THE INFLUENCE OF THE MATCH BETWEEN MENTOR AND MENTEE ON THE SUCCESS OF A MENTORSHIP PROGRAMME

by

MARIETA WASSERFALL

Submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the subject

INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR : PROF J P R JOUBERT

JUNE 2002
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank the following people who made this important milestone in my life possible:

- My parents, who created the opportunity right from the beginning
- My husband, Jooste who supported me throughout without ever complaining
- Gerrit du Toit, my own mentor who showed me that I can do it
- Prof Hennie Kriek and Tina Joubert from SHL for the usage of the OPQ and the assistance with the statistical analysis
- Prof Pierre Joubert, my supervisor, for all the explanations and encouragement
- And lastly, but not the least, Arthur and Vicky for their moral support during the final phases
SUMMARY

The general purpose of this study was to determine the impact that the match of mentor and mentee had on the success of the mentoring relationship. The leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee were determined and effectiveness of the match was determined. This was done in order to determine the impact of the match between mentor and mentee on the quality of the mentoring relationship. The study was conducted within a local government milieu with a sample of 34 mentors and 40 mentees, thus a total of 40 mentoring pairs. These participants were all part of a formal mentorship programme within the organisation.

The findings indicated that when leadership and reporting styles of mentoring pairs are complementary it will not have a significant effect on the success of the mentoring relationship. It furthermore suggests that careful consideration should be given in selecting participants before initiating mentorship programmes.
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Chapter 1: Scientific orientation to the Research

1.1 INTRODUCTION
This study investigates the influence of the match between the mentor and the mentee on the success of their mentoring relationship. The match is determined by comparing the leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee. Should these two styles complement one another the match will be considered to be effective.

1.2 BACKGROUND FOR AND MOTIVATION OF THE RESEARCH
In the development of management potential, innovative ways of approaching the identification and development of suitable personnel are always sought. In order to develop knowledge and skills an individual should go through a structured process to acquire knowledge as well as get an opportunity to apply this knowledge, through experiential learning. The concept of experiential learning indicates a process where an individual is given the opportunity to apply acquired knowledge in the real work environment under some form of supervision. According to previous schools of thought potential managers are nominated to attend management courses of various lengths and levels, the only preparation for such an individual to function as an effective manager. The need exists to take this process further and give individuals the opportunity to go through some or other intervention of utilising and applying knowledge and be given sensitive and sensible guidance in this process.

Mentorship is a process during which the individual is empowered to develop his or her potential to the full and to apply this in such a way that career goals are realized. Furthermore the individual is enabled to grow to a mature, more enlightened and successful employee. The mentorship relationship therefore supports the furtherance of individual career development, organisational success and career satisfaction (Kram, 1985).
The aim of mentorship as part of an integrated, corporate career development programme is to enable individuals to develop their potential and consequently to reach career goals within the shortest possible time.

Because an individual is given the opportunity through a mentorship intervention to apply theory practically, he or she will ultimately be more effective should he or she be appointed in a managerial position. In the rapid growth of technology and the wider knowledge expected of employees, it is becoming more and more important to guide the development of individuals to ensure that the maximum learning takes place in the minimum time span - and to put the individual into a position to immediately function effectively within the work environment he or she was prepared for (Cohen & Galbraith, 1995).

Mentorship as seen in the light of helping individuals to develop new skills; and as such address career goals, is part of the field of Career Development. Career and human resource development falls within the scope of Industrial Psychology and it therefore makes sense to carry out research on the above in the field of Industrial psychology.

1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The current development of managers falls short of the needs and expectations not only of the individuals involved, but also in terms of cost effectiveness for the organisation. Management training focus on the acquiring of knowledge and not the development of skills. Prospective managers are not offered the opportunity to apply knowledge in a guided environment and as such get the opportunity to learn from their mistakes, before being appointed as managers. The organisation is not as productive as it can be, because newly appointed managers need time to learn the practicalities of management.

Mentorship is proposed as a method to address and rectify the above shortfalls and as such can play a major role in the field of career and human resource development within Industrial Psychology as a whole.
The following research questions can therefore be asked in terms of the above theme:

1) What characteristics of mentorship are depicted in available literature?
2) What different types of leadership styles and complementary reporting styles are addressed in literature?
3) What is the impact of the leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee on the quality of the relationship?
4) How can weaknesses in the programme be addressed as well as successes repeated?

1.4 AIMS

1.4.1 General aim
With reference to the above-mentioned problem statement the general objective of this research is to determine the impact of quality of the relationship between mentors and mentees taking part in a formal mentorship programme, on the success or failure of the mentoring programme.

1.4.2 Specific aims
In order to meet the general aim the following specific aims were formulated:

1) Determine the characteristics of mentorship through a literature review.
2) Ascertaining what role leadership and the relationship between leader and follower play in the success of such relationships through a review of available research findings.
3) Determine the quality of the relationship as well as the leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee.
4) Formulate recommendations for implementing mentorship programmes in terms of the role that the relationship between participants plays within the success of the programme.
THE PARADIGM PERSPECTIVE

The paradigm perspective refers to the frame of reference for viewing the world, consisting of a set of concepts and assumptions. A paradigm is the mental world through which the researcher views the world, and is also the framework used to interpret what is seen (Bailey, 1987).

This research falls within the field of Industrial psychology and more specifically Career Psychology, with the focus on human resource development. "Career development is a means by which an organisation can sustain or increase its employees' current productivity, while, at the same time, prepare them for a changing world" (Robbins, 1989, p.436).

The existential-humanistic paradigm underlies this research, focussing on the development potential of humans underlined in the proposed research. Ivey, Ivey and Simek-Morgan (1997) explain the world view of this frame of reference as follows:

- people are empowered to act on the world and determine their own destiny
- making of decisions lies within the individual, rather than being determined by the environment
- the humanistic aspect of this paradigm focuses on people-in-relation to one another.

This frame of reference therefore highlights the combination of respect for the individual and the importance of relationships with others. The individual knows himself through the relationship with the world and in particular through relationships with other people (Ivey et al, 1997).

According to Meyer, Moore and Viljoen (1989) humanistic psychology takes the responsible human being as its model, someone who is able to choose freely from the options available to him or her. It also focusses on the continuous growth of a person. Man is seen as having a positive nature, with conscious processes, especially conscious decision-making. The person is seen as actively participating in determining his or her own behaviour, not simply reacting to stimuli from the external environment.
This research will focus on theories of human development and more specifically management development. The theory of social learning will also be applied. Robbins (1989) describes it as a process where people learn through observation and direct experience. In the empirical study the focus will be on psychometrics and statistical analysis of data provided through the administering of questionnaires.

The following descriptions of concepts used in the study are relevant in this research.

1.5.1 Conceptual descriptions

1.5.1.1 Mentorship
Mentorship is the formal agreement between two individuals, namely the mentor and the mentee, during which the lesser experienced individual (mentee) is advised by the mentor in the development of the individual's knowledge, skills and attitudes (Murray & Owen, 1991).

1.5.1.2 Experiential Learning
Experiential learning is the process through which a specific individual is taken through a step by step plan in order to enhance and verify his knowledge within a specific field of work as put forward in the development plan. It is therefore a learning process through which a person is taken in order to develop knowledge and skills in certain tasks (Crane, 2001).

1.5.1.3 Mentor
The mentor will oversee the total development process of the mentee for the duration of the relationship. The role of the mentor is that of giving advice and guidance to the mentee. The mentor must have a personal concern for the mentee and a feeling of responsibility towards his or her success (Clutterbuck, 1985).

1.5.1.4 Mentee
The mentee is the person around which the concept of mentorship evolves; the target for development. The mentee, being selected according to certain criteria (of which one is
potential), will ultimately be responsible for his or her own development (Murray & Owen, 1991).

1.5.1.5 Leadership style and reporting style
Every leader conducts his functions within the framework of certain leadership styles. Followers reporting to leaders also use a specific style of reporting. The leadership and reporting style can be complementary, meaning that the leader and follower have a better chance of getting along. Should the styles not be complementary it will be more difficult for them to work well together (Bass, 1981).

1.5.1.6 Mentoring relationship
This concept is used to describe the day to day functioning of the mentor and mentee whilst they are taking part in the mentorship programme. This relationship can be successful, meaning that the mentor is playing his or her role effectively and that the mentee is benefiting from the relationship. This relationship focuses on the development of the mentee through the regular intervention of the mentor (Caruso, 1992).

1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN
Research design is the process of rational decision-making during the research process, with the aim to plan and structure the research in such a manner that the validity of research findings is maximised (Mouton & Marais, 1990).

1.6.1 Variables
Two types of variables are applicable when determining the relationship between variables, namely independent and dependant variables. The independent variable is the one capable of affecting change in the other (dependent) variable. The value of the dependent variable is therefore determined by the independent variable (Bailey, 1987).
In this research study the following research variables are applicable:

- Independent variable - the leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee and if these styles are complementary or not in each individual mentoring relationship.
- Dependant variable - quality of the mentoring relationship

This implies that the research will investigate the impact of the match between the mentor and mentee on the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship.

1.6.2 Hypothesis

Mouton and Marais (1990) define an hypothesis as a statement in which an assumed relationship or difference between two variables is stated. Within the framework of quantitative research hypotheses are tested, meaning that a statistical relationship between two phenomena is tested.

With the variables listed in paragraph 1.6.1 in mind, the hypothesis for this research is formulated as follows:

A complementary match between leadership and reporting style results in a more successful mentoring relationship

1.6.3 Evaluation process

In order to evaluate the mentor-mentee relationship a quantitative research design was used. The unit of analysis is a dyad, namely the mentor and the mentee; the quality of their relationship, and the interaction between them. A questionnaire (Mentoring relationship questionnaire) was administered to gather data on the opinion of the mentor and mentee about the quality of their relationship.

Thereafter the Occupational personality questionnaire (OPQ) was administered to determine the leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee.
An analysis of the different styles in combination with the perceived quality of the relationship will indicate more or less effective mentor and mentee combinations in terms of their different styles.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research will be conducted in two phases, namely a literature review and empirical study.

1.7.1 Phase 1 Literature review

The literature review will consist of the following steps:

Step 1 Determining the characteristics of mentorship
Step 2 Conceptualisation of leadership and reporting styles

1.7.2 Phase 2 Empirical study

The empirical investigation will consist of the following steps:

Step 1 Description of population and sample
Step 2 Choosing the research instruments
Step 3 Data gathering by administering questionnaires
Step 4 Statistical analysis of questionnaire results
Step 5 Formulation of research hypothesis
Step 6 Reporting and interpretation of results
Step 7 Discussion of the limitations in the research
Step 8 Formulating a conclusion
Step 9 Making of recommendations
1.8 CHAPTER DIVISION

The chapters will be presented as follows:

Chapter 1: Scientific orientation to the research
Chapter 2: Characteristics of mentorship
Chapter 3: Leadership and reporting
Chapter 4: Empirical study
Chapter 5: Results of empirical study
Chapter 6: Limitations, conclusion and recommendations

1.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter sets up the background to the research as well as the problem statement, aims, paradigm perspective, research design and lastly the chapter division of the rest of this document.

In chapter two the results of the literature review on the characteristics of mentorship will be introduced. This chapter will address step 1 as set in phase 1 of the research methodology.
Chapter 2 : Characteristics of mentorship

2.1 INTRODUCTION
The aim of this chapter is to clarify characteristics of mentorship through reviewing literature on mentorship. Aspects to be addressed are firstly descriptions and definitions of concepts in order to clarify what mentorship is, another aspect to be explained is the benefits of a mentorship programme for the different role players, the mentor, mentee and the organisation. The final aspect is the impact of the relationship on the participants, namely the mentor and the mentee. An understanding of each of the above will ensure a sound foundation on which the practical implementation of a mentorship programme can be built.

2.2 MENTORSHIP
The word “Mentor” originated in Greek mythology. In the Odyssey by the Greek poet, Homer, Odysseus one of the characters, was preparing to go and fight in the Trojan War. He realised that he may be away for quite a while and is leaving behind his son and heir - Telemachus. While he was away Telemachus would need coaching and guidance (usually done by the father). He therefore hired a trusted friend, namely Mentor to be his sons' tutor.

Murray and Owen (1991) define mentoring as the deliberate pairing of a more skilled or experienced person with a lesser skilled or experienced one, with the agreed-upon goal of having the lesser skilled person grow and develop specific competencies.

Today the concept of mentorship focuses on career development and as such is an important part of the organisations' human resource management and development. The mentoring relationship is a relationship that enhances career development (Kram, 1985). The coaching and guidance that will take place within the organisation, will be done by supervisors with a lot of experience in the organisation as well as people skilled in the field of working with people.
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Mentorship programmes are used in organisations as a means of furthering career development of employees with the ultimate goal to improve organisational competitiveness (Caruso, 1992). Formal mentorship programmes are used to improve management, nurture the individual, as well as organisational growth in order to discover the secret of higher productivity (Zey, 1991). Formal programmes are initiated within organisations, and are implemented according to a preplanned format. The aim of these programmes is to firstly benefit the organisation, because it is the organisation that supplies the money and infrastructure to implement a formal programme.

For any programme to be effective and needs orientated, it is important that it should be designed to address and comply with the objectives set for the programme. The starting point of any mentorship programme is to have a clear statement of objectives, and the success or failure of the programme will be assessed according to these objectives (Clutterbuck, 1985). The programme should also be designed to support company objectives (Caruso, 1992). The objectives play the role of guidelines so that everyone knows where they are going to and exactly how they are going to get there.

The concepts mentor and mentee will be discussed next.

2.3 MENTOR

The mentor will oversee the total development process of the mentee for the duration of the relationship. The role of the mentor is to give advice and guidance to the mentee. The mentor must have a personal concern for the mentee and a feeling of responsibility for his or her success. The mentor is the person with more experience in the organisation, that includes functional work and managerial experience. A frame of reference is used by the mentor to guide the mentee. The only way to develop a frame of reference is through experience, and to obtain experience takes time. This indicates that a successful mentor should be someone who has been working for the organisation for a number of years. He or she should be familiar with the culture and values of the organisation, as well as the way in which the organisation operates (Clutterbuck, 1985). The mentor is usually older that the mentee, if not in age, then in years of working experience. The mentor should have knowledge of the organisation, the work done in the organisation and knowledge of
managerial skills. To guide and coach another, the mentor will have to be a good worker and a good manager. The mentor should have a track record of success in the organisation - someone who can set an example for the mentee to follow. In order for the mentee to respect the mentor it is important that the mentor should be knowledgeable (Zey, 1991).

The mentor offers a blend of assistance to promote the development of the mentee. The mentor must demonstrate skills by effective interaction with the mentee to support and enhance learning (Cohen & Galbraith, 1995).

Qualities important for a mentor are strong interpersonal skills, organisational knowledge, exemplary supervisory skills, technical competence, personal power and charisma, status and prestige, willingness to be responsible for someone else's growth, ability to share credit, patience and risk taking (Murray & Owen, 1991).

In mentoring the manager can now take the responsibility for continuous development of mentees by making use of on-the-job training. The manager as mentor presents a positive alternative to the traditional authoritarian role. Mentors in these redefined workplace relationships can provide a valuable service by increasing the total ability of mentees to function more effectively as skilled workers (Cohen & Galbraith, 1995).

2.4 MENTEE

The mentee is the person around which the concept of mentorship evolves; the target for development. The mentee, being selected according to certain criteria (of which one is potential), will ultimately be responsible for his or her own development. Murray and Owen (1991) emphasise that the mentee's potential must be assessed as well as his or her ability to perform in more than one skill area. Another important aspect to which the mentee should comply is to be receptive to feedback and coaching.

The mentee is an inexperienced person on a journey of self-development with the accompaniment of the mentor (Cohen & Galbraith, 1995).
Zey (1991) lists the following factors that mentors look for in mentees:

- intelligence to identify and analyse problems rapidly
- ambition to further his or her career
- desire and ability to accept power and risk and take responsibility
- loyalty to the mentor
- ability to perform the mentor's job and thus being able to replace the mentor as he or she moves up higher in the organisational hierarchy
- similar perception as the mentor of values regarding work and organisational goals
- commitment to the organisation and positive perception of the organisation
- understanding of organisational culture and values
- ability to establish alliances and interact smoothly with co-workers.

2.5 BENEFITS OF A MENTORSHIP PROGRAMME.

The above implies that the implementation of a mentorship programme has certain benefits for individuals as well as organisations as a whole.

Mentoring is viewed as highly relevant to promote the continuing development of adults in our learning society (Cohen, 1995).

An important goal for a planned mentorship programme is to synthesize the individual's career development objectives with the organisational goals. This creates a shared vision between individuals and their organisations. This shared vision is necessary for maximum efficiency and competitiveness (Caruso, 1992).

According to Clutterbuck (1985) the benefits of a mentorship programme are threefold - benefits for the mentee, mentor as well as the organisation which implements the programme. Each of these will now be discussed individually.
2.5.1 Mentee benefits

Benefits for the mentee in taking part in the programme are the improving of self-confidence, learning to cope with the formal and informal structure of the organisation, career advice and progress as well as managerial tutoring. This proves that a structured mentorship programme can help develop the mentee as a whole, concentrating on different aspects of the person. Mentees reach senior positions on average two years ahead of other officials within an organisation who did not take part in a mentorship programme.

Schulz (1995) states that through the information provided by the mentor, the mentee is continuously learning. Opportunities for practice and role play allows for the mentees' work produced to be reviewed before submitting it. The mentee obtains job information that may not be otherwise available.

Another area of benefit is creative and intellectual growth through task accomplishment. The mentee has the freedom to fail, which is a powerful growth and learning opportunity. Mentoring gives the mentee permission to fail, allowing the mentee to test ideas in a safe environment. Growth also includes development of self-confidence and decision-making skills to make choices and to take ownership of finished projects and own personal growth. Another area of growth is the development of leadership skills that are so important to personal and professional growth.

According to Murray and Owen (1991) benefits for the mentee are the development activities that are targeted directly towards his or her own needs. This allows for an increased likeliness of success. It also means that less time is spent in the wrong position in the organisation, because of an increased awareness of the organisation.

Mentorship allows for the mentee to confirm his or her own capabilities, testing job skills and working independently. This ultimate development can take place during the separation phase of the relationship (Kram, 1985). Maturity evolves from the ability to give up the previously dependant relationship between mentor and mentee and establish a new one.
2.5.2 Mentor benefits

Factors such as improved job satisfaction, increased peer recognition and career progress manifests as benefits for the mentor. Obviously the benefits are focussed on the mentors' development and his or her overall progress, and not as much on the acquiring of knowledge.

For the mentor the rewards are more intrinsic. According to Murray and Owen (1991) some of these benefits are enhanced self-esteem, a revitalised interest in his or her work, and the fulfilment of the mentor's own development needs.

According to Schulz (1995) mentors gain recognition, respect and satisfaction by sharing their wisdom. This is a confirmation of their self-worth and acceptance in the organisation. The mentor also has the opportunity to obtain new ideas from the mentee, to grow personally and professionally by becoming aware of his or her own level of competence (self-discovery and personal awareness) and lastly the relationship offers a mechanism for mentors to face their future in middle adult life, how they can be of continued value in the work setting.

2.5.3 Organisational benefits

With the participants benefiting from the programme, it is not surprising that the organisation should also benefit.

According to Clutterbuck (1985) the first benefit for the organisation is during the recruitment and induction phase. If a mentorship programme is implemented during this phase employees become more productive and tend to stay with the organisation longer. Other benefits are a motivated employee with obvious value for the organisation. A mentorship programme also enhances a stable corporate culture and improved communication that ensures that information is communicated and effective networks are established. General leadership development is another benefit. It must be remembered that the relationship forces the mentor to develop as well. It therefore implies training of two people for the price of one.
According to Kram (1985) mentorship programmes have both career and psychosocial functions. These functions have benefits for the mentor as well as the mentee, but understandably the mentee will have the advantage in terms of growth, because the focus is to enhance his or her sense of competence and efficiency in his or her professional role. Career functions comprise sponsorship, exposure/visibility, coaching, protection and challenging assignments. Psychosocial functions are role modelling, acceptance and confirmation, counselling and friendship. Through these two types of functions the mentee develops and as such the organisation will benefit.

Caruso (1992) mentions the above functions (he added more examples in each function) and also adds a third function category, namely specific learning functions. These functions are; learning technical skills and knowledge, learning the current job, learning organisational culture, learning organisational policies and being prepared for future jobs or promotions.

From the above it is clear that mentorship does not only assist the individuals involved, but can have a positive impact on the organisation. It can also be used as a specific tool in the introduction of a new culture or projects, or the confirmation of existing values. Mentoring also reduces turnover, because mentees are placed on a career path and stay with the organisation. Promotion can be made without leaving a void, because managers can mentor their own replacements (Schultz, 1995).

Mentorship can also play a role to help employees to prepare for the future (Zey, 1991). The following aspects are mentioned:

- to address the labour shortage in highly skilled areas
- to integrate the diverse workforce into management positions
- to create an environment that will heighten the development of new ideas, and the introduction thereof
- to secure the effectiveness of company mergers
- to strengthen the culture of cross-cultural corporations.
The above are aspects that are developing in the company milieu worldwide and will have a far greater impact as organisations progress further. In addressing the above, the survival of an organisation can be more securely assured.

It is clear that implementing a mentorship programme in an organisation has benefits for participating individuals as well as the organisation itself. A lot of time and manpower goes into the implementation of such a programme. It is therefore important that it should be realised successfully. To ensure this, it is important that the design of the programme is such that ultimate success is supported and problem areas are addressed.

Important aspects in the successful implementation of a formal mentorship programme will be addressed next.

2.6 GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

For a mentorship programme to be implemented successfully certain aspects must be addressed. Several guidelines are addressed in literature that the authors feel are important in the successful implementation of a mentorship programme. Six points are repeated time and again in the reviewed literature.

2.6.1 Top management support

The programme must have the support of top management to be effective. This implies that strategies should be included in the programme design to ensure the commitment of top management. An obvious step is to communicate the aims and design of the programme. If management realises what the benefits of the programme can be for them, they will be committed. Kerr, Schulze and Woodward (1995) suggest that the Chief Executive Officer can, for example, serve as a mentor to show top management commitment to the programme.

2.6.2 Voluntary participation

Participation in the programme must be voluntarily. Noncompulsory participation will enable employees to choose if they want to take part in the programme or not. If a person makes a freewill choice to take part, his or her commitment will be generated within him
or herself and then commitment can be guaranteed. For a person to make an informed choice it is important that relevant information is made available before participants make the choice of taking part or not.

Zey (1991) states that especially mentors must take part voluntarily. Programmes that force managers to take part cannot be successful.

2.6.3 Matching of participants
Participants must be matched very carefully. The constructive relationship between mentor and mentee is the foundation of any mentorship programme. This relationship determines the success or failure of the programme, it is therefore of utmost importance that the matching of participants should be done very carefully (Clutterbuck, 1985). In order to suitably match participants it is necessary to know certain personality characteristics and skills of a person. The process of acquiring this knowledge should also be incorporated into the design of the programme.

The actual matching should be done by considering the characteristics and needs of each individual mentor and mentee. Examples of criteria include, career aspirations (the aspirations the individual has for career advancement), gender, interests (what fields of interest the mentor and mentee share) and availability (especially availability of the mentor to spend time with the mentee) (Kerr et al, 1995).

2.6.4 Programme testing
The programme must be tested before implementation. After the design of the programme it should be tested by holding a trial run with a small group of participants. The purpose of this is to evaluate the results thereof carefully and if problems should occur, how they can be addressed before the final implementation of the mentorship programme throughout the organisation. This will enhance the chances of a successful outcome of the programme.

Kerr et al (1995) reiterate this by stating that when an organisation decides to initiate a mentorship programme, it is important to conduct a small pilot programme first.
2.6.5 Organisational development

The programme should be part of the larger programme of development in the organisation. By adapting the programme to comply with the existing development programme within the organisation, the purpose thereof will be clearer to employees. The benefits for them will also then be more obvious, because it will fall within their own perspective of career development within the organisation.

Mentoring should be seen as only one possible dimension of career development within the organisation (Clutterbuck, 1985).

2.6.6 Preparing participants

Participants should be prepared for participation. It should not be assumed that everyone understands the purpose and processes of a mentoring programme, education and communication about the programme is necessary. This preparation can be done through training. Mentors must be motivated, and information in terms of how to develop mentees should be dealt with during these training sessions. Other aspects applicable to mentors are possible risks involved, as well as problems that may occur. Mentees should be prepared in terms of their personal career goals, and how the programme can enhance these goals, as well as action plans to achieve career goals. Training should also include information on the roles played by participants and how they should perform in these assigned roles effectively. The expectations and limitations of the programme must be very clear. Participants must know what mentoring is and what it is not. Other aspects that need to be considered are flexibility within the programme, the provision of adequate support for the programme and participants and keeping the organisation informed about the programme routinely (Kerr et al, 1995).

Another important factor in the designing of mentorship programmes, is that the design should copy the natural mentoring process as closely as possible (Caruso, 1992). This will ensure that the positive aspects of natural mentoring are incorporated, whilst addressing company needs.
Another important participant in the programme apart from the mentor and mentee is the direct manager of the mentee. Often in programme design he or she is ignored in terms of the role played. Because of the close contact between the supervisor and mentee (they work together every day), he or she can play a positive or destructive role within the whole process. It is therefore important that the direct manager is involved in the programme, even if only through the attendance of an information session to explain the purpose of the programme and what is expected of him or her. If the supervisor is not positive about the process, it can have a very negative impact on the progress of the development of the mentee, as well as the effectiveness of the relationship between the mentor and mentee. The supervisor should be seen as an ally of the programme and the mentee (Clutterbuck, 1985).

2.6.7 Programme design

Zey (1991) addressed some aspects that should be considered in the designing of a formalised mentorship programme. The ability of the organisation to absorb candidates that successfully complete the programme should also be investigated. It makes no sense to design a comprehensive programme to prepare employees for career advancement and there are no promotion possibilities within the organisation. Again the importance of the objectives of the programme is stressed - if legitimate objectives are being addressed, legitimate outcomes for mentees can be administered.

Another aspect is to enable participants to withdraw from the programme. If problems do occur and ways to address and solve them have been exhausted, participants should be permitted to discontinue participation. Seen in the light of the importance of voluntary participation, it will be a significant mistake to force participants to continue with the programme (Caruso, 1992).

The last important consideration in the successful implementation of a mentorship programme is the monitoring of programme success (Clutterbuck, 1985). The only way to monitor effectively is through a thorough process of feedback. This process should therefore be included in the programme design. Monitoring should also be done over a long period of time to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the programme.
By accumulating positive results on the impact of the programme, the programme will be utilised by employees and the organisation will ultimately be benefiting from it.

Kerr et al (1995) reiterate this by stating that evaluation is essential in any organisation to obtain data that will influence decision-making in the programme.

In conclusion it can be said that a mentorship programme should address the preparing of all participants, the careful matching of mentors and mentees and a continuous monitoring of the impact of the programme through comprehensive feedback.

2.7 MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS

The mentoring relationship is a one-on-one relationship in which the newer, less experienced individual (mentee) learns and obtains career and personal assistance from an older, more experienced individual (mentor) (Caruso, 1992). It is a way of helping another understand more fully and to learn more comprehensively from day-to-day experiences. It is also a support system, where the mentor serves as a guide and shoulder to lean on. It is a confidential relationship, where both the mentor and mentee can speak freely. The relationship is characterised by depth and caring. The mentor is someone who takes an interest in and promotes the cause of a mentee that he or she believes has untapped potential.

By identifying and training the mentors before involving the mentees it can be assured that mentors are prepared for the role, are willing to take part, and have the appropriate characteristics to be a successful mentor. During this process mentors that do not comply can therefore be eliminated without this having a negative impact on the mentee. Mentees can now be identified with the pool of mentors in mind and the whole process of matching mentees and mentors can be carried out more effectively (Clutterbuck, 1985).

Caruso (1992) sees the relationship as a mentee driven, open system. The reason for this is the fact that essential functions of the mentoring relationship are often provided through a dispersed system of social activities driven by the mentee. This system comprises of supervisors, peers, senior managers and external sources, for example, professional
associations. This approach emphasises the importance of the mentees' role of being the initiator and energiser of the relationship. The relationship is shaped around the mentee's career and career focussed development. The mentees' specific needs should be addressed during the programme - needs that were identified by him or her and needs that he or she feels are important to his or her career.

2.7.1 Role of the Mentor

The relationship between the mentor and mentee is a helping relationship and involves the playing of various roles by the mentor (Kirk & Kirk, 1995). These roles are as follows:

2.7.1.1 Advisor

To play the role of advisor means that the mentor helps the mentee to set and achieve career goals. This task begins with the focus on specific, short-term needs. Being an advisor implies that the mentor has knowledge and experience that the mentee does not have and as such can recommend certain actions and make suggestions to help the mentee.

Cohen (1995) refers to this as the information factor. The mentor requests detailed information from the mentee and offers specific suggestions to mentees about current plans and progress in achieving career goals.

2.7.1.2 Coach

Here the mentor helps the mentee to reach job performance norms. Mentoring is often confused with coaching. Coaching is a tool that mentors use in the mentoring of mentees (Kalinauckas & King, 1994). Coaching is intended to help individuals to maximise their potential and turn it into performance (Bisiker, 2001).

Coaching is therefore directed towards bettering skills in order to better overall performance. Coaching will create a performance-focussed organisation, one that is capable of creating and sustaining a competitive advantage (Crane, 2001).
2.7.1.3 Explainer
The mentor as explainer provides the mentee with information on policies and procedures. Mentoring is used to assist young managers to become familiar with the political and management systems used in the organisation (Kalinauckas & King, 1994). Segerman-Peck (1991) sees the mentor as a resource, a person giving advice and providing information and share experiences. For a mentee to obtain knowledge in the organisational policies and procedures are important.

2.7.1.4 Protector
Here the mentor helps the mentee to avoid costly mistakes. As stated earlier the mentor has more experience than the mentee and can share experiences with the mentee in order to help him or her to make the same mistakes.

This role has a confrontive focus where the mentor challenges the mentees' explanations for or avoidance of decisions and actions relevant to development (Cohen, 1995).

2.7.1.5 Sponsor
As sponsor the mentor helps the mentee to secure positions and assignments. The sponsor can provide inside information and expose the mentee to new opportunities and assignments. The sponsor can also smoothen the way to get projects approved. The sponsor can do this because he or she is well-respected in the organisation and has a track record of successes (Haselkorn, 1998).

2.7.1.6 Validator
The validator provides the mentee with psychological support during the programme. This role implies complete trust. The mentee must be able to share any problems with the mentor and know that it will remain completely confidential. The reason for this role is the fact that personal problems may hinder performance and must be talked about as such (Haselkorn, 1998).

Segerman-Peck (1991) also sees the mentor as a confidante, someone to listen to problems and to help where possible. Cohen (1995) describes this role as the relationship
emphasis. It is conveyed through active, empathetic listening with a genuine understanding and acceptance of the mentee's feelings.

It can be seen that the effectiveness and quality of the relationship will be determined by the positive impact that the role of the mentor has on the development of the mentee (Murray & Owen, 1991).

Other aspects that impact on the general role of the mentor are the collaborative nature of mentoring. Meaning that the mentor plays a role of accompaniment and gives expanded views to help the mentee to explore areas and obtain a better understanding of the situation presented. Accompaniment therefore takes the form of collaborative action where ideas are checked during regular conversations to extend the mentees' capabilities in a new situation (Kozolanka & Horwood, 1997).

Robinson (1994) sees the role of the mentor as a new style of management. This is to review the mentees' on-going development, to agree on practical steps towards further development and to brief the mentee on new initiatives or changes that effect them.

Another point made by Hamilton (1993) is the difference in focus of the mentor and manager. The mentors' point of focus is on the development of the learner (mentee), whereas the manager focus on results and therefore develops staff to achieve these specific results. The aim of a manager is to reach a higher level of productivity and to reach the functional goals of his or her section. The aim of the manager in training personnel is therefore to prepare them to do their jobs - the jobs as set out in their job descriptions, the job they are being paid to do. The role of the mentor goes further than this. The mentor will focus on the overall development of the mentee even if this should be totally outside his or her specific job. It is a broader field of developing, the developing of the mentee as a total person.

Mentorship is learner (mentee) centred and the development is thus at the mentee's own pace and according to his own specific requirements.
2.7.2 Role of gender in the mentoring relationship

According to Kalbfleisch and Keyton (1997) women have not had the same success as men in the forming of mentoring relations. When women establish such a relationship it is usually with another woman. Women need a mentoring relationship with other characteristics than that of men. They need more emotional support and empathy. The male-to-male relationship focus on task activity. Because of the bigger need for emotional support females find a more suitable relationship in peer mentoring, but then lack the development opportunities provided by an influential mentor.

Women also need a different mentoring model than men, because their career development and entering into the workforce, is different to that of men (Kalbfleisch & Keyton, 1997). Females have the added responsibility of children and keeping up the home environment. Men cannot provide a model for all of these roles that the professional female need to play in order for her to accomplish personal and professional goals.

Kram (1985) identified the following problems associated with cross-gender mentoring, namely:

• confusion and anxiety on how to work closely with someone of the opposite sex
• the effect of the sex role socialization on the dynamics of the relationship
• the scrutiny attracted by this type of relationship in the organisation.

The above issues places added negative pressure on the relationship that can have a negative influence on the success thereof.

Cohen and Galbraith (1995) supports this by stating that males prefer to not approach younger females, because of the sexual innuendoes and that females are reluctant to approach older males because such requests may be viewed with suspicion by co-workers. Even strictly conducted professional relationships can still generate gossip.

Women experience problems when establishing mentoring relationships, because men tend to prefer a relationship with other men and another aspect is the fact that the traditional mentoring model that suit the male-male mentoring relationship will not suit the female-female relationship.
2.7.3 The effects of culture on the mentoring relationship

According to Murphy and Ensher (1997) mentoring as a social process may be affected by culture differences just as other work relationships are affected. Aspects that will play a role in mentoring are social norms, values and beliefs inherent in a culture. When people from different cultures see the similarities between themselves it provides the opportunity for positive contact and therefore a more rewarding mentoring relationship.

Murphy and Ensher (1997) states that the training content that is provided to prepare participants for participating in the programme should include four areas to enhance the quality of a cross-cultural relationship. These four areas are: a) the understanding of cultural differences that may affect perceptions of behaviour, b) increasing communication skills, and specifically how culture can contribute to ineffective communication, c) allowing participants to set ground rules for open communication; and d) providing opportunities and guidelines for the mentor to seek feedback from the mentee.

The mentoring dialogue, when used with knowledge and sensitivity helps to recognise the differences between people and is as such a valuable part of the learning experience (Cohen & Galbraith, 1995). This relationship offers the opportunity for both to explore real-world differences between themselves and be prepared for the understandable discomfort that will be created as their relationship evolves.

Rodriguez (1995) says that the environment of the organisation also plays a role in culturally diverse mentoring. This environment includes the people, mission, and structure of the organisation. Employees should be representative of the diversity that exists in larger society, and the mission must speak of social equity and respect for differences. The structure of the organisation, as well as that of the mentoring programme must reflect a multicultural orientation.

Organisations will have to train mentors to enable them to mentor in a diverse mentoring relationship. Mentors need to become multicultural people. This will require transformational changes. Mentors will have to learn more about different cultures, will have
to confront their own racism and bias and lastly will have to learn to see reality from various perspectives. It means learning new things and to unlearn old ones (Rodriguez, 1995).

Employment equity is a reality in our country and cross-cultural mentoring is one of the ways to prepare mentees for the future and their future positions in the organisation. Organisations can ensure that these relationships thrive by providing an environment that values and rewards these relationships (Murphy & Ensher, 1997) and ensures that participants are prepared for the task by effective training beforehand.

2.7.4 Mentoring relationships within the organisation

Hamilton (1993) states that to get started on mentorship in an organisation is difficult. Prerequisites are needed which will help the process and especially the relationship between the mentor and mentee. In this process the first meeting is vital. This meeting will set the climate and will determine the future success of the relationship. This applies even more for the successful implementation of a formal mentorship programme.

During the implementation of a mentorship programme, mechanisms should be put in place to address problems that may arise in the relationship between mentor and mentee as well as the progress of the mentee. Different people are included in this process of which the supervisor of the mentee plays the most important role.

Mentoring in the workplace can be a means to establish vital work-related relationships that promote learning by employees. Staff can now contribute productive ideas and as such mentors can learn from mentees (Cohen & Galbraith, 1995). Mentors and mentees learn together by discussing those suggestions and in this way avoid misunderstanding and conflict.

The quality of the mentor-mentee relationship is a certain determinant of the outcome. Characteristics common to successful relationships are regular meetings between participants, where the mentees' interested are closely followed. Also relationships where the mentee is regularly reassured of their value and where mentees are helped to cope
with difficult situations. Another characteristic is when the mentor provide advice that the mentee valued (Johnson & Sullivan, 1995).

Kram (1985) documented four phases in mentoring relationships, namely initiation, cultivation, separation and redefinition. During initiation, the selection and matching of mentors and mentees takes place as well as the introductory interactions. During the cultivation phase mentoring functions peak and learning accrues to both mentor and mentee. During the separation phase the relationship ends. Finally the redefinition phase is often marked by the relationship becoming similar to a peer friendship. As the mentee matures, they become real colleagues, with the mentee contributing to the knowledge and growth of the mentor. This process can go further to a stage where the mentor and mentee become real friends.

The opposite of this can also take place. When differences in opinion and attitudes develop, the relationship may become distant and even hostile (Torrance, 1984). This can be seen as a treat by some mentors and they will then reject the mentee.

2.8 IMPACT OF THE MATCH BETWEEN MENTOR AND MENTEE

In the matching of the mentor and mentee a lot of issues have an influence on the success or failure of the relationship. Issues such as gender and culture resulting in a diversified relationship, meaning that the mentee and mentor are from different genders and/or cultures play a role. According to Ragins (1997) the greater the degree of diversity in a potential relationship, the less comfort is reported in initiating the relationship. She also indicates that in diversified relationships the issue of identification will be negatively related to the degree of diversity. This implicates that identification between mentor and mentee will be stronger in homogeneous relationships.

Noe (1988) found that mentors matched with mentees of the opposite gender reported that these mentees utilised the relationship more effectively than mentees of the same gender as the mentor did.
Clutterbuck (1985) feels that cross-gender mentoring is of great benefit to women. It gives her legitimate access to key male executives who have the power to facilitate her career. But according to him there are also potential problems. These problems can be between the mentor and mentee, but also between the spouses and the mentoring pair. Sexual gossip in the organisation can also kill the relationship. He concluded this issue by saying that cross-gender mentoring holds great promise as a means to create equal opportunity for women.

Another aspect that plays a major role in the matching of participants is personality. The personality of the mentor is a critical factor in the success of any mentoring relationship (Hamilton, 1993). In a study done by Turban and Dougherty (1994) they determined that personality characteristics such as locus of control and emotional stability in the mentee plays an important role in the matching of mentor and mentee. The higher these two factors the better results during the initial formation of the relationship and the more positive the influence on the amount of mentoring the mentee receives.

In the matching of participants and factors playing a role in making the most of the relationship, Allen and Poteet (1999) listed factors that they have found relates to effective mentoring. Factors listed the most by participants in their study are open communication, setting of standards and trust.

The formal or informal matching/assigning of mentors also plays an important role. Fagerson-Eland, Marks and Amendola (1997) found that formally arranged relationships appear to be less optimal than relationships that develop naturally. Another factor that they looked at is the perception of the participants of mentoring. They found that these perceptions are affected by the relationship structure and experience factors. They also determined that the perceptions of mentors and mentees in terms of the progress of the mentee differ. This suggests that mentee and mentor perceptions cannot be generalised to one another.
Noe (1988) investigated the determinants of successful assigned relationships. He emphasised the positive role that internal locus of control in the mentee plays as well as the greater level of job involvement. Both these aspects will ensure more time spent with the mentor, and bringing about a more effective relationship.

Zey (1991) lists the following factors that plays a role in the decline of the relationship. They are failure to communicate needs and goals, the mentees' failure to correctly assess the mentors' intentions and emotional overdependence. These aspects need to be addressed in the initial matching of participants. According to Scandura (1998) dysfunctional relationships can result from mentee and mentor characteristics, as well as dysfunctional mentoring. This means that the people involved, as well as the process can play a negative role.

According to Murray and Owen (1991) problems that may complicate the relationship are the perception that needs are not met, when the mentor is too possessive, when their personalities clash, and when the mentee is too ambitious. Naturally these problems will occur when the matching of mentors and mentees is not done properly. Proper selection of participants is vital, and a large part of a formal mentoring programme should be spent on this important aspect. Not only the selection of participants, but also the matching is crucial to ensure the overall success of the programme.

A last aspect that plays an important role in the successful matching of participants is sound mentoring agreements. After participants are trained and informed about the mentoring programme and made aware of the potential problem areas, they must sit together and negotiate an agreement (Murray & Owen, 1991). The agreement must address the specific role of the mentor, the goals of the mentee as well as aspects such as confidentiality, frequency of meetings and time to be invested in the relationship. With this agreement drawn up the mentee and mentor must sign it as part of the formal process in order to enhance the quality of the relationship.
2.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter looks at the different concepts related to mentorship. The roles of participants are described and the benefits of a mentorship programme is discussed from different viewpoints. Lastly the impact of the match between mentor and mentee are considered.

Chapter 3 clarify aspects around leadership and the reporting of employees to leaders. The concepts will be explained as well as the different styles involved in each. Aspects regarding complementary styles will also be elaborated on.

This chapter will address step 2 of phase 1 of the research methodology.
Chapter 3: Leadership and Reporting

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to clarify the concepts around leadership and the interaction between the leader and follower. The training of leaders will also be addressed.

3.2 DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP

Robbins (1989) describes leadership as the ability to influence a group towards the achievement of goals. According to him this influence can be formal through, for example, the position that a person holds in an organisation, or informal, for example when a leader emerges within a group of peers.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1992) also define leadership as the influencing of the activities of followers and add that this is done through the communication process and is towards the attainment of goals. This definition focuses on the importance of communication. The accuracy and clarity of communication therefore has an effect on the performance of followers.

Cronin (1993) mentions that leadership is about getting people to work together to make things happen that might not otherwise occur.

In all these definitions it is emphasised that leaders cannot function on their own, they need followers to influence. This implies that the follower may also have an influence on leadership and that the goal that needs to be achieved must be a shared one.

3.2.1 Leadership versus management

Kotter (1993) differentiates between leadership and management. Management is about coping with complexity and leadership is about coping with change.
Good management brings order and consistency to large organisations. Major changes are necessary to survive in today's business environment. More change always demands more leadership. From the above it can be seen that management and leadership are complementary systems of one action. Each with its own function and characteristic activities, both are necessary for an organisation to be effective in the new environment. The challenge for organisations is to combine strong management with strong leadership. It is rare that both these aspects are found in one person, the solution is to make both kinds of people part of the team. Some members lead and some members manage.

Zaleznik (1993) describes managers as people who maintain the balance of operations and leaders as those who create new approaches and imagine new areas to explore. According to him managers and leaders differ fundamentally in their world views. Leaders tolerate chaos and lack of structure, whereas managers seek order and control.

Bennis (1993) lists differences between leaders and managers. (See Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1: Differences between Leaders and Managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administers</td>
<td>Innovates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a copy</td>
<td>Is an original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains</td>
<td>Develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on systems and structures</td>
<td>Focuses on people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relies on control</td>
<td>Inspires trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-range view</td>
<td>Long-range perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks how and when?</td>
<td>Asks what and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye on the bottom line</td>
<td>Eye on horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts status quo</td>
<td>Challenges status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does things right</td>
<td>Does the right thing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaders have a clear idea of what they want to do and they have the strength to persist even in the face of setbacks and failures. They know where they are going and why.
3.3 THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership can be described and understood from different angles, especially aspects concerning models of leadership. Aspects listed are the personality traits of a leader (trait theories), and the ability to adapt to specific situations and to adapt the leadership style to support the specific situation (situational theories).

Bass (1981) states that it is fair to say that every procedure known to social science in general has been applied to the study of leadership. Gardner (1993) supports the issue of different theories of leadership by saying there are many different ways of leading and many kinds of leaders.

According to Anderson (1992) the challenge for leaders in the here and now is the ability to adjust successfully to changing environmental circumstances. He sees the “new” leader as a transforming leader, someone who has inwardly decided to grow into being more conscious, developed, skilled, sensitive and creative. They strive to make positive differences in organisations as well as in the lives of others.

Through transformational leadership a leader will be able to identify gaps in his or her experience and will be able to formulate a plan to fill these gaps in order to apply it in his or her personal life and work environment.

Bennis (1993) emphasises the fact that to be a leader in the new age, we need to evolve by paying attention to what is changing and adapting to it. According to him the key is to make the right choices by understanding and embodying the leadership qualities necessary to be successful in the global economy. The need is for leaders, not managers.

3.4 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT STYLES

Leadership style is the leaders' way of handling specific aspects of his or her role, for example assigning responsibility and maintaining relationships with his or her followers (Bassett, 1966).
Bassett (1966) lists the following three dimensions of management style:

- **Authoritarian** - runs the show himself, reacts personally to each problem as it arises and renders a decision to what needs to be done.
- **Permissive** - no model for behaviour is provided, followers are allowed to assess problems for themselves, they can make their own mistakes. Directives are often ambiguous. This style is the total opposite of the authoritarian style.
- **Integrative** - This style is in between the above two. The manager serves as a link by gathering information about goals and values and sometimes modelling them or may put followers in contact with goals and values to obtain their own information.

Bell (1973) states that leadership style consists of your habits, work patterns and unchanging mannerisms you use to relate to others. He identifies the following six styles:

- **Commander leadership style** - highly visible and consistent actions. They make decisions for subordinates, seldom seeking advice or listening to opinions.
- **Attacker leadership style** - finds the duties of leadership distasteful and tend to take little responsibility for subordinates, leaving them to struggle for themselves.
- **Avoider leadership style** - dislikes responsibility, thus a true non-leader. Procrastinates in making decisions and seeks no participation from followers. A distant style of relating to others, seldom expressing thoughts and ignoring followers.
- **Pleaser leadership style** - Tries through actions and decisions to be popular with followers. Encourages extensive participation from followers. Easy to get along with, adjusting his or her behaviour to accommodate follower wishes.
- **Performer leadership style** - Explores for proper rules of behaviour and makes sure his or her followers follow them. Makes own decisions, but get followers to feel that they have participated. Seeks compromises to resolve conflict.
• Achiever leadership style - Sets high yet realistic goals. Gets relevant participation from followers in making decisions. Confronts conflict directly and find solutions for it by trying to understand what happened. He or she allows for the growth of followers through training and exposure. This style generally produces the most effective results of all six types of leaders.

Each of the above six styles will be more effective when applied in the correct circumstances and situations.

Bass (1981) describes the following styles:
• Autocratic style - depends on power to coerce and their ability to persuade. They will reward followers for compliance and punish them for rejection
• Democratic style - Using majority decision-making, consulting and striving for consensus, pursuing an open, trusting follower-oriented relationship.
• Participative style - Leader permits and encourages group members to participate actively in discussion, problem solving and decision-making.
• Directive style - Leader plays the active role in problem solving and decision making and expects group members to be guided by his decisions.
• Task-oriented style - Strong concern for the groups’ goals and the means to achieve them. Likely to keep psychological distance from followers and be more cold and aloof.
• Relations-oriented style - Strong concern for group members in the extent to which they pursue a human relations approach by maintaining friendly, supportive relations with followers. Trusts in followers, feels a lesser need to control them. More general supervision.
• Laissez-faire style - Avoids influencing their subordinates and evades supervisor duties. Has no confidence in their ability to lead. Leaves too much responsibility with followers, sets no clear goals and makes no decisions or helps the group to make decisions.
Motivation to manage style - Is an active and assertive father figure for followers. Exercises power over them with appropriate use of negative and positive sanctions and accepts responsibility for administrative details.

Analysis of leadership styles has suggested five broad styles. Four of these are based on fundamental "task versus people" interaction, while a fifth reflects leadership "negotiated" on a "tit for tat" (you do this for me/I do that for you) basis (Bass, 1981). He also states that leaders and managers vary in how they deal with subordinates. The concepts describing how they vary involves either work-related or person-related behaviour.

3.5 LEADER-FOLLOWER INTERACTION

It takes at least two individuals for leadership to occur. Someone to act; someone else to react (Bass, 1981). Kellerman (1984) defines leadership as the exercise of authority and matches it to applying authority on behalf of facilitating the development of those around the leader, for her this person can truly be called a leader. As stated in the defining of the concept of leadership it is again emphasised that leadership cannot occur if there are no followers. Leadership is an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes (Ciulla, 1996).

Organisations that have effective leaders tend to allow for the development of effective followers. Effective followers are partners in creating organisational vision. They take responsibility for getting their job done (Lee, 1993).

The leader and the follower depend on one another, for whoever leads and whoever follows stimulates and reinforces the others' behaviour. The leader initiates or proposes and the follower complies, resists, or ignores. It is therefore a process of influence and counterinfluence. Successful leaders influence their followers, they bring about changes in attitude and behaviour. Follower compliance is the mirror of successful leadership (Bass, 1981).
Each leadership style has a complementary follower style. For example, directive leaders may give more direction and guidelines to followers. The complementary follower role should tend to be more dependant, someone who is happier operating with clear direction.

The leader contributes to the level of performance of the follower by:

- clarifying what is expected
- explaining how to meet such expectations
- spelling out the criteria for the evaluation of effective performance
- providing feedback on whether the objectives are being met, and
- allocating rewards on meeting objectives (Bass, 1981).

Saville et al (1999) also emphasise the fact that for each leadership style there is a complementary reporting (follower) style. Five leadership and reporting styles and the attributes of each that they identify reflected in table 3.2.

**TABLE 3.2 : LEADERSHIP AND REPORTING STYLE ATTRIBUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEADERSHIP STYLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Leader</td>
<td>Maintains responsibility for planning and control. Issues instructions in line with own perception of priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative Leader</td>
<td>Minimal personal involvement. Believes in delegation of task and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Leader</td>
<td>Favours consensus decision-making. Prepared to take time over decisions. Ensures involvement of all relevant individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Leader</td>
<td>Pays genuine attention to opinions/feelings of report, but maintains a clear sense of task objectives and makes final decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiative Leader</td>
<td>Makes &quot;deals&quot; with reports. Influences others by identifying their needs and using these as a basis for negotiation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As was stated earlier each leadership style has a complementary reporting style. Table 3.3 depicts which style suits each other (Saville et al, 1999).

TABLE 3.3: LEADERSHIP AND REPORTING STYLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Reporting style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive Leader</td>
<td>Receptive report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative Leader</td>
<td>Self-reliant report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Leader</td>
<td>Collaborating report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Leader</td>
<td>Informative report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiative Leader</td>
<td>Reciprocating report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De Pree (1993) states that the relationship between leaders and followers can be magical and health-giving or dispiriting and fatal. According to him performance of the group is the only proof of leadership.
3.6 TRAINING OF LEADERS

According to Lorber (1996) the way most people move up in their careers is through networking (finding out about job opportunities through word-of-mouth and being recommended by someone already there), mentoring (being coached through informal norms of the workplace), and sponsorship (being helped to advance by a senior colleague).

Bass (1981) is of the opinion learning and opportunities to serve on higher levels of responsibility in the organisation are facilitated by training. Training of leadership has been widely used in industry. He differentiates between on-the-job and off-the-job training. Refer to table 3.4 for examples of each.

**TABLE 3.4 : LEADERSHIP TRAINING EXAMPLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-the-job training</th>
<th>Off-the-job training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Participation in professional or trade associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job rotation</td>
<td>Formal classrooms of workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeships</td>
<td>Problem discussion groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership internship</td>
<td>Role-playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process consultation</td>
<td>Simulations, e.g. In-baskets, games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey feedback</td>
<td>Computer-assisted instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special project assignments</td>
<td>Sensitivity training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These broad aspects of on-the-job training will now be discussed.

3.6.1 Coaching

A coach focuses on specific job results during a specified period by creating opportunities for the learner to use new skills and explore problems (Rosenbach 1993). According to Deegan (1979) a successful coach is one who can unleash the full potential of individuals. The difference between mentoring and coaching according to Parsloe (1992) is the fact that a coach is concerned with the immediate improvement of performance through the use
of a form of tutoring or instruction, whereas a mentor is concerned with the long-term acquiring of skills in a developing career through a form of advising and counselling.

Bass (1981) concludes that coaching has been successfully applied to leadership and human relations training.

### 3.6.2 Job rotation

Job rotation is the transferring of trainees from one job to another to provide a succession of educational experiences (Bass, 1981). Rotation increases the individuals' identification with the whole organisation rather than with one single area.

### 3.6.3. Feedback

Bass (1981) states that feedback about performance on the job is critical if learning is to occur. Feedback therefore must play a major role in management training. Through feedback gaps in knowledge and skills are shared with the individual by putting him or her into a position to fill the gap by acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills. According to Deegan (1979) the idea is to look at good performance and determine how it can be repeated in future as well as look at poor performance and determine what can be learned from the experience and how to prevent it from occurring again.

### 3.6.4 Mentoring

Another type of training is mentoring. Mentoring allows followers to become intimately familiar with a well-developed style of leadership that should enable them to better develop their own style (Rosenbach, 1993).

The formal mentoring relationship as proposed and investigated in this study include the aspects of on-the-job training as described by Bass (1981).

When teaching leadership the nature and practical qualities of a just society must be addressed (Temes, 1996). The future of leadership depends on the quality of its scholars and the commitment of its teachers (Ciulla, 1996). Strong leadership that motivates
followers to perform beyond expectation is part of transformational leadership. A culture of transformational leadership stimulates mentoring (Rosenbach, 1993). He also accentuates the importance of mentoring as an accepted mechanism for leadership development.

Looking at training and development of adults in general Swanson and Arnold (1996) say that human resource development should strive to contribute directly to the organisations' performance goals. The ultimate goal is to create a learning organisation. A learning organisation is one in which learning and work are integrated on an ongoing and systematic fashion to support continuous change and improvement at all levels. (Rowden, 1996). Another important aspect in training and development is the relationship between theory and practice. Theory provides guidance for practice (Mott, 1996). Theory addresses the why and practice looks at the how to, both aspects of importance in adult training and development (Chalofsky, 1996).

Garland (1989) emphasises the importance that training plays in the effectiveness of organisations. According to him effective training is not just some once off event, but a continuous process. This process must continuously provide managers and followers with new information, as things changes new skills and knowledge will be needed.

3.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter theories around leadership and management are described as well as the impact that leadership style has on the followers reporting to a leader. The complementary reporting and leadership styles are listed and each briefly described. Lastly the concept of training of leaders is discussed and different types of training interventions are identified. Using mentorship in the training of managers was compared to other methods of training.

In chapter 4 the concepts described in the literature review will be applied on a group of people participating in a mentorship programme in order to test the set hypothesis. The first steps as set out in phase 2, empirical study of the research methodology will apply in this chapter.
Chapter 4: Empirical study

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the empirical study that was done in order to test the research hypothesis.

The following steps as set out in the research methodology are addressed in this chapter:

Step 1 Description of population and sample
Step 2 Choosing the research instruments
Step 3 Data gathering by administering questionnaires
Step 4 Statistical analysis of questionnaire results
Step 5 Formulation of research hypothesis

4.2 DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The study targeted a group of employees working for a metropolitan municipality who took part in a formal mentorship programme during the year 2000 and 2001. Only mentees on a junior management level were included in the study. The population consisted of a total of 58 mentees and 46 mentors. The number of mentors was smaller than that of mentees due to the fact that some of the mentors mentored more than one mentee.

From this population an accidental sample was drawn. Everyone was invited to attend sessions in order to complete the relevant questionnaires. According to Kerlinger (1986) accidental sampling is the weakest form of sampling, but is also most frequently used. Accidental sampling means that the available sample is taken. In this study only those who attended sessions completed questionnaires. Because both the mentor and mentee needed to complete questionnaires the data of two candidates had to be discarded, because one of the participants (either mentor or mentee) did not complete questionnaires.
The result of the sampling are portrayed in table 4.1.

### TABLE 4.1 SAMPLING RESULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mentees</th>
<th>Mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following descriptive statistics for the sample of mentees (N=40) and mentors (N=34) provides a profile of respondents.

#### 4.2.1 Descriptive statistics of mentors

The following tables provides descriptive statistics applicable to the mentors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.03</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Experience</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | Count   | Cumulative Count | Percent of Valid | Cumulative % of valid | % of all cases | Cumulative % of all | |
|----------------------|---------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------| |
| **Education**        |         |                  |                  |                       |                |                     | |
| Grade 10/11          | 2       | 2                | 5.88             | 5.88                  | 5.88           | 5.88                | |
| Grade 12             | 5       | 7                | 14.71            | 20.59                 | 14.71          | 20.59               | |
| Degree/3 yr diploma  | 17      | 24               | 50.00            | 70.59                 | 50.00          | 70.59               | |
| Post graduate        | 10      | 34               | 29.41            | 100.00                | 29.41          | 100.00              | |

| **Home language**    |         |                  |                  |                       |                |                     | |
| Afrikaans            | 31      | 31               | 91.18            | 91.18                 | 91.18          | 91.18               | |
| North Sotho          | 1       | 32               | 2.94             | 94.12                 | 2.94           | 94.12               | |
| Swazi                | 1       | 33               | 2.94             | 97.06                 | 2.94           | 97.06               | |
| Tsonga               | 1       | 34               | 2.94             | 100.00                | 2.94           | 100.00              | |
### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative Count</th>
<th>Percent of Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative % of valid</th>
<th>% of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative % of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>82.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative Count</th>
<th>Percent of Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative % of valid</th>
<th>% of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative % of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>20.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>79.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.2 Descriptive statistics of mentees

The following tables provides descriptive statistics of mentees.

#### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative Count</th>
<th>Percent of Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative % of valid</th>
<th>% of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative % of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10/lower</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/ 3 yr diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Home language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative Count</th>
<th>Percent of Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative % of valid</th>
<th>% of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative % of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sotho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swazi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative Count</th>
<th>Percent of Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative % of valid</th>
<th>% of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative % of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Cumulative Count</th>
<th>Percent of Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative % of valid</th>
<th>% of all cases</th>
<th>Cumulative % of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The research method used in this empirical study was the survey method. Bailey (1987) described a survey as consisting of asking questions of a cross-section of the population at a single point in time. Kerlinger (1986) defined survey research as the studying of populations by selecting samples chosen from these populations to discover relative incidence, distributions and interrelations.

In this study participants were invited to attend a session during which two questionnaires were completed by them. Because the population was small to begin with it was decided to have personal sessions, rather than using mail questionnaires in order to ensure better participation and correctly completed questionnaires. A total of five one and a half hour sessions were scheduled over a period of five days. Participants were contacted through the internal e-mail system of the organisation.

Two self reporting questionnaires were used during this study. The purpose of the first questionnaire was to determine the quality of the relationship between the mentor and mentee. Both participants completed the questionnaire from their own perspective and perceived quality of the relationship. The second questionnaire was used to determine the
leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee. The purpose was to determine if the match between mentor and mentee in terms of leader-reporting match had a significant impact on the quality of the relationship between them.

4.3.1 Mentoring relationship questionnaire

4.3.1.1 Description
The purpose of the questionnaire is to determine the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship in terms of six roles that the mentor plays in any such relationship. Each of the six roles are explained by three statements. The mentor and mentee both completed this questionnaire. The focus is on the role played by the mentor and rating was done according to the mentees' and mentors' own perception of how successful the role is.

The rating anchor used in the questionnaire was:
4 = very effective
3 = effective
2 = partially effective
1 = not effective.

An example of this questionnaire is attached as appendix 1.

4.3.1.2 Dimensions
The six roles played by the mentor each represents a dimension of the relationship. Dimensions needed to be verified by indication on a Likert type rating scale. According to Thomas (1999) rating scales are used for gathering information about the degree to which a person finds something; for example, helpful or effective.

The six roles with each of their dimensions are as follows:

a  Role : Advisor
As advisor the mentor helped the mentee to set and achieve career goals.
Statements used to verify this role were:
• Helped mentee clarify career interests, competencies and values
• Assisted the mentee in setting specific career goals
• Jointly developed strategies for achieving career objectives

b Role: Coach
As coach the mentor helped the mentee to meet job performance norms.
Statements used to verify this role were:
• Model exemplary work outputs
• Shared effective and efficient performance practices
• Provided feedback regarding the mentees' job performance

c Role: Explainer
The role of the mentor here was to provide the mentee with information on policies and procedures.
Statements used to verify this role were:
• Informed mentee on the nature of the organisations' culture
• Tutored mentee on how to get things done in the organisation
• Assisted mentee with routine paper work and procedures

d Role: Protector
In the role as protector the mentor helped the mentee avoid costly mistakes.
Statements used to verify this role were:
• Pointed out things that might reflect negatively on mentee
• Maintained good relationship between mentee and his or her immediate superior
• Agreed to positive conclusion of the mentoring relationship

e Role: Sponsor
As sponsor the mentor helped the mentee to secure positions and assignments.
Statements used to verify this role were:
• Made introductions to influential people in the organisation
• Made recommendations for assignments and participation on project teams
• Publicly praised the mentees' accomplishments and abilities
Role: Validator

As validator the mentor provided the mentee with psychological support during the programme. Statements used to verify this role were:

- Made the mentee feel a part of the organisation
- Served as a confidant, offering reassurances and encouragement
- Assisted the mentee in resolving crisis situations

4.3.1.3 Reliability

According to Leedy (1985) reliability deals with accuracy, the accuracy of the instrument that was used to measure certain concepts. Thus, a measurement was reliable if it reflected mostly true score, relative to the error. (http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html). One method of determining the reliability of a questionnaire is by ascertaining the content reliability thereof. The homogeneity of items was determined through the analysis of the performance on items of the test and specifically the internal consistency of items. Internal consistency is at its maximum if the inter-item correlation is high, the item-variance is high and the grade of difficulty of items is the same (Smit, 1986).

The Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to determine the reliability of this questionnaire. This statistic determines split-half reliability. It is used for two-way, as well as items with more scales (Huysamen, 1990). Cronbach's alpha is a formula used to estimate the proportion of true score variance that is captured by the items by comparing the sum of item variances with the variance of the sum scale. (http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html). This is also referred to as the internal-consistency reliability of a questionnaire. In this formula if all items are perfectly reliable and therefore measure the same thing (true score), then the coefficient alpha is equal to 1.

The Cronbach alpha of this questionnaire was 0.896904. This means that the reliability of the measurement was near to the true score and that the questionnaire accurately measured what it was set out to measure.
4.3.1.4  Validity

Leedy (1985) states that when determining validity an attempt is made to ascertain whether an instrument actually measured what it was presumed to measure. Validity of this questionnaire was determined through face validity. This was determined by using a focus group to discuss the content of the questionnaire and determine any discrepancies in the understanding of concepts.

4.3.1.5  Motivation for inclusion

A measurement on how effective each of the participants perceived their relationship with each other was necessary to use as basis for determining whether leadership style and reporting styles played a role in the success of the relationship. Whether the two styles were complementary or not was compared with how the participants rated the effectiveness of their relationship. By doing this, the impact of the styles became meaningful.

4.3.2  Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ)

4.3.2.1  Description

The OPQ was designed to give information on individual styles or preferences of behaviour at work - an occupational model of personality. In this study version 32n was used. The OPQ32n asked respondents to rate statements on a scale of 1 to 5.

The following scale was used:
1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Unsure
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree.

The questionnaire consisted of 230 statements. In the profiling of participants the leadership styles of mentors and the reporting styles of mentees was determined. The purpose of scoring these styles were to determine how an individual would fit into vertical
relationships, such as between mentors and mentees. In chapter 3 the various styles as depicted in literature was described, as well as the leadership and reporting styles most suited to one another.

The five leadership styles, together with their complementary reporting styles according to the OPQ are listed in table 4.2.

**TABLE 4.2 LEADERSHIP AND REPORTING STYLES ACCORDING TO THE OPQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Reporting style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive leader</td>
<td>Receptive report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative leader</td>
<td>Self-reliant report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative leader</td>
<td>Collaborating report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative leader</td>
<td>Informative report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiative leader</td>
<td>Reciprocating report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2 *Scale descriptions*

The OPQ model of personality categorises personality down into three domains, namely relationships with people, thinking style and feelings and emotions. The three domains are joined by a potential fourth - the dynamism domain.

The relations with people domain looks at aspects such as influence, sociability and empathy. The thinking domain determines areas such as analysis, creativity and change and structure. The domain for feelings and emotions identifies aspects such as worrying, optimistic and emotionally controlled. The fourth domain, dynamism is composed of scales such as vigorous, achieving and competitive; which relate to sources of energy (Saville et al, 1999).

A description of each of the scales is depicted in Table 4.3.
### TABLE 4.3 SCALES OF THE OPQ

#### RELATIONSHIPS WITH PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>High score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rarely pressures others to change their views, dislikes selling, less comfortable using negotiation</td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>enjoys selling, comfortable using negotiation, likes to change other people's views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy to let others take charge, dislikes telling people what to do, unlikely to take the lead</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>likes to be in charge, takes the lead, tells others what to do, takes control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds back from criticising others, may not express own views, unprepared to put forward own opinions</td>
<td>Outspoken</td>
<td>freely expresses opinions, makes disagreement clear, prepare to criticise others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepts majority decisions, prepared to follow the consensus</td>
<td>Independent minded</td>
<td>prefers to follow own approach, prepared to disregard majority decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet and reserved in groups, dislikes being centre of attention</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>lively and animated in groups, talkative, enjoys attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable spending time away from people, values time spent alone, seldom misses the company of others</td>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>enjoys others' company, likes to be around people, can miss the company of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feels more comfortable in less formal situations, can feel awkward when first meeting people</td>
<td>Socially confident</td>
<td>feels comfortable when first meeting people, at ease in formal situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>High score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>makes strengths and achievements known, talks about personal success</td>
<td>Modest</td>
<td>dislikes discussing achievements, keeps quiet about personal success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared to make decisions without consultation, prefers to make decisions alone</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>consults widely, involves others in decision making, less likely to make decisions alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selective with sympathy and support, remains detached from others' personal problems</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>sympathetic and considerate towards others, helpful and supportive, gets involved in others' problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THINKING STYLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>High score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prefers dealing with opinions and feelings rather than facts and figures, likely to avoid using statistics</td>
<td>Data rational</td>
<td>likes working with numbers, enjoys analysing statistical information, bases decisions on facts and figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not focus on potential limitations, dislikes critically analysing information, rarely looks for errors and mistakes</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>critically evaluates information, looks for potential limitations, focuses on errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not question the reason for peoples' behaviour, tends not to analyse people</td>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>tries to understand motives and behaviour, enjoys analysing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low score</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>High score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favours changes in work methods, prefers new approaches, less conventional</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>prefers well-established methods, favours a more conventional approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefers to deal with practical rather than theoretical issues, dislikes dealing with abstract concepts</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>interested in theories, enjoys discussing abstract concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more likely to build to than generate ideas, less inclined to be creative and inventive</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>generates new ideas, enjoys being creative, thinks of original solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefers routine, is prepared to do repetitive work, does not seek variety</td>
<td>Variety seeking</td>
<td>prefers variety, tries out new things, likes changes to regular routine, can become bored by repetitive work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaves consistently across situations, unlikely to behave differently with different people</td>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>changes behaviour to suit the situation, adapts approach to different people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more likely to focus on immediate than long-term issues, less likely to take a perspective</td>
<td>Forward thinking</td>
<td>takes a long-term view, sets goals for the future, more likely to take a strategic perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlikely to become preoccupied with detail, less organised and systematic, dislikes tasks involving detail</td>
<td>Detail consensus</td>
<td>focuses on detail, likes to be methodical, organised and systematic, may become preoccupied with detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sees deadlines as flexible, prepared to leave some tasks unfinished</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>focuses on getting things finished, persists until the job is done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not restricted by rules and procedures, prepared to break rules, tends to dislike bureaucracy</td>
<td>Rule following</td>
<td>follows rules and regulations, prefers clear guidelines, finds it difficult to break rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low score</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>High score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tends to feel tense, finds it difficult to relax, can find it hard to unwind after work</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>finds it easy to relax, rarely feels tense, generally calm and untroubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feels calm before important occasions, less affected by key events, free from worry</td>
<td>Worrying</td>
<td>feels nervous before important occasions, worries about things going wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive, easily hurt by criticism, upset by unfair comments or insults</td>
<td>Tough minded</td>
<td>not easily offended, can ignore insults, may be insensitive to personal criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned about the future, expects things to go wrong, focuses on negative aspects of a situation</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>expects that things will turn out well, looks to the positive aspects of a situation, has an optimistic view of the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wary of others' intentions, finds it difficult to trust others, unlikely to be fooled by people</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>trusts people, sees others as reliable and honest, believes what others say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openly expresses feelings, finds it difficult to conceal feelings, displays emotions clearly</td>
<td>Emotionally controlled</td>
<td>can conceal feelings from others, rarely displays emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likes to take things at a steady pace, dislikes excessive work demands</td>
<td>Vigorous</td>
<td>thrives on activity, likes to be busy, enjoys having a lot to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislikes competing with others, feels that taking part is more important than winning</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>has a need to win, enjoys competitive activities, dislikes losing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sees career progressions as less important, looks for achievable rather than highly ambitious targets</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>ambitious and career-centred, likes to work towards demanding goals and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tends to be cautious when making decisions, likes to take time to reach conclusions</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>makes fast decisions, reaches conclusions quickly, less cautious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above scales were used to determine leadership and reporting styles.
4.3.2.3 Reliability

According to Kerlinger (1986) reliability has to do with stability, dependability and accuracy of the instrument used to measure. This is important because without consistency, scores could not be meaningful. High reliability of the OPQ32n was proven through test-retest reliability (range from 0.64 to 0.91 with a median of 0.79) and internal consistency reliability (range from 0.87 to 0.65 with a median of 0.79 for the general population) (Saville et al, 1999).

Reliability factors that could be controlled by the person administering the questionnaire such as the candidates' motivation and alertness was taken into account to ensure better reliability.

4.3.2.4 Validity

Kerlinger (1986) describes validity as focussing on what is being measured, in other words the determining whether what is being measured is what should be measured. Validity does not only have to do with the relevance and effectiveness of the questionnaire itself, but is also concerned with the interpretation of scores and whether the inferences drawn are realistic.

Validity of the OPQ32 was proven through various studies. These studies positively established face validity, content validity, construct and criterion validity. Positive relationships with various other personality questionnaires, such as Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and 16PF5 were determined. Saville et al (1999) states that the clear patterns of relationships found in studies done provided strong support for the validity of the OPQ32.

4.3.2.5 Motivation for inclusion

The OPQ32n was used because the study was done within an organisational context. As described above the high validity and reliability also played a role in the selection.
The questionnaire also adheres to the following criteria as stipulated by Bailey (1987), which would ensure that the information collected was complete, valid and reliable:

- the questionnaire was relevant to the study and the respondents
- questions were clearly constructed
- the response categories were easy to respond to, with clear indication of what each category means
- leading questions were avoided
- clear instructions were given in the beginning of the questionnaire.

4.4 DATA GATHERING

4.4.1 Planning

According to Thomas (1999) planning is critical to the success of any survey. It should be the central part of the project. As part of the planning of data gathering the following steps were determined beforehand and adhered to throughout the process to ensure that every aspect was covered. These steps only covered the actual process of gathering data, at this stage the population was already determined.

- Step 1 Determine dates for sessions to administer questionnaires
- Step 2 Book lecture room and gather stationary
- Step 3 Send out e-mail to everyone in the population to invite them to attend a session
- Step 4 Telephonically contact non-respondents
- Step 5 Prepare for administering of questionnaire
- Step 6 Administer questionnaire
- Step 7 Scrutinise completed questionnaires and ensure that every aspect are correctly completed. (When questionnaires were handed in during step 6)
- Step 8 Organise of completed questionnaires prior to determining results
4.4.2 Covering letter
As stated earlier communication with participants was done through the internal e-mail system of the organisation. In this communication important aspects dealt with in Bailey (1987) were adhered to. Aspects such as explaining the purpose and nature of the study were addressed, as well as the importance for everyone to take part in the project. As the researcher was personally acquainted with each of the members in the population, the e-mail was addressed to each one personally.

Other aspects addressed were why the study were important as well as how long it would take to complete the questionnaire (Thomas, 1999). Dates and times for sessions were also given as well as a target date to confirm attendance. Non-attendants were contacted telephonically to ensure maximum attendance.

4.4.3 Confidentiality
Thomas (1999) maintains that it is critical that the privacy of individuals participating in a study be respected. During the administering of questionnaires participants were given the assurance that information would not be disclosed. Thomas (1999) also suggests that surveys must be given anonymously. In this study it could not be done, because of the fact that the results of the mentor and mentee had to be compared with one another to be able to draw conclusions. The researcher also know all of the participants personally, because of their participation in the 18 month long formal mentorship programme that was run in the organisation. The researcher furthermore developed and acted as project leader of this formal mentorship programme. This relationship between researcher and participants was built on trust and as such participants knew that all information shared would be kept confidential.

4.5 DATA ANALYSIS
After the collection of the data from the two questionnaires it was analysed in the following manner.
4.5.1 Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ)

The OPQ was computer scored. The results were used to determine the leadership style of each of the mentors and the reporting style of each of the mentees. The reporting style of the mentee and the leadership style of the mentor of the different mentoring pairs were then compared to determine if their styles are complementary or not.

4.5.2 Mentoring relationship questionnaire

These questionnaires were hand scored. Inter-item correlation between items and the six mentoring roles were calculated electronically. The results of the mentoring relationship questionnaires were used to determine the quality of the relationship between each pair of mentor and mentee.

4.5.3 Comparison of OPQ results and the quality of the mentoring relationship

The extent to which mentoring styles are complementary was compared to the quality of the relationship. The leadership and reporting styles and the fact that they were complementary or not was compared to the perceived quality of the relationship as rated by mentor and mentee pairs. Aspects that were looked at were whether relationships rated as successful had complementary styles and those rated as unsuccessful comprised of non-complementary styles.

4.6 FORMULATION OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

According to Bailey (1987) a hypothesis is a statement that is formulated in a testable format that predicts a particular relationship between two or more variables. This statement would be proven right or wrong through research.

Kerlinger (1986) supported this by stating that a good hypothesis is stated in such a manner as to carry clear implications for the empirical testing of the stated relations.

In order to carry out the above, two hypotheses needed to be formulated. The first is called the null hypothesis \( H_0 \), indicating no difference between the two variables. The second hypothesis is called the alternative hypothesis \( H_1 \). This was the research hypothesis that
indicated the proposed relationship between the two variables (Bailey, 1987).

The research hypotheses formulated for this research were:

\[ H_0 : \text{There is no relationship between the leadership and reporting styles and the quality of the mentoring relationship.} \]

\[ H_1 : \text{There is a relationship between the leadership and reporting styles and the quality of the mentoring relationship.} \]

### 4.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter represented the first 5 steps in the research methodology as set out in chapter 1. In this chapter the methods and instruments used to gather data from the sample population were explained and a research hypothesis was formulated.

In chapter 5, the results of the empirical study will be discussed.
Chapter 5 : Results of the empirical study

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 5 contains the empirical analysis of the data that was gathered during the data gathering phase. Step 6 of phase 2 of the research methodology applies. Specifically the measure of the quality of the mentoring relationship as perceived by both the mentor and the mentee and the styles (leadership and reporting) that was identified through the administering of the OPQ. The analysis was summarised in charts and each will be discussed separately.

5.2 MENTORING RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

The statistical analysis done in order to verify and determine the results of this questionnaire will be discussed next.

5.2.1 CRONBACH ALPHA OF THE MENTORING RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

A reliable scale is made up of items that proportionately measure mostly true score (http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html). The Cronbach alpha reliability analysis allowed for the scrutiny of the relation of individual items in relation to the other items in the questionnaire.

Table 5.1 depicts the Cronbach alpha reliability analysis of this questionnaire. In this table the Item-Total Correlation shows the correlation between the respective item (question) and the total sum score (without the respective item) and the alpha if deleted-column shows the internal consistency of the scale (coefficient alpha) should the respective item be deleted (http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html).
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The Cronbach alpha of the Mentoring relationship questionnaire was 0.896904. This means that the reliability of the overall questionnaire is near to the true score of 1 and that measurements are accurate.

Analysing the Item-Total Correlation in the above table question 7 (Q7) and question 14 (Q14) are not consistent with the rest of the scales. All the other questions apart from these two correlate at 0.48 and higher.

The correlation of question 7 with the sum scale was 0.38. The content of question 7 was
part of the explanatory statements that formed part of determining the explainer role of the mentor. The statement in the questionnaire was, “inform mentee on the nature of the organisations culture”. The explainer role was to provide the mentee with information on policies and procedure. The other two items in this role, questions 8 and 9 focussed on getting things done in the organisation (Q8) and routine paper work and procedures (Q9). Question 7 highlighted culture, therefore not part of the content of policies and procedure. During the literature review (as stated in Chapter 2, paragraph 2.7.1.3) it was determined that the focus of this role was more on the mentor explaining policies and procedure. The part that culture played was not specifically addressed. Culture underlies procedure and policy and might have an influence on them. Policy and procedure content could be seen as the result of a specific organisational culture. This might explain the fact that the statement on culture was not consistent with the rest of the scale.

Question 14 was part of the explanatory statements on the sponsor role of the mentor. The sponsor role was to help the mentee to secure positions and assignments. The statement being, “make recommendations for assignments and participation on project teams.” This question’s correlation with the sum scale was 0.34, even lower than that of question 7. The other two items in this role were about introducing the mentee to influential people in the organisation (Q13) and praising the mentees' accomplishments (Q15). Question 14 highlighted the recommendation of the mentee by the mentor to take part in project teams, therefore supporting the mentee to become involved in actual tasks. Literature (as set out in Chapter 2, paragraph 2.7.1.5) explained the sponsor role of the mentor from the background of respect for the mentor in the organisation. The mentor could play the role of sponsor because he or she was well-respected. Question 14 assumed that the mentor made recommendations from the fact that he or she was well-respected. It is not a direct result of being well-respected, such as implied in question 13 and 15. The actual participation of the mentee in project teams would be determined by other people in the organisation. This may explain the fact that question 14 was not consistent with the rest of the scale.
5.2.2 ITEM INTERCORRELATION OF THE MENTORING RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

Correlation is a measure of the relation between two or more variables. The correlation coefficient can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents absolute negative correlation and +1.00 absolute positive correlation. The value of 0.00 illustrates a lack of correlation (http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html).

In the examining of the item intercorrelation of the Mentoring relationship questionnaire p<0.05 was interpreted as significant. Statistical significance (p-value) meant that the higher the p-value the less believable the observed relation between variables was. It is therefore not a reliable indicator of the relation between the perspective items.

A p-value of 0.05 indicated that there was a 5% probability that the relation between items was by accident. In research a p-value of 0.05 is customarily treated as a "border-line acceptable" error level. This means that should a result be p=0.05 it involves a probability of 5% error (http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html).

Bailey (1987) states that the minimum level of r (correlation) required to be significant at p = .05 for a sample size of 60 is 0.254 and for a sample size of 80 it is 0.220. In this study a sample of 74 was used, meaning that an r of approximately 0.24 is significant. An r of 0.20 means that the two variables share four percent of their variance.

Kerlinger (1986) supports this by stating an r of 0.30 is statistically significant. It points to an important relation. With large samples r's between 0.20 and 0.30 are statistically significant.

An analysis of the item intercorrelation of the Mentoring relationship questionnaire was done to determine if the three questions asked to ascertain the success of each of the six roles of the mentor measured the same concept. An r of 0.30 was used during this analysis.
The correlation between Q7 and Q9 (r=0.23), Q10 and Q12 (r=0.20) and Q10 and Q11 (r=0.26) indicated that the correlation between them is low and that they measure different concepts. These items share more or less four percent variance.

In all of the other correlations the r value indicated the same concepts are being measured and that the correlation is high (r>0.30). This meant that there was a strong relationship between the concepts within roles being measured. The fact that the relationship was strong, was dependent on the reliability of the questionnaire. Because reliability of this questionnaire was addressed adequately in the compilation of questions, it can be stated that the relationship between the concepts measured were significant.

The complete table of item intercorrelation of the Mentoring relationship questionnaire is attached as appendix 2.

The next step was to look at the intercorrelation of the six categories or roles of the mentor as measured by the Mentoring relationship questionnaire. Table 5.8 shows the intercorrelation.

**TABLE 5.2: MENTORING RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE INTERCORRELATION (N=74)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVISOR</th>
<th>COACH</th>
<th>EXPLAINER</th>
<th>PROTECTOR</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>VALIDATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVISOR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAINER</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTOR</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSOR</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALIDATOR</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An inspection of the six scales shows that all the correlations are significant with $r>0.30$. This suggests a high correlation between the six roles of the mentor. The lowest significance ($r=0.39$) was between the explainer and validator roles. Comparing these scores to the definition of these roles as depicted in literature it can be seen that the differences between the roles were not meaningful. Each of these roles was a separate aspect played by the mentor within the bigger role of supporting the mentee to enhance his or her career. This might explain the fact that the intercorrelation showed that the items measure the same concept.

The biggest difference was between the roles of validator and explainer. The validator role of the mentor, according to literature (Chapter 2, paragraph 2.7.1.6) was to provide the mentee with psychological support, whereas the explainer role (paragraph 2.7.1.3) was to provide the mentee with information about policies and procedures. These two roles addressed different aspects of the supporting roles of the mentor towards the mentee. One focussed on softer issues such as emotional support and the other on factual and concrete aspects such as policies and procedures.

An analysis of the inter-item correlation of all 18 questiona of the questionnaire show a distinct variance between different $r$-values. (See appendix 2). A total of 54 correlations have an $r$ of less than 0.30. The highest $r$ is 0.59; the correlation between Q4 and Q6. Only 5 correlations are higher than $r=0.50$. The rest of the $r$'s therefore fall between $r=0.30$ and $r=0.50$.

5.3 OCCUPATIONAL PERSONALITY QUESTIONNAIRE (OPQ)

The results and the analysis of the results of the OPQ32 questionnaire will be discussed next.

5.3.1 LEADERSHIP AND REPORTING STYLES

The purpose of the administering of the OPQ was to determine the leadership style of the mentor and the reporting style of the mentee. These two styles could then be compared to determine if they were complimentary or not. The styles that were complementary were
defined in Chapter 3, table 3.4. It was assumed that if the two styles complemented one another the relationship between those participants would be more successful.

FIGURE 5.1: MATCHING OF LEADERSHIP AND REPORTING STYLES

In the above figure it can be seen that in the total of 40 relationships, 16 complement one another (40%) and 24 did not (60%). (The complete list of data is attached as Appendix 3 - Matching of leadership and reporting styles).

In this study the mentee had the responsibility to choose his or her own mentor. The only prerequisite was that the mentor should hierarchically be on a higher level than the mentee and that it should be someone that he or she respects. The mentee had to be sure that the mentor would be able to guide him or her successfully through the programme. As the choice of mentor was left to the discretion of the mentee. It was interesting to note that only 40% of the relationships matched according to the literature on matching leadership and reporting styles. From the above it can be concluded that mentees looked at other aspects in their mentors when choosing them, rather than having a complementary leadership style. It must be noted that mentees did not know what their reporting style was, nor what the leadership style of the mentor was when they had to choose a partner.

Complementary styles should get along better. Putting this aspect into perspective, mentees knew their mentors beforehand and necessarily chose someone that they felt
they could work with, someone they got along with well. In other words the impact of the fact that some leadership and reporting styles complemented one another did not play a major role when mentees had to choose mentors.

5.4 QUALITY OF MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

The purpose of the mentoring relationship questionnaire was to calculate the quality of the relationship as observed by both the mentor and the mentee. The mean score of each participant was calculated. The mean score of all the participants was then calculated to get an overall mean for the quality of the relationship of all the participants. This resulted in an overall mean of was 3.11.

The individual pairs of mentors and mentees were then added and the mean of their scores calculated to determine their perceived quality of their own relationship. These were then compared to the overall mean of 3.11. Should a pair score their relationship mean as more than 3.11 the relationship was labelled as successful. A score of less than 3.11 was labelled as unsuccessful.

Of the total of 40 relationships 20 (50%) were deemed successful by the participants and 20 (50%) not. (The complete list of data is attached as Appendix 4 - Quality of the mentoring relationship as scored by the mentor and the mentee). This means that only 50% of participants felt that the six supporting roles played by the mentor were successful. This may be an indication that the mentor did not put in enough effort to play his or her role successfully, or it might be that the culture within the organisation did not support these roles and subsequently the mentor could not fulfil these roles.

In the investigation of the top 25% (25% of pairs with highest mean scores) a mean of 3.52 was calculated. Relating this back to the original scale with a highest score of 4, the mean of 3.52 indicates these mentoring pairs felt that their relationship was highly successful. The fact that mentor and mentee styles (leadership and reporting) did not complement one another or did match may have also played a role in the success of the relationship, but this will be discussed in paragraph 5.5
An analysis of the different scores of the different roles brought a few aspects to light. The success of the relationship was determined against the six roles that the mentor had to play in the relationship. In each role three questions were asked that the participants had to score on a 4-point scale. The maximum score per role was therefore 12. Table 5.9 indicates the overall score indicated by participants for each role.

**TABLE 5.3 : SCORING OF SIX MENTOR ROLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVISOR</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAINER</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTOR</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSOR</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALIDATOR</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest score was indicated for the validator role and the lowest for the sponsor role. The validator role was to provide the mentee with psychological support by being a confidante and the role of sponsor was where the mentor helped the mentee to secure positions and assignments.

The scoring of these roles might be an indication of the culture of the organisation. During the period that this mentoring project was undertaken the organisation was going through a transformational phase. Emotional support might have been important to mentees during this phase to help them to cope with the changes taking place.

The lower score of sponsor might be explained by the fact that mentors taking part in this project were hierarchical on a middle management level of the organisation. They did not have a lot of power to appoint mentees to positions or even to assure them the allocation of assignments. It must be remembered that mentees were not allowed to choose their direct supervisor as mentor, meaning that the mentor had to work through the direct
supervisor of the mentee to allocate assignments. This was not always possible, because of the differences in goals of the mentor and supervisor. (These differences are discussed in chapter 2, paragraph 2.7.1)

It was interesting to note that throughout, the mentees scored the effectiveness of the different roles higher than the mentors. The following table set out these differences.

**TABLE 5.4 : DIFFERENCES IN THE SCORING OF MENTORS AND MENTEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLES</th>
<th>MENTEE SCORING</th>
<th>MENTOR SCORING</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explainer</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protector</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validator</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from the above that the mentees throughout scored the effectiveness of the role of the mentor higher than the mentor did his or her own role. This might be because of the natural tendency of people to be more critical towards their own achievements.

**5.5 COMPARING THE MATCH OF STYLES TO THE SUCCESS OF THE RELATIONSHIP**

Lastly the above information needed to be compared to determine if the fact that the leadership and reporting styles were complementary had any effect on the quality of the mentoring relationship.
This figure indicates that in 45% of the successful relationships (those with a mean score of 3.11 and higher) the styles matched and in 55% of these successful relationships the styles did not match. This then meant that in 55% of the relationships the fact that the styles did not match did not have a negative influence on the success of the relationship. Factors that were discussed in chapter 2 are gender and culture.

In an examination of the 25% that scored their relationship the highest of these 10 pairs 6 (60%) indicated that their styles did not match and 4 pairs (40%) had matching styles.

In this figure it can be seen that in the relationships scored as unsuccessful by the
participants, 65% of the styles did not match. A percentage of 35% was indicated for styles that matched. In this context the fact that the styles did not match might have had a more negative impact on the success of the relationship. This might have meant that the fact that the styles did not match may have a negative influence on the quality of the relationship, but matching styles did not play a decisive role in successful relationships. This indicates that other factors determine the success of the relationship. Other factors as discussed in chapter 2 are for example gender and culture.

The complete list of data is attached as Appendix 5 - Matching of leadership and reporting styles to the quality of the mentoring relationship as rated by participants)

Focussing on the 20 relationships that the participants had considered as successful and looking at the outcome of the leadership and reporting style match it could be concluded that the match of these styles had no significant impact of the success or not of the mentoring relationship. Out of these 20 only 9 (45%) matched in styles. Supporting this was the fact that out of the 20 unsuccessful relationships 7 (35%) matched in style.

Because of the finding that 65% (13 relationships) of the unsuccessful relationships did not have complementary styles it might be concluded that because they did not match, the relationship was not successful, but then the match of those in the successful category would have been higher to support this statement.

5.6 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
The general aim of this research was to evaluate the relationship between participants taking part in the mentorship programme, and then to evaluate the impact that the matching of mentor and mentee had on the success or failure of the mentoring relationship.
The hypothesis that was formulated was that a complementary match between leadership and reporting results in a more successful mentoring relationship.

In other words, the complementary matching of leadership and reporting style would lead to a successful mentoring relationship and that without this match the relationship was doomed to failure.

Through the analysis of the acquired data and the conclusions drawn from it, this hypothesis could not be supported and should be rejected.

It could therefore be concluded that the fact that leadership and reporting styles complement one another had no positive impact on the success of the mentoring relationship.

5.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter contains the statistical results of the empirical study. Results were explained and interpreted and a general conclusion was given. Chapter 6 will address the last three steps in phase 2 of the research methodology, namely looking at the limitations of the study, concluding the results and making recommendations for further research.
Chapter 6 : Limitations, conclusions and recommendations

6.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter will address the following steps of the empirical study:
Step 7 Discussion of the limitations in the research
Step 8 Formulating a conclusion
Step 9 Making recommendations.

6.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH
Limitations of the research are discussed with regard to the literature review and the empirical study.

In terms of the literature review the following:
• a limited amount of literature is available on the nature of the relationship between mentor and mentee, especially looking at personality and other interpersonal characteristics. Only aspects such as culture and gender of participants in a mentoring relationship were covered in the literature reviewed.
• the majority of literature on mentorship covers aspects on the implementation of a mentorship programme and the successful operation thereof.

In terms of the empirical study the following:
• the sample size of 74 (40 pairs) was not big enough to draw any significant conclusions on the final result of the research
• the sample was also not diverse enough to look at other aspects that might have played a role in the resulted indication of the quality of the relationship.
• the study only focussed on the impact of leadership and reporting style on the quality of the relationship. Many other aspects might have an impact, such as gender or culture. Taking these aspects into consideration a more comprehensive conclusion can be made.
• the formulation of the questions on the roles of the mentor in the mentoring relationship questionnaire could have been more diverse. The item intercorrelation between the various questions were high. This might be an indication that there was not enough contrast between the different roles in the questionnaire.

6.3 CONCLUSION
Referring back to the research questions and subsequent aims that were set for the research the following conclusions can be made.

6.3.1 Literature review
Aims set for the literature review were:

• Specific aim 1: Determine the characteristics of mentorship.

This aim was addressed in chapter 2. Mentorship was studied looking at different concepts and programme implementation, as well as the mentoring relationship. Literature indicated that mentoring played a role in the development of potential and if a programme was set up correctly in an organisation, both participants (mentor and mentee) and the organisation gained benefit from the programme implementation.

In chapter 2, paragraph 2.6 six guidelines are given for the effective implementation of a mentorship programme. The mentorship programme that was used for this study adhered to five of these guidelines. The only one that was not adhered to was that the programme should be part of the larger programme of development in the organisation. The mentorship programme investigated in this study was implemented in the organisation in order to start developing a culture of learning and development. As such there was no larger programme of development in the organisation.

Another aspect that was also not adhered to, as stated in literature, was the fact that the careers of mentees were not directly positively influenced when they took part in the programme. For many of them there were no promotion possibilities.
The organisation where the study took place was in a transformational phase with many changes taking place, resulting in negativity and low morale. This transformation took place because of new legislation in the field of local government, which stipulated areas of change for municipalities. This study was done a few months before the actual integration of the smaller structures into a bigger municipality. Uncertainty prevailed and no assurances were given that jobs were secure. No one knew exactly what would happen to the organisation, its structure or what the impact on their daily tasks would be.

The above aspects compared to available literature might have played a role in the result of this study.

• Specific aim 2: Ascertain what role leadership and the relationship between leader and follower play in the success of such relationships

This aim was achieved in chapter 3. In conclusion it can be said that different literature identifies different types of leadership style and each indicates a complementary follower or reporting style. This means that for each style of leadership there is one reporting style that makes the best match. This match would work better together and less conflict would evolve and they would ultimately have a more successful relationship.

6.3.2 Empirical study

Aims set for the empirical study were:

• Specific aim 3: Determine the quality of the relationship as well as the leadership (mentor) and reporting (mentee) style of participants and then deduct what types are best suited.
The quality of the relationship was determined through the administering of the Mentoring relationship questionnaire and the styles by administering the OPQ32n. This procedure and the results are discussed in chapter 4. It was concluded that 50% of the relationships were successful according to the applicable mentor and mentee and that 50% were not successful. The leadership and reporting styles of all participants as determined are set out in appendix 5.

The process of deducting what types of styles are most suited were dealt with in chapter 5. Styles were compared to the indicated quality of the relationship. No direct correlation could be proven between the types of leadership and reporting styles of participants and the quality of the relationship. Those that indicated that their relationship was successful did not necessarily have complementary styles and those who indicated that the relationship was not successful did not necessarily have styles that were not complementary. This meant that the styles had no direct impact on the quality of the relationship.

6.3.3 Hypothesis

The following hypothesis was set for this study:

A complementary match between leadership and reporting style results in a more successful mentoring relationship.

Comparing this with the concluded results of the study, this hypothesis is rejected.

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Against the background of the above the following recommendations can be made regarding future research in this field:

- other aspects impacting on the relationship as indicated in chapter 1 may have played a role in these findings, future research will have to be done to determine their impact.
• many aspects have an impact on the mentoring relationship. Interpersonal, intrapersonal as well as environmental aspects might play a role. A larger study looking and comparing all of these should be able to come to more definite conclusions
• it is important that a programme should be implemented according to available guidelines on successful implementation, before aspects that impact on the relationship can be determined.

6.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY
This chapter addressed the last three steps in phase 2 of the research methodology. Limitations of the study were listed and discussed. Conclusions were furnished against the aims of the study and lastly recommendations were made for further research.
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Questionnaire: Mentoring Relationship

Participants in Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your name (person completing this questionnaire)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the effectiveness of your relationship in terms of six mentoring roles that the relationship comprises of.

**METHOD**

Indicate (X) on the scale the effectiveness of your mentoring relationship in terms of the roles indicated.

**SCALE**

The following scale must be used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Partially effective</td>
<td>Not effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. ROLE : ADVISOR
To help the mentee to set and achieve career goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Help mentee clarify career interests, competencies and values</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assist the mentee in setting specific career goals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jointly develop strategies for achieving career objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. ROLE : COACH
To help the mentee to meet job performance norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model exemplary work outputs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Share effective and efficient performance practices</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide feedback regarding the mentees' job performance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. ROLE : EXPLAINER
To provide the mentee with information on policies and procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inform mentee on the nature of the organisations' culture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tutor mentee on how to get things done in the organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Assist mentee with routine paper work and procedures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. ROLE : PROTECTOR
To help the mentee avoid costly mistakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Point out things that might reflect negatively on mentee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maintain good relationship between mentee and his or her</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immediate supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Agree to positive conclusion of the mentoring relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. **ROLE: SPONSOR**

To help the mentee to secure positions and assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Make introductions to influential people in the organisation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Make recommendations for assignments and participation on project teams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Publicly praise the mentees' accomplishments and abilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. **ROLE: VALIDATOR**

To provide the mentee with psychological support during the programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Make the mentee feel a part of the organisation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Serve as a confidant, offering reassurances and encouragement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Assist the mentee in resolving crisis situations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MENTORING RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM INTERCORRELATION APPENDIX 2

Marked correlations are significant at p < .05000 (N=74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.036</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.344</td>
<td>p=.035</td>
<td>p=.126</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.007</td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
<td>p=.024</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.010</td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.029</td>
<td>p=.019</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.049</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.007</td>
<td>p=.058</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.026</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.003</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.015</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.031</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.221</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.385</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.113</td>
<td>p=.087</td>
<td>p=.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.023</td>
<td>p=.082</td>
<td>p=.009</td>
<td>p=.048</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.012</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.007</td>
<td>p=.755</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.008</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td>p=.129</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.007</td>
<td>p=.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td>p=.010</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.009</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MATCHING OF LEADERSHIP AND REPORTING STYLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentee</th>
<th>Reporting Style</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME1</td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR1</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR2</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR3</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4</td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR4</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR5</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME6</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR6</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME7</td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR7</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME8</td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td>MR8</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME9</td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td>MR9</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME10</td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td>MR10</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME11</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>MR11</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME12</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR12</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME13</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR13</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME14</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR14</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME15</td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>MR15</td>
<td>Negotiative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee</td>
<td>Reporting Style</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME16</td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td>MR16</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME17</td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>MR17</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME18</td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR18</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME19</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR19</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME20</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR20</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME21</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR21</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME22</td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td>MR22</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME23</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR23</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME24</td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR24</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME25</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR25</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME26</td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR26</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME27</td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td>MR27</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME28</td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td>MR28</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME29</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR29</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self reliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME30</td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>MR30</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME31</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR31</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME32</td>
<td>Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR32</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME33</td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>MR33</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee</td>
<td>Reporting Style</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME34</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR34</td>
<td>Directive, Participative, Consultative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME35</td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>MR35</td>
<td>Consultative, Negotiative</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME36</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR36</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME37</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR37</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME38</td>
<td>Receptive, Collaborating, Informative</td>
<td>MR38</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME39</td>
<td>Receptive, Reciprocating</td>
<td>MR39</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME40</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>MR40</td>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(In some cases the participant identified more than one style, all of these styles are listed. In cases where one of these styles compliments the other participants' style the applicable style is put in italics.)
QUALITY OF THE MENTORING RELATIONSHIP AS SCORED BY THE MENTOR AND MENTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentee</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Successful/not (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME1</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>MR1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>MR2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>MR3</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>MR4</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>MR5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME6</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>MR6</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>MR7</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>MR8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME9</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>MR9</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>MR10</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME11</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>MR11</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME12</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>MR12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME13</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>MR13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME14</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>MR14</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>MR15</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME16</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>MR16</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>MR17</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME18</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>MR18</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME19</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>MR19</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME20</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>MR20</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME21</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>MR21</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME22</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>MR22</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME23</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>MR23</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME24</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>MR24</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Successful/not (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME25</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>MR25</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME26</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>MR26</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME27</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>MR27</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME28</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>MR28</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>MR29</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME30</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>MR30</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME31</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>MR31</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME32</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>MR32</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME33</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>MR33</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME34</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>MR34</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>MR35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME36</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>MR36</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME37</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>MR37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME38</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>MR38</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME39</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>MR39</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME40</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>MR40</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATCHING OF LEADERSHIP AND REPORTING STYLES TO THE QUALITY OF THE RELATIONSHIP AS RATED BY PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentee</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Leadership Style and Reporting Style Match</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME1</td>
<td>MR1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2</td>
<td>MR2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3</td>
<td>MR3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4</td>
<td>MR4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5</td>
<td>MR5</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME6</td>
<td>MR6</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME7</td>
<td>MR7</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME8</td>
<td>MR8</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME9</td>
<td>MR9</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME10</td>
<td>MR10</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME11</td>
<td>MR11</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME12</td>
<td>MR12</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME13</td>
<td>MR13</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME14</td>
<td>MR14</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME15</td>
<td>MR15</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME16</td>
<td>MR16</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME17</td>
<td>MR17</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME18</td>
<td>MR18</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME19</td>
<td>MR19</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME20</td>
<td>MR20</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME21</td>
<td>MR21</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME22</td>
<td>MR22</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME23</td>
<td>MR23</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME24</td>
<td>MR24</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Leadership Style and Reporting Style Match</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME25</td>
<td>MR25</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME26</td>
<td>MR26</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME27</td>
<td>MR27</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME28</td>
<td>MR28</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME29</td>
<td>MR29</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME30</td>
<td>MR30</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME31</td>
<td>MR31</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME32</td>
<td>MR32</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME33</td>
<td>MR33</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME34</td>
<td>MR34</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME35</td>
<td>MR35</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME36</td>
<td>MR36</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME37</td>
<td>MR37</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME38</td>
<td>MR38</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME39</td>
<td>MR39</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME40</td>
<td>MR40</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>