UNDERSTANDING MENTORING:
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CANADIAN FORCES

Prepared for

The Canadian Forces Leadership Institute
The Royal Military College
Kingston, Ontario

Bill Wild (MA)

May 2002

Mentoring in the Canadian Forces

Table of Contents

Mentoring in the Canadian Forces

Introduction

This paper has been prepared as the result of an omnibus Request for Proposal (RFP) soliciting input on a number of leadership topics. The question posed for the topic of mentoring was:

> A key factor in many leadership development programs is the role of more senior individuals as mentors or coaches. How should this function be understood, and in particular, what are the implications in a hierarchical organization such as the military?

This literature review will first provide an overview of mentoring in general, it will then look at its application within the military, and lastly it will address mentoring in the context of the Canadian military.

Mentoring – an overview

Although definitions of mentoring vary among authors and researchers, some commonality is evident. Most researchers and practitioners in the field would agree that mentoring is "a particular interpersonal relationship that can influence career progress" (Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991, p. 332).

Differences occur across definitions in the nature and level of formality in mentoring relationships. To Hunt & Michael (1983), the relationship is between experienced and inexperienced organizational members: "the development process in many occupations: master-apprentice; physician-intern; and teacher-student" (p.

475). Similarly, in the Official Languages and Employment Equity Guidelines for Development of a Mentoring Program, mentoring is defined as:

> a learning and/or counselling relationship between an
> experienced person who shares his or her professional expertise
> with a less experienced person in order to develop the skills
> and abilities of the less experienced party. (p. 5)

Kram (1986), however, specifically mentions the possibility of peer mentors in her definition, "relationships between junior or senior colleagues, or between peers, that provide a variety of developmental functions" (p. 161), while the Public Service Commission indicates that supervisors can also be mentors:

> Mentoring is a one-to-one relationship based on
> encouragement, constructive comments, openness, mutual
> trust, respect, and a willingness to learn and share. It exists
> between a more experienced employee (sometimes, but not
> necessarily a supervisor) and a less experienced employee
> (e.g., a student). (A Guide to Mentoring Students, p. 1).

Murray and Owen (1991) introduce the concept of formal mentoring "programmes" when they define mentoring as "a 'deliberate pairing' of a more experienced or skilled person with a lesser experienced or skilled one, with the agreed-upon goal of having the lesser skilled person grow and develop specific competencies" (p. xiv).

Thus far, definitions include the theme that mentoring involves primarily advice and support, however as Darwin (2000) points out, "There is much more to mentoring than giving advice". Chao, Waltz, and Gardner (1992) define mentorship as:

an intense work relationship between senior (mentor) and junior) (protégé) organizational members. The mentor has experience and power in the organization and personally advises, counsels, coaches, and promotes the career development of the protégé. Promotion of the protégé's career may occur directly through actual promotion or indirectly through the mentor's influence and power over other organizational members. (p. 624).

while Noe, (1988) writes:

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 protégé to decision-makers in the organization who may influence career opportunities. (p. 458).

In these definitions mentoring includes the added dimension of the mentor as "champion" bringing the protégé's work to the attention of decision-makers, supporting developmental career opportunities and sponsoring accelerated career advancement. Knackstedt (2001), in a paper written for the Canadian Forces, is clearly includes the concept of the mentor as a champion in her definition:

Mentors are higher ranking, influential organizational members with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward mobility and support to their protégés career development, and who serve as role models, and who increase the protégé's visibility to organizational decision-makers who may influence career opportunities. (p 1/12).

Ragins and Scandura (1997) are unequivocal in regarding mentors as champions of their protégés when they state that:

> …mentors are generally defined as individuals with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward support and mobility to their protégés. (p. 945).

In summary, there is general agreement that mentoring is a process that involves a relationship between two people with career development the desired outcome. Whether the relationship is between junior and senior, whether a supervisor can also be a mentor, whether mentoring is best conducted informally or as part of a formal programme, and whether advising or active championing is more appropriate are a few of the questions that will be addressed in this paper.

Functions of the Mentor

The nine mentoring function delineated by Kram (1986) have been widely cited in the literature from their initial publication date continuing to today (Noe, 1988; Dreyer, & Ash, 1990; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Scandura, 1992; Ragins, & Cotton, 1999; Knackstedt, 2001). According to Kram, career functions "are those aspects of a relationship that enhance learning the ropes and preparing for advancement in an organization" (p. 161). Career functions include **sponsorship** or using connections in the organization to arrange positions, tasks, or promotions that will enhance the career advancement of the junior, **coaching** to improve the junior's performance and potential, **protection** by shielding the junior from unwarranted criticism or smoothing over errors, **exposure** to job opportunities that demonstrate competence or to people who can progress the juniors career, and the provision of **challenging assignments** that stimulate growth and prepare the junior for career advancement.

A second set of mentoring functions, according to Kram (1986), is psychosocial functions. The purpose of psychosocial functions is to contribute to the self-worth of the individual both inside and outside the organization. Psychosocial functions include **role modeling** or demonstrating behaviours, attitudes, and skills valued by the organization in the hope that the junior will adopt characteristics that assisted the senior succeed, **counselling** in a confidential forum with a view to enhancing development, **acceptance and confirmation** to strengthen self-confidence and self-image, and **friendship** beyond the confines of work.

Adherence to Kram's (1986) functions is not universal. Knackstedt (2000) reviewed research findings and discovered 10 mentor functions not mentioned by Kram (1986), such as vouching for protégé's accomplishments, teaching the protégé about organizational politics, assisting protégé with tasks (career functions), and encouraging, acting as a parent figure, and socializing outside work (psychosocial functions). Although not mentioned by Kram (1986) most of these additional functions can be readily integrated into her nine functions.

Some Mentoring programmes include fewer functions than those listed by Kram (1996). The Official Languages and Employment Equity Branch Guidelines for the Development of a Mentoring Program (1995) list mainly psychosocial functions under the roles and responsibilities of mentors. Protection, exposure, and the provision of challenging assignments, all functions that have more to do with championing than guiding, are absent from the programme. Because career functions are absent, one could question whether the Official Languages and Employment Equity programme is a true mentoring programme or something else.

Primary/Secondary Mentoring

Not all mentoring relationships provide all possible functions. Kram (1986); Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher (1991, 1992); and Russell and Adams (1997) among others have differentiated between primary and secondary mentoring. Primary, or

classical, mentoring is an intense relationship of long duration, characterized by unselfish, altruistic and caring behaviour on the part of the mentor. Primary mentoring includes the full range of psychosocial and career functions. The focus of primary mentoring is the protégé and his or her success in the organization and in life. Primary mentoring is more rare than secondary mentoring.

Secondary mentoring, on the other hand, is less personal, of shorter duration, and primarily career progress oriented. Secondary mentoring benefits: the protégé by preparing him or her for advancement; the organization by grooming capable people; and the mentor by showing him or her to be, in the eyes of superiors, a good corporate citizen.

Phases of Mentoring

Kram (1983) described four distinct phases of the mentoring relationship; initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. Although these defined phases have received little empirical investigation, one recent study (Ragins and Scandura, 1997) was based in part on Kram's (1983) phases, and another (Chao, 1997) found some support for the phases.

The initiation phase of the mentoring relationship lasts from six to twelve months during which time the prospective protégé recognizes and comes to admire a more senior person in the organization. At the same time, the prospective mentor, through interaction with the prospective protégé either as a direct subordinate, a fellow member of a team or committee, or through the recommendation of others, comes to see the prospective protégé as someone who deserves special attention and coaching. Interaction in the first year increases with the mentor showing special interest and the protégé reciprocating by seeking advice or giving opinions on work related issues. Both parties interpret the other's behaviour as a sign of interest in entering a mentoring relationship. This provides the foundation to move to the next phase.

The cultivation phase lasts from two to five years. It is during this phase that the benefits of mentoring are optimized. Career functions are the first to emerge with the mentor providing coaching, challenging work, exposure, protection, and sponsorship. As the emotional bond intensifies, psychosocial functions emerge and the mentor provides acceptance and confirmation, modeling, or even counselling and friendship. The degree to which career functions are provided depends on the mentor's position in the organization and the amount of influence that can be brought to bear on the protégé's behalf. The amount and type of psychosocial support offered depends on the degree of trust and respect developed.

At some point, the functions provided by the mentor are no longer required and the protégé becomes independent or moves on to another mentor. This separation phase can last from six months to two years. Separation occurs both structurally (a posting or promotion) and emotionally. Structural separation before emotional separation can hasten the latter, whereas emotional separation before structural separation can be a source of anxiety if one party begins to disengage before the other is ready.

The last phase in the mentoring process is redefinition. This phase is most often characterized by friendship. Mentoring functions do not end altogether but are less frequent, less intense and can be reciprocal. If peer status is achieved, new discomforts occur as the junior member continues to see the senior as all knowing and the senior begins to fear being surpassed.

Formal and Informal Mentoring

A key aspect of mentoring is how mentor and protégé come to establish a relationship. Chao et al. (1992) claim "the basic distinction between formal and informal mentorship lies in the formation of the relationship" (p. 620). The importance of how the relationship is formed extends beyond the initial stages of the

relationship, because how the relationship is formed has great impact on how the relationship evolves and what functions the mentor undertakes.

Informal relationships occur spontaneously, without organizational intervention. They are not managed, structured or formally recognized by the organization (Chao et al. 1992; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Informal relations develop from a personal bond fuelled by like interests, goals and accomplishments (Young & Perrewe, in press). Mentors select protégés based on work or non-work issues (Chao, et al.), such as performance, social background, and appearance (Hunt and Michael, 1983). In informal mentoring relationships, protégés may attract the attention of a superior or even initiate the relationship (Hunt and Michael, 1983).

Formal mentoring relationships, on the other hand, are developed with organizational support, including matching of protégés and mentors, and are normally of shorter duration (Chao et al., 1992; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). They are characterized by programme coordinators, orientation sessions and data banks of mentors and protegés (Guidelines for the Development of a Mentoring Program).

Knackstedt (2000) suggested a third typology, the semi-formal programme. It includes all of the attributes of the formal programme with the exception of matching protégés and mentors. In the semi-formal programme, the organization provides education and training, and facilitates matching by providing opportunities for participants to meet and form a relationship, but stops short of assigning mentors to protégés.

The formal – informal distinction is a relatively new phenomenon. In 1983, Hunt and Michael (1983) mention that some organizations have formalized the mentor role but give no indication of any organizational role in the mentoring process. In 1986, Kram (1986) speaks of corporate culture or practices that encourage mentoring by rewarding mentoring behaviour, but no mention is made of

overt matching of mentors and protégés. In 1988, Noe (1988) found that the majority of mentoring relationships were informal.

In contrast, by 1999 Ragins and Cotton (1999) found that many organizations had recognized the benefits of mentoring and estimated that a third of major U.S. companies had developed formal mentoring programmes.

Each of the two types of mentoring has its advantages and disadvantages. In informal mentoring, a relationship of trust and respect is present from the outset because the parties establish a relationship as a result of shared interests (Guidelines for the Development of a Mentoring Program). On the other hand, in formal programmes, parties matched by a programme coordinator may take time to establish a relationship of trust and respect or may never establish such a relationship because of personality conflicts or lack of commitment on the part of a mentor (Noe, 1988).

The major strength of informal mentoring, a relationship of trust and respect arising from shared interests, is also a major weakness. Shared interests can arise from shared backgrounds, personalities, and characteristics. People in senior positions, when selecting protégés, most often select people like themselves (Dreher & Dougherty; 1997, Darwin, 2000). Given the demographics of people in senior positions of many North American organizations, this can disadvantage minorities (Kram, 1986; Frey & Noler, 1986; Darwin, 2000), and women (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Baum, 1992; Ragins & Scandura, 1997; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Knackstedt, 2000) who are, therefore, less likely to attract the attention of a mentor. Attitudes towards authority are also likely to affect whether individuals seek out mentorship relationships with senior collogues (Kram, 1986). This may explain why Whitely, Dougherty, and Dreher, (1991) found that employees of lower socio-economic status are less likely to have a mentor than members of the upper-middle or upper status. Because employees from higher socio-economic backgrounds are more likely to have been exposed to people in positions of authority in their lives, they will be more familiar and therefore more comfortable with authority.

Formal mentoring programmes can serve to even the playing field by ensuring equal access to mentoring by all organizational members.   However, an equal playing field may not be the aim of a formal mentoring programme. The advancement of high performing candidates is another possible rationale for developing a formal mentoring programme. In this case, those not selected for the programme may feel "deprived, resentful, and increasingly pessimistic about their own opportunities for development (Kram, 1986). On the other hand, with informal mentoring, those who do not form a relationship with a mentor, either because they feel uncomfortable initiating such a relationship, or because no mentor steps forward, are equally likely to feel deprived and resentful.

Another disadvantage of a formal programme is that the protégé may feel that the mentor's commitment is to the programme or the organization rather than to the protégé (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). This can occur if the mentor is required to participate in the programme, or participates primarily because it sends the message that he or she is a team player supporting the goals of the organization.

It is generally agreed that informal mentoring produces better results. The risks of formal mentoring programmes are high and mentoring relationships cannot be engineered but must be spontaneous (Kram, 1986). Noe, in his 1988 investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships, found that protégés in formal mentoring relationships received beneficial psychosocial functions but limited career functions compared to those in informal relationships.

Chao et al. (1992) came to a similar conclusion; there was no difference in psychosocial support but protégés in informal mentoring relationships enjoyed greater career related support, higher salaries and more job satisfaction than protégés in formal relationships. The lack of career support in formal mentoring programmes is of particular importance. If the primary contribution of the formal mentor is

psychosocial, it is redundant support because psychosocial functions can be adequately provided by friends, coworkers, and supervisors (Chao et al., 1992; Allen, et al., 1997; Koberg et al., 1998).

Ragins and Cotton (1999) specifically investigated formal and informal mentoring relationships and concluded that protégés with informal mentors received greater benefits than protégés with formal mentors. In their survey study of 1154 journalists, social workers, and engineers, protégés with informal mentors reported receiving greater benefits on nine of Kram's (1985) eleven mentor roles. Protégés in informal relationships reported greater satisfaction with their mentors and earned more than protégés in a formal relationship. Protégés in a formal relationship, on the other hand, received no greater career benefits, as measured by promotion and compensation, than did their non-mentored peers.

Protégés prefer the informal mentoring process (Scandura, 1997) because it is more effective in advancing their careers than is the formal process and Noe (1988) cautioned that organizations should not expect protégés in formal programmes to receive the benefits received by protégés in informal mentoring relationships. If this is the case, then formal programmes will not address the problem of inequitable career development opportunities for under-represented segments of the population because it is the informal process that is effective and this process is not readily available to these segments (Dreher & Dougherty, 1997).

While informal mentoring may produce better results, as Lacey (2001) observes, "It is not an either/or debate" (p. 4). She urges organizations to develop cultures that encourage spontaneous mentor relationships while at the same time establishing formal programmes for those for whom a spontaneous relationship has not developed.

Why Mentor?

The popular press, various guidelines for mentoring programmes, and the academic literature list a great number of benefits of mentoring for the organization, protégé, and mentor. Benefits claimed for the organization include enhanced efficiency, more dynamic and warmer workplace, "made to measure" personnel training, improved HR planning and management, and improved communications (TB Guide to Mentoring Students); better informed and more skilled staff, and better communications and sharing of values (Guide to Mentoring Students); improved recruiting (prospective recruits will be less apprehensive if they believe that someone will be assigned to "show them the ropes" (Murray, 2001) and decreased turnover (Darwin, 2000; Lacey, 2001; Murray, 2001), and re-motivating burnt out managers (Lacey, 2001).

The mentor is said to benefit from the relationship through enhanced self-esteem (Lacey, 2001; Murray, 2001), satisfaction in helping others (Barton 2001; Darwin, 2000; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1983, 1986; Lacey, 2001; Murray, 2001; TB Guide to Mentoring), by gaining an alternate view of the organization through the eyes of the protégé (Lacey, 2001; TB Guide), leaving a legacy (Lacey, 2001; Murray, 2001; Kram, 1986), "generativity" or leaving somebody to take your place after you have gone (Kram, 1983) and peer recognition (Darwin, 2000).

Perhaps the biggest winner in the mentoring relationship is the protégé. Benefits said to accrue to the protégé include, increased job satisfaction (Dreyer & Ash, 1990; Murray, 2001; Fagenson, 1989; Scandura, 1997), greater career success, mobility, promotion, income (Barton, 2001; Darwin, 2000; Dreyer & Ash, 1990; Fagenson, 1989; Russell & Adams, 1997; Scandura, 1992; Whitely et al.), greater confidence, competence, effectiveness (Barton, 2001; Kram, 1993; Lacey, 2001; Murray, 2001; TB Guide), and increased knowledge of the organizational culture (Barton, 2001; Darwin, 2000; Murray, 2001; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993).

Empirical evidence to support all of these claims is scant.   There is evidence, however, to support some of the benefits ascribed to mentoring. Chao and Gardener (1992) in a survey study of 552 managers and professionals found that employees who reported having a mentor reported greater organizational socialization and job satisfaction and higher salaries. Scandura (1992) in a survey of 224 managers found that mentoring was related to career success as measured by promotions and salary. Ragins and Cotton (1999) in a survey study of 1154 journalists, social workers and engineers, found that informally mentored individuals (but not those in formal programmes) earned more than their non-mentored counterparts. Dreher and Ash (1990) in a survey study of 220 business school graduates found that individuals reporting extensive mentoring also reported more promotions, higher salaries, and were more satisfied with their pay and benefits than their non-mentored peers. Whitely et al. (1991) in a survey study of 633 university alumni found that mentoring was related to early career promotion and total compensation, that is, people with mentors get promoted more often and earn more than people without mentors. They also found that mentoring activities predicted early career promotion only for those from upper-middle and upper class social backgrounds. Turban and Dougherty (1994) in a survey study of 147 university management faculty graduates also found a positive relationship between mentoring received and career attainment.   Chao (1997) in a longitudinal survey study of 428 university alumni and employees of a small private institute found that the effects of mentoring on income and socialization endured over the long term.

Mentoring has also been found to enhance early socialization to an organization. Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) in a survey study of 332 engineering and management graduates six months after graduation found that "mentored newcomers were more quickly sensitized to the importance of organizational culture, politics, history and other system-wide features …" (p. 180).

Championing vs Mentoring

The universal feature of the mentoring conceptualizations delineated in the introduction to this paper is the training and development role of the mentor. A common, but not universal, feature is the conceptualization of mentor as sponsor, or champion as well as teacher. The commonly used term "protégé" – "protected, having a big pull, having many friends in court" (Dubois, 1969, p. 576) implies a championing role, as do a number of the definitions cited earlier. Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) refer to a number of definitions that have been offered to describe a mentor ranging from coach or guide to champion or Rabbi. Darwin (2000) speaks of the traditional mentor as a "protective teacher, guide, or sponsor (p. 198).

Lacey (2001) lists a continuum of career supporters from supporter to significant peer, role model, coach, sponsor, and mentor. She considers the role of the sponsor and mentor to be different only in that the mentor's role is formal and consciously performed while the sponsor's role is informal, unconscious and perhaps even unknown to the person sponsored. Both, according to Lacey (2001) promote and protect the protégé.

It seems clear that championing is an accepted aspect of mentoring, and yet the Official Languages and Employment Equity Branch Guidelines for the Development of a Mentoring Programme (1995) list no championing functions amongst the roles and responsibilities of the mentor, and the Treasury Board A Guide to Mentoring Students lists only "provides networking opportunities" (p. 1) as a championing function of the mentor. Murray (2001), like Lacey (2001), distinguishes between sponsor and mentor but the distinguishing feature is the protection and sponsoring functions; functions provided by the sponsor but not the mentor (p.13-14).

It may be that the traditional, informal, primary mentor performs more of a champion's role than the assigned mentor of the formal programme. Kram (1986) suggested that informal mentors are likely to choose people like themselves, the very

people they are likely to protect and sponsor. Chao et al. (1992), Noe (1988), and Ragins and Cotton (1999) all found that informal relationships led to greater career benefits for protégés as measured by compensation, promotion or job satisfaction. In many cases career benefits for protégés in formal relations were no greater than for non-mentored employees. Burke et al, (1991) hypothesized that supervisors would undertake more career strategizing, provide more support, and engage in greater promotion of protégés than of typical subordinates. They found that supervisors clearly provided more psychosocial functions to protégés. The provision of career functions was less clear with some being provided more to protégés and others being provided equally to protégés and typical subordinates.

While there is no clear answer, it appears that the mentor as champion is more prevalent in informal relationships than in formal. This may be as a result of an unwillingness, on the part of organizations, to sanction and encourage favouritism through the creation of mentoring programmes with championing as an explicit function... Career management or structured succession planning may be perceived as a more appealing means of ensuring the best rise to the top than a "free for all" pitting managers and their protégés against one another.

Drawbacks to Mentoring

Not all studies conclude that mentored employees have the edge on their non-mentored peers. Burke and McKeen (1997), in a study of female business graduates, found no differences between mentored and non-mentored employees when controlled for a number of personal and situational factors. They concluded that a number of factors influence income, career advancement, job satisfaction and other work outcomes and that it might be unrealistic to expect that mentoring has strong and consistent effects.

It may not be that mentors make protégés better performers but that higher performing employees get mentored (Scandura 1998). Or as Baum (1992) puts it: "it

is possible that income and career advancement are associated with being mentored because ambitious and competent people are especially likely to seek mentors" (p. 224). Ragins and Cotton (1999) suggested, in their comparison of formal and informal mentoring programmes, that protégés in informal mentoring relationship were higher performers than protégés in formal programmes and would be more successful even without mentor assistance. Perhaps it is not the process that leads to career success but rather the characteristics of the employees who take advantage of the process.

What kind of person seeks to be a protégé or is sought out by prospective mentors? Competence and ambition appear to be the key factors determining who gets mentored. Fagenson (1992), in her survey study of 169 high tech employees, found that protégés scored higher than non-protégés in their need for achievement and need for power. Turban and Dougherty (1994), in their survey study of 147 Faculty of Management graduates, found that individuals with an internal locus of control, high self-monitoring and emotional stability were more likely to initiate and receive mentoring. Kram (1986) suggests that attitude toward authority is likely to affect whether a mentor relationship with a senior colleague is sought. Thus it appears that protégés are ambitious, comfortable with authority figures and if not technically competent, at least have the psychological characteristics required to develop technical competence.

While ambition is what leads an protégé to seek a mentor, ability is what attracts a mentor to a protégé. According to Hunt and Michael (1983), in order to attract the attention of a prospective mentor, the protégé must have certain characteristics. These include good performance and the opportunity to demonstrate the extraordinary. Koberg, Boss, and Goodman (1998) suggest educational achievement attracts mentors because it signifies greater career mobility. Fagenson (1989) goes so far as to suggest that if ability to advance in the organization is a reason for mentors to select protégés, then it is to be expected that early career promotion rates would favour the protégé and Chao et al., (1992) suggest that

"informal mentors accurately identify the better performers in an organization and recruit these individuals as protégés" (p. 634). Allen, Poteet, and Russell (2000) in their survey study of 607 first line managers found that mentors were more likely to select protégés based on ability than on need for help. They suggested that mentors select protégés as much to bolster their own career as the protégé's. Mentors with capable protégés can groom them as their successor making the mentor available for promotion. Capable protégés also improve the power base of the mentor in the organization. It may be that capable people choose to be mentored and mentors choose capable people. Under these circumstances it is not unreasonable to question whether it is the process or the characteristics of those mentored that lead to career success.

A second characteristic required to attract a mentor is similarity to the mentor. Hunt and Michael (1983) suggest that a social background that permits relating to and knowing the mentor socially, and looking good in a suit, are characteristics mentors look for in a protégé, and Darwin (2000) suggests that people in senior positions tend to advance people like themselves. Eby, McManus, Simon, and Russell (2000) in a survey of 156 subordinates of managers in an executive development programme found that 83 percent of those who reported a positive mentoring experience also reported having similar attitudes, values, and beliefs to those of their mentor.

The type of person who attracts or pursues a mentor is ambitious and has displayed competence. Mentors seek protégés who demonstrate competence and are similar to themselves. Two problems for mentoring occur. The ambitious and competent employees who enter mentoring relationships would likely have succeeded without mentoring. The benefit of mentoring then, can only be to bring them along more quickly. There is a risk here, however, that career advancement will not be as rapid as the protégé had expected leading to disappointment (Guidelines for the Development of a Mentoring Programme).

Mentors seeking protégés similar to themselves causes an additional problem. Kram (1986) spoke of generativity or generating a replacement. Darwin (2000) comments that there has been a strong reproductive element attached to mentoring and suggests that the process, steeped as it is in the Medieval era of Guilds and Patrons, is more appropriate to a society intent on protecting the status quo then to one undergoing rapid change. Whitely et al., (1991) speak of the "coattail effect" in which protégés (in their case upper social class) are pulled along as their mentors rise in the organization. If protégés are not the most deserving of advancement, the organization might not be well served.

One particular rapid change that is hampered by a "just like me" mentoring process is the advancement of women and minorities. It is not by coincidence that much of the impetus for formal mentoring programmes has occurred at the same time as efforts to increase participation of women and minorities in corporate management (Ragins and Cotton, 1999). Women and minorities do not have access to the informal mentoring of the "old boys" network, a critical requirement for career advancement. Unfortunately, as we have seen earlier, research has shown that typical formal programmes cannot replicate the successes of informal mentoring.

Establishing a mentoring relationship is also difficult for organizational members from lower socio-economic classes. It is members from this group who are likely uncomfortable in the presence of authority figures (Kram, 1986) and so less likely than individuals from higher social class origins to approach a mentor. As Whitely, Dougherty, and Dreher, 1991 point out "Perhaps young managers and professionals from higher social class origins are more skilled at survival, upward-manoeuvring, and adaptation than those from lower social origins" (p. 346). As with women and minorities, formal programmes would redress this inequity only if formal programmes were as successful as informal mentoring. Research has not shown this to be the case.

A number of other deficiencies of mentoring have been suggested. Others can feel threatened by the process. Mentors may come to feel threatened by the success of their protégés who may surpass their achievements in the organization (Kram, 1983, 1986; Reich, 1985). Non-protégés may find there is a lack of procedural justice or the application of fair rules, in the allocation of resources and come to be jealous of the "fair haired" boys and girls receiving attention that they do not receive (Scandura, 1997) and become resentful and increasingly pessimistic about their own opportunities for advancement. Relationships among peers may be strained and long-term commitment undermined (Kram, 1986). The protégé may also be too closely identified with the mentor and be labelled as his or her "person" (Reich, 1985) or teacher's pet (Murray, 2001).

Over dependence has also been cited as a drawback of mentoring (Darwin, 2000; Guidelines for Development of a Mentoring Program). As Fagenson-Eland et al. (1997) comment "the more mentoring they receive, the more mentoring they may expect" (p. 30), while Reich (1985), in his survey of women professionals, found "too much protection" to be a disadvantage of the mentoring process (p. 53). Lastly, mentoring requires resources ((Murray, 2001). Formal programmes may require a coordinator, education and training, databanks of prospective mentors and protégés, matching criteria and file reviews. The mentoring process itself takes time and energy away from the primary roles of both the mentor and protégé.

Women and Minorities

There is extensive evidence to suggest that the current surge of interest in mentoring, and in particular formal mentoring programmes, has resulted from the needs of women and minorities aspiring to corporate leadership (Frey & Noler, 1986). The benefits of mentoring for women and minorities is thought to be "overcoming gender-related barriers to advancement" (Ragins & Scandura, 1997, p. 945), "breaking into what has been largely a male organizational world" (Baum, 1992, p. 224), "help them break through the glass ceiling" (Ragins and Cotton (1999) or "to

develop newcomers … in particular groups of newcomers such as women, minorities, and/or high-potential candidates" (Kram, 1986, p. 183).   Organizations are urged through mentoring to "help women move into senior positions" (Reich, 1985, p. 55). The type of organization employing mentoring is described as "an organization … with structural supports for more equal treatment of women and minorities" (Hunt & Michael, 1983, p.479).

In many cases, the organizational barrier to women and minorities being addressed, through the introduction of formal programmes, is the lack of access to mentoring itself. Dreyer & Dougherty (1997) suggest that "women and non-white men do not have equal access to influential mentors' (p. 110), while Ragins and Cotton (1999) suggest that "women face greater barriers to developing informal relationships than men" (p. 529). Burke et al. (1993) recognize the value of the mentor but observe that women have a more difficult time finding mentors. Perhaps women have difficulty finding a mentor because as Turbon and Dougherty (1994) suggest "women may be less likely than men to initiate mentoring relationships" (p. 691). Regardless of the reasons preventing women from employing informal mentoring, Darwin (2000) suggests "In an attempt to make mentoring more accessible to women and disadvantaged groups, organizations created specialized programs" (p. 203). "Women may be more motivated than men to utilize mentors provided via a formal programme because of the general lack of mentors for women" (Noe, 1988, P. 475). Formal mentoring programmes are seen as a means of granting women and minorities the benefits of informal mentoring that have always been available to white males.

Women appear to have embraced the process. Burke, McKeen, & Mckenna (1991) in a study comparing mentoring to supervisory relationships, found that more women subordinates were identified by managers as protégés than as typical subordinates. Noe (1988), in his study of mentoring relationships, found that female protégés made more effective use of their mentor regardless of the gender of the mentor and derived more psychosocial support from mentors than did men. Noe

(1988) suggested that women may be more motivated than men to use formal mentoring programmes due to the lack of informal mentoring available to them. Reich (1985) found that women more than men "felt that mentors helped them find and use their talents" (p. 52).

Women and mentoring programmes are not a perfect fit however. Romantic or sexual involvement is sometimes associated with cross-gender mentoring (Darwin, 2000). Kram (1986) suggests that the complexities of cross sex mentoring and in particular anxiety over the boundaries of the relationship inhibit the mentoring process. Baum (1992) characterizes male-female mentoring in terms of falling in love or being in love and cautions women, but not men, to guard against confusing mentor with lover or husband. Even if romance is not a characteristic of a particular mentoring relationship, it may be difficult to convince others. Murray (2001) speaks of the gossip and suspicion resulting from the relationship between a female protégé and her male mentor two levels above her. Cross-gender mentoring pairs "must manage the closeness/distance in their internal relationship as well as the perceptions of the relationship by outsiders" (Burke et al.,1993, p. 884). Turbon and Dougherty (1991) suggest that one reason women are less likely than men to initiate a mentoring relationship is that most mentors are men and such a relationship may be seen by others in the organization as sexual.

Jealousy was cited earlier as a drawback of mentoring in general. Jealousy may be even more problematic if mentoring is employed to facilitate affirmative action goals (Kram, 1986). Majority group members may become resentful of the support and guidance provided to members of targeted groups. Resentment may affect relationships between peers as well as individuals' long term commitment to the organization.

Formal mentoring programmes have been developed, in part, to address the difficulties women and minorities have found in finding a mentor. And yet, as we have seen earlier, formal programmes are not as effective as informal mentoring. The

differences are even more striking for women. Ragins and Cotton (1999) in a comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships found that women in a formal relationship received less coaching, role modeling, friendship, social interaction and counselling than women in informal mentoring relationships. These differences were not found for men. In fact, for one function, counseling, men in formal relationships reported receiving more support than men in an informal relationship.

Supervisors as Mentors

In spite of the fact that practitioners recommend that mentors be two levels above their protégés in the organization, (Knackstedt, 2000) usually mentors are their protégé's supervisor (Reich, 1985). Burke et al. (1993), in a study of mentors in the high tech field, found about half reported that protégés were in a direct line of supervision. Eby et al. (2000), in a study of protégés, found that two-thirds of the mentoring relationships reported were with supervisors, and Burke and McKeen (1997) found that fully 85% of women in a mentoring relationship reported that their mentor was in a direct supervisory position. In all of these cases, the study participant decided whether or not to describe the relationship as a mentoring one. Whether mentoring by supervisors is as prevalent as suggested or great confusion exists over the concept of mentoring is not known. Riley and Wrench (1985) did find that, while 67 percent of women subjects responded positively to a single item question about having a mentor, only 47 percent met the more strict criteria of scoring an average of 3.5 out of 5 over a series of questions on the mentoring relationship. In any case, a significant proportion of the population believes their immediate supervisor performs a mentoring function.

If supervisor mentoring is so prevalent, what are the differences between leadership/supervising and mentoring. To Riley and Wrench (1985) it was the number and degree of support functions provided. Mentors provide more functions and to a greater degree than non-mentors. The Official Languages and Employment

Equity (OL and EE) Branch Guidelines for the Development of a Mentoring Program suggest that the role of the mentor is long-term career development while that of the supervisor is primarily short term and task focused.

A number of problems with boss as mentor have been cited in the literature. Scandura (1998) observes that a supervisor mentor is in a position of power over the protégé. Control of assignments and influence over performance ratings, and perhaps promotion, make the relationship much different than the traditional mentoring relationship. Burke and McKeen ((1997) suggest that the more levels higher in the organization mentors are than protégés, the better able they are to offer career planning and sponsorship. Kram (1986) adds that a subordinate may feel reluctant to confide in a supervisor mentor because the supervisor is responsible for the performance review that ultimately leads to career advancement. Also, the supervisor mentor may be reluctant to sponsor a subordinate for fear of losing them through transfer or promotion, or through fear that the subordinate might surpass the accomplishments of the mentor.

Although the theory might be that non-supervisor mentors are better able to advance the careers of their protégés, the practice appears to be different. Ragins and Cotton (1999) found that supervisory mentors provided more support in four of the five career development functions (sponsorship, protection, challenging assignments, and exposure. Fagenson- Eland et al. (1997) in their study of two technology firms found that mentors whose protégés were their subordinates reported providing more career guidance and communicating more frequently than mentors whose protégés were not their subordinates. Protégés with mentor supervisors reported receiving more career guidance, communication, and psychosocial support than their peers who were mentored by a non-supervisor. Burke and McKeen (1997), in their study of female business graduates, also found that more mentoring functions were received when the mentor was the direct supervisor. Contrary to the findings of Ragins and Cotton (1999), however, they found that mentors who were higher in the organization were better able to provide career planning and sponsorship. Burke,

McKenna, and McKeen (1991), in a survey study of 94 high tech managers, found that employees who had a special mentoring relationship with their bosses received a higher level of psychosocial support but the same level of career support as employees who did not have the special mentoring relationship.

Supervisors provide more mentoring because they have more frequent contact and communication with their protégés (Eby et al., 1999; Burke & McKeen 1997), or because protégés are more comfortable communicating with their supervisors than mentors who are organizationally distanced from them (Fagenson et al. (1997). Perhaps then, supervisors should be mentors. Hunt & Michael speak of a " new developmental ethic" (p. 475) in which the manager is responsible for developing talent, while Knackstedt (2001) states that "all leaders should perform mentoring functions" (p. 3/12). Sosik and Godshalk (2000) suggest that the psychosocial support functions of mentoring parallel Yukl's (1990) leadership behaviours of supporting, motivating, inspiring, and developing. Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) argue that supervisor mentoring can be conceptualized as a type of transformational leadership.

Because of the benefits of supervisor mentoring, Fagenson-Eland et al. (1997) recommend that organizations encourage bosses to serve as mentors and Aryee et al. (1996) suggest that if organizations consider mentoring to be an important role requirement, development of subordinates should be a critical requirement on the manager's annual performance review.

Alternatives to Traditional Mentoring

Darwin (2000) suggests that the traditional model of mentoring, consisting as it does of concepts passed down from the English feudal system of favoured pages and squires being mentored in their quest for knighthood, and the apprenticeship model of the Guild in Medieval times, is "old school" and inappropriate in our technological society. She suggests that traditional mentoring perpetuates the status

quo, as mentors select protégés who embody their attitudes and culture, thereby ensuring organizational change will be slow to occur. In the learning organization of today, power relationships, exemplified by mentoring, are replaced by dialogue and horizontal relationships. In this era of rapidly changing technology, it is not unrealistic to assume that recent graduates of university and technical schools will have knowledge and information that is more current than that of their supervisors. The function of a relationship between older and younger colleagues becomes one of co-learning in an adult-like, interdependent manner rather than the parent-child mentoring relationship.

Chao and Gardner (1992); Allen, Russell, and Maetzke, (1997); and Koberg, Boss and Goodman (1998) posit that there are many people in an organization: friends, co-workers, supervisors, who can perform the psychosocial functions of mentoring as these functions do not require any particular position or influence within the organization. Eby (1997) suggests that lateral or peer mentoring might be more relevant in today's flatter more participative organizations. In the previous section, much evidence was presented to suggest that supervisors already provide most psychosocial and many career functions thought to be benefits of the mentoring process.

If numerous people can provide psychosocial functions, then traditional mentoring is differentiated by the provision of career functions: coaching, protecting, exposure, and challenging assignments. Dreher and Dougherty (1997), however, suggest that these functions can be adequately addressed by a properly designed and functioning career management and assessment system (CMAS). CMASs have the advantage over mentoring processes because, as we have seen earlier, informal systems tend to exclude women and minorities and the effectiveness of formal systems has not been demonstrated.

According to Dougherty and Dreher (1997) CMAS could replace the five functions of career mentoring (sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure, and

challenging assignments). The goals of sponsorship could be achieved by establishing merit boards to ensure that the most capable individuals are promoted. Exposure and challenging assignments could be accomplished by human resource practices that include job rotation for promising employees to expose them both to senior managers and to all areas of the organization. Assessment centres could be employed for coaching and development and extensive use of project teams could serve to shield the developing leaders from individual failure.

Mentoring and the Military

Although the military literature on mentoring is sparse, it is telling. After a spate of articles in the mid 1980s, the discussion on mentoring seems to have dried up. A " Working Bibliography" of US Army mentorship found on the US Army War College at Carlyle barracks web site was dated 1992 and contained articles from the mid 1980s, mainly from the American journal <u>Military Review</u>. A review of recent volumes of <u>Military Review</u> held in the NDHQ library turned up no articles on mentoring from 1997, 2000, or 2001 (there was one short "Insight" column from 1999. 1998 volumes were not available)

While the early literature includes lively discussion on the merits of mentoring, the more recent literature mentions mentoring almost in passing. Maggert & James (1999), in a short "Insight" column, urge leaders to mentor in order to "motivate, educate, and guide quality people" (p. 86) while a review of a US Military study (McGuire, 2001-02) found mentoring to place behind operational assignments and institutional education in importance as tools of leader development. Mentoring was included in the study not because it was an integral part of leader development models of the five services (it was not), but because the study designers considered it an influential leader development process. A 2001 article entitled <u>Training and Developing Army Leaders</u> mentions mentoring only in the context that one member of a panel studying leader development in the new operational environment was referred to as "our senior mentor" (Steele & Waters, 2001, p.5). Having established

that "mentor" was part of the lexicon, the panel developed a leader development model that did not include mentoring.

The earlier military literature on mentoring offers considerably more information and to a great degree parallels the discussions still ongoing in the civilian literature. In the formal vs. informal front, the consensus seems to be that informal is best. Bagnel. Pence, and Merriwether (1985) contend that "the more personal and informal roles played by mentors cannot be mandated" (p. 10). Sorley (1988) agrees: "the mentoring relationship is not susceptible by its very nature to being established by regulation or policy" (p. 76), while according to Maggert and James (1999) "the best mentoring comes from personal commitment between senior and junior leaders rather than from some type of formalized assignment process" (p. 87). Examples of mentoring relationships (Jolemore, 1986; Kingsseed, 1990) invariably refer to informal relationships.

Whether sponsorship is a legitimate function of mentoring causes some disagreement in the military literature. Bagnal and Merriwether (1985) speak of mentorship in the military context as focusing on a "mentorship style of leadership" (p. 8) characterized by open communication, role modeling of values, counselling and sharing the leader's frame of reference or the context in which decisions are made. To Bagnal and Merriwether (1985) sponsorship cannot be condoned in the Army, as it implies "perceptions of favouritism, elitism, and promotion by riding on the coattails of senior officers" (p. 17). Jolimore (1986) disagrees and argues that sponsoring has proven valuable in helping exceptional people move to the top. Examples of mentoring relationships (Jolemore, 1986; Kingsseed, 1990) invariably describe a relationship that includes sponsorship.

Who can be a mentor has a military twist that is, while not unique to the military, more prevalent and accepted than in the civilian sector. Bagnel and Merriwether (1985) and Sorely (1988) both mention the mentoring the young Army officer receives at the feet of his Platoon 2 i/c. The same relationship is found in

other services as well; on the shop floor in aircraft maintenance facilities and on-board ships; all places where old hands, albeit junior in rank, (although not always in pay) show their new "boss" the ropes. Darwin (2000) discusses subordinate mentoring of supervisors albeit in a different context than that found in the Army.

Finally, as part of a larger study on attrition, Wild (2000) asked Canadian Forces General Offices their opinions on mentoring. While most admitted to having had a mentor, opinions were split on whether a mentoring programme would be worthwhile. Many felt that, in the military, supervisors were responsible for mentoring subordinates. Most agreed that to be successful, mentoring relationships would have to be facilitated rather than legislated; the programme would work best if its implementation was "invisible" to participants, that is, they were not aware that they were participating in a formal programme.

Mentoring and the Canadian Forces

When considering mentoring in the CF, three questions must be answered. Is it appropriate? Is it required? Will it succeed? It is not the intent of this section to answer these questions, only to provide insight so that organizational decision makers can answer them.

Is Mentoring Appropriate?

As was mentioned earlier, it is widely accepted that there are nine functions to mentoring. Five "career functions": sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure, and challenging assignments, and four "psychosocial" functions: role modeling, counselling, acceptance, and friendship.

Clearly there can be little doubt that many of these are acceptable functions, that is, they are not unethical or in some manner undesirable. A few function, however, are likely to stimulate discussion. Acceptance of some functions:

sponsorship, protection, the provision of challenging assignments, and exposure to influential senior managers, as legitimate functions of a mentor, is not universal. "Godfathers" in all branches of the CF carry out these functions on an ad hoc or informal basis. While not welcomed by those left out of the programme, Godfathering is generally tolerated as part of military culture. This is perhaps surprising given that also part of the military ethic is the idea that every soldier has a Field Marshall's baton in his knapsack. If every soldier has a baton, why are only a few chosen to develop the skills required to use it? Sponsorship, protection, choice assignments and exposure to influential managers can be viewed by some as favouritism and the benefactors of such mentoring as "golden boys" or girls, "high flyers", "bootlickers" or worse. Sponsorship, protection, choice assignments and exposure to influential senior managers may lead to jealousy among peers and feelings that career opportunities are slim for other than the chosen few. Morale and cohesion, the foundation of a professional military, cannot exist in an atmosphere of peer distrust and jealousy.

If such preferential treatment is not currently detrimental to the CF it is because it is personal (or regimental) rather than institutional. It is not an organizational justice issue (Scandura, 1997) because it is not organizationally driven. To legitimize the practice by having senior people select or be assigned juniors to "bring along" might be seen by some as favoritism, elitism, and promotion by riding on the coattails of senior officers (Bagnal and Merriwether, 1985).

For the sponsorship and protection, exposure and challenging assignments aspects of mentoring to gain acceptance in the CF, CF culture would have to change. It would have to be accepted that not all of those individual who are entolled have equal chance of reaching senior levels and not everybody at every career stage is preparing for the next. If a formal mentoring programme were instituted, the culture would have to change from one of constant striving for career advancement to one of acceptance of career limitations if one had not been assigned or managed to acquire a mentor.

Is Mentoring Required?

If some form of mentoring is considered acceptable, is it required? Or are the functions of the mentor already being performed by somebody else? In studies that have asked employees if they have had a mentor, and to identify the mentor, between 50 and 85 percent responded that their immediate supervisor was their mentor (Burke et al., 1993; Burke & McKeen, 1997; Eby, 2000; Riley & Wrench, 1985). Perhaps such high percentages are a result of respondents being confused about the role of a mentor or it could be that supervisors are already performing many of the traditional functions of the mentor. Many studies have shown that, in particular, the psychosocial functions of mentoring: role modeling, counselling, acceptance, and friendship are adequately provided by many people in the organization (Chao & Gardner , 1992; Allen, Russell, & Maetzke, 1997; Koberg, Boss & Goodman, 1998). Role modeling, or leading by example, and counselling for improved performance are basics tenet of military culture expected of every supervisor. Modeling appropriate behaviours and values is such an important function of the CF supervisor that "Ethics and Values" is a performance criterion on the CF Personnel Evaluation Report (PER). Friendship and acceptance are provided by friends, co-workers, peer-mentors and in organizations where transformational leadership is practiced, by supervisors. A military organization, in particular, because of the emphasis placed on morale and cohesion, is committed to ensuring members find friendship and acceptance.

Many career functions are also adequately provided by supervisors and others; in many cases to a greater degree than by non-supervisor mentors, because the supervisor has more contact with his people than the mentor has with his protégé (Eby, et al., 1999; Burke & McKeen, 1997). Coaching to improve performance and potential is the responsibility of every leader in the CF while the responsibility to provide challenging assignments is shared by the supervisor for short assignments (tasks) and the career management system for long term assignments (postings). McGuire (2001-2002) points out that in the US military, "each service has identified

developmental commands and positions where the most promising officers are assigned" (p.92). The same is likely true in the CF.

Developing subordinates is the underlying goal of mentoring. In the CF, this is a supervisory or leadership responsibility and like Ethics and Values it is such a key responsibility that it is one of the 16 performance requirement on the CF Personnel Evaluation Report. Protection from unwarranted criticism is the responsibility every leader has to his subordinates and the smoothing over of errors should not be required if, as recommended in Canadian Officership in the 21st Century: Officer Professional Development 2020, the CF "develop(s) an environment tolerant of mistakes" (p. I-34). In an environment that accepts mistakes as a consequence of stretching ones capabilities in the interest of professional growth, the protection of a mentor is not required. No smoothing over of errors is required because honest errors are acceptable and expected. Errors resulting from negligence should not be smoothed over or accepted. Mentors who smooth over negligence are not supporting the organization.

The last two career functions of the mentor, sponsorship and exposure, are easily accomplished by a career management system that includes an element of succession planning (Dougherty & Dreyer, 1997).

Mentoring practices occur throughout the CF, albeit under different names. The senior subaltern in an Army unit performs many mentoring functions for young officers new to the unit and regiment, in particular one of the most important, the teaching of customs and traditions. As has been reported in the military literature, Senior NCOs in all Branches of the CF play a major role in the early development of young officers and as such are a type of mentor, offering advice and guidance, and at times protection or defence from the criticism of others in the Senior NCO ranks. Many units assign a sponsor to new arrivals to indoctrinate them to the unit and help them learn the ropes.

The role of the Officers Mess as well as the Senior NCOs and Warrant Officers Mess and even the Junior Ranks Club cannot be ignored. These institutions provide the opportunity for junior and senior CF members to meet and interact in a social atmosphere. It is here that older, more influential members can meet junior members on a more personal footing and form a guiding relationship or meet to carry out the relationship. This, after all, is the role of the mess, a role used to best advantage only if inter-rank and inter-work group mingling occurs. Mess dinners also provide an opportunity for more personal interaction. Opportunities for interaction between junior and senior members are lost, however, if seating is arranged by rank. Practices in the Royal Australian Regiment (RAR) are instructive here. On attending a 3 RAR Mess Dinner in the mid 1970s, the author noted that the Commanding Officer and Field Officers sat among the Captains and Subalterns rather than at the head table. While it is not suggested that being seatmates implies a mentoring relationship, certain of the mentoring functions could occur and the experience could facilitate the initiation of a mentoring relationship.

In the CF, many of the functions of the mentor are expected of the supervisor in the exercising of leadership. The superimposing of a mentor on the leader-follower relationship would require some care. The functions and responsibilities of each would have to be clear so as to avoid the perception of interference of the mentor in supervisory functions. In the type of informal mentoring arrangements currently practiced, such interference is largely avoided as mentors and protégés maintain a low key relationship which is largely unacknowledged. If a formal programme were introduced to match mentors and protégés, care would have to be taken to involve the supervisor.

Will Mentoring Succeed?

In order to determine whether or not mentoring would be successful, it must be determined what mentoring is meant to accomplish. The aims of mentoring mentioned in the literature include: succession planning, development of

subordinates, indoctrination of new employees and equitable treatment of disadvantaged groups. Most of the research on mentoring has focused on succession planning and equitable treatment. Much of this research (Chao, 1997; Chao & Gardener, 1992; Dreyer & Ash, 1990; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura, 1992; Turban & Dougherty, 1994; Whitely et al, 1991) has confirmed that mentored individuals have more success in their careers, as measured by compensation, promotion, and job satisfaction, than their non-mentored peers. What is not clear is if mentoring makes the difference, or if the type of person who seeks mentoring, or is sought out by a mentor, is more ambitious or competent. Scandura (1998) concluded that it might not be that mentors make protégés better performers but that better performers become protégés.

Numerous terms (bootlicker, brown-noser being two of the least offensive) are part of the CF lexicon to describe a person who curries favour with superiors. Generally speaking, peers, superiors, and even subordinates frown on such behaviour. Careerism, "placing personal success ahead of the good of the service" and "looking upwards to please subordinates rather than downward to fulfil the legitimate needs of subordinates" (Kellett, 1982, p.160) is considered to be an insult to the military ethos and was considered a major contribution to problems in the Vietnam War era US military. If the proactive seeking of mentor sponsors is to be a legitimate aspect of military mentoring, care will have to be taken to ensure it is not perceived as organizationally sanctioned careerism.

Some writers (Darwin, 2000; Kram, 1983; Whitely et al., 1991) have suggested that as a succession planning strategy, mentoring is deficient because mentors tend to select as protégés, subordinates with similar characteristics to themselves. This ensures that the organization's culture will be maintained and precludes the rapid change sometimes required to maintain competitiveness in this rapidly changing world. OPDP 2020 speaks of the necessary realignment of attitudes and philosophies (p. 1). The next generation of leaders, in order to lead this realignment, must embody attitudes and philosophies conducive to change. These

may not be the attitudes and philosophies of the leaders of today. If future leaders are to usher in change, mentoring may be inappropriate because "mentoring is more appropriate to a society intent on maintaining the status quo than one undergoing rapid change" (Darwin, 2000).

Mentoring has been suggested as a means of assisting members of disadvantaged groups, in particular women and minorities, advance in the workplace (Baum, 1992; Frey & Noler, 1986; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1986; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Ragins & Scandura, 1977; Reich, 1985). This certainly would be advantageous to the CF. Unfortunately, informal mentoring has largely been unavailable to these groups (Burke, 1993; Darwin, 2000; Dreyer & Dougherty, 1997; Noe, 1988; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Turbon & Dougherty, 1994) partly because, as stated in the previous paragraph, without organizational intervention, mentors chose people like themselves as protégés (Darwin, 2000; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Eby et al, 2000). Formal programmes have been suggested as a means of overcoming obstacles to disadvantaged groups forming informal relationships but formal mentoring has failed to demonstrate the same results as informal mentoring (Chao etal., 1992; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Scandura, 1997).

Another disadvantaged group is members of lower social origins. Research by Whitely, Dougherty, and Dreher (1991) has suggested that upper class organizational members benefit more from mentoring than lower classes and Kram.(1986) has suggested that individuals who are uncomfortable with authority would be less likely to approach a mentor. This is of particular importance for the CF. The CF considers itself to be an egalitarian organization where social class is irrelevant and merit the only determinant of success. If mentoring favours the upper class, the practice is at odds with the avowed culture.

Semi-formal mentoring as suggested by Knackstedt (2000) may overcome some of these problems. In semi-formal mentoring, the organization provides legitimacy to the process by offering education, training and opportunities for

prospective mentors and protégés to meet and initiate a relationship. In informal mentoring, the organization does not assign mentors to protégés. This form of mentoring offers the advantages of being available to everybody, minimizing the stigma of informal arrangements or the favouritism of formal programmes. Mess life already offers the opportunity to initiate relationships. An education and training programme in which the focus of mentoring is on what Ingraham (1987) calls giving the junior officer a "glimpse of the context in which the superior makes decisions" (p. 47), would do much to dispel any stigma attached to learning relationships between junior and senior members.

Primary or classical mentoring, as discussed earlier, is altruistically provided and of long duration – from three to eight years. Given the short posting cycle for many military personnel and the phases of the mentoring relationship (Kram, 1986), protégés risk deriving limited benefits from classical mentoring because they would be posted before the relationship became fruitful and long distance mentoring has been found wanting (Noe, 1988). Secondary mentoring might be more effective because the less personal nature of the relationship relies on shorter periods of interaction to reach the point of maximum effectiveness. On the other hand, the effectiveness of the relationship cannot match that of primary mentoring and a long distance secondary mentoring relationship is even less likely to endure than a long distance primary mentoring relationship.

Conclusion

The requirement for this paper was to conduct a survey of the literature and provide an integrative review addressing the following question:

"A key factor in many leadership development
programs is the role of more senior individuals as
mentors or coaches. How should this function be

understood, and in particular, what are the implications

in a hierarchical organization such as the military?"

Although the question this paper has addressed assumes that coaches and mentors are the same, the literature suggests coaching is but one of nine mentoring functions. The other eight functions of mentoring are sponsorship, protection, exposure, challenging assignments, role modeling, counselling, acceptance, and friendship. Not all functions need be promoted by the organization. Before mentoring is organizationally sanctioned, or a formal programme introduced, a number of issues must be considered. First, it must be determined which of the nine functions are compatible with organizational values. Second, it must be determined which functions are currently performed inadequately and for which groups. Third, it must be determined whether mentoring is the best means of addressing the inadequacy, and fourth, there must be reasonable assurances that mentoring can have the desired effect. Only after these issues are resolved should mentoring be considered.

Forms of mentoring discussed include a mentorship style of leadership (Bagnal and Merriwether 1985), semi-formal mentoring (Knackstedt, 2000), informal mentoring (Kram, 1986 and others), and formal mentoring (Kram, 1986 and others). If mentoring it determined to be the best means of addressing deficiencies it must be determined what form of mentoring is most appropriate.

A final point concerns terminology. Although mentor and protégé have been used throughout this paper, they are not necessarily the most appropriate terms for the CF. Appropriate terms, if labels are required at all, can only be suggested once the scope of the mentoring has been decided.

References

A guide to mentoring students www.http:// publicdervice.tbs-sct.gc.ca_pol /hrpubs/
TB_856agtms1_e.html#_Toc490552.

Allen, T.D., Poteet, M.L., Russell, J.E., & Dobbins, G.H. (1997). A field study of
factors related to supervisors' willingness to mentor others. Journal of
Vocational Behaviour, 50, 1-22.

Allen, T.D., Poteet, M.L., & Russell, J.E. (2000). Protégé selection by mentor: What
makes the difference? Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 21, 271-282.

Allen, T.D., Russell, J.E.A., & Maetzke, S.B. (1997). Formal Peer mentoring:
Factors related to protégés' satisfaction and willingness to mentor others.
Group and Organizational Management, 22, (4), 488-507.

Aryee, S., Chay, Y.W., & Chew, J. (1996). The motivation to mentor among
managerial employees. Group and Organizational Management, 21, (3), 261-
277.

Bagnal, Lieutenant-general C.W., Pence, E.C., & Meriweather, Lieutenant-Colonel
T.N., (1985, july). Leaders as mentors. Military Review, 4-20.

Baum, H.S. (1992). Mentoring: Narcissistic fantasies and oedipal realities. Human
Relations, 45, (3), 223-229

Burke, R.J. & McKeen, C.A. (1989). Developing formal mentoring programs in
organizations. Business Quarterly Winter, 76-79.

Burke, R.J., & McKeen, C.A. (1997). Benefits of mentoring relationships among managerial and professional women: A cautionary tale. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 51, 43-57.

Burke, R.J., McKeen, C.A., & McKenna, C. (1991). How do mentors differ from typical supervisory relationships. Psychological Reports, 68, 459-466.

Burke, R.J., McKeen, C.A., & McKenna, C. (1993). Correlates of mentoring in organizations: The mentor's perspective. Psychological Reports, 72, 883-896.

Chao, G.T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 51, 15-28.

Chao,G.T., Walz, P.M., & Gardner, P.D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring fuctions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. Personal Psychology, 45, 619-636.

Darwin, A. (2000). Critical reflections on mentoring in work settings. Adult Education Quarterly, 50, (3), 197-211.

Dreher, G.F., & Ash,R.A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 539-546.

Dreyer, G.F. & Dougherty, T.W. (1997) Substitutes for career mentoring: Promoting equal opportunity through career management and assessment systems. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 51, 110-124.

Dubois, M.M. (1969). Dictionnaire modern francais-anglais. Paris: Librairie Larousse.

Eby, L.T. (1997). Alternative forms of mentoring in changing organizational environments: A conceptual extension of the mentoring literature. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 51, 125-144.

Elby, L.T., McManus, S.E., Simon, S.A., & Russell, J.E. (2000). The protégés perspective regarding negative mentoring experiences: The development of a taxonomy. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 57, 1-21.

Fagenson, E.A. (1989). The mentor advantage: perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 10, 309-320.

Fagenson, E.A. (1992). Mentoring – who needs it? A comparison of protégés and nonprotégés needs for power, achievement, affiliation and autonomy. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 41, 48-60.

Fagenson-Eland, E.A., Marks, M.A. & Amendola, K.L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring relationships. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 51, 29-42.

Frey, B.R., & Noller, R.B., (1986). Mentoring: A promise for the future. Journal of Creative Behaviour, 20, 149-151.

Hunt,D.M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. Academy of Management Review, 8, 475-485.

Ingraham, Lieutenant-Colonel L.H., (1987, December). An uninvited talk to army leaders. Military Review, 45-48.

Jolemore, Major-General K.A. (1986, July). The mentor: More than a teacher, more than a coach. Military Review, 5-17.

Kellett A. (1982). <u>Combat motivation: The behaviour of soldiers in battle</u>. Boston: Klower Nijhoff.

Kingseed, Lieutenant Colonel C.C. (1990, October). Mentoring general Ike. <u>Military Review</u>, 26-30.

Knackstedt, J.E.U. (2000). <u>Organizational mentoring: What about protégé needs</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, Waterloo.

Knackstedt, J. (2001, March). Mentoring in organizations, unpublished paper.

Koberg, C.S., Boss, R.W., & Goodman, E. (1998). Factors and outcomes associated with mentoring among health-care professionals. <u>Journal of Vocational Behaviour</u>, <u>53</u>, 58-72.

Kram, K.E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>26</u> (4), 608-625.

Kram K.E. (1986). Mentoring in the workplace. In Douglas T. Hall and associates (Eds.), <u>Career Development in Organizations</u> (pp 160-201). San Francisco: Jose-Bass.

Maggert Major-General L.E., & James, Colonel J.S. (1999, May-June). Mentoring – A critical element in leader development. <u>Military Review</u>, 86-87.

McGuire, M.A., (2001-02, Autumn/Winter). Senior officers and strategic leader development. <u>Joint Forces Quarterly</u>, 91-96.

Minister of Supply and Services Canada (1995) Official Languages and
Employment Equity Branch guidelines for development of a
mentoring program. Ottawa, ON: Treasury Board of Canada.

Noe, R.A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned
mentoring relationships. Personnel Psychology, 41, 457-479.

Olian, J.D., Carroll, S.J., Giannatonio, C.M, & Feren D.B. (1988). What do protégés
look for in a mentor? Results of three experimental studies. Journal of
Vocational Behaviour, 33, 15-37.

Orpen, C. (1995). The effects of mentoring on employee's career success. The
Journal of Social Psychology. 135, (5), 667-668.

Ostroff, C. & Kozlowski, S.W. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information
gathering process of newcomers during early organizational socialization.
Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 42, 170-183.

Ragins, B.E., & Cotton, J.L. (1999) Mentor functions and outcomes: A comparison of
men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. Journal of
Applied Psychology, 84 (4), 529-550.

Ragins, B.E., & Scandura, T.A. (1997) The way we were: Gender and termination of
the mentoring relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 945-953.

Ragins, B.R., & Scandura, T.A. (1999). Burdon or blessing: Expected costs and
benefits of being a mentor. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 20, 493-509.

Reich, M.H. (1985). The mentor connection. Personnel, February, 50-56.

Russell, J.E., & Adams, D.M. (1997). The changing nature of mentoring in organizations: An introduction to the special issue on mentoring in organizations. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 51, 1-14.

Scandura, T.A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 13, 169-174.

Scandura, T.A. (1997). Mentoring and organizational justice: An empirical investigation. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 51, 58-69.

Scandura, T.A. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes. Journal of Management, 24, (3), 449-467.

Scandura, T.A. & Schriesheim, C.A. (1994). Leader-member exchange and supervisory career mentoring as complimentary constructs in leadership research. Academy of Management Journal, 37, (6), 1588-1602.

Sorley, L. (1988, August). In search of a mentor. Military Review, 70-79.

Sosik, J.J., & Godshalk, V.M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 21, 365-390.

Steele, Lieutenant-General W.M., Walters, Lieutenant-Colonel R.P., (2001, July-August). Training and developing army leaders. Military Review, 2-9.

Turban, D.B., & Dougherty, T.W. (1994). Role of protégé personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. Academy of Management Journal, 37, (3), 688-702.

Whitely, W., Dougherty, T.W. & Dreher, G.F., (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>34</u>, (2), 331-351.

Whitely, W., Dougherty, T.W., & Dreher, G.F. (1992). Correlates of career-oriented mentoring for early carrer managers and professionals. <u>Journal of Organizational Behaviour</u>, <u>13</u>, 141-154.

Wild, B. (2001 July). <u>Generals and flag officers: Why they leave</u>. (Paper prepared for Director of Human Resources Research and Evaluation). Ottawa ON: National Defence Headquarters.

Young, A.M., & Perrewe, P.L. (in press). The exchange relationship between mentors and protégés: the development of a framework. <u>Human Resource Management Review</u>.