

**Mentoring in the Workplace:  
An Exploratory Study of the Protégé's Perspective**

Angela Bramley, Leah Burke,

Wing Yan Lau, Kate Marentette, and Michelle Tallman

University of Guelph

As generations age the more experienced workers leave the company to younger employees who take their place, but with such a large generation such as the Baby Boomers leaving the workforce they will be leaving a large void which needs to be filled quickly. To transition smoothly the senior employees will need to pass their knowledge about job aspects quickly to new hires and guide, counsel and advise them. One way to this is through mentorship programs, both formal and informal. Junior workers can learn the ropes from someone who is more experienced through a mentoring relationship where they work side by side with a senior member. This research paper studies the importance of mentorship in the workplace, specifically the effect/impact of mentorship programs for Generation Y.

As Baby Boomers age and retire, Generation Y will be filling the empty jobs in organization. Munro (2009) suggests that mentoring is fundamental to Generation Y and it needs to be linked into the organization quickly in order for Generation Y to seamlessly transition into the role of running these organizations. To do this successfully, research is needed which focuses on what Generation Y wants and needs from a mentorship program so the programs can be tailored to this.

This research can help businesses to tailor current mentorship programs and help them attract and appeal to Generation Y workers. Organizations that do not currently have a mentorship program will be better equipped to institute one, and will be able to gain the most from the new program. If done correctly, mentoring programs can help to save companies money by reducing their turnover, improving productivity of workers and improving company culture. Generation Ys will also benefit from this research as they can enter the workplace with a stronger knowledge of what to look for in an efficient mentorship program and as they are the new entrants to the workplace, and will be responsible for continuing the company as the Baby

Boomers retire, it is imperative to understand what they want from their employer. By using the information from this study, companies can maximize the returns on their investments in Generation Ys and mentorship programs.

### *Literature Review*

Generation Y is the cohort of people who were born between 1980 and 1995 (Ng, Schweitzer, & Lyons, 2010) and are the children of the Baby Boomers (born between 1946 and 1961) (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). They are the new entrants to the workplace and will be responsible for assisting the Generation Xs (born between 1962 and 1979) in filling the void left behind as the Baby Boomers exit the workplace (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). As they begin to play an important role in the business world it is necessary for businesses to understand what it is that Generation Y wants from their employers. Studies to date are not exhaustive in this area and it is the intention of this study to provide insight into Generation Ys mentoring desires (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008).

The Generation Y population segment is thought to want it all and want it now, desiring regular promotion with minimal effort (Ng, Schweitzer, Lyons, 2010). Generation Y has high career expectations, but are realistic when it comes to their first job after graduation (Ng, et al., 2010) likely due to current economic conditions and knowledge of friends' starting salaries (Huybers, 2011 & Ng, et al., 2010). Furthermore, Huybers (2011) found similar support for the preconceived notion that Generation Ys do not intend to stay at one job for the rest of their lives, feel entitled to regular pay increases and promotion and require regular praise and feedback.

Generation Y is under a significant amount of pressure and is mostly unaware of it at the present time (Meagher, 2010). The Baby Boomers are currently in senior management positions, and as they near retirement the Generation Xs are not large enough to fill the occupational void left behind, and Generation Ys will need to advance through corporate hierarchies rapidly

(Meagher, 2010; & Ng et al., 2010). This means that Generation Y will be thrust up the corporate ladder, playing to what they desire, but they may have little time to adapt and adjust to the pressures associated with it (Meagher, 2010). With this stress, in conjunction with the stresses associated with having to support a larger group of seniors than ever before, there is no telling how the Generation Ys will cope without adequate and valuable training. This fact is one of the main reasons that mentoring has resurfaced as an important tool in training the upcoming workforce as it can help them to better cope with these pressures (Munro, 2009).

A mentoring relationship is defined as a "developmental relationship in which a more advanced or experienced person (a mentor) provides career and/or personal support to another individual (a protégé)" (Kram, 1986 as cited in Munro, 2009). A mentor can be defined as a confidential advisor, guide, counsellor, tutor, confidante, and/or role model (Allen, Eby, O'Brien, & Lentz, 2008; Dymock, 1999; & Munro, 2009). This mentor works often with one protégé who is the recipient of the guidance, support and training of the mentor. The art of mentoring can be traced through generations and is linked to ancient history. In the early years mentoring was termed apprenticeship where the apprentice (protégé) learns from their employer (mentor) in order to learn a craft (e.g. Blacksmith) and one day take over the business or open their own shop (Allen et al., 2008). The recent increase in the desire to pass information on to a younger group of workers has given this idea new life, as the younger workers will be pushed quickly into the role of being senior management (Ng, Schweitzer, & Lyons, 2010). The most recent research on mentoring describes it as a fast way of preparing the new incumbents to ascend the corporate ladder while retaining the values and ideals that have grown to shape the company (Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000).

Mentoring relationships vary in their structure, thus research on what structure is most effective and efficient is necessary to best prepare Generation Ys for management roles. The structure of the mentoring relationships can be formal or informal; the distinction lies in who initiates the mentoring relationship. In a formal mentoring relationship, as was studied by Munro (2009), the organization starts the process with the purpose of passing on one's greater knowledge to those who do not possess it (Munro, 2009). The formality can vary from the organization planning only the initial partnering, to the organization becoming a key player in the entire formation and execution of the mentoring (Munro, 2009, & Dymock, 1999). Previous research from Dymock (1999) suggests successful protégés found low levels of structure in the formal program led to decreased satisfaction and that regular meetings would have greatly improve the experience. This suggests that the formal pairing of the mentoring relationship may not be enough to fully satisfy protégés as well as their mentors, and the creation of a more structured relationship may benefit all involved. This study researches further into whether generation Ys have participated in a formal mentoring program; if not, are they interested and if they have, and whether they would do it again.

The differentiating factor between formal and informal mentorship programs was studied by Allen, Eby and Lentz (2006). Allen et al. (2006) and found that the factor may be the ability to choose one's own mentor. Choosing one's mentor was correlated to the success of the informal mentorship program, and that perhaps it is the perceived freedom of being involved in the process that strengthens the relationship (Allen et al., 2006). This is often the case in informal relationships where the mentor and protégé are not necessarily partnered together through organizational intervention, but rather seek out the opportunity for themselves (Munro, 2009). Unfortunately informal mentoring relationships are much more difficult to identify and as such

they are much less frequently studied (Munro, 2009). However, this research study explains what an informal mentoring relationship is, and asks the same questions as the formal program; have the Ys participated in an informal mentoring program; if not, are they interested and if they have, would they do it again?

While there is relatively little research on informal relationships the literature at present suggests that this form of mentoring allows both the mentor and protégé to be more involved with decision making processes (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). This lends itself well to Generation Ys as they are independent workers who wish to have a say in what they do (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Generation Y is thought to resist micromanagement and to value independence as well as opportunities for growth and flexibility (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). Though Generation Ys desire to be involved in their own future they tend to like the ability to take part in decisions which directly affect them, and these desires of Generation Y led to the following hypotheses: H1 ó Generation Ys will prefer the relaxed structure of an informal relationship over the high structure of a formal relationship.

H2 ó Generation Ys will prefer to be involved in mentor selection versus being paired by the company or organization.

Mentoring programs can differ in many ways other than how they are structured and Eby, McManus, Simon and Russell (2000) explored some of the negative aspects of mentoring from the protégés perspective. The researchers found consensus on a list of five categories which protégés found to be negative in the relationship. These categories were: match with the mentor, distancing behaviour, manipulating behaviour, lack of expertise and general dysfunction. Under the general category of match with the mentor different aspects such as the mentor's gender, age,

background, similarity in attitudes/values/beliefs, and status (supervisor or peer) were evaluated (Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000).

Distancing behaviour is described as negative behaviour which seeks to alienate, or isolate an individual in the relationship. Behaviours indicative of this include the mentor taking credit for the protégé's efforts, the mentor not allowing the protégé to demonstrate their abilities, or the protégé being used as an escape goat for the mentor (Eby, et al., 2000). Eby et al. (2000) identify manipulating behaviour as separate from distancing behaviour, although there is some overlap in areas such as blaming the protégé for the mentor's mistakes or taking credit for the protégé's successes. They suggest that manipulation can include things such as withholding important information from the protégé in order to make themselves look better, giving undesirable jobs to the protégé to do even when it does not further their knowledge or learning, and sabotaging their chances of success or promotion (Eby, et al., 2000).

The next topic, lack of expertise, is extremely important as it indicates that the protégé does not feel that their mentor is someone they can respect and look up to as a role model of what they could become. This will decrease the amount of effort the protégé puts forward and could ultimately cause the mentorship relationship to collapse (Eby, et al., 2000).

These qualities can negatively affect the mentoring relationship and can ultimately lead to a failed mentoring relationship. When considering Generation Y's personality traits, it is important for organizations to consider what it is that Generation Y would like in a mentorship program in order to avoid negative aspects from arising. This led to the third hypothesis: H3 ó Generation Y will indicate an aversion to negative behaviours which seek to minimize their contribution, take credit for their work and remove their 'freedom' to choose.

In order to have a successful relationship it has already been suggested that Generation Y and their mentors need to have a good fit. Cennamo and Gardener (2008) conducted extensive research on the values and beliefs of the different generations (Generation Y, X and Baby Boomers) as well as how it affects their abilities to work together effectively. They found that the youngest groups placed more importance on status and freedom work values than the oldest group (Cennamo & Gardener, 2008). The oldest groups placed more importance on better person-organisation values, with emphasis on extrinsic values and status values (Cennamo & Gardener, 2008).

One article spoke directly to Generation Y and Baby Boomers working together in the workplace. Hewlett, Sherbin and Sumberg (2009) conducted two large surveys of college graduates which suggests that there were many similarities between what the Boomers and the Generation Ys wanted (Hewlett, Sherbin, & Sumberg, 2009). The main findings suggest that Boomers and Generation Ys both wish to help society through their work efforts and both want flexible time (Hewlett et al., 2009). This is due to two differing reasons, one is that Boomers have spent so much time working they want to spend some time living, where the Generation Ys have watched their parents work non-stop and do not wish to follow that path (Hewlett et al., 2009).

As there is a large influx of Generation Ys entering into the workplace it is beneficial for organizations' mentorship programs to appeal directly to the incumbents. Existing literature on this topic does not satisfactorily address this from the prospective of Generation Y. This study intends to address the lack of qualitative knowledge on what generation Y, who will be entering the workplace within the next 7 years, want from mentorship programs. The following questions will also be addressed in this paper:



Q1 ó What preferences with respect to their mentor will Generation Ys report?

Q2 ó What preferences of mentor personality will Generation Y rate as most highly important to a successful mentoring relationship?

### *Methods*

The goal of our study is to understand the perception of mentoring relationships from the protégés' point of view. We wanted to understand what personal attributes, what personality traits, and what program design characteristics that protégés would deem most important in order to have a successful mentoring relationship. Further to this, our focus was specifically on those protégés who fall in the cohort of Generation-Y. In order to operationally define Generation-Y, we limited our data collection to those respondents who were 18-25 years old.

The purpose of our study was exploratory in nature. Due to this fact, we needed to develop our own measures in order to gather the information required to answer our research questions. Using the previously published literature we developed an exhaustive list of personal attributes, mentor personality traits, and mentoring program design characteristics that previous literature has deemed important in mentoring relationships. With these findings in mind, we developed our own 5-point Likert scales to assess the perceived importance of each of these items (See Appendix A). The scales and questionnaire used was reviewed and approved by Dr. Sean Lyons, the Subject Matter Expert (SME) overseeing the research.

Once the questionnaire was developed, we created a digital copy of the survey using Qualtrics in order to distribute the survey electronically. It was determined that using electronic distribution of the survey would result in the best response rate due to the highly technical nature of Generation-Y and their substantial use of social media (DeRushia, 2010). Once the survey was ready for distribution, our research team distributed it via email, Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn to our followers generating a convenience sample. We also asked our followers to re-

post the link to their followers and so on thereby using the snowball sampling technique. We feel as though our survey was accessible to a large number of potential respondents due to this distribution method.

We ended up with a total of 265 responses with 236 responses being completed fully, resulting in a completion rate of 89%. Once data were cleaned we ended up with a usable sample of 209 respondents. Of these respondents 139 were female representing 66.5% of the sample, the other 70 respondents were male accounting for the remaining 33.5%.

The results were analyzed using descriptive statistics and a t-test. The mean responses to each question were analyzed to get a description of respondent perceptions. The t-test analysis was done to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between the male and female respondents to the survey.

### *Results*

The following section describes the results of whether generation Y would like to participate in mentoring and what they would want in a mentoring program.

In Table 1, a two sample t-test was performed to examine the difference between the group of generation Ys who were interested in participating in a formal mentoring relationship and those who were interested in participating in an informal mentoring relationship. The findings were not significant ( $t = 0.87, p = 0.39 > 0.05$ ). This suggests that there is little preference for formal or informal mentoring relationships. Another two sample t-test shown in Table 2 was performed testing whether respondents would participate in another formal mentoring relationship if the situation arose and whether they would participate in another informal mentoring relationship if the situation arose. Results show that there is a significant difference in both groups ( $t = -3.17, p = 0.0017 < 0.05$ ). We obtained a negative t-statistic, which

indicates that respondents preferred to have an informal mentoring relationship if the situation arose rather than having a formal mentoring relationship.

Table 1

Question	Mean
How interested would you be in participating in a FORMAL mentoring relationship?	3.5
How interested would you be in participating in an INFORMAL mentoring relationship?	3.35
t-statistic	p-value
0.87	0.39

Table 2

Question	Mean
I would participate in another FORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose.	3.97
I would participate in another INFORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose.	4.31
t statistic	p value
-3.17	0.0017

Gender differences associated with mentoring preference is examined in the next selection.

In Table 3a and 3b, we examined the gender differences of whether they would be interested in participating in a formal mentoring relationship if the situation arose and in an informal

relationship. There is no significant difference in both tests ( $t = 1.19$ ,  $p = 0.2404$  &  $t = 0.21$ ,  $p = 0.8339$ ) as male and female respondents did not react differently, suggesting that gender is not a factor in preferences.

Table 3a

Question	Mean
I would participate in another FORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose. (MALE)	3.34
I would participate in another FORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose. (FEMALE)	3.59
t ó statistic	p ó value
1.19	0.2404

Table 3b

Question	Mean
I would participate in another INFORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose. (MALE)	4.28
I would participate in another INFORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose. (FEMALE)	4.32
t ó statistic	p ó value

0.21	0.8339
------	--------

In addition, we conducted some two sample tests to examine the importance of attributes as part of the program design. The results shown in Table 4 indicate that there was a significant difference between whether respondents would like a supervisor as their mentor or a peer as their mentor ( $t = 6.36, p = < 0.0001$ ). Respondents favoured having a supervisor of higher status mentor them. Table 5a and Table 5b show that females preferred to have a mentor assigned to them and to have regular meetings with their mentor; there was a significant difference between female and male responses.

Table 4

Question	Mean
Having a mentor who is a supervisor (higher in status to me)	3.57
Having a mentor who is my peer (equal in status to me in some respects)	2.71
t ó statistic	p ó value
6.36	< 0.0001

Table 5a

Question	Mean
Having a mentor assigned to me (MALE)	3.57
Having a mentor assigned to me (FEMALE)	2.71

t ó statistic	p ó value
6.36	< 0.0001

Table 5b

Question	Mean
Having regular scheduled meetings with my mentor (MALE)	3.51
Having regular scheduled meetings with my mentor (FEMALE)	3.86
t ó statistic	p ó value
2.59	0.0106

In the following table, it shows the results of what qualities respondents think would be important in a good mentor. All the qualities listed below were significant ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

Table 7

Question	Mean	t ó statistic	p ó value
Someone who listens	4.53	11.10	< 0.001
Someone who gives advice	4.48	10.20	< 0.001
Someone who leads by example	4.47	9.99	< 0.001

Someone who admits to their limitations	4.23	4.49	< 0.001
Someone who gives the opportunity for me to "show what I know"	4.35	6.57	< 0.001
Someone who is motivating	4.53	11.43	< 0.001

*Discussion*

The primary purpose for our exploratory research was to understand the attributes Generation Y wanted in a mentoring program, as well as determine what characteristics Generation Y thought a good mentor would possess. Based on our findings around half of Generation Yø have participated in a formal mentoring program and a significant number have participated in an informal mentoring program. Out of those who have previous experience in a formal or informal mentoring program, the majority enjoyed their relationship and would participate in another program.

It was interesting to note that 44% of Generation Yø have previously participated in a formal mentoring relationship at this stage in their lives. A conclusion we can make from this finding is that Generation Yø are just starting out in the workforce, and many companies have followed current literature integrating new employees into the organization through a formal mentoring relationship to smooth transition into the company. The results for previous experience in an informal mentoring relationship were expected, as in post secondary education

there are multiple opportunities for seniors to take juniors under their wing and show them the ropes. It is also not rare for professors to take a liking to students and ensure that their time at the institution is enjoyable and certainly educational.

#### *Hypothesis 1 – Program Formalities*

We hypothesized that Generation Y would prefer the relaxed structure of an informal program over that of a highly structured formal program. The results suggest to us that Generation Yø would prefer to pick their own mentor versus having a mentor assigned to them, aligning with our hypothesis as picking one's own mentor is an essential part of informal mentoring programs. In contrast, Generation Yø indicated that they would prefer regular scheduled meeting times therefore aligning with a more formally structured mentoring program suggesting only partial support for our hypothesis.

#### *Hypothesis 2 – Mentor Selection*

We hypothesized that Generation Y would prefer to be involved in the mentor selection process, rather than having a mentor assigned. As stated above, the results indicated that Generation Y would prefer to pick their own mentor, supporting this hypothesis. Through an analysis we further investigated the difference between genders in selection of mentors and concluded that females are more oriented towards being able to select their own mentor. Digging further down, we also found out that the gender of the mentor does not affect the selection process between males and females. These results were surprising to us as through the literature we have discovered that many women would rather have a male mentor than a female one.

These findings suggest that organizations should implement their mentoring programs with the employees involved in the mentor selection process. Surveys can be used to help employees decide which type of mentor one wants, allowing them to think about the qualities



they would like their mentor to possess, or alternatively, employees could simply pick and choose from a list of possible mentors.

### *Questions 1 & 2 – Mentor Attributes*

We were curious in discovering what attributes and characteristics Generation Y would prefer their mentors to possess, we concluded that Generation Y would prefer their mentors to be: someone who listens, someone who leads by example, someone who admits to their limitations, someone who is motivating, someone who gives advice, and lastly someone who gives the opportunity to “show what I know”. When given the chance to add their own thoughts, the participants in the study mentioned for the mentor to be non-judgemental, polite and patient, friendly, and available when needed. This is useful information for organizations who are trying to implement a mentoring program and determining who would be a suitable mentor in the program.

This information is also useful for protégés to look at as it explains what is wanted from them in a mentor-protégé relationship. By providing this information to mentors, they can determine if they will be suitable for the job, or if they need to make improvements to their character, or projected persona.

### ***Limitations***

The software used for the survey (Qualtrics) only allowed for 250 respondents, putting a cap on our findings. There were a total of 265 respondents so the first 250 were used and only 209 respondents’ data could be used. Using software with a higher allowance of respondents could have made the results of our survey more verifiable. The survey also used convenience sampling, as it was presented in the research team’s social media networks so it was not random. This type of sampling may not give an accurate representation of all 18-25 year olds, only the ones who were in the immediate networks were sampled. The survey did not limit itself to just

post-secondary students, however a large percentage of them are in post-secondary and from the University of Guelph this may give an inaccurate proportion for generation Ys. The research conducted was exploratory research, so others need to replicate this study and conduct others to strengthen the results and further the knowledge.

Generation Y is defined to be those born between 1980 and 1995, however only data for those who are between the ages of 18-25 (born between 1986 and 1993) was interpreted thus there is a large gap in generation Y which we did not include. Generation Y is a large cohort, with those born in 1995 drastically different than those born in 1980. To get a more accurate measure, it is suggested that the cohort be stratified into subgroups to give a more representative result of the various ages within Generation Y. The survey did not explore much into what generation Ys want out of a formal and informal mentorship program. They were asked if they have participated in one, and if yes would they do it again, or if not would they be interested in completing one. Most of the questions asked were about the preferences on the protégé for the mentor. The components of a formal/informal mentorship program were not broken down, i.e. how often they would like to meet, in what location they would like to meet. A in depth look at the specifics of mentorship were not explored, which makes the research a little broad.

The survey also asked what they would want in a mentor (difference in status and age), but didn't ask the differences in preferences of cohorts of mentors. This could have explored the possible benefits/limitations these different cohorts have and also the stereotypes of cohorts could have been explored (I.e. are Baby Boomers less tech savvy, and thus are they less adequate as a mentor?).

## References

- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006). Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: Closing the gap between research and practice. *The American Psychological Association* , 567-578.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., O'Brien, K. E., & Lentz, E. (2008). The State of Mentoring Research: A qualitative review of current research methods and future research implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* , 343-357.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for proteges: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 127-136.
- Burke, R. J., McKeen, C. A., & McKenna, C. (1994). Benefits of mentoring in organizations the mentor's perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* , 23-32.
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* , 23 (8), 891-906.
- Dymock, D. (1999). Blind date: a case study of mentoring as workplace learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counselling Today* (11), 312-317.
- Eby, L., McManus, S., Simon, S., & Russell, J. (2000). The Protege's Perspective Regarding Negative Mentoring. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (57), 1-21.
- Ensher, E. A., & Murphy, S. E. (2010). The mentoring relationship challenges scale: The impact of mentoring stage, type and gender. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* , 1-14.
- Gibson, J. W., Greenwood, R. A., & Murphy, E. F. (2009). Generational differences in the workplace: personal values, behaviors, and popular beliefs. *Journal of Diversity Management* , 4 (3).
- Hewlett, S. A., Sherbin, L., & Sumberg, K. (2009). How gen y & boomers will reshape your agenda. *Harvard Business Review* , 1-8.

- Huybers, C. M. (2011). The Recruitment and Retention of Generation Y. *The Graduate School University of Wisconsin-Stout* , 1-86.
- Meagher, R. (2010). Retaining Gen Y in the Workplace. *College of Professional Studies Professional Projects* .
- Munro, C. R. (2009). Mentoring needs and expectations of generation-y human resources practitioners: Preparing the next wave of strategic business partners. *Journal of Management Research* , 1-25.
- Ng, E. S., Schweitzer, L., & Lyons, S. T. (2010). New Generation, Great Expectations: A Field Study of the Millennial Generation. *Journal of Business Psychology* (25), 281-292.
- (1999). Gender and mentoring relationships. In B. R. Ragins, *Handbook of Gender in Organizations* (pp. 347-371). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of applied psychology* , 529-550.
- Smith, J. L. (2011, April). Mentoring improves organizations. *Face of Quality* , p. 14.
- Udeh, I. E., & Omar, A. (2009). Strategic Versus Gratuitous Mentoring: a preliminary investigation. *Proceedings of the Academy of Strategic Management* , 8 (1), 44-47.
- Young, A. M., & Perrewe, P. L. (2004). The Role of Expectations in the Mentoring Exchange: an analysis of mentor and protege expectations in relation to perceived support. *Journal of Managerial Issues* , 16 (1), 103-126.
- Young, A. M., & Perrewe, P. L. (2000). What did you expect? An examination of career-related support and social support among mentors and proteges. *Journal of Management* , 26 (4), 611-632.

## Appendix A: Survey Design

### Mentoring in a Workplace Environment

Mentoring is the process where a more experienced individual uses their greater knowledge, skills, experience and understanding to support the development of a junior or less experienced individual.

**Protege:** the less experienced individual in the mentoring relationship

**Mentor:** the more experienced individual in the mentoring relationship

A mentor can be defined as a confidential advisor, guide, counsellor, tutor, confidante, and/or role model to the junior/less experienced protege.

Given this information, please answer the following questions

A **formal mentoring relationship** is one that is set up by an organization or school and is defined as a mandatory partnership between individuals in an organization.

**1. Have you ever been a part of a formal mentoring relationship?**

Yes      No

1. a) **If yes**, Indicate the amount you agree or disagree with this statement:

I would participate in another FORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose.

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------

1. b) **If no**, How interested would you be in participating in a FORMAL mentoring relationship?

Not at all interested (1)	Uninterested (2)	Neither uninterested nor interested (3)	Interested (4)	Extremely Interested (5)
---------------------------------	---------------------	--	-------------------	--------------------------------

**2. An informal mentorship relationship can be defined as a mentoring relationship that occurs naturally without any appointed roles. The relationship is formed by the mentor and protege on their own and there is no facilitation from the organization or school.**

**Have you ever been a part of an informal mentoring relationship?**

Yes      No

2. a) **If yes**, Indicate the amount you agree or disagree with this statement:

I would participate in another INFORMAL mentoring relationship if the situation arose

Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------

2. b) **If no**, How interested would you be in participating in a INFORMAL mentoring relationship?

Not at all interested (1)	Uninterested (2)	Neither uninterested nor interested (3)	Interested (4)	Extremely Interested (5)
------------------------------	---------------------	--	-------------------	-----------------------------

**3. How old are you? (Anything other than 18-25 will be re-routed to a thank you page)**

- 17 or under       18 - 25       26 - 35       36 or older

**4. If you were to take part in a mentorship program as the protege, how important would each of the following attributes be as part of the program design. Please rate them below:**

	Not important (1)	Somewhat unimportant (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Very Important (5)
Being able to pick my own mentor	1	2	3	4	5
Having a mentor that is older than me	1	2	3	4	5
Having regularly scheduled meeting times with my	1	2	3	4	5

mentor					
Having a mentor with a professional designation	1	2	3	4	5
Having a mentor who is a supervisor (higher in status to you)	1	2	3	4	5
Having a mentor who is my peer (equal in status to me)	1	2	3	4	5
Having a mentor of the same gender as me	1	2	3	4	5
Having a mentor who works in the same organization as me	1	2	3	4	5
Having a mentor assigned to me	1	2	3	4	5

**5. What qualities do you think would be important to have in a good mentor?**

	Not Important (1)	Somewhat unimportant (2)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat Important (4)	Very Important (5)
Someone who listens	1	2	3	4	5
Someone who gives advice	1	2	3	4	5

Someone who leads by example	1	2	3	4	5
Someone who admits to their limitations	1	2	3	4	5
Someone who gives you the opportunity to “show what you know”	1	2	3	4	5
Someone who is motivating	1	2	3	4	5

6. What other attributes or qualities would be important to you in a potential mentor?

---



---



---



---

7. Please state your gender:

- Male       Female

8. What is the highest level of education that you currently have?

- Less than High School
- High School / GED
- Some Post-secondary education
- College Diploma
- Undergraduate Degree
- Masters Degree
- Doctoral Degree
- Professional Degree (JD, MD)



**9. What is your race?**

- White/Caucasian
- African descent
- Hispanic
- Asian

If Asian, What part of Asia are you from?

- North
  - West
  - East
  - Southeast
  - South
  - Central
- 
- Aboriginal/Native
  - Pacific Islander
  - Other