3  4

13. How many role models did you have during this time
   1  2  3  4

14. Approx. how old were you when you had each role model
   1  2  3  4

15. Who were your role models
   1  2  3  4

16. Did you have role models in college or thereafter
   1  2  3  4

17. Who were these role models
   1  2  3  4

Sponsors

18. During your career, how many sponsors have you had
   1  2  3  4

19. Do you believe sponsors played an important part in your career advancement
   1  2  3  4

20. Rate the impact of sponsors on your career advancement
   1  2  3  4

Mentors

21. How many mentors have you had
   1  2  3  4

22. Do you believe mentors facilitate career advancement
   1  2  3  4
23. Rate the importance of mentors on career advancement 1 2 3 4
24. Rate the importance of having someone show an interest in your career. 1 2 3 4
25. Rate the importance of having someone provide career counseling 1 2 3 4
26. Rate the importance of having someone provide professional development for another's career 1 2 3 4
27. Rate the importance of having someone who provides assistance and/or guidance in work related problem resolution 1 2 3 4

Questions A through O will be repeated to accommodate each mentoring experience the respondents may have had.

A. What was the person's position in relationship to yours 1 2 3 4
B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide 1 2 3 4
C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management 1 2 3 4
D. Was this person also a role model for you 1 2 3 4
E. Was this mentor a man or a woman 1 2 3 4
F. How long did this relationship last 1 2 3 4
G. Rate the importance of this relationship to your career development 1 2 3 4
H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided 1 2 3 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Rate the impact this person had on your career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Rate the effect that this person had on your career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Rate the effect this person had on your promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire Content Validation

#### Rater Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Item</th>
<th>Rater A</th>
<th>Rater B</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rater Results—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Item</th>
<th>Rater A</th>
<th>Rater B</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>176.00</td>
<td>171.00</td>
<td>173.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Pilot Test: Letter and Questionnaire
June 16, 1985

Dear

Per our conversation, I am enclosing the questionnaire for your participation in the pilot project of my study on the career paths of community college administrators. Any comments you may wish to make on any portion of the questionnaire would be most welcome. Please don't be deterred by the thickness of the questionnaire; sections have been repeated and you need only fill in those which apply.

I am aware that your time is very valuable, and I do so appreciate your willingness to participate in this study. If you are interested, I will gladly share my findings with you.

For your convenience, I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which you may return the questionnaire.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Marianne Adam
QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal History

1. Code____________________

2. Sex____________________

3. Age____________________

4. Your present title___________________________________

5. Number of years in this position.____________________

6. Number of years of administrative experience________

7. Type of institution in which you held this position

8. Please list your credential granting institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. List three main factors which have contributed to
your career success._________________________________

11. Consider how you first became an administrator.

a. (yes / no) Because of someone's encouragement.
   (If yes, please identify the relationship)________

b. (yes / no) Being at the right place at the right
time.

c. (yes / no) Carefully planned and actively sought
to obtain an administrative position.
d. yes/no Through a series of unplanned events.
e. Other factors which may have contributed to your decision to become an administrator.

Role Models

12. At any time during you pre-college years, did you have a role model, a person whose position and/or traits you emulated and admired? __________

13. If so, how many role models did you have during that time? ________________

14. Approximately how old were you when you had each role model? _____________________________________________________

15. Who were your role models? ______________________________

16. Did you have role models in college or thereafter? __

17. Who were these role models? ______________________________

Sponsors

A sponsor is a person who promotes you (figuratively) and your skills to upper management, but does not groom you professionally or take a personal interest in your career.

18. During your career, how many sponsors have you had? __

19. Do you believe sponsors played an important part in your career advancement? __________

20. Rate the impact of sponsors on your career advancement.

     (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

Mentors

A mentor is a person who has taken a special interest in your career, has guided and taught you, has influenced your career and/or facilitated your advancement.
21. How many mentors have you had? ______________________

22. Do you believe mentors facilitate career advancement?

23. Rate the importance of mentoring on career advancement

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

24. Rate the importance of having someone show an interest in your career.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

25. Rate the importance of having someone provide career counseling.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

26. Rate the importance of having someone provide professional development for another's career.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

27. Rate the importance of having someone who provides assistance and/or guidance in work related problem resolution.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

Questions A through 0 have been repeated to accommodate each mentoring experience that you may have had. Please consider each mentor separately when answering the following sections.

(Mentor A)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?

( superior / immediate supervisor / colleague / subordinate / other ) Please circle or specify: _____

B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

________________________________________

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? ____________

D. Was this person a role model for you? ____________
E. Was this mentor a man_______or a woman?________

F. How many long did this relationship last?___________

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

(Mentor B)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?
   (superior / immediate supervisor / colleague /
   subordinate / other) Please circle or specify:____
B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? 

D. Was this person a role model for you? 

E. Was this mentor a man or a woman? 

F. How long did this relationship last? 

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

(Mentor C)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?

(superior / immediate supervisor / colleague / subordinate / other) Please circle or specify: 

B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? __________

D. Was this person a role model for you? ________________

E. Was this mentor a man______ or a woman?_______

F. How many years long did this relationship last?_____ 

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

(Mentor D)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?
   (superior / immediate supervisor / colleague / subordinate / other) Please circle or specify: ______

B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?
   ________________________________

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? __________

D. Was this person a role model for you? ______________

E. Was this mentor a man ______ or a woman? __________

F. How long did this relationship last? __________________

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
Appendix C

Study: Letters, Forms, and Questionnaire
Dear

Business has heralded the importance of mentors in career advancement. Yet, mentoring appears to be a more common occurrence in the private sector than in education. Does education share the belief that mentoring is an asset in the career advancement process? In response to this question, I am currently conducting a research study through Western Michigan University to discover the impact that mentors have made on the career advancement of administrators in Michigan colleges.

The foundation of this research involves a survey of those who "have made it" in education; therefore, a select group of those who hold the position of dean or above in public institutions of higher learning have been selected to participate in this study. It is through the sharing of your experiences that important information can be acquired regarding the career advancement and the role of mentors in aiding one's career.

Your response is critical. As you are aware, only a very small percentage of women are members of this select administrative group. Each woman who holds the position of dean, provost, vice president or president is part of the population for this study and has been carefully matched with a man who holds the same position in a similar educational institution. Your failure to respond to this questionnaire will, therefore, invalidate the matched pair.

As a faculty member and part-time administrator, I am aware of the time pressures under which you labor, but it is through the sharing of your experience that education can continue its never ending process of self improvement.

Needless to say, the confidentiality of your input is guaranteed. Only I will have access to the information which you provide, and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

For your convenience, I have enclosed a stamped self-addressed envelope in which you may return the questionnaire.
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Should you need clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me; I would enjoy hearing from you. If you desire, I will gladly share my findings with you. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Marianne Adam
Dear

Three weeks ago, I mailed you a questionnaire intended to gather data for my research on the impact of mentoring on the career paths of college administrators. The study will compare responses between men and women administrators who have been matched by virtue of the similar positions which they hold in the same or similar educational institution. As you may be aware there are only eighteen women who hold positions of dean, vice president, or president in community colleges in the Michigan. This severely limits the population for this study. You are a member of this very select population, and your response is so crucial.

I realize your schedule is very demanding and this request places and additional demand on your time. The questionnaire is not as lengthy as it initially appears since sections have been repeated to accommodate each mentoring experience you may have had. If confidentiality is your concern, rest assured only I will see your responses, and feel free to omit any section you believe will identify you. Please take the few minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Your prompt return of the questionnaire will insure the processing of the data in the month of October. If you have already returned the questionnaire within the last few days, please disregard this request and accept my appreciation for your participation in this research. If you have any questions or concern whatsoever, please do not hesitate to call me at 546-7062.

I hope that you will reconsider your participation is this study, and I beg you patience with my second request.

Sincerely yours,

Marianne Adam
PLEASE SIGN AND RETURN WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

I understand that my participation in the study of mentoring and the career paths of college administrators, conducted by Marianne Adam, a doctoral student and Western Michigan University, is totally voluntary and that I may elect to withdraw my consent to participate at any point in the study. I further understand that no identifying information will be made known either through publication or presentation, and that all identifying information will be destroyed upon completion of this study.

_________________________
Signature

_________________________
Date
QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal History

1. Code ___________________
2. Sex ____________________
3. Age ____________________
4. Your present title______________________________
5. Number of years_____months_______in this position.
6. Number of years of administrative experience_______
7. Type of institution in which you held this position

______________________________

8. Please list your credential granting institutions.

Degree Institution Major/Concentration Year


9. List three main factors which have contributed to your career success.______________________________

11. Consider how you first became an administrator.
   a. (yes / no) Because of someone’s encouragement.
      (If yes, please identify the relationship)_________

   b. (yes / no) Being at the right place at the right time.

   c. (yes / no) Carefully planned and actively sought to obtain an administrative position.
d. _yes/ no_ Through a series of unplanned events.
e. Other factors which may have contributed to your decision to become an administrator.

Role Models

12. At any time during you pre-college years, did you have a role model, a person whose position and/or traits you emulated and admired? (_yes/ no_)

13. If so, how many role models did you have during that time?
   1  2  3  4  5 (If more, please specify number) ______

14. Approximately how old were you when you had each role model?

15. Who were your role models?__________________________

16. Did you have role models in college or thereafter? (_yes/ no_)

17. Who were these role models?__________________________

Sponsors

A sponsor is a person who promotes you (figuratively) and your skills to upper management, but does not groom you professionally or take a personal interest in your career.

18. During your career, how many sponsors have you had?
   1  2  3  4  5 (If more, Please specify number.)_____

19. Do you believe sponsors played an important part in your career advancement? (_yes/ no_)

20. Rate the impact of sponsors on your career advancement.

   (low)  1  2  3  4  5 (high)
Mentors

A mentor is a person who has taken a special interest in your career, has guided and taught you, has influenced your career and/or facilitated your advancement.

21. How many mentors have you had? 0 1 2 3 4 5
   (If more, please specify number) _________________________

22. Do you believe mentors facilitate career advancement? (yes / no)

23. Rate the importance of mentoring on career advancement.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

24. Rate the importance of having someone show an interest in your career.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

25. Rate the importance of having someone provide career counseling.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

26. Rate the importance of having someone provide professional development for another's career.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

27. Rate the importance of having someone who provides assistance and/or guidance in work related problem resolution.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

Questions A through O have been repeated to accommodate each mentoring experience that you may have had. Please consider each mentor separately when answering the following sections.

(Mentor A)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?
   (superior / immediate supervisor / colleague / subordinate / other) Please circle or specify: ___
B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? (yes / no)

D. Was this person a role model for you? (yes / no)

E. Was this mentor a man or a woman?

F. How many years and months did this relationship last?

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.

   (low)  1  2  3  4  5 (high)

(Mentor B)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?
   (superior / immediate supervisor / colleague / subordinate / other) Please circle or specify: ______

B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? (yes / no)

D. Was this person a role model for you? (yes / no)

E. Was this mentor a man ______ or a woman? ______

F. How many years ______ months ____ did this relationship last?

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.

   (low)  1  2  3  4  5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.

   (low)  1  2  3  4  5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.

   (low)  1  2  3  4  5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.

   (low)  1  2  3  4  5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.

   (low)  1  2  3  4  5 (high)
L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

(Mentor C)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?
   (superior / immediate supervisor / colleague / subordinate / other) Please circle or specify: ______

B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? (yes / no)

D. Was this person a role model for you? (yes / no)

E. Was this mentor a man ______ or a woman? ______

F. How many years _____ months ____ did this relationship last?

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

(Mentor D)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?
   (superior/ immediate supervisor/ colleague/ subordinate/ other) Please circle or specify: ______

B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

____________________________________________________________________________________

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? (yes/no)

D. Was this person a role model for you? (yes/no)

E. Was this mentor a man______ or a woman?______
F. How many years ______months _____did this relationship last?

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

O. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

(Mentor E)

A. What was this person's position in relation to yours?
   (superior / immediate supervisor / colleague / subordinate / other ) Please circle or specify:_____
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B. What kind of assistance did this mentor provide?

C. Did this person also sponsor you by promoting your skills to upper management? (yes/no)

D. Was this person a role model for you? (yes/no)

E. Was this mentor a man_________or a woman?_____

F. How many years_____months_____did this relationship last?

G. Rate the importance of this relationship on your career development.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

H. Rate the quality of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

I. Rate the degree of assistance this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

J. Rate the credit this person gave you for your work.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

K. Rate the impact this person had on your career advancement.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

L. Rate the effect that this person had on your promotion.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

M. Rate the effect this person had on the increase in your salary.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

N. Rate the prestige that affiliation with this person provided.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)
0. Rate the benefits of the training that this person provided.

(low) 1 2 3 3 4 5 (high)
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