

Mentorship Programs in City Government: A Survey of US Cities

By

George J. Sanders III

Gjsandersiii@gmail.com



An Applied Research Project
(Political Science 5398)

Submitted to the Department of Political Science
Texas State University-San Marcos

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Public Administration

Fall 2016

“Mentoring is a brain to pick, an ear to listen, and push in the right direction.” –John Crosby

About the Author

George J. Sanders III is a native Houstonian and resides in Arlington, Texas. George has served nine years in the United States Army as a Paralegal Non-Commissioned Officer. During his military career, he has deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom 2008-2009. George is employed by the United States Department of Justice.

George holds a bachelor's degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice from The University of Texas at Arlington. Upon completion of this project, he will have earned a Master's Degree in Public Administration from Texas State University.

Acknowledgements

I thank Dr. Thomas Longoria for his support and motivation to complete the MPA program. His continuous understanding and assistance influenced my tenure as a student at Texas State University.

I thank my classmates Devin Bailey and Sheila Wiora for their support throughout the completion of this project and the MPA program. They continuously held me accountable and encouraged me to persevere through the rigors of life while completing the MPA program.

Dodie Weidner, I thank you.

Finally, I want to thank my son Judah who was born my first semester of the MPA program. His presence throughout my tenure a graduate student was motivated by his existence.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	7
<i>What is a mentor?</i>	8
<i>What is a protégé?</i>	8
<i>Benefits of Mentoring</i>	9
<i>Purpose and Scope</i>	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review	11
<i>Chapter Purpose</i>	11
<i>Conceptual Framework</i>	11
<i>Mentorship Programs Types</i>	12
<i>Formal Mentoring</i>	13
<i>Informal Mentoring</i>	13
<i>Reciprocal Mentorship</i>	14
<i>Peer Mentorship</i>	15
<i>Reverse Mentorship</i>	16
<i>Functions of Mentoring</i>	17
<i>Career Functions</i>	17
<i>Psychosocial Functions</i>	19
<i>Mentoring Relationships</i>	20
<i>Protégé Selection</i>	21
<i>Agency Directed</i>	22
<i>Participants Selection</i>	22
<i>Program Deficiencies</i>	23
<i>Mentor-Protégé Selections Deficiency</i>	23
<i>Sexual Harassment</i>	24
<i>Program Length</i>	24
<i>Women in Mentoring</i>	25
Chapter 3: Methodology	26
<i>Chapter Purpose</i>	26
<i>Research Design</i>	26

<i>Strengths and Weaknesses</i>	26
<i>Research Setting and Study Participants</i>	27
<i>Operationalization Table</i>	28
<i>Survey Distribution</i>	30
<i>Institutional Review Board Approval & Human Subjects Protection</i>	31
Chapter 4: Results	32
<i>Chapter Purpose</i>	32
<i>Survey Response</i>	32
<i>Population Trends</i>	32
<i>Regional Trends</i>	33
<i>Program Participation</i>	34
<i>Mentorship Program Type</i>	34
<i>Career Functions</i>	35
<i>Psychosocial Functions</i>	35
<i>Participant Selection</i>	36
<i>Participant Matching Discrepancy</i>	37
<i>Sexual Harassment</i>	37
<i>Problems Encountered during Mentorship</i>	37
Chapter 5: Conclusion	39
<i>Chapter Purpose</i>	39
<i>Research Summary</i>	39
<i>Bibliography</i>	42
Appendix A: Survey	46
Appendix B: Institutional Review Board Exemption	49

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Conceptual Framework.....	11
Table 2.2 Functions of Mentorship.....	17
Table 3.1 Strengths and Weaknesses of Survey Research.....	27
Table 3.2 Operationalization Table of Conceptual Framework.....	28
Table 4.1 Population Trends.....	33
Table 4.2 Regional Trends.....	33
Table 4.3 Program Participation.....	34
Table 4.4 Mentorship Program Types.....	34
Table 4.5 Career Function Rankings.....	35
Table 4.6 Psychosocial Function Rankings.....	36
Table 4.7 Participant Selection.....	36
Table 4.8 Participant Matching Discrepancy.....	37
Table 4.9 Problems Encountered During Mentorship.....	38

Mentorship within City Government

Chapter 1

Introduction

Organizations seek to hire motivated people to support and contribute to the mission statements of their agencies. In recent years, government agencies are impacted by the retirement of baby boomers, tenured personnel in wrong positions, and high turnover rates (Godwin 2009). Godwin describes baby boomer retirements as a “demographic tsunami” that result in a lack of interested and qualified candidates for entry-level senior positions. Retirement affects organizations due to the loss of institutional knowledge. Institutional knowledge is a group of concepts, ideas, and facts held by a particular group of people. The retention of institutional knowledge enhances continuity of organizational effectiveness. Establishing mentor programs within an organization assist retention of institutional knowledge.

What is mentoring?

The concept of mentoring is very complex and has multiple meanings. Mentoring programs help organizations develop leaders, retain diverse and skilled employees, and enhance succession planning (Allen, Finkelstein and Poteet 2009, 1). Mentoring has received multiple definitions throughout literature. Kram defines mentoring as a relationship between two individuals whose nature changes over time (K. E. Kram 1983). Allen, Finkelstein, and Poteet describes mentoring as a relationship between two people, usually a junior and senior partner, whereby the senior employee takes the junior employee “under his or her wing” to teach the

junior employee about their job, orient them to the industry and organization, and address social and personal issues that may arise on the job (Allen, Finkelstein and Poteet 2009, 2). Hunt and Michael define mentoring as a dyadic relationship in which older individual coaches, guides, and help a protégé (Hunt and Michael 1983). According to Sosock & Godshalk (2000), mentoring relationships are when individuals with advanced experience and knowledge provide support and facilitate the upward mobility of junior organizational leaders. For the purpose of this study mentoring will be defined as the agreement between two or more individuals for the development of personal and career objectives (K. E. Kram 1985) (Hunt and Michael 1983).

What is a mentor?

Mentorship relationships are composed of two participants' mentor and a protégé. A mentor is considered the backbone of mentorship programs since they are entrusted with broad responsibilities while participating in a mentoring relationship. A mentor is regarded as a coach, sponsor, teacher, and trusted advisor (Klauss 1981). The role of a mentor is to provide the protégé with insight and direction (Crawford 2010). Mentors provide invaluable knowledge to their protégé and assist them with career and personal support.

What is a protégé?

Protégés are recipients of guidance, coaching, and support of a mentor throughout a mentoring relationship. Protégés are classified as the younger colleague or inexperienced person that enters into a developmental relationship with an experienced individual for the purpose of academic, career, and personal advancement (Middendorf 2010). According to Johnson & Ridley protégés adopt the behaviors, professional practices, and over time the practices of an influential mentor

(Johnson and Ridley 2004).

Benefits of Mentoring

Mentorship programs integrate protégés into an organizations' career setting. The mentoring relationship is important as it provides employees with a "sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role. The programs benefit the organization and the protégé by creating organizational bonds (Nemanick 2000), job satisfaction, socialization (Nemanick 2000), career advancement (Sosik and Godshalk 2000), reduced turnover rates (Eby and Lockwood 2005), and preparation of leaders (Burke 1984). Organizations must have real bonds with their employees. The majority of work products produced by workers are associated with the perspective and attitude employees have with an agency. Mentorship programs build relationships with staff because they are exposed to different aspects from their mentor.

Employees produce their best work product when they are satisfied with their job. Job satisfaction is necessary within an agency because negative energy diminishes morale. The availability of mentorship increases job satisfaction for new employees because the protégé has someone consult if a problem arises. Employees that have a mentor to discuss workplace issues can mitigate negative attitudes within the workplace. Some organizations experience high turnover rate that is not cost effective. Finding prospective employees isn't cost effective as the organization has to advertise the position, conduct interviews, and pay for security clearances dependent upon the security level of the position. Government agencies may encounter employees leaving their organizations for other employment opportunities. Multiple factors impact employee's decisions to leave an agency for another organization or private sector employment. Mentorship informs protégé of different opportunities within an organization

impacts turnover.

Participating in a mentorship program has multiple advantages for protégés. Benefits for protégé participation are faster advancements, higher incomes, greater career satisfaction than employees in contrast to employees who do not participate in the program (Ensher and Murphy 1997). The ability for advancement within an organization is the main factor that attracts employees to an organization. Mentorship programs expose positive characteristics and skills of the protégé to the executive staff (Sosik and Godshalk 2000).

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this applied research project is to describe various mentorship programs available for use by governmental agencies. This paper will examine mentorship programs, explain the benefits of mentorship programs, and potential problems associated with mentorship programs. The topic of mentorship is important for regulatory agencies because it provides incoming employees the opportunity to be matched with tenured employees for integration into the workforce. Successful integration into an organization assists with employee satisfaction and work productivity. Organizations seeking to prepare employees to become future leaders and successfully implement programs will have a great impact on the current workforce.

The following chapter of this applied research project review literature on organizational mentoring and will develop the concept in its entirety of the importance of mentorship programs and their effectiveness as well as problems associated with mentorship. To examine mentorship efficiency, Chapter 3 will operationalize mentorship and conduct a survey to human resource directors of cities with a population greater than one hundred thousand citizens. Chapter 4 will explain the results of the study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter Purpose

This section reviews scholarly articles that explain mentorship programs utilized by organizations. The literature describes various mentorship programs and their functions. First, the different types of mentorship programs will be explained. Second, mentorship functions will be explained. Third, this project will describe selection process of participants. Fourth, the phases of mentorship relationships will be described. Finally, discrepancies within mentorship programs will be discussed. The information within this section will adequately express how to choose mentorship programs suitable for organizations and how programs impact employees.

Conceptual Framework

Table 2.1 presents the conceptual framework and introduces key elements explained in this applied research project. The conceptual framework is an outline of important ideas that pertains to the purpose and scope of the research project (Shields and Rangarajan 2013). Analyzing academic literature developed key components in the conceptual framework.

Table 2.1: Conceptual Framework	
Descriptive Category	Supporting Literature
1. Mentorship Program Types	(Eby and Lockwood 2005)
1.1 Formal Mentoring	(Klauss 1981)
1.2 Informal Mentorship	(Ragins and Cotton 1999)
1.3 Reciprocal Mentorship	(Mavrinac 2005)
1.4 Peer Mentorship	(Nemanick 2000)

1.5 Reverse Mentorship	(Viator 1999) (Harvey, et al. 2009) (Carey and Weissman 2010) (K. E. Kram 1985)
2. Functions of Mentorship 2.1 Career 2.2 Psychosocial 2.3 Mentorship Relationship	(K. E. Kram 1983) (K. E. Kram 1985) (Mavrinac 2005) (Nemanick 2000) (Eby and Lockwood 2005) (Ragins and Cotton 1999) (Middendorf 2010) (Allen, Finkelstein and Poteet 2009) (Clutterbuck and Lane 2014) (Middendorf 2010)
3. Protégé Selection 3.1 Agency Selection 3.2 Participant Selection	(Ragins & Kram) (Burke 1984) (Furano, et al. 1993)
4. Program Deficiencies 4.1 Mentor-Protégé Selection 4.2 Sexual Harassment 4.3 Program Length 4.4 Gender & Race	(Ehrich, Hansford and Tennent 2004) (K. E. Kram 1985) (Kumar and Blake-Beard 2012)

Mentorship Programs Types

Organizations have various mentorship programs available to choose when deciding to implement a mentorship program. Organizations construct appropriate mentorship program dependent upon their organizational structure and mission. Mentoring creates an environment for employees to build deeper relationships with the organization (Mavrinac 2005). Agencies that create mentorship programs attempt to retain and develop valuable employees.

There is not a clear-cut mentorship program compatible with each organization. The differences are important because different mentorship programs are suitable depending on the agency, the individual involved, and mentor-protégé relationship (Chun, Sosik and Yun 2012).

Different programs are beneficial to various organizations dependent upon their organizational structure and mission (Burke 1984).

Formal Mentoring

Organizations establish formal mentoring programs to develop employees and support organizational goals. An essential element of a formal mentorship program is organizations match mentors and protégés (Eby and Lockwood 2005). Also, formal mentorships programs have specific requirements mentors and protégés must follow while actively participating in the program. For example, formal programs require mentorship agreements define terms of the program (Klauss 1981). Formal agreements include establishing the duration of the program, which typically ranges from six to twelve months (Ragins & Cotton, 1999).

Formal mentorship programs are often explicitly linked to professional development. The primary objective of a formal mentorship is to improve employee competence. The goals of formal mentoring programs are talent development and improvement of employee knowledge, skills and abilities, retention, and diversity enhancement (Edy, et al. 2001).

Informal Mentoring

Mentorship does not require a formal agreement. In fact, informal mentorship is the most common form of mentorship (Ragins and Cotton 1999). Mentors select protégé whom they believe are rising stars (Ragins and Cotton 1999). In contrast to formal mentorship programs, protégés select mentors that possess desired expertise or connections within an organization (Nemanick 2000). Participants of informal mentorship programs select mentors of common interests and mutual attraction that begins the mentor-protégé relationship (K. E. Kram 1983).

The mentor serves as a facilitator of professional guidance and plans the protégés potential career path. Participants of informal mentorship program occasionally are not employed by the same agency (Ragins and Cotton 1999). Informal mentorship occurs when two parties have an incentive to form a relationship and engage in psychosocial functions such as counseling, social interactions, role modeling, or providing friendship (Nemanick 2000). These mentorship activities occur in social gatherings, corporate events, and exposure to influential people such as agency directors and corporate executives. The strength of the informal program is the concern for the protégés career goals and can place their needs above the organizations (Ragins and Cotton 1999).

An informal mentorship is an active form of mentorship due to the lack of structure. Informal mentoring develop in settings where potential protégés and mentors have the opportunity to interact and observe each other (Viator 1999).

Reciprocal Mentorship

Reciprocal mentorship simultaneously develops the mentor and protégé. Participants of reciprocal mentorship communicate on a daily basis (Gonzalez and Thompson 1998). This consensual information exchange agreement serves not only to facilitate organizational learning but could potentially contribute to creating a sustained competitive advantaged given that we are finding ourselves in an increasingly knowledge oriented marketplace (Harvey, et al. 2009). The theory of reciprocal mentoring states mentoring has mutual positive effects for both the mentor and the protégé, and throughout the program, these individuals become co-learners (Chandler and Kram 2005).

Reciprocal mentoring allows for all participants within the program to share information in regards to specific career or organizational goal. This program impacts the entire organization. As organizational relationships grow the ability for people to create groups or networks within the organization allows a constant flow of knowledge. These systems will assist organizational growth and will be able to interlock networks that will enhance the structure of their program.

Peer Mentorship

Peer Mentoring is a developmental relationship that's constructed on a multiple mentor approach in which mentoring is gained from a variety of experiences and people throughout an employee's career (Mavrinac 2005). Peer mentoring allows employees to share their experiences with others that give organizations the ability to share a plethora of experience. Peer mentorship focuses on the capacity of colleagues to assist each other while completing job task. This mentorship builds an atmosphere of comradery within an organization. Peer mentoring removes barriers are within bureaucratic organizations since they focus on being a team.

Carey (2010) divides peer mentorship into two categories of peer mentorship collegial social relationships or collaborative peer mentoring. The first type of peer mentorship is collegial social mentorship or special peer mentoring. Collegial social mentorship is when colleagues serve as friends, personal advisor, academic advisor, peer mentor, and project collaborators (Carey and Weissman 2010). Collegial social mentorship involves personal relationships between people of similar career goals and share experiences as they progress throughout their career. Parties mutually agree to assist each other throughout their career and plan to improve together.

Collaborative peer mentoring involves the same characteristics of collegial social mentorship in a group setting. Collaborative group mentorship begins upon receipt of a work project that requires multiple personnel from within a department or interdepartmental cooperation. Collaborative Mentorship can be a part of an informal or formal mentorship program. The formal mentorship program within collaborative mentorship is facilitated peer mentoring. In facilitated peer mentoring, a small peer group works collaboratively toward an agreed upon goal with the guidance of a senior facilitated mentor. The role of a facilitated mentor is to provide project-specific advice.

Reverse Mentorship

Reverse mentorship is a unique form of mentorship programs because the mentor is not an experienced professional. Reverse mentorship is defined as an inverted mentorship program whereas junior employees are partnered with senior managers understand technology (Harvey, et al. 2009). This form of mentorship has gained popularity due to the rapid level of technological innovation and the globalization of business (Harvey, et al. 2009). The inclusion of technology throughout organization personnel is ignorant to the usage of technology software programs such as Microsoft Word, Access, and Excel. Reverse mentorships assist with the retention rate of new employees because they're exposed to the executive management and receive expertise directly from people in positions they aspire to hold within the latter of their career.

This program improves the climate of within the organizations because it allows junior employees to feel valued and appreciated while teaching executives how to operate new technological advances. Within the workplace employees within non-supervisory positions long to feel appreciated and acknowledgment of their efforts to support the mission of the

organization. The benefits of reverse mentoring are information access, social feedback, job performance improvement (Mullen and Noe 1999), personal satisfaction, personal development (K. E. Kram 1985), and personal fulfillment (Busch, 1985).

Functions of Mentoring

Mentors are a catalyst to protégés' career advancement, success, and emotional growth within the workplace. The relationship between a mentor and protégé is dyadic and enhances the protégés knowledge, professional development, and emotional stability. Kram (1985) defined mentoring functions as “aspects of developmental relationships to enhance individual growth and advancement.” Table 2.2 list is mentoring functions theorized by Kram.

Table 2.2 Functions of Mentoring	
Career Functions	Psychosocial Functions
Sponsorship Exposure and Visibility Coaching Protection Challenging Work Assignments	Acceptance and Confirmation Counseling Friendship Role-Modeling

Career Functions

Career functions help protégé become successful (Turban, Dougherty and Lee 2002). Kram (1983) describes career functions as sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Career functions assist the protégé with organizational development and preparing for advancement opportunities (K. E. Kram 1983).

The mentor provides sponsorship by recommending them for promotions and advancements (Ragins and Cotton 1999). Sponsorship creates a positive reputation for the mentor and protégé (K. E. Kram 1985). The mentor utilizes their credibility so the protégé to

receive advancements. Throughout sponsorship, mentors supervise the protégé capabilities and ability to complete new work competencies. Kanter (1977) argues that protégés receive “reflected powers” through association of their sponsor. Reflected powers are gained through association with influential people. The powers gained by the protégé are mirrored upon the influence of their mentor. However, these powers only exist while their mentor is employed with the organization.

Coaching outlines protégé goals and creates strategies for accomplishing career objectives and aspirations. The protégé draft their aspirations and the mentor will help implement a plan that would be beneficial to the protégés career. Mentors introduce protégés to different aspects of the organization and teach them how to effectively perform within the organization (Murrell 2007).

Exposure and visibility are when protégés receive a task from executives (K. E. Kram 1985). Exposure allows protégés to prove their competence by completing complex work assignments. Upon completion of these tasks, the protégé presents their project and may receive promotion or accolades for their productivity. Also, protégés receive visibility by participating in important operational meetings (Clutterbuck and Lane 2014).

Protection is the shielding of the protégé from harmful contact with supervisors. The mentor protects the protégé by accepting the faults of a protégé. Mentors intervene in situations the protégé cannot manage or stressful situations. Protégés can be shielded from premature exposure to senior management. Protection is to the benefit of the protégé because mentors have the ability to expose the protégé upon successful training and proved competence.

Mentors provide complex work assignments to the protégé to expose them to different aspects of their position. The challenging work assignment function is defined by entrusting the

difficult task to the protégé so that he or she can develop technical skills and competencies (Middendorf 2010).

Psychosocial Functions

Psychosocial functions enhance character traits and personal development of protégés (Ragins and Cotton 1999). The four psychosocial functions are acceptance and confirmation, counseling, friendship, and role modeling (K. E. Kram 1985). These functions connect protégés emotions to an organization. According to Ragins & Cotton (1999) psychosocial functions address the quality of interpersonal relationship and the emotion bond that affects a relationship.

Support and encouragement of the protégé provide acceptance and confirmation as they become established within the organization. This function is provided after trust is created and the protégé is familiar and gained confidence through their mentor. The mentor assists the protégé gain self-confidence.

The mentor provides an attentive ear within the counseling function. Mentors perform this function by listening to the protégés problems that may interfere with positive career accomplishments (K. E. Kram 1983). Mentors resolve concerns by offering positive advice. Friendship is provided throughout the mentoring relationship by giving respect and support (Ragins and Cotton 1999). Friendship allows relief from the stressors within the workplace.

The final facet of a psychosocial function is role modeling. Role modeling is the imitation of a mentor's mannerism. According to Kram (1985), role modeling is the representation of the mentors, values, attitude, and behavior.

Mentorship functions vary depending on independent relationships. Kram (1985) defined three factors to which functions appear in the mentoring relationship. First, mentorship functions

utilized within the relationship is dependent on the developmental needs of mentor and protégé. Upon determination of appropriate mentoring functions, those functions will be applied to the relationship. Second, interpersonal skills of the participants will determine whether a relationship will be maintained. Lastly, the composition of the organization can impact mentorship functions based on opportunities, hierarchy, and whether relationships are encouraged within the organizations to work environment (K. E. Kram 1985).

Mentoring Relationships

The development of mentoring relationships is based on the needs of the protégé. Kram explains four stages of mentorship relationships. The four stages of relationships are the initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition (Kram, 1985).

The first phase is initiation. According to Kram (1985), the lifetime of the initiation phase is six to twelve months. She characterizes the individuals to have positive thoughts about the relationship that gives them the ability to view the outcome of the relationship as positive. During this phase, each participant takes their perspective role within the relationship and is completing the objectives of their role. The initiations phase participants are grasp positive attitudes of the relationship. A mutual attraction develops, and as time passes, both individuals develop positive expectations for the relationship based on those early encounters (K. E. Kram 1985).

The second phase of relationships is cultivation. The lifetime of the cultivation phase is 2 to 5 years. Throughout the cultivation phase, several of career and psychosocial functions are utilized. Cultivation focuses on career functions needed for mentorship. Variation of functions provided during the cultivations phase is due to differences in individual developmental needs,

individual capacities to engage in trusting relationships, mutuality, and intimacy (K. E. Kram 1985). The cultivation phase implements expectations made between participants in the initiation phase. If expectations are achieved the relationship progress.

The next phase of relationships is separation. During the separation phase, participants end their relationship. The lifetime of this phase is six months to a year. Separation exists when the relationship diminish. Separation may begin when one party thinks the relationship isn't advancing or opportunities have reduced for advancement.

The redefinition phase of mentorship occurs after the separation phase in which the participants' relationship converts into friendship rather than a mentorship relationship. Kram argues that within the redefinition phase the relationship is different due to the less stringent obligations as a mentor.

Protégé Selection

Selection of protégés varies upon the mentorship programs used by an organization. Formalized mentorship programs have a structured process to choose protégés. In contrast, informal programs occur sporadically between mentor and protégé. A core feature that defines mentoring relationships and distinguishes it from other types of personal relationships that Mentoring is a developmental relationship embedded within career context (Ragins and Kram 2007). The following section reviews literature that explains how protégés are selected for mentorship programs.

Agency Directed

Participants of formalized mentorship programs submit applications. A committee selects qualified individual's protégés they believe has the most potential to benefit the organization. Matching may be a more structured process in which potential mentors and protégés make assignments from preference lists submitted (Cunningham 1993; Burke and McKeen, 1983). Within some agencies, protégés are not able to choose their mentor. In some instances, organizations have a pool of mentors and protégés whom collaboratively work together to find the best matches for the mentorship relationship. Allowing protégés the opportunity to assist with mentor selection is beneficial because it allows them to find the best candidate. Mentorship matching is at its best when mentors are selected within their department because; it allows them to receive growth within their expertise.

Agencies may also match participants randomly. This selection uses a pool of mentors and protégés. Participants are selected according to similar interest, backgrounds, and geographic proximity (Furano, et al. 1993). Random selection of participants may be complicated to ensure the program is effective because it may lead to participants having separate interest.

Participants Selection

The mentor and protégé may potentially have the opportunity to select their counterpart. Executives may find a new employee with ambitions and career goals that remind them of themselves within the beginning of their career. Mentors select protégés that have the greatest potential. Mentors strive to ensure their protégé is successful in their career and may use their namesake to promote advancement for them.

Mentors assist protégés with their career by accepting responsibility to critique, develop, and provide direction. Mentors show protégés the most efficient way to obtain job success. The purpose of mentors initiating a relationship is because they have a vision for the protégé and believe they are potential candidates for advancement. Mentors select protégés carefully for management to have confidence to choose protégés that have the ability to perform at a higher rate than the general population of the organizations' workforce. Protégés have the opportunity to select mentors to provide them with career guidance. The mentor that the protégé selects is frequently holding the position the protégé aspires to hold or the ability to successfully plan a career map.

Program Deficiencies

Mentorship programs are developed to assist the protégé with career management and exposure, however; mentorship programs fail to complete program objectives. The purpose of this section is to explain barriers encountered by mentorship programs.

Mentor-Protégé Selections Deficiency

Appropriate selection of participants for the mentoring program is important. Mismatching of personnel within a mentorship relationship may cause tension within the relationship. It is suitable for organizations to consider possible and demographic factors such as race, gender, age, and availability. Ehrich et al. (2004) argue professional expertise and personality mismatch created the most problems during mentoring. She greater explains the differences were in result of personality, ideological, or expertise differences (Ehrich, Hansford and Tennent 2004).

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is a factor, which impacts mentorship programs. Sexual harassment violates trust within a mentorship program since the protégé is vulnerable to the mentor since they wish to gain support and career guidance. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) defines sexual harassment as “unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature” (EEOC, 2014). Sexual harassment is solely harassment between different genders.

The core of mentorship programs is relationships of the mentor and protégé. It’s considered the core of programs because to have an effective program the protégé must establish trust and willingness to communicate personal issues to their mentorship. Within these relationships, we may find that one party within the relationship may compromise the mentor protégé relationship due to an attraction. Sexual harassment is more likely to occur within cross-gendered relationships.

Program Length

Duration of mentor programs impacts the protégés ability to receive adequate mentorship. Different mentorship programs have different lengths of the mentorship that could possible impact the mentor-protégé relationship. The core of mentorship programs is relationships and relationships develop over time. Effective mentorship programs allow adequate time for the mentor and protégé to develop a working relationship. Formal mentorship programs don’t allow for a relationship to form to its maximum capacity due to the time restraints placed on the program. The program is outlined by management, which dictates the minimum amount of meeting and objectives of their program. This potentially leads to participants to solely “check

the box” and meet the program objectives rather than use the program as a benefit. As discussed earlier in the chapter formal mentorship programs are restricted twelve months. Formal mentorship is useful within the federal government because it assists retention of new employees throughout their probationary period.

Informal mentorship programs allow adequate time for relationships to develop. A longer duration allows for participants to adequately cycle through relationship phases as previously stated earlier in this chapter. According to Kram (1985), informal relationships could last three to six years dependent upon the progress of the protégé. Longevity of informal mentorship gives better results and satisfaction of mentorship in contrast to formal programs.

Women in Mentoring

The literature presents obstacles for women while participating in mentorship programs. Recent statistics indicate 47 percent of the American workforce is female (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015). Women that participate in mentorship programs receive promotions but less compensation than males (Ragins and Cotton 1999). The Department of Labor notates the women to men earnings ratio is 78.3 percent, and the wage gap is 21.7 percent (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015). The pay disparity women receive in the workforce is contributed to the glass ceiling (Ragins and Cotton 1999). The glass ceiling is “artificial barriers based on an attitudinal or organizational bias that prevents qualified individuals from advancing upwards in their organization to management level positions” (Blake-Beard 2001).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Chapter Purpose

This applied research project is a descriptive study of mentorship programs in public agencies. The descriptive categories of the conceptual framework were used to create a survey to describe mentorship programs. First, this chapter describes the research design to identify the effectiveness of mentorship program. Second, strengths and weaknesses of methods used for this project as well as the justification of these methods. Finally, the chapter will explain the operationalization of the conceptual framework as provided in chapter two.

Research Design

This applied research project uses survey research to collect data of the conceptual framework. According to Babbie, surveys are the best method available to the social researcher that is interested in collecting original data too large directly observes (Babbie 2010, 287). Survey research is appropriate for this project because it allows the interviewer to have the flexibility to obtain protégé's perceptions on the effectiveness of their mentorship program.

Strengths and Weaknesses

It is appropriate to understand the strengths and weaknesses of survey research. The strength and weaknesses of survey research described by Babbie are illustrated in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Strengths and Weaknesses of Survey Research	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Describing Characteristics of Large Population Make Large Samples Feasible Flexible Standardized Questionnaires	Standardization Superficial Responses Inflexibility Artificial Subjects

Surveys gauge characteristics of large populations if the sample is carefully selected as well as the standardized questionnaire. It is important the researcher commit to the study and not deviate from the questionnaire. Standardized questionnaires are easy to measure due to respondents' response to identical questions. Surveys allow flexibility due to the amount of questions asked within the study.

In contrast, survey research is inflexible because it does not enable the research to change. Survey research can miss the important aspects of a subject if not carefully prepared. Superficial answers may be given to survey research because most studies do not allow social and emotional context to be included in the research. Lastly, studies may receive artificial answers from respondents.

Research Setting and Study Participants

This research was conducted within the United States of America. The primary objective of the survey is to examine effectiveness and outcome of participating in mentorship programs. The study was administered to human resource directors of cities with a population of one hundred thousand citizens or greater. To obtain a comprehensive list of cities with a population greater than one hundred thousand citizens, a search was conducted on the United States Census Bureau's website. A search within the data tools section exhibited a spreadsheet titled "Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July

1, 2015, Population: April 1, 2010, to July 1, 2015 – United States.” The spreadsheet located 283 cities with a population of one hundred thousand or greater. For the purpose of this study, United States territories and the District of Columbia are excluded from this research project.

After gathering the list, the researcher created an alphabetical list by state of the cities. Human resource directors’ emails were obtained through their online staff directory. A small portion didn’t have this information public, and the city was contacted electronically via a public information request. Many cities did not respond to this request. Two cities stated they would not be of any assistance to my research because; they did not have a mentorship program.

Operationalization Table

The operationalization table for this study defines descriptive categories for elements determine the effectiveness of mentorship programs. The first column illustrates the descriptive categories of mentorship, which includes the types of mentorship, functions of mentorship, program type, protégé selection, and program deficiencies. Multiple subcategories precede each major category. The second column lists questions used in the survey for the descriptive categories. The questions within the study address each element of the conceptual framework.

Table 3.3: Operationalization Table of Conceptual Framework	
Descriptive Category	Criteria to be evaluated
Mentorship Program Types Formal Mentorship Informal Mentorship Reciprocal Mentorship Peer Mentorship Reverse Mentorship	30) Does your city have a mentorship program? 2) Does your agency allow for employees to create their own mentorship relationship? 3) Are employees allowed to share effective ways to complete work assignments?

	4) Does your agency allow inter-departmental collaborations to complete work assignments?
Functions of Mentorship Career Psychosocial	<p>5) Please rank the following statements by the level of importance where 1 is most important and 6 being the least important. (Click and Drag Statements)</p> <p>_____ Public Support of the protégé by advocating their potential and skills.</p> <p>_____ Recommendation of the protégé for promotions or lateral moves while participating or upon completion of the program.</p> <p>_____ Greater visibility for protégés during or after participating in mentorship program.</p> <p>_____ Networking opportunities for protégés within their field of interest.</p> <p>_____ Mentors protecting protégés from controversial situations.</p> <p>_____ Protégés receiving challenging assignments while participating in mentorship programs.</p> <p>6) Please rank the following statements by the level of importance where 1 is the most important and 5 being the least important. (Click and Drag Statements)</p> <p>_____ Protégés imitating the behaviors and values of their mentor.</p> <p>_____ Mentors assist protégés in developing professional self-worth.</p> <p>_____ Protégés gain self-confidence while participating in the mentorship program.</p> <p>_____ Mentors providing an open door for protégés to speak about their conflicts.</p> <p>_____ Mentors offering personal advice to overcome personal and professional conflicts.</p> <p>_____ Participants developing a personal friendship while participating in the mentorship program.</p>
Protégé Selection Random Selection Participant Selected Spontaneous Relationship Dictated by agency	<p>7) How are participants selected to participate in your cities mentorship program?</p> <p>8) Are participants given the opportunity to select their counterpart?</p> <p>9) Are there instances where two employees enter a mentorship relationship and inform the agency of the relationship?</p>

Program Deficiencies Participant Matching Discrepancy Sexual Harassment Disinterested Party Program Length Gender & Race	10) Have there been instances where participants of mentorship programs were mismatched? (Wasn't the right fit) 11) In the instances of participants mismatching, how was the situation resolved? 12) What problems do your city mentorship program encounter? 13) Has your city experienced problems with coed participants of your city mentorship program? 14) What are reported issues of coed participants? 15) Have participants of your city's mentorship program reported sexual harassment while participating in the program? 16) What is the percentage of males and females reporting sexual harassment while participating in your city's mentorship program? _____ Male _____ Female 17) What is the duration (in years) of your city's mentorship program? 18) What is the percentage of women participating in your city's mentorship program?
--	--

Survey Distribution

The survey was distributed electronically to 198 human resource directors on October 5th, 2016. This survey was tested five times to ensure data collection without technical problems. Participants were notified about the importance of the study and their rights to participate in the study. Reminders were sent to participants on October 11, 2016, and October 17, 2016. The survey closed on October 18, 2016.

Institutional Review Board Approval & Human Subjects Protection

This applied research project uses human subjects as respondents. This Applied Research Project was submitted to the Institutional Review Board at Texas State University under request number EXP2015U342622L and was declared exempt. Questions involved in this project are not related to personal matters and respondents were informed their participation was voluntary and they may refuse to participate. The findings of this survey research are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results of the survey administered to human resource directors. The results are based upon the operationalization of the conceptual framework presented in Chapter 3.

Survey Response

This survey was administered to 198 respondents. Immediately upon conducting the survey, ten emails bounced which resulted to 188 potential respondents. Qualtrics recorded forty-four responses to the survey. Three surveys were incomplete and not included in the findings. The complete recorded surveys were 39, and the calculated response rate is 20.74%.

Population Trends

The survey asked respondents to select the population range of their respective city. Population range divides cities into four categories small, medium, large, and extra-large. As indicated in Table 4.1 small cities reported the highest rate of mentorship program participation at 81.25%. Medium cities were not represented in this survey, as respondents did not elect medium as their population range. Large cities accounted for 6.25% of mentorship program participation. Lastly, extra-large cities accounted for 12.50% of mentorship program participation.

Table 4.1 Population Trends	
City Size (per citizen)	Mentorship Program Participation
Small (100,000-299,999)	81.25%
Medium (300,000-599,999)	0.00%
Large (600,000-899,999)	6.25%
Extra-Large (900,000 and above)	12.50%

Regional Trends

The survey asked respondents to select their geographic region. The regions are West, Midwest, Northeast, Southwest, and Southeast. As indicated in Table 4.2 the Western region has the greatest participation with the rate of 56.25%. The following rates of mentorship participation are Midwestern (12.50%), Northeastern (6.25%), Southwestern (2%), and Southeastern (12.50%).

Table 4.2 Regional Trends		
Region	States Represented	Mentorship Program
Western	WA,OR,CA,AK,HI,MT,ID,WY,NV,UT,CO,AZ,NM	56.25%
Midwestern	ND,SD,NE,KS,MN,IA,MO,WI,IL,MI,IN,OH	12.50%
Northeastern	PA,NY,VT,NH,ME,MA,RI,CT,NJ	6.25%
Southwestern	TX,OK,AR,LA	2%
Southeastern	MS,TN,KY,AL,DE,MD,WV,VA,NC,SC,GA,FL	12.50%

Program Participation

The study asked respondents if their city participated in a mentorship program. It was found that 43.59% participated in mentorship programs and 51.28% did not have a mentorship program. Two respondents failed to respond to the question.

Table 4.3 Program Participation		
	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	17	43.59%
No	20	51.28%
Unanswered	2	5.13%
Total	39	100%

Mentorship Program Type

Questions 1-4 inquired about the type of mentorship programs used in cities. As illustrated in Table 4.4 formal mentorship (43.59%), informal mentorship (48.27%), and peer mentorship (2.56%) were used by respondents. 5.13% of respondents didn't respond to the question.

Table 4.4 Mentorship Program Type		
Program	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Formal	17	43.59%
Informal	19	48.72%
Peer	1	2.56%
Unanswered	2	5.13%
Total	39	100%

Career Functions

The importance of career functions and the order in which career functions are provided to the protégé was measured in question five. The survey asked respondents to rank statements, which related to a specific career function of mentorship by the level of importance. As indicated in Table 4.5 respondents ranked challenging work assignments as the most important career function.

Table 4.5 Career Functions Rankings	
Function	Ranking
Challenging Work Assignments	First
Sponsorship	Second
Exposure & Visibility	Third
Coaching	Fourth
Protection	Fifth

Psychosocial Functions

The importance of psychosocial functions and the order in which psychosocial functions are provided to the protégé was measured in question six. The survey asked respondents to rank statements, which related to a specific psychosocial function of mentorship by the level of importance. As indicated in Table 4.6 respondents indicated Acceptance and Confirmation as the most important psychosocial function.

Table 4.6 Psychosocial Functions Ranking	
Function	Ranking
Acceptance & Confirmation	First
Counseling	Second
Role-Modeling	Third
Friendship	Fourth

Participant Selection

The study asked how participants are selected for mentorship programs. Forty-eight percent of respondents stated members are chosen by the agency. The survey responses discovered two categories of body placement. First, protégés receive mentors upon initial entry of employment. Second, participants complete a formal application process and the agency place protégés with mentors that align with their projected career goals. Thirty percent of respondents indicated their members chose their counterpart. The remaining twenty-two percent of respondents stated this question was not applicable.

Table 4.7 Participant Selection	
Selection Type	Percentage of Respondents
Agency Selected	51.28%
Participant Selected	30.76%
Undecided	17.98%

Participant Matching Discrepancy

The study asked if participants notify the agency about discrepancies within mentorship relationship. As shown in Table 4.5 48.72 percent of respondents stated participants notified the agency of matching discrepancies. 28.21% stated no discrepancies were reported and 23.07% failed to answer the question.

Table 4.8 Participant Matching Discrepancy		
Number of Respondents		Percentage of Respondents
Yes	19	48.72%
No	11	28.21%
Unanswered	9	23.07%
Total	39	100%

The survey further asked how the agency corrected matching discrepancies. All respondents stated protégés are assigned, new mentors.

Sexual Harassment

The survey asked respondents if participants reported instances of sexual harassment. Respondents reported no instances of sexual harassment.

Problems Encountered during Mentorship

The survey asked respondents to list problems encountered while during mentorship programs. The responses are consolidated and shown in Table 4.6. 25.64% of respondents stated “time” as a problem of their mentorship program. One respondent state, “participants, making time to meet with each other and thinking of creative opportunities to expose the protégé to more meaningful aspects of the

current mentors'' position or responsibilities within the organization. Another respondent stated mentorship programs takes time away from employees to complete work assignments. 10.26% of respondents stated their programs don't have professionals willing to accept the responsibility of becoming a mentor. 12.82% of respondents stated their problem within their organization is they didn't have a mentorship program. 5.13% of respondents stated their agency didn't have formal mentorship program and hoped to convert informal mentorship to a formal program. 2.56% of respondents stated their discrepancy is the lack of funding for a mentorship program. 2.56% of respondents reported matching participants is their problem. 2.56% of respondents indicated their mentorship program was lacking a formal follow-up program to check on the well-beings of the former protégés.

Table 4.9 Problems Encountered during Mentorship		
Problem	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Time	10	25.64%
Lack of Participants	4	10.26%
Department Closed	1	2.56%
Lack of Program	5	12.83%
No Formal Program	1	2.56%
Funding	1	2.56%
No Problem	2	5.13%
Participant Matching	1	2.56%
Follow-Up	1	2.56%
N/A or No Response	12	30.76%
Total	39	100%

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to review the research and summarize the finding of this study. The purpose of this applied research project is to describe various mentorship programs available for use by governmental agencies.

Research Summary

The literature disclosed multiple mentorship programs available for use by organizations. These programs are Formal Mentorship, Informal Mentorship, Reciprocal Mentorship, Peer Mentorship, and Reverse Mentorship. The finding of this survey is congruent with the literature that informal mentorship is most common. The survey showed the majority of organizations utilize informal mentorship programs.

Formal mentorship is slightly used less than informal programs. The formal program as reported by respondents is organized by the organization. The survey found formal programs were enacted to enhance existing employees or assist new hires. The survey revealed three ways in which participants are selected for formal mentorship programs. First, participants submit a formal application to the agency and the human resource directors make selections. Second, supervisors recommend subordinates. Lastly, new employees are automatically paired with a mentor. The study inquired about mismatching of participants.

The survey recorded 48.72% of respondents experienced participant matching discrepancies. Furthermore, respondents stated in situations of matching problems the protégé is reassigned.

The literature explains the career and psychosocial functions of mentorship. These functions were thoroughly defined throughout the literature. However, research wasn't conducted that rate functions by the level of importance. This study allowed respondents to arrange statements related to mentorship functions by the level of importance. Career functions by the level of importance were arranged in the following order: challenging work assignments, sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, and protection. Psychosocial functions by the level of importance were arranged in the following order: acceptance and confirmation, counseling, role modeling, and friendship.

Lastly, the study investigated problems encountered while conducting a mentorship program. The majority of respondents considered "time" to be the greatest problem of mentorship. The aspect of time was multifaceted, and respondents gave three accounts of how time affected their program. First, participants fail to make time to meet. Second, respondents stated mentorship programs are time-consuming to manage. Finally, respondents stated mentorship programs interfere with the completion of participants' job duties. Time is important to mentorship. A relationship will not evolve if participants are not taking the opportunity to meet. Also, one respondent stated their organizations refuses to fund a formal mentorship program.

The final problem encountered during mentorship program is the lack of personnel accepting the role of a mentor. Mentors are the backbone of mentorship programs. They have a wealth of knowledge and resources to assist protégés throughout their career. Mentorship programs ensure institutional knowledge is maintained within an organization.

There is extensive research of mentorship within the private sector. However, this study is administered by government entities. The study of mentorship is important because it enhances

the competence of employees. It is imperative organizations develop newer employees because they are the future and will ensure the mission of the organization is complete. The topic of mentorship should be researched further to find how mentorship programs assist protégés throughout their career.

Bibliography

- Allen, Tammy D., and Lillian T Eby. "Relationship Effectiveness for Mentors: Factors Associated with Learning and Quality." *Southern Management Association* (Sage Publishers), 2003.
- Allen, Tammy D., and Lillian T. Eby. "Mentorship Behaviors and Mentorship Quality Associated With Formal Mentoring Programs: Closing the Gap Between Research and Practice." *Journal of Applied Psychology* (American Psychological Association) 91, no. 3 (2006): 567-578.
- Allen, Tammy D., Lisa M Finkelstein, and Michael M. Poteet. *Designing Workplace Mentoring: An Evidence-Based Approach*. Maldon: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Babbie, Earl. *The Practice of Social Research*. Twelfth. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2010.
- Blake-Beard, Stacy D. "Taking a hard look at formal mentoring programs: A consideration of potential challenges facing women." *The Journal of Management Development*, 2001.
- Bozeman, Barry, and Mary K. Feeney. "Public Management Mentoring: What Affects Outcomes ." *Journal of Public Administration* (Oxford University Press) 19 (March 2008): 427-452.
- Burke, Ronald J. "Mentors in Organizations." *Group & Organizational Studies* (Sage Publications) 9, no. 3 (1984): 353-372.
- Carey, Elise C., and David E. Weissman. "Understanding and Finding Mentorship: A review for Junior Faculty." *Journal of Palliative Medicine* (Mary Ann Liebert, INC) 13, no. 11 (2010): 1373-1379.
- Chao, Georgia T., Pat M. Walz, and Philip D. Gardner. "Formal and Informal Mentorship: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts." *Personnel Psychology*, 1992: 619-636.
- Chun, J. J., J. J. Sosik, and N. Y. Yun. "A longitudinal study of mentor and protege outcomes in formal mentoring relationships." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2012: 1071-1094.
- Clutterbuck, David, and Gill Lane . *Situation Mentor: An International Review of Competencies and Capabilities in Mentoring*. Burlington, VT: Gower Publishing Company, 2014 .
- Crawford, Curtis J. *Manager's Guide to Mentoring*. Chicago: McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Eby, Lillian T., and Angie Lockwood. "Proteges and Mentors reactions to participating in formal mentoring programs: A qualitative investigation." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (Elsevier) 67 (2005): 441-458.
- Edy, E., S. Tannenbaum, G. Alliger, C. D'Abate, and S. Givens. "Mentoring in industry: The top 10 issues when building and supporting a mentoring program." *Technical Report prepared for the Naval Air Warfare Training Systems Division (Contract No. N61339-99-D-0012)*, 2001.

- Ehrich, Lisa C, Brian Hansford, and Lee Tennent. "Formal Mentoring Programs in Education and Other Professions: A Review of the Literature." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 2004: 518-540.
- Ensher, Ellen A., and Susan E Murphy. "Effects of Race, Gender, Perceived Similarity, and Contact on Mentor Relationships." *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* (Academic Press), 1997: 460-481.
- Feldman, Daniel C. "Toxic Mentors of Toxic Proteges? A Critical Re-Examination of Dysfunctional Mentoring." *Human Resource Management Review* (Elsevier Science Inc) 9, no. 3 (1999): 247-278.
- Furano, Kathryn, Phoebe A. Roaf, Melanie B. Styles, and Alvia Y. Branch. "Big Brothers Big Sisters: A study of program practices." *Public/Private Ventures*, 1993.
- Godwin, Marcia. "Preparing the Next Generation of Local Government Professionals: Mentoring, Diversity, and Professional Affiliation." *Western Political Science Association*. British Columbia, 2009. 1-34.
- Harvey, Michael, Nancy McIntyre, Joyce T Heames, and Miriam Moeller. "Mentoring global female managers in the global marketplace: traditional, reverse, and reciprocal mentoring." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* (Taylor & Francis) 20, no. 6 (2009): 1344-1361.
- Hicks, Deborah. "The practice of mentoring: reflecting on the critical aspects for leadership development." *the Australian Library Journal*, 2011: 66-74.
- Hodges, Beverly. "Factors that can influence mentorship relationships." *Paediatric Nursing* 21, no. 6 (2009): 32-35.
- Hunt , D. M., and C. Michael . "Mentorship: Everyone Needs a Helping Hand." *Academy of Management Review* 8 (1983): 475-485.
- Hurley, Amy E. "Challenges in cross-gender mentoring relationship: psychological intimacy, myths, rumours, innuendos and sexual harassment." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* (Emerald Group Publishing, Limited) 17, no. 3 (1996): 42-49.
- Johnson, W. B., and C. R. Ridley. *The Elements of Mentoring* . New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillon, 2004.
- Johnson, W. Brad, and Nancy Nelson. "Mentor-Protege Relationships in Graduate Training: Some Ethical Concerns." *Ethics and Behavior* (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc) 9, no. 3 (1999): 189-210.
- Kanter, R. M. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Klauss, Rudi. "Formalized Mentor Relationships For Management and Executive Development Programs in the Federal Government." *National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration*, 1981: 481-496.
- Kram, Kathy E. *Mentoring at Work Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1985.
- Kram, Kathy E. "Phases of Mentor Relationship." *Academy of Management Journal* 26, no. 4 (1983): 608-625.
- Kumar, Payal, and Stacy Blake-Beard. "What Good is Bad Mentorship? Protege's Perception of Negative Mentoring Experiences." *Indian Journal of Industrial Relation* , 2012: 79-93.
- Mavrinac, Mary A. "Transformational Leadership: Peer Mentoring as a Values-Based Learning Process." *Libraries and the Academy* (The Johns Hopkins University Press) 5, no. 3 (2005): 391-404.

- Merriam, Sharan. "Mentors and Proteges: A Critical Review of The Literature." *Adult Education Quarterly* (Sage Publishers) 33, no. 3 (1983): 161-173.
- Middendorf, Tom. "The Impact of Career, Psychosocial, and Spiritual Functions of Mentoring on Undergraduate Students ." *Ed.D. Dissertations* Paper 9 (2010).
- Moseley, Laurence G., and Moira Davies. "What do mentors find difficult?" *Journal of Clinical Nursing* (Blackwell Publishing Ltd), 2007: 1627-1634.
- Mullen, Ellen J., and Raymond A. Noe. "The mentoring information exchange: when do mentors seek information from their proteges?" *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1999: 233-242.
- Murrell, Audrey J. "Five Key Steps for Effective Mentoring Relationships." *The Kaitz Quarterly*, 2007.
- Myers, Donald W., and Neil J. Humphreys. "The Caveats in Mentorship." *Business Horizons*, 1985.
- Nemanick, Richard C. "Comparing formal and informal mentors: Does Type make a difference?" *Academy of Management Executive* , 2000: 136-137.
- Passmore, Jonathan, David B. Peterson, and Teresa Freire. "The Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring ." *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd), 2013: 1-11.
- Ragins, Belle R., and John L. Cotton. "Mentor Functions and Outcomes: A Comparison of Men and Women in Formal and Informal Mentoring Relationships." *Journal of Applied Psychology* (American Psychological Association, Inc) 84, no. 4 (1999): 529-550.
- Ragins, Belly Rose, and Kathy E. Kram. "The Roots and Meaning of Mentoring." (Sage Publications) 2007.
- Shields, Patricia M., and N. Rangarajan. *A Playbook for Research Methods: Integrating Conceptual Frameworks and Project Management*. Stillwater, OK: New Forum Press, Inc, 2013.
- Singh, Romila, Belle R. Ragins, and Phyllis Tharenou. "What matters most? The relative role of mentoring and career capital in career success." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (Elsevier), 2009: 56-67.
- Sosik, John J., and Veronica M. Godshalk. "The Role of Gender in Mentoring: Implications for Diversified and Homogenous Mentoring Relationship." *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* (Academic Press), 2000: 101-122.
- Straus, Sharon E., Mallory O. Johnson, Christine Marquez, and Mitchell D. Feldman. "Characteristics of Successful and Failed Mentoring Relationships: A Qualitative Study Across Two Academic Health Centers." *National Institute of Health (Acad Med)* 88, no. 1 (2013): 82-89.
- Turban, Daniel B., Thomas W. Dougherty, and Felissa K. Lee. "Gender, Race, and Perceived Similarity Effects in Developmental Relationships: The Moderating Role of Relationship Duration." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (Elsevier Science), 2002: 240-262.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Women in the labor force: a data book*. Washington: BLS Reports, 2015.
- Viator, Ralph E. "An Analysis of Formal Mentoring Programs and Perceived Barriers to Obtaining a Mentor at Large Public Accounting Firms." *Accounting Horizons* (American Accounting Association), 1999: 37-53.

- Zasloff, Mindy, and Mary E. Okurowski. "Federal Agency Finds Success in Group Mentoring Programs." *The Public Manager*, 2012: 53-56.
- Zerzan, Judy T., Rachel Hess, Ellen Schur, Russell S. Phillips, and Nancy Rigotti. "Making the Most of Mentors: A Guide for Mentees." *Academic Medicine* 84, no. 1 (2009): 140-144.
- Zigarelli, Michael A. "Clarifying the Boundaries of Sexual Harassment and Employer Liability: Judicial Application of *Harris v Forklift Systems, Inc.*" *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* (Plenum Publishing Company) 10, no. 1 (1997): 49-63.

Appendix A: Survey

1 Does your city have a mentorship program?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2 Does your city allow for employees to create their own mentorship relationship?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

3 Are employees allowed to share effective ways to complete work assignments?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

4 Does your city allow inter-departmental collaborations to complete work assignments?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

5 Please rank the following statements by the level of importance where 1 is most important and 6 is least important. (Click and Drag Statements)

- _____ Public Support of protégé by advocating for their potential and skills.
- _____ Recommendation of protégé for promotions or lateral moves while participating or upon completion of the program.
- _____ Greater visibility for protégés during or after participating in mentorship program.
- _____ Networking opportunities for protégés within their field of interest.
- _____ Mentors protecting protégés from controversial situations.
- _____ Protégés receiving challenging assignments while participating in mentorship programs.

6 Please rank the following statements by level of importance where 1 is most important and 5 is least important. (Click and Drag Statements)

- _____ Protégés imitating the behaviors and values of their mentor.
- _____ Mentors assist protégés in developing professional self-worth.
- _____ Proteges gain self-confidence while participating in the mentorship program.
- _____ Mentors providing an open door for protégés to speak about their conflicts.
- _____ Mentors offering personal advice to overcome personal and professional conflicts.
- _____ Participants developing a personal friendship while participating in the mentorship program.

7 How are participants selected to participate in your cities mentorship program?

8 Are participants given the opportunity to select their counterpart?

☐ Yes

☐ No

9 Are there instances where two employees enter a mentorship relationship and inform the agency of the relationship?

☐ Yes

☐ No

10 Have there been instances where participants of mentorship programs were mismatched? (Wasn't the right fit)

☐ Yes

☐ No

11 In instances of participant mismatch, how was the situation resolved?

12 What problems do your city mentorship program encounter?

13 Has your city experienced problems with coed participants in mentorship program?

☐ Yes

☐ No

14 What are reported issues of coed participants?

15 Have participants of your city's mentorship program reported sexual harassment while participating in the program?

☐ Yes

☐ No

16 What is the percentage of males and females reporting sexual harassment while participating in your city's mentorship program?

_____ Male

_____ Female

17 What is the duration (in years) of your city's mentorship program?

18 What percent of women participate in your city's mentorship program?

_____ Percentage of Female Participants

19 Please select your geographic region.

- ☐ West (WA,OR,CA,AK,HI,MT,ID,WY,NV,UT,CO,AZ,NM)
- ☐ Midwest (ND,SD,NE,KS,MN,IA,MO,WI,IL,MI,IN,OH)
- ☐ Northeast (PA,NY,VT,NH,ME,MA,RI,CT,NJ)
- ☐ Southwest (TX,OK,AR,LA)
- ☐ Southeast (MS,TN,KY,AL,DE,MD,WV,VA,NC,SC,GA,FL)

20 Please select the population range of your city.

- ☐ 100,000 - 299,999
- ☐ 300,000 - 599,999
- ☐ 600,000 - 899,999
- ☐ 900,000 and above

Appendix B: Institutional Review Board Exemption

Exemption Request EXP2015U342622L - Approval

10/7/16, 1:59 PM

Exemption Request EXP2015U342622L - Approval

AVPR IRB [ospirb@txstate.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2015 1:44 PM

To: Sanders, George J

DO NOT REPLY TO THIS MESSAGE. This email message is generated by the IRB online application program.

Based on the information in IRB Exemption Request EXP2015U342622L which you submitted on 02/11/15 13:37:58, your project is exempt from full or expedited review by the Texas State Institutional Review Board.

If you have questions, please submit an IRB Inquiry form:

http://www.txstate.edu/research/irb/irb_inquiry.html

Comments:

No comments.

=====

Institutional Review Board

Office of Research Compliance

Texas State University-San Marcos

(ph) 512/245-2314 / (fax) 512/245-3847 / ospirb@txstate.edu / JCK 489

601 University Drive, San Marcos, TX 78666

Texas State University is a member of the Texas State University System

NOTE: This email, including attachments, may include confidential and/or proprietary information and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient or his or her agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and deleting this email immediately. Unless otherwise indicated, all information included within this document and any documents attached should be considered working papers of this office, subject to the laws of the State of Texas.