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Abstract

This study was designed to investigate the functions performed by female mentors to female protegees. The Noe Mentoring Survey was used to assess whether mentoring functions were reported by consultants in two cosmetic companies. The Taylor and Bowers Job Satisfaction Survey and the Lawler, Hall, and Oldham Organizational Climate Survey were also used to determine if there were cultural differences between the two cosmetic companies. The subjects were 140 female consultants, 75 from Company 1 and 65 from Company 2. Results indicated that psychosocial functions were reported with greater frequency than career functions. The psychosocial functions of acceptance/confirmation and counseling were performed more often than role modeling, coaching, and friendship. Career functions but not psychosocial functions were reported more often by consultants in Company 1 than consultants in Company 2. Limitations and future recommendations of the study are suggested in the discussion.
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INTRODUCTION

The use of a mentor as a teacher, trainer, or guide to a younger, less experienced apprentice has been dated as far back as the Neolithic Age and even earlier. Some of the most famous historical stories citing mentoring relationships include wise elders sitting around the fire and instructing proteges on how to drive the mastedon into a pit and kill it with stones and spears; Homer's Odysseus speaking of a Mentor as a guardian, teacher, and father-like figure to Telemachus, Odysseus' son; and Merlin teaching the young King Arthur (Gerstein, 1985; Woodlands Group, 1980).

No one in business today would deny that a mentor-protege relationship is as important as it is powerful (Morris, 1992). Considerable evidence supports the important contributions of mentors to the career success of proteges. Mentoring is recognized as a critical on-the-job training development tool for career success for both men and women (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Ragins, 1989). Those individuals who are mentored are better educated, better paid, more mobile, and more satisfied with their work and career progress compared to those who are not mentored. Further, Levinson (1978) and Kram (1980) have found that mentoring helps integrate career and family responsibilities.

DEFINING MENTORING

Defining Mentoring Functions
Although there has been extensive research on mentoring, disagreement exists about the definition and functions performed by a mentor. Examination of the various definitions of mentoring (e.g. Bolton, 1980; Clawson, 1980; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Klauss, 1981; Levinson, 1978; Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992; Collins, 1979; Kram, 1985) reveals several common themes: the mentor is usually a senior experienced employee who serves as a role model, provides support, direction, and feedback to the younger employee regarding career plans and interpersonal development, and increases the visibility of the protege to decision-makers in the organization who may influence career opportunities.

Mentoring relationships can serve a number of functions (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1983, 1985; Zey, 1984). The most systematic and detailed work regarding the mentoring functions has been conducted by Kram and her associates (Kram, 1983, 1985; Kram & Isabella, 1985). Kram (1983) conducted in-depth biographical interviews with eighteen managers in a public sector organization to identify the functions provided by mentors. Content analysis of the interviews revealed that mentors provided a number of career and psychosocial functions. Career functions included those aspects of the mentoring relationship that prepare the protege for advancement through the hierarchy of an organization. Some of these functions include nominating the protege for desirable projects, internal moves, and promotions (sponsorship); providing the protege with assignments that increased visibility to organizational decision makers and exposure to future opportunities (exposure and visibility); sharing ideas, providing feedback, and
suggesting strategies for accomplishing work objectives (coaching); reducing unnecessary risks that might threaten the protege's reputation (protection); and providing challenging work assignments (challenging assignments). Psychosocial functions were those that enhanced the protege's sense of competence, identity, and work role effectiveness. These functions included serving as a role model of appropriate attitudes, values, and behaviors for the protege (role model); conveying unconditional positive regard (acceptance and confirmation); providing a forum in which the protege is encouraged to talk openly about anxieties and fears (counseling), and interacting informally with the protege at work (friendship). Noe (1988a) confirmed Kram's career and psychosocial functions through a factor analysis when investigating the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships.

Kram suggests that the greater the number of functions provided by the mentor, the more beneficial the relationship will be to the protege. Together these two functions enable individuals to address the challenges of early career stages (Kram, 1985). Mentor relationships that provide both functions are characterized by greater intimacy and stronger interpersonal bonds and are considered more indispensable, more critical to development, and more unique than other relationships in the manager's and protege's life at work. Relationships that provide only career functions are characterized by less intimacy and are valued primarily for instrumental ends.

Other titles have been applied to the function of mentoring. For example, Olian, Giannantoni, and Carrol (1985) found mentors to
provide two roles which are similar to Kram's career and psychosocial functions; (1) an instrumental role, which included the mentor's behavior that influenced the protege's visibility in the organization, and (2) an intrinsic role, which included the mentor's behavior that provided psychological support to the protege. Because of the wide acceptability of Kram and Noe's work, the terms psychosocial and career will be used throughout this paper.

**Crucial Mentoring Functions**

In his work on the benefits of mentoring for men, the most important function Levinson (1978) believed a mentor should perform is to support and facilitate the realization of a protege's dream and act as a teacher to enhance the protege's skills and intellectual development. Levinson also supported that a mentor should serve as a sponsor, utilize his influence to facilitate the young man's entry and advancement, host and guide, welcome the protege into a new occupational and social world, acquaint the protege with his own values, customs, resources, and cast of characters, and provide counsel and moral support in time of stress. If one were to assign character traits to the ideal mentor, they would be nurturing, supportive, protective, aggressive, assertive, and risk-taking (Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992).

**Crucial Mentoring Functions for Female Protegees**

Researchers have suggested several functions that may be particularly important for female protegees. For example, Ragins (1989) has argued that the mentoring function of promoting upward mobility is the most important for female protegees. Burke and McKeen (1990)
cited the mentoring functions as helping learn the ropes and adapting to the organizational expectations, alleviating stress by increasing the protegee's self confidence, forewarning her of career stress and suggesting ways to deal with it, and relating to stress factors that are common to working females.

Evidence for the support function in particular was found in a study by Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992). Eighty five percent of the 106 women mentors and protegees noted that advice and information were the most important ingredients in a mentor relationship and eighty percent cited personal support as beneficial.

**Importance and Benefits of Mentoring for Male and Female Proteges**

Levinson (1978), a Yale psychologist studying mentoring, in *The Seasons of a Man's Life*, suggested that men may miss an important developmental experience if they do not have a mentor by the time they are in their late twenties or early thirties. Indeed, Levinson has called the mentoring relationship "one of the most complex and developmentally important a man can have in early adulthood."

Men are frequently exposed to mentor relationships and some of the benefits include greater personal development, advancement in the organization, challenging work assignments, guidance and counseling, exposure to top management (Burke, 1985; Jennings, 1976; Phillips-Jones, 1982; Roche, 1979). Roche's (1979) report of the Heidrick and Struggles, Inc., study reveals that nearly two-thirds of the prominent male executives in the study who had mentors received higher salaries,
bonuses, and total compensation than did executives who did not have mentors.

Mentoring relationships are at least as important for the career development of women as they are for men (Kanter, 1977; Collins, 1983; Fitt & Newton, 1981). Mentoring helps women learn to do more than just deal with gender barriers. Mentoring helps women assess their strengths, abilities, opportunities, points out ways to get around obstacles, and suggests ways to gain experience (Johnson, 1989). It has also been proposed by Fitt and Newton (1981) that female protegees need more encouragement than male proteges.

Morrison et al. (1987) and Henning and Jardim (1977) (in Burke & McKeen, 1989) studied 76 top executive women in the United States and reported that 100 percent of those who reached the highest levels had help from mentors. The women in the study who failed to reach the highest levels attributed their failure to lack of mentors. Missirian (1992) (in Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992) interviewed top business women and found that 85.7 percent of the women who reached the top management ranks had a mentoring relationship of some kind. Reich (1985) found that 77 percent of his 353 female sample had mentors who influenced their career development. In a later survey of female executives and academicians, Reich (1986) concluded that women who were mentored reported greater self-confidence and an enhanced awareness of and use of skills. Riley and Wrench (1985) found that women who had mentors had greater job success. Missirian (1982) (in Noe, 1988) interviewed women executives and found that mentors
created opportunities similar to those that men enjoy: high performance standards, publicized the protegees' achievements, and provided an environment that was conducive to experimenting with new behaviors and ideas. Women who have been mentored report higher levels of job satisfaction and job motivation than non-mentored women (Zey, 1984). Brown (1985) (in Ragins, 1989) found that women benefit from mentoring relationships because they become more familiar with the politics of the organization, identify with role models, build up a network, and are encouraged to achieve their goals.

Reich (1985, 1986) compared a study of 131 female executives and 416 male executives and observed that females were more likely than males to report benefits from mentoring related to gains in self-confidence, useful career advice, counseling on company politics, and feedback about weaknesses. Burke (1984) compared 51 male proteges and eight female protegees and concluded that females reported their mentors serving psychosocial functions whereas males reported their mentors providing a greater influence on their career choices.

Benefits of Mentoring for Mentors

Mentoring functions are those aspects of a developmental relationship that enhance both the mentor and protege's growth and advancement (Kram, 1985; Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992). To support these assertions, Keele and De LaMare-Schaefer (1984) interviewed 168 female managers and found that for each of the benefits accrued to the protege, benefits accrued for the mentor. Benefits ranged from increasing job advancement, gaining more control of the work
environment, creating a support system, gaining more access to system resources, developing a reputation, and increasing personal satisfaction. Levinson (1978) has also suggested mentors are provided with a creative and rejuvenated life and have been found to get satisfaction and confirmation through helping less experienced individuals in their development (Hunt & Michael, 1983).

**Mentor Characteristics**

Good mentors possess genuine generosity, compassion, and concern and are usually self-appointed. Successful mentors are more apt to be concerned with the needs of the protege than with the needs of the organization. As a result of a good mentor, the protege will be invested in the relationship because of the help received (The Woodlands Group, 1980).

Most mentors are generally older than their proteges by a half-generation (eight to fifteen years) and are individuals who are old enough to have accumulated the experience necessary to benefit the protege (Hunt & Michael, 1983). However, Levinson (1978) warns that mentor relationships with large age differences pose hazards of creating a parent-child relationship. If the age differences are less than six to eight years the mentor and protege may become intimate or collaborative co-workers.

Kram (1980) studied managers between the ages of twenty five and thirty five who had been proteges in mentorship relationships. She found that two thirds of the mentors in her study were in their forties, or mid-life which fits the Levinson model of mentorship.
Types of Gender Mentor Relationships

Several possible gender mentor and protege combinations exist. Specifically, male-mentor, male-protege; male-mentor, female-protegee; female-mentor, male-protege; female-mentor, female protegee. Most of the research of mentorship has been studies of the male-mentor, male-protege relationship. An area that seems particularly underrepresented is that of female mentors and female protegees. No doubt the lack of research of this specific dyad can be attributed to the rarity of female mentors. The purpose of this study is to examine the female-mentor, female-protegee relationship and the functions performed by the female mentor in this type of dyad.

Importance of Gender of the Mentor

The gender of the mentor is probably an important variable in the mentor-protege relationship. As already noted earlier, most of the research on mentor relationships is with men as mentors and men as proteges (Executive Female, 1990). Although little research exists to address the success of mixed dyads, several researchers (Gerstein, 1985; Kram, 1980; Levinson, 1978) suggest that for a successful relationship to exist the mentor and protege should be of the same sex.

Kram (1980) compared male-mentor, male-protege and male-mentor, female-protegee relationships and found that male-mentor, female-protegee relationships have special complexities. Both participants must deal with sexual tensions and fears, increased public scrutiny, and stereotypical male/female roles. The essential modeling and
identification processes seems to be more complex in cross-gender relationships (Kram, 1980; Levinson, 1978).

**Differences Between Male and Female Mentors**

Both male and female proteges report that male and female mentors provide different functions. Male mentors tend to give practical advice and support, whereas female mentors appear more responsive to emotional needs (Shapiro & Jeruchim, 1992; Siegel, 1992).

Women mentors are believed to serve as better role models, be more empathetic, and more comfortable sponsoring a female protegee (Brown, 1985; Reich, 1986). Further, female protegees with a female mentor are less likely to encounter sexual issues that are in cross-gender relationships (Ragins, 1989).

**Defining Stages of Mentoring Relationships**

Scheele (1992) and Siegel (1992) propose there are various stages in mentoring relationships. In the beginning, the protege needs someone older and wiser to help figure out the basics of what to do, how to do it, and what to say and when. As the relationship grows and the protege's expertise increases, the protege needs fewer explanations and lessons but more strategies. During this growing stage, the protege does not rely on one person for advice but rather a network of people who have gone through these similar experiences and can act as sounding boards for the protege.

**Differential Stages for Men and Women**

Levinson (1978) discusses a model of stages of mentoring that is quite different for males and females. His male mentorship model profiles
young men as choosing a career in their early twenties and then in their early thirties searching for their identity in life and for an important mentoring patron and friend. When men reach their forties or mid-life stage they consider becoming mentors themselves for younger professionals entering the work force.

Although his research has focused on men, Levinson has argued that the mentoring developmental process is probably different for women. Levinson does not apply his model of mentoring to women because of the variability of women's developmental changes and lack of research on women (Levinson, 1978; Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992; Hunt & Michael, 1983). Levinson's theory on mentoring has been criticized by feminists because men are taken for models of human development despite the fact that doing so excludes half of humankind (Levinson, 1978).

**Mentors Used in Developmental Stages for Women**

To fill this void, Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) propose some possible uses of mentors during a woman's lifespan. As women age, they may in fact, express their work differently in their twenties, thirties, and forties. Women may need several mentors at the different developmental stages in life. For example, a woman in her twenties may be focused on her career so she may need a high energy type mentor. In her thirties, a woman may prefer an older career woman who also has children. A woman may think about becoming a mentor herself in her forties and fifties. Men typically can pursue their careers throughout their adult lives with few family or personal interruptions or conflicts, but for women,
everystageoffemaleadulthoodcontainsconflictsandcompromisesastheytrytobalancetheirrolesathomeandatwork. As a result of this complex development, women probably need a variety of mentors. Women would do well to have both male and female mentors to support them as their needs evolve and change at different stages of adult life (Kram, 1985).

**Informal and Formal Mentoring Programs**

Although in casual conversation, mentoring is considered a monolithic term, at least two types of mentoring relationships exist: informal and formal. Phillips-Jones (1983) indicated that the majority of mentoring relationships are informal and they develop spontaneously (Levinson, 1978; Burke & McKeen, 1989). Informal mentoring relationships result as two individuals are interested in forming a relationship because they are friends (Willbur, 1987; Noe, 1988b). Informal mentoring is not monitored and appears to function best on an individual basis (Farren, Gray, & Kaye, 1984).

Formal mentoring relationships involve the assignment of mentors and proteges. Successful formal mentoring programs are characterized by clearly defined purposes and goals, top management support, careful selection of mentors and proteges, an extensive orientation program emphasizing the development of realistic expectations concerning the relationship, clearly stated responsibilities for both the mentor and protege, and established minimums of duration and frequency of contact between mentor and protege (Lean, 1983; Phillips-Jones, 1983; Zey, 1984). Many of Fortune 500 companies such as Johnson
& Johnson, AT&T, Colgate, Pacific Bell, Merrill Lynch have set up formal mentoring programs (Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992).

Formal mentoring programs are not without detractors. Kram (1985) believes the risks in formal mentoring relationships outweigh the benefits. Those who are not matched become resentful and increasingly pessimistic about their career prospects and those who are matched feel burdened by the responsibility. Another disadvantage is that immediate supervisors may feel threatened by a program that appears to undermine their authority. Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) contend that formal mentoring relationships may cause personality conflicts and lack of communication on either part. Kram claims that some relationships become helpful and enduring but usually remain superficial alliances at best. Phillips-Jones (1983) states that mentors in formal mentoring programs should be trained and have weekly meetings with their proteges. Keele, De LaMare-Schaefer and Farren (1989) contend that formal mentoring programs must be monitored carefully for any problems between the mentor and protege, too many expectations, and perpetuation of the myth that people must have mentors to succeed.

The advantages of women in formal mentoring programs are important, nevertheless. Women can become socialized into the corporate culture, develop their own personal network, receive more training and gain exposure to more mentoring relationships. Burke and McKeen (1989) claim formal mentoring programs improve job performance of both mentor and protege, reduce turnover in early
career stages, develop sufficiently talented managers to replace those about to retire, maintain high levels of managerial contributions through middle age and beyond, and prepare individuals for leadership roles.

**Differential Availability of Mentors to Women and Men**

Kram (1980) claims mentors are available to only a few high potential managers who are more than likely men. Those not labeled as "fast trackers" are less likely to find the guidance, coaching, challenging assignments, and other opportunities. Most of these fast trackers are males who hold more of the upper-level and critical positions that give them access to valuable information concerning job openings, pending projects, and management decisions through the "old boy network" (Noe, 1988).

However, women have been making steady gains in their rise and acceptance in the labor force over the last several decades. The U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1994 revealed there were 62,050 women in executive, administrative, managerial positions compared to 72,318 men (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1994). These numbers are increasing every year but women have not had the same recognition and advancement opportunities as men have had because they have been limited to lower managerial levels which are associated with little power and influence (Johnson, 1989; Ragins, 1989). Noe (1988b) observed that the number of mentoring relationships available to women has not kept pace with the increase in number of women needing mentors. Collins (1983) reported other disadvantages of women not having ready access to mentors. She surveyed over 400 professional women in the San
Francisco area and found that women were not as sophisticated in seeking mentors and over half reported that they "fell into" the relationship. Collins also found that women did not really understand the mentoring concept and were not comfortable being coached.

**Explanation of Availability of Mentors for Women**

There has been a slow rise of women into middle and upper level positions. Most researchers attribute this to social conditioning, overt and subtle discrimination, stereotypical notions of male and female roles, and the "old boy's" network system. The slow rise of women in the workforce results in a lack of mentors available to women (Levinson, 1978; Willbur, 1987; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Bolton, 1980; Collins, 1983; Zey, 1984; Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992; Gerstein, 1985).

Ragins (1989) claims most females in management level positions decide not to become mentors because they are more than likely stressed with their own job duties, overloaded with requests from female protegees, and afraid of the high visibility should they decide to become a mentor. Some women who do make it to the top may not be able to serve as mentors because they are weighed down by the stress of working in an environment dominated by men (Levinson, 1978).

**Consequences for Lack of Mentors for Females**

Levinson (1978) believes that lack of mentoring acts as a barrier to women's professional development and may also have consequences in their adult life development. Of the 106 women they interviewed, Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) found that twenty three percent of the
women said they did not have a mentor and almost all of them said they would have achieved more had they had one.

Further evidence that lack of mentoring may stymie women's career development comes from Osborn et al. (1992) who studied faculty at a medical school. Women may choose not to pursue a career in a male-dominated field because of the lack of mentors. Over twenty percent of the female junior faculty sampled said they never had a mentor compared to nine percent of the male junior faculty. Not surprisingly, many of the women claimed this was a negative experience in their career.

A lack of mentors available for women may also result in poor job performance, frustration, intellectual and self-efficacy curtailed, avoidance of challenging assignments, and decrease in motivation (Noe, 1988b).

**Alternatives for Women**

Since there is a lack of mentors available for female protegees, Noe (1988b) and Kram and Isabella (1985) suggest that an alternative to mentor relationships may be peer relationships. These peer relationships may be as important to women as mentoring relationships. These peer relationships also provide career and psychosocial functions.

As suggested by Jeruchim and Shapiro (1992) that women may need several mentors in their career stages, Riley and Wrench (1985) hypothesized that it may be more desirable for professional women to have a number of supportive relationships termed "group-mentored" rather than a traditional mentor relationship termed "a true mentor." A
woman has a true mentor if this individual provides a high level of career support. A woman is group-mentored if she has two or more individuals who provide moderate levels of career support. Riley and Wrench concluded that more women were truly mentored than group mentored. Depending on the needs of a female protegee and availability of mentors, women may seek out as many individuals to meet her needs.

**Sources of Female Mentors**

Women mentors are likely to be more available in organizations where women constitute the majority. Female executives in female-typed organizations may be more willing to sponsor female protegees since there are less barriers (Ragins, 1989).

**Formal and Informal Mentoring Programs Available for Women in the United States**

There are several companies and programs that offer an informal or formal mentoring program to women. In these companies and programs women are the mentors and protegees. They are Women's Network for Entrepreneurial Training (WNET), Clairol, Nafe, Mary Kay Cosmetics, and BeautiControl Cosmetics.

In 1988 the Small Business Administration's Office of Women's Business Ownership launched a program called Women's Network for Entrepreneurial Training (WNET). The program links successful female entrepreneurs (mentors) with female business owners (protegees) whose companies are ready to expand. WNET is designed to provide a year-long relationship between the mentor and the entrepreneur (Johnson,
The mentors serve as role models, offer advice on when to take risks, diversify, or expand. WNET has proven to be so successful that it is established in all fifty states where it has served more than 500 pairs. Protegees were found to have benefited from these mentor relationships by increasing revenues, attracting more accounts and customers, and increasing staff. The mentors helped the protegees brainstorm about specific problems, were emotionally supportive, and promoted financial/managing skills (Delaney, 1992).

The Clairol Mentor Program pairs women in the same field such as advertising, architecture, banking and finance, education, fashion, health care/nursing, law, publishing, retailing, sales, marketing, and small business. Each entrant to the program must submit a 100 word essay expressing what a good mentoring relationship means to her and how it could play a role in her career success. The winners are given $1,000 and the mentors are chosen based on their commitment to their fields (Executive Female, 1990).

Nafe is a professional organization dedicated to the advancement of women in the workplace through education, networking, and public advocacy. Nafe's goal is to help women succeed in achieving their career goals and financial independence. The Nafe Program is an effort to encourage mentoring and foster the continuations of future generations of professional women. The program includes 200,000 female mentors who are matched with protegees and whose duties include opening doors for women, sharing political insight,
role modeling, and showing how to balance work and a personal life (Burden, 1992).

It is suggested in this present study that there are informal mentoring programs established in the Mary Kay Cosmetics and BeautiControl Cosmetics. This study plans to compare employees' mentoring needs at these two cosmetic companies. Both companies are similar in that they both manufacture and market cosmetic makeup products, skin care products, nail care products, fragrances, women's clothing, and accessories.

**Mary Kay Cosmetics**

Mary Kay Cosmetics, founded in 1963 by Mary Kay Ash, is a Fortune 500 company. Industry Week (1991) magazine named Mary Kay's distribution facility one of the country's three best in wholesale sales, along with Hershey and L.L. Bean. Over the years, this company has evolved into a major international cosmetic company with world-wide sales of over $1 billion at retail (Fortune, 1993).

The company's philosophy is based on a few simple principles; care, consideration, and kindness (Ash, 1987). Mary Kay believes these principles are what builds a highly motivated workforce and commitment to the quality of the product. Mary Kay Cosmetics offers a strong sense of self-worth, fostered by a supportive caring culture and the company's non-competitive network of sales representatives and directors (Ash, 1987).

From the beginning, Mary Kay's philosophy has been that women deserve recognition for their efforts. When a new consultant starts Mary
Kay Cosmetics, a recruiter, director, and other consultants provide her with all of the education and training needed to launch her career and make her successful. Helen McVoy, a National Sales Director, believes in helping everyone, regardless of whether or not there is any money at the end of the trail (Incentive, 1991).

Unit meetings, programs, contests, awards, and prizes are available to the consultants to motivate and inspire them to succeed in the company and recognize those that have been successful (Ash, 1984). Managers at each level spend a great deal of time supporting and encouraging the representatives below them (Incentive, 1991). Also, all consultants receive a monthly magazine with valuable product information, selling tips, and constant words of praise and recognition for the consultants' accomplishments. From all of this, a consultant will learn how to conduct a skin care class effectively and efficiently and learn how to manage the business to maximize profits.

Males do play a number of roles in Mary Kay Cosmetics. There are about 2,000 male consultants in Mary Kay versus 300,000 female (Farnham, 1993). The other role men play are to be the supporting husbands. Mary Kay gives lectures to the husbands of consultants and encourages husbands to be supportive and encouraging or stay out of the way.

Mary Kay Cosmetics abides by the following goals which the company believes almost guarantees every new consultant to succeed: "support every step of the way, teach, not sell, what you earn is up to
you, provide incentives, inspiration, and motivation, and learn new skills and positive life training."

The positions in Mary Kay are the following: New Consultant, Star Recruiter, Team Leader, Team Manager, Director-in-Qualification, Sales Director, Senior Director, Executive Senior Director, National Sales Director, and Senior National Sales Director.

Mary Kay Cosmetics has an informal mentoring program which involves the directors and other management acting as mentors and the consultants as protegees. This company encourages new consultants to use Mary Kay staff for support to build a successful career. During the unit meeting, the Director and other staff members provide support and encouragement as well as give out product information. What distinguishes Mary Kay's informal mentoring program from other companies' mentoring programs is that every woman in Mary Kay has the opportunity to have access to a female mentor at weekly meetings and any day of the week. A lot of the times support is given over the phone or at the protegee's or director's home.

**BeautiControl Cosmetics**

BeautiControl Cosmetics, Inc. describes itself as "The World's Premier Skin Care and Image Company" (BeautiControl Annual Report, 1993). This Carrollton, Texas-based cosmetic company was founded by Richard and Jinger Heath in 1981.

BeautiControl's philosophy is women helping others by looking and feeling better about themselves and helping women realize their dreams for independence, self-fulfillment, and financial security. This Company
has a commitment to product innovation, customer satisfaction and offering women an unequaled earning opportunity. BeautiControl offers consultants comprehensive training, time flexibility, unlimited earning potential, and recognition awards and programs.

BeautiControl has been repeatedly recognized by leading business publications such as Business Week and Forbes magazines for its growth and outstanding management abilities. This company has come from nowhere to become the third largest player in the direct-selling women's cosmetics business, behind Avon and Mary Kay. In annual revenue, BeautiControl is still far behind Mary Kay Cosmetics ($400 million), Avon (3 billion) and BeautiControl (33 million) (Barrett, 1989).

BeautiControl has over 37,000 professionally-trained staff throughout the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico. BeautiControl is the only cosmetic company known to offer clients a Total Image Solutions which includes customized skin care, color-coded cosmetics, and exclusive value-added services such as Skin Condition Analysis with patented Skin Sensors, free color analysis, and computer-assisted image analysis.

The positions in BeautiControl are Image Consultant, Senior Consultant, VIP, Unit Manager, Director, and National Executive Director. It is up to the director when her unit will meet and in the unit meetings the director discusses new products, recognizes top sales individuals, encourages and supports consultants to succeed with the company, disburses gifts and prizes, and shares personal successes and stories.
In addition to BeautiControl’s approach on helping consultants become successful, in 1993 Jinger Heath established the WHO (Women Helping Other) Foundations, a non-profit organization dedicated to recognizing and encouraging the humanitarian efforts of women in our society. The WHO Foundation supports and contributes to women’s health, education, business and welfare organizations and annually recognizes BeautiControl Consultants for their generous community service work.

BeautiControl sponsors an informal mentoring program. The directors and unit managers of the unit act as mentors and the image consultant act as protegees.

PRESENT INVESTIGATION

My study focuses on the relationship between a female mentor and a female protegee. In the companies sampled, these roles correspond to “director” and “consultant.” The purposes of this study are to focus on females in mentor and protegee roles, to determine whether mentoring relationships do indeed exist in these two cosmetic companies, to examine how the relationships are viewed and formed, and to examine the functions performed by mentors.

Two companies that have female-mentor, female-protegee relationships were the target population of this study. These two cosmetic companies asked their identities be masked because of possible negative publicity from this study. Therefore, I will refer to the two
cosmetic companies as Company 1 and Company 2. A possibly
important distinction between companies is that Company 1 holds their
unit meetings once a week; Company 2’s meetings are once a month.

Hypotheses

Psychosocial functions are those that enhance a protegee’s sense
of competence and build self-worth. Career functions prepare a
protegee for advancement up the hierarchy. This study posits that
females will report more psychosocial than career functions from their
mentors.

H1: Female mentors will provide psychosocial functions with greater
frequency than career functions.

Of the psychosocial functions, counseling and
acceptance/confirmation will be more favored because they are linked
more directly to increasing self-esteem and self-worth. Increasing self-
esteeom and self-worth are important components of the cosmetic
companies’ philosophies.

H2: Of the psychosocial functions, acceptance/confirmation and
counseling will be performed more often than role modeling, coaching,
and friendship because acceptance, confirmation, and counseling are
gereed towards increasing self-esteem and self-worth.

As noted earlier, Company’s 1 sales consultants meet once a week
with their sales director whereas sales consultants in Company 2 meet
once a month with their sales director. Because of the greater frequency
of exposure, females in Company 1 were expected to report functions
with greater frequency.
H3: Protegees in Company 1 will report greater frequency for psychosocial and career functions than protegees in Company 2 because mentors are available more often.

This study also proposed that if career and psychosocial functions were reported with greater frequency, the more beneficial the mentoring relationship would be. The benefit of the more frequent receipt of functions was expected to be evident in the sales performance of the consultants.

H4: Protegees across companies that report higher scores on the Noe Mentoring Survey will have higher dollar sales volumes.

METHOD

Subjects

There were 140 females who completed a self report survey; 75 were from Company 1 and 65 from Company 2.

Demographic Information. Consultants were asked how long they had been a consultant for the company. The mean time employed in Company 1 was 3.9 years and for Company 2, 3.5 years. Consultants were asked how many consultants were in their unit. The average number of consultants in Company 1's unit meetings was 30 and for Company 2, 39. Consultants were asked about how much time on average they spent outside of the unit meetings meeting with their director. Two and sixtenths hours on average per week were spent in Company 1 by each consultant on the phone with her director while Company 2 consultants spent 3.2 hours.
Performance Data. Consultants were asked what their personal sales volume in 1994 was. The mean annual sales for Company 1 consultants in 1994 was $5,723.51 and $9,886.30 for Company 2 consultants. The mean annual sales for 1994 for both companies was $7,533.42. Only 39 consultants from Company 1 reported their annual personal sales volume for 1994 and 30 from Company 2.

Measures

The subjects completed a set of measures that included the Noe Mentoring Survey (Noe, 1988), General Job Satisfaction Survey (Taylor and Bowers, 1972), and an Organizational Climate Survey (Lawler, Hall & Oldham, 1974).

Revised Noe's Survey (1988). This 27-item survey originated from the 29-item survey developed by Noe in 1988. Noe originally developed the survey to measure the extent to which proteges believed mentors provided career and psychosocial functions. These items were developed on the basis of career and psychosocial functions identified by previous qualitative analyses and descriptive studies of mentoring relationships (Burke, 1984; Kram, 1983, 1985; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Roche, 1979, Zey, 1984). The 27-item revised Noe survey contains eleven psychosocial items and sixteen career items. The psychosocial items are grouped into counseling, coaching, role modeling, friendship, and acceptance and confirmation. The career items are identified as coaching, exposure and visibility, protection, challenging assignments, and sponsorship. In this study consultants were asked to read each statement and report the extent to which it described their mentoring
relationship with their director. A six-point Likert-type scale was used with 1 anchored with "Always" and 6 anchored with "Never." The protegee made an "X" next to the statement which best described her mentoring relationship. A low score on the mentoring survey represents more mentoring functions being reported. The internal consistency estimate for the career-related function-scale was .89 and .92 for the psychosocial-related function-scale. For this study no items were deleted; the alphas for the psychosocial and career scales were .87 and .93, respectively (See Table 1).

Table 1
Reliabilities of Noe's Mentoring Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>Item Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial Functions</td>
<td>NOE1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE3</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE4</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE5</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE6</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE7</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE8</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE9</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE11</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 113; Alpha = .87; N of Items = 11

| Career Functions | NOE12 | 1.71 | 1.06 | .66 | .92 |
| NOE13 | 1.64 | 1.02 | .64 | .92 |
| NOE14 | 2.65 | 1.51 | .61 | .92 |
| NOE15 | 1.99 | 1.36 | .56 | .92 |
| NOE16 | 2.21 | 1.49 | .76 | .92 |
| NOE17 | 2.88 | 1.74 | .69 | .92 |
| NOE18 | 2.58 | 1.66 | .59 | .92 |
| NOE19 | 1.84 | 1.21 | .69 | .92 |
| NOE20 | 3.04 | 1.69 | .65 | .92 |
| NOE21 | 2.72 | 1.56 | .56 | .92 |
| NOE22 | 2.28 | 1.39 | .69 | .92 |
| NOE23 | 2.23 | 1.28 | .69 | .92 |
| NOE24 | 3.12 | 1.69 | .58 | .92 |
| NOE25 | 1.81 | 1.19 | .69 | .92 |
| NOE26 | 2.59 | 1.69 | .67 | .92 |
As noted, Noe’s scales of psychosocial and career functions have several subscales: counseling, coaching, role modeling, exposure and visibility, and protection. Because Hypothesis 2 used these subscales, alphas were run for the seven subscales with multiple items. The alphas ranged from .61 (role modeling) to .88 (career-coaching) (See Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Corrected Item- Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial NOE1</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function NOE2</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling NOE3</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOE4</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 113; Alpha = .81; N of items = 4

| Psychosocial NOE5 | .46 | .62 |
| Function NOE6 | .46 | .39 |
| Coaching |

N = 113; Alpha = .62; N of items = 2

| Psychosocial NOE7 | .34 | .62 |
| Function NOE8 | .52 | .39 |
| Role NOE9 | .41 | .51 |
| Modeling |

N = 113; Alpha = .61; N of items = 3

| Career NOE12 | .63 | .87 |
| Function NOE13 | .56 | .87 |
| Coaching NOE14 | .64 | .87 |
| NOE15 | .59 | .87 |
| NOE16 | .80 | .85 |
| NOE17 | .73 | .86 |
| NOE18 | .64 | .87 |
| NOE19 | .65 | .87 |

N = 113; Alpha = .88; N of items = 8

| Career NOE20 | .51 | .83 |
| Function NOE21 | .66 | .65 |
| Exposure NOE22 | .70 | .63 |
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Because the scales of Noe’s mentoring survey differ in number of items appearing on each scale, responses for each subscale were combined and averaged for the number of items to yield a final scale score for each subject. This scale score could range from 1 to 7, with lower scores representing more frequent receipt of mentoring.

Taylor and Bowers General Satisfaction Survey (1972). Because some differences in protegees’ responses on the mentoring scales could be attributed to satisfaction in the job, job satisfaction was assessed. This seven item survey was designed to assess general satisfaction on the job. A 5-point Likert-type scale was used for 1 = “Very dissatisfied” to 5 for “Very satisfied.” Scores could range from 7 to 35 with a high score on the job satisfaction survey representing high job satisfaction. Coefficient alpha was cited as 0.87 for the full survey and test-retest correlation value of 0.55 (Taylor and Bowers, 1972). This measure was used to determine if job satisfaction would be a significant covariate of mentoring in predicting success. For the present study, alpha was .90
and could have been improved marginally with the deletion of item 6; no items were deleted (See Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>Item Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Corrected Item Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 127; Alpha = .90; N of Items = 7

Lawler, Hall, and Oldham Organizational Climate Survey (1974). Organizational climate, like job satisfaction, was also used as a covariate of mentoring to predict success of the protegees. This 15-item survey is in semantic differential format with a 7-point response set. The organizational climate survey has five scales: competent, responsible, practical, risk-oriented, and impulsive. The Spearman-Brown reliabilities on the five scales have been reported to be .89 for Competent/Potent, .60 for Responsible, .52 for Practical, .87 for Risk-Oriented, .75 for Impulsive (Lawler, Hall, and Oldham, 1974).

The coefficient alpha for the entire survey was .55. Coefficient alphas for the five subscales competent/potent, responsible, practical, risk-oriented, and impulsive were .62, .10, .05, .20, and .63, respectively. These low alphas and item-total correlations (See Table 4) suggested that this scale was neither unidimensional nor the 5 factors specified by Lawler, Hall, and Oldham. A principle component analysis was run on the
15 items. The most interpretable solution was two factors shown in Table 5. The first factor appeared to be a "strong assertive" factor and the second factor appeared to represent a "passive" dimension. The coefficient alpha for factor 1 was .75 and .69 for factor 2. These factors were judged sufficiently reliable for further analyses (Nunnally, 1978).

Because these 2 factors had different numbers of items, the responses for each consultant were combined and averaged for each scale for the number of items. Therefore, the scale scores for each of these factors may range from 1 to 7 with a high scale indicating greater endorsement of the concept by the respondent. That is, a high value on the first factor, strong assertive, indicates the consultant believes her company is best described as having an assertive culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>Item Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 114; Alpha = .55; N of Items = 15

Table 5
Factor Analysis of Lawler, Hall and Oldham Organizational Climate Survey/Collectivism Items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uninhibited</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoral</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 1 - N = 114; Alpha = .75; N of items = 8
Factor 2 - N = 114; Alpha = .69; N of items = 7

Procedure

Subjects were recruited through unit meetings located in southern California and told the purpose of the study was to determine what functions a mentor performs. Before subjects received a questionnaire they were asked to read and sign an informed consent form (See APPENDIX A for a copy of the survey, consent form, and debriefing form.

Once the questionnaires were collected, the subjects received a debriefing form which explained in more detail, the nature of the study (See Appendix B).

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1: It was hypothesized that consultants in both companies would report psychosocial functions being performed more frequently than career functions. A paired sample t-test between social and career functions was significant (Social $M = 2.08$, Career $M = 2.29$, $t$
indicating consultants in both companies reported psychosocial functions performed more frequently than career functions. The means for both functions were relatively high. (A low score represents more frequency with which a function was reported).

**Hypothesis 2:** It was hypothesized that of the psychosocial functions, the counseling and acceptance/confirmation functions would be performed more often. An ANOVA, contrasting the counseling and acceptance/confirmation functions with the other psychosocial functions (role modeling, coaching, and friendship), was conducted. The results of the ANOVAs supported the hypothesis for the counseling function, with $M = 1.93$, $F(1, 113) = 75.02$, $p < .001$ and the acceptance/confirmation function with $M = 1.44$, $F(1, 113) = 87.99$, $p < .001$. Means and standard deviations for the other functions were: coaching $M = 1.44$; role modeling $M = 2.28$; friendship $M = 4.0$.

**Hypothesis 3:** Consultants in Company 1 were expected to report psychosocial and career functions performed more frequently than consultants in Company 2 because of the greater exposure to a mentor. The results from the MANOVA of psychosocial and career functions by firm indicated no significance for psychosocial functions being reported more often in Company 1. However, there was a significant difference in frequency of career functions being reported in Company 1. $M_1 = 2.12$, $M_2 = 2.50$, $F = 4.18$, $p = .04$.

**Hypothesis 4:** This hypothesis predicted that the higher the mentoring function scores reported by a consultant, the higher her annual sales would be. The two mentoring subscale scores (psychosocial
and career), job satisfaction, and the two factor climate subscales were entered as independent variables into the regression with annual sales volume as the dependent variable (See Table 6). No variables predicted annual sales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Annual Sales (DV)</th>
<th>Career Social Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Job Sat</th>
<th>Climate 1</th>
<th>Climate 2</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>4198.61</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-7.16</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-7.16</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSat</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2100.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-591.89</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate2</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>2361.95</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = .206
F = .40
p = .845
N = 51

All effects are non-significant

Additional Analyses. In addition to the standardized surveys, consultants were asked two open-ended questions. Question 1 asked consultants to describe what they “liked about the company” they worked for. Question 6 asked what consultants “got out of their unit meetings.” For Question 6, two examples were provided; support and information, to assist the consultants with answering the question. All of the surveys were reviewed and the researcher generated a list of themes from the responses to questions. Responses for question 1 fell into the following themes: philosophy of the company, incentives, benefits of being self-employed, support from the director and peers, and the career development opportunities offered by the company. Themes
generated for question 6 were support from the director and peers, information about the company and products, incentives, and career development.

Table 7 represents the percentages of the content analyses of these two open-ended questions. For question 1 almost half (47.1%) of the consultants stated philosophy of the company was an important factor. Most (85%) consultants did not mention incentives. About a third (35%) mentioned the benefits of being self-employed and support from fellow peers and directors (34.3%). Most (79.3%) consultants mentioned career development as an aspect they liked specifically about their company.

For Question 6 most consultants identified support from peers and directors (85%) and information about products and the company (75%) as reasons they attended unit meetings. Most (93.6%) did not report incentives or career development (85%) as important benefits of attending unit meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>47.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5</td>
<td>Career Dev.</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitmet 1</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitmet 2</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitmet 3</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitmet 4</td>
<td>Career Dev.</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because a priori differences were expected in the companies because of their somewhat different philosophies, histories, and frequency of unit meetings, Z tests of proportions were performed on the written response questions to compare results by Company. The results are presented in Table 8. For question 1 there were significant differences between companies by philosophy, incentives, benefits of being self-employed, and by career development. Consultants in Company 2 were more likely to report incentives, the benefits of being self-employed, and the support and career development of the company than the consultants in Company 2. Company 2 consultants reported the philosophy of their company as a benefit of the company more often than consultants in Company 1.

For Question 6 there was also a significant difference between companies' unit meetings by support, information about the company and products, and career development. Consultants in Company 1 reported more often than consultants in Company 2 that support, information, incentives and career development were what they received from the unit meetings. Overall, Company 1 is perceived in a more favorable light than Company 2 by its consultants.

Table 8
Z Tests of Proportion on the Written Response Questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean Proportion</th>
<th>Probability of Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT THE COMPANY?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company2</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits of being self-employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company2</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>5723.51</td>
<td>6806.41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because differences in how consultants felt about their companies could be important to interpretation of results, t-tests comparing the climate, job satisfaction, and demographic variables were performed. No statistical significant effects were found (See Table 9).

Table 9

T-Tests Between Company 1 and 2 by Climate 1, Climate 2, Job Satisfaction, Annual Dollar Sales, Tenure, Number in Unit, Hours Spent On Phone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Company1 Mean</th>
<th>Company2 Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate1</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate2</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobsat</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>5723.51</td>
<td>6806.41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company1</td>
<td>Company2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>9886.30</td>
<td>11347.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in unit</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent on phone</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

As hypothesized and consistent with past research (Kram, 1983; Reich, 1985, 1986; Shapiro & Jeruchim, 1992; Siegel, 1992), psychosocial functions were reported by the consultants in the two cosmetic companies as being performed more often than career functions. Psychosocial functions include role modeling, counseling, coaching, friendship, and acceptance/confirmation. Career functions include coaching, challenging assignments for women to complete, sponsorship, exposure and visibility, and protection.

An explanation for this finding could be that women desire functions that increase self-esteem and self-worth. When a female's self-esteem is increased, she feels more confident, competent, and successful in her job. Burke and McKeen (1990) stated that increasing the protegee's self-confidence is crucial for women's success—a primary goal of the psychosocial functions. Reich's (1986) study also indicated that mentored females reported higher levels of self-confidence, suggesting why these functions were reported more often in this study.
Further support for the preference for psychosocial functions can be found in the content analysis of the written response questions. Most women reported support and encouragement they received from their director and co-workers as being what they most liked about the company and unit meetings.

Spiegel’s findings (1992) are also consistent with this study’s findings. Female mentors were found to be more responsive to emotional needs in this study as in Spiegel’s study. Because no male mentors were reviewed in this sample, caution must be exercised in stating that female mentors were providing more psychosocial functions, only that female consultants (protegees) reported more psychosocial functions from their female mentors.

In at least one respect, it may be surprising that psychosocial functions were provided more often than career functions. The philosophies of Company 1 and Company 2 are based on encouraging women to succeed and to view their careers as equally important to anyone else’s. It may be possible that although the philosophies of the companies emphasize career objectives, the direction at unit meetings provides both career and psychosocial elements of mentoring. Indeed, the means for both functions were quite high. The researcher attended several unit meetings and noted that the majority of the meetings focused on nurturing women, supporting them in every aspect of the job, and sharing stories of successes and failures.

The data also suggest that consultants from both the cosmetic companies are moderately satisfied with their employers (See Table 9).
The support and encouragement women receive from the company may be part of the explanation as to why they are satisfied. These results are in congruence with Zey's (1984) findings that females who were mentored reported higher levels of job satisfaction than non-mentored women.

Hypothesis 2 was supported for the psychosocial functions; consultants reported higher levels of counseling and acceptance/confirmation functions than role modeling, coaching, and friendship. As stated before, the counseling function and the acceptance/confirmation functions are geared towards supporting and understanding the needs of women which enhance self-esteem. It may be important to note that although support was found for this hypothesis, all means for psychosocial functions were quite high (ranged from 1.44 to 4.0). Only friendship (4.0) fell below the midpoint of the scale.

Hypothesis 3 was partially supported by the data. Company 1 consultants reported career functions being performed more often than Company 2 consultants. Company 1 consultants have their unit meetings once a week while Company 2 consultants have their meetings once a month. A Company 1 consultant may be more likely to report functions as occurring more frequently because she is exposed to her director two to three times more often than a Company 2 consultant. More exposure to a director would allow the mentor to perform these functions. However, because there were no differences in psychosocial functions being performed there may be an alternative explanation for this difference in career mentoring. For example, the
researcher noted that the "pressure to sell" seemed greater in Company 1. Perhaps this climate leads the proteges in Company 1 to attend more specifically to career information than is true in Company 2.

Hypothesis 4, which was not supported, hypothesized that the greater frequency of functions a consultant reported, the higher her annual sales volume would have been. The failure to support this hypothesis could be that few consultants reported their annual sales for 1994, resulting in a lack of power. Consultants could have been somewhat shy, hesitant, or embarrassed to reveal their income.

After observing these two cosmetic companies in detail, it seemed that these consultants did not have a true mentor relationship. Riley and Wrench (1985) discussed a true mentor to be someone who provides a high level of career support. These consultants seemed to have been more group-mentored involving several supportive mentor relationships from several peers in addition to the director. These consultants were more group-mentored because other management personnel were available as mentors to them. A consultant in Company 1 was not only likely to be mentored by her director but also by her team leader and team manager. These individuals are the ones that sponsored them into the company and a consultant is more likely to feel comfortable asking them for support. A Company 2 consultant was also more likely to be mentored solely by her unit manager.

Limitations of Study
This study looked only at the female-mentor, female-protegee relationship. Although there are male consultants in Company 1 none were found at the meetings from which I sampled.

Implications of Present Study

My research added to the limited research on mentoring and the functions a mentor performs. This study confirmed that mentoring existed in these two cosmetic companies and an informal mentoring program was intact. The present study added information on the relationships between a female mentor and a female protegee. This study supports the statement that female mentors in female-based organizations can provide career and psychosocial functions to protegees.

Recommendations for Future Research

Simply stated, there needs to be more research on the subject of mentoring among females. Future research should confirm whether mentoring exists for women in other organizations whether predominantly female-based or not. This will aid women in looking for employers that provide mentors. It is recommended that researchers look into the relationship between male consultants and female mentors since they do exist in these two cosmetic companies. It would be interesting to note if there are any differences in the type of functions reported.

Researchers may also want to look at the varying amount of mentor-protege relationships a mentor can have. Is it beneficial for a mentor to be mentoring more than one protege?

Summary and Conclusions
Mentoring relationships are as important for the career development of women as they are for men (Kanter, 1977; Collins, 1983; Fitt and Newton, 1981). Women need to be encouraged to seek out female or male mentors. As women reach higher level management positions they should find the time to be a mentor since there is a shortage.
Appendix A
Mentoring Survey

This questionnaire is being done in order to determine what functions a mentor performs. A mentor is defined as a person who guides you, supports you emotionally, provides career advisement, and teaches you the ropes for going through the company. As a consultant think of your director as your mentor.

The following is a list of functions your mentor (i.e. director) may or may not provide to you. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate how each statement applies to you by circling one of the numbers next to the item. Please use the following key.

1 = Always
2 = Almost Always
3 = Frequently
4 = Sometimes
5 = Almost Never
6 = Never

1 2 3 4 5 6 1. My director shares personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my problems.

1 2 3 4 5 6 2. My director demonstrates good listening skills in our conversations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 3. My director encourages me to talk about my anxieties and fears that distract me from my work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 4. My director tries to understand my feelings I have discussed with her.
5. My director has kept feelings and doubts that I shared with her in strict confidence.

6. My director shares her ideas with me.

7. My director tells me about her career as a consultant and how she became a director.

8. I agree with my director's attitudes, values, and philosophy of life of the company.

9. I find myself trying to imitate the behavior of my director.

10. My director interacts with me socially outside of work.

11. My director shows respect for me as an individual.

12. My director suggests specific strategies for achieving my goals.


14. My director tells me how I am doing as a consultant.

15. My director answers my questions about how well I am doing in the company.

16. My director tells me my chances of becoming a team leader and director.

17. My director tells me how well I work with other consultants.
18. My director answers my questions regarding work and family conflicts.

19. My director encourages me to move up in the company by being a team leader and then director.

20. My director gives me assignments that increase my personal contact with other directors and team leaders.

21. My director encourages me to network with other directors and team leaders who can help me eventually become a director.

22. My director helps and encourages me to meet other consultants, team leaders and directors.

23. My director helps remove some of the barriers that could keep me from succeeding in the company.

24. My director helps me finish assignments/tasks that would have been difficult to complete by myself (i.e. inventory).

25. My director gives me suggestions on how to become a better consultant.

26. My director gives me assignments that allow me to learn new skills (i.e. running a weekly meeting).

27. My director gives me things to do that would prepare me for a team leader or director position.

**Demographic Information**

Age: _____ Ethnicity: _________ Gender: _______
**Additional questions**

1. What do you like about the company?

2. What was your personal sales volume in 1994?

3. How long have you been a consultant for the company?

4. How many other consultants are in your unit?

5. How much time, on average, do you spend outside of the unit meetings with your director?

6. What do you get out of unit meetings? (i.e. product information, support from your peers).
We would like you to help us to understand more about your company as a place to work for. Please circle the number which applies to your company. Here is an example:

If you would describe your company as more "inspirational" than "dull", you would make the scale this way;

Dull - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Inspiring

Here are some other items. Please fill them out to describe how you feel about your company.

1. Competent/Potent
   Inhibited - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Uninhibited
   Shallow - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Deep
   Unscientific - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Scientific
   Impersonal - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Personal
   Uncreative - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Creative

2. Responsible
   Irresponsible - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Responsible
   Moral - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Amoral

3. Practical
   Realistic - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Idealistic
   Unconventional - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Conventional

4. Risk-oriented
   Daring - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Cautious
   Aggressive - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Unaggressive
   Cold - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Warm
   Weak - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Strong
5. Impulsive

Active - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Passive

Objective - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Subjective

Please indicate how satisfied you are with your job by circling the number. Please use the following key.

1= Very dissatisfied
2= Dissatisfied
3= I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not
4= Satisfied
5= Very satisfied

1 2 3 4 5 1. How satisfied are you with the persons in your unit?
1 2 3 4 5 2. How satisfied are you with your director?
1 2 3 4 5 3. How satisfied are you with your job?
1 2 3 4 5 4. How satisfied are you with this organization, compared to
   most others?
1 2 3 4 5 5. Considering your skills and the effort you put into the work,
   how satisfied are you with your pay?
1 2 3 4 5 6. How satisfied do you feel with the progress you have made
   in this organization up to now?
1 2 3 4 5 7. How satisfied do you feel with your chances for getting
   ahead in this organization in the future?
Appendix B
Consent Form

Dear Participant,

I am a psychology student at California State University, San Bernardino collecting data as a requirement to complete my thesis for a Masters in Psychology. This project is being supervised by Dr. Jan Kottke of the Psychology Department.

There is a lack of information on mentoring in women organizations. This research is being conducted to obtain information about the functions a female mentor (team leader, director) provides to a female protegee (consultant, team leader). A mentor is defined as a person who would guide you, support you emotionally, provide career advisement, and teach you the ropes of being successful in the company.

Although there are no right or wrong answers to the questions, it is important that you answer each question as honestly as you can. Your answers will remain completely confidential and anonymous. Do not put your name on any pages of the questionnaire other than the consent form. To insure the confidentiality of your answers, this consent form will be removed before your responses are tabulated. The questionnaire should take you approximately ten minutes to complete.

If you become uncomfortable completing the questionnaire, please feel free to terminate your participation and return the incomplete forms to the researcher.

If you would like the results of this study, please contact the student listed below and a written report of the findings will be mailed to you.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in my research.

Sincerely,

Angela Ricketts
(909) 335-0040

I HAVE READ THE ABOVE STATEMENTS AND AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

NAME:_____________________________________

DATE:_____________________________________
Appendix C
Debriefing Form

You have just participated in a study that was designed to investigate the functions a female mentor (team leader, director) performs to female protegee (consultant, team leader). Researchers have identified two sets of functions, career and psychosocial, which exemplify the prototype of the mentoring relationship. Career functions include exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Psychosocial functions include functions which benefit the individual by building confidence, self worth, and effectiveness through role modeling, acceptance, confirmation, counseling, and friendship.

The questionnaire you just completed was designed to measure whether female mentors perform more psychosocial functions than career functions.

Only group results for this project will be available. We cannot give out any information on your questionnaire because they will be analyzed only as part of the group data collected.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the research, please contact either the student listed below or Dr. Jan Kottke at (909) 880-5585.

Once again I greatly appreciate your contribution to this research. Good luck!

Angela Ricketts
Graduate Student

(909) 335-0040
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