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We used structural equation modeling to investigate relationships among protégés' personality characteristics, initiation of mentoring, mentoring received, and career success for 147 managers and professionals. Protégés influenced the amounts of mentoring they received by initiating relationships with mentors. Internal locus of control, high self-monitoring, and high emotional stability enhanced initiation, which mediated the relationships between personality characteristics and mentoring received. The latter was related to career attainment and perceived career success, and career attainment influenced perceived success. Finally, protégé gender was not related to initiation or mentoring received.

Mentoring is a set of role activities, including coaching, support, and sponsorship, that upper-level managers provide to protégés (Kram, 1985). Recent research indicates that mentoring enhances the compensation, promotions, and pay satisfaction of the employees who receive it (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Scandura, 1992; Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991). Although research has identified outcomes of mentoring, we know very little about the initial formation of mentoring relationships (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Much of the scholarly and popular writing on mentoring appears to assume that mentors seek out protégés, yet little research has investigated the formation of mentoring relationships. Nonetheless, as Hunt and Michael (1983) noted, certain individuals may attempt to initiate relationships with possible mentors. We addressed calls in the literature to investigate whether protégés' characteristics influenced the mentoring they received (Fagenson, 1989; Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Specifically, we proposed that individuals' personality characteristics influence the extent to which they report attempts to initiate mentoring relationships, which is, in turn related to their reports of mentoring received. We also investigated whether mentoring received is related
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to career attainment and perceived career success and whether protégé gender is related to attempts to initiate mentoring relationships and to receipt of mentoring.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

Protégé Personality Characteristics

Although many possible personality characteristics might influence people’s attempts to initiate mentoring relationships, the personality characteristics investigated should (1) influence perceptions of and reactions to an individual’s environment and (2) have acceptable measurement instruments. The personality characteristics we chose to investigate—locus of control, self-monitoring, and emotional stability, measured as self-esteem and negative affectivity—met both those criteria. Further, we chose to investigate these personality characteristics because they appeared to be indicators of proactive behaviors leading to interactions with others in an environment, and therefore would be expected to influence the initiation of mentoring.

Locus of control. Locus of control measures the extent to which individuals believe that rewards and outcomes are controlled by their own actions or by external forces in their environments (Rotter, 1966; Spector, 1982); the former individuals have been labeled “internals,” the latter, “externals.” Evidence indicates that internals are more likely to attempt to influence their environments, to obtain job-relevant information, and to expect that effort will lead to rewards (Spector, 1982). Additionally, as Noe (1988a) noted, because internals are more likely than externals to believe that they can improve their skills, they are more likely to participate in developmental activities, such as mentoring relationships.

Self-monitoring. Self-monitoring measures the extent to which individuals vary in their sensitivity to social cues and in their ability to adapt their behavior to the requirements of a situation (Snyder, 1987). Individuals high on self-monitoring are sensitive to social cues, can modify their behavior using those cues, are concerned with behaving in a situationally appropriate manner, and change their behaviors on the basis of what they believe is appropriate for a situation. Those low on self-monitoring lack either the ability or the motivation to change their behavior to fit situations, rely less on social cues to regulate their behavior, and therefore behave more consistently across situations. Because “high self-monitors” are more sensitive to interpersonal and social cues than “low self-monitors,” the former are likely to be more aware of the value of mentoring for success in organizations. Therefore, we expected that self-monitoring would be positively related to initiating mentoring experiences.

Emotional stability. We measured emotional stability, one of the “big five” personality dimensions (Digman, 1990), in terms of self-esteem and negative affectivity. Self-esteem refers to how favorably individuals evaluate
themselves; high-self-esteem individuals evaluate themselves more positively and believe they are more capable and competent than low-self-esteem individuals (Brockner, 1988). Self-esteem influences behavior in such a way that low-self-esteem individuals are more likely to withdraw from esteem-threatening situations like challenging tasks, have less confidence in their abilities to accomplish challenging assignments, are less likely to seek feedback, and see themselves as less appealing partners (Brockner, 1988; Campbell, 1990). Negative affectivity is a relatively stable dimension of individual differences characterized by a tendency to experience negative emotional states (Levin & Stokes, 1989; Watson & Clark, 1984). High-negative-affectivity individuals tend to focus on negative aspects of other people and themselves, to feel nervous, tense, and dissatisfied, to report stress, and to be hostile, demanding, and distant. Emotional stability is indicated by high self-esteem and low negative affectivity.

Because mentoring relationships involve, in part, a mentor helping a protegé obtain assignments that are highly visible to upper-level managers and then providing feedback to the protegé, we expected that individuals with low emotional stability would be less likely to initiate mentoring relationships because such individuals, who lack confidence, will not seek out challenging assignments and will not want to increase their level of nervousness and tension by establishing relationships with upper-level managers.

Hypothesis 1: Individuals who are internals in locus of control, high on self-monitoring, and high in emotional stability will initiate more mentoring relationships than individuals who are externals, low on self-monitoring, and low in emotional stability.

Initiating Mentoring and Mentoring Received

Very little research has investigated why some individuals receive more mentoring than others (Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1992). We extended earlier efforts by hypothesizing that individuals who initiate mentoring relationships will report receiving more mentoring. Although this hypothesis seems almost self-evident, because very little research has investigated potential protégés' ability to influence the formation of mentoring relationships, we empirically examined whether reports of initiating mentoring relationships were related to the reported amount of mentoring received. Additionally, if, as discussed earlier, individuals with certain personality characteristics are more likely to initiate mentoring, such individuals would be expected to receive more mentoring than those without such characteristics. We expected, however, that protégé personality characteristics would not influence the mentoring received directly, but would do so indirectly, by influencing the initiation of mentoring. Although protégés with certain personality characteristics may be more likely to be chosen by mentors, we
investigated the characteristics that might lead people to attempt to initiate mentoring relationships, rather than focusing on characteristics that might lead potential mentors to choose protégés. Therefore, we expected initiation of mentoring to mediate the relationship between personality characteristics and the mentoring received.

Hypothesis 2: Protégés’ initiation of mentoring will be related positively to the mentoring they receive and will mediate the relationship between their personality traits and the mentoring received.

Career success. Recent evidence indicates that mentoring experiences are related to career success (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Scandura, 1992; Whitely et al., 1991). We replicated and extended those studies by investigating the relationship between mentoring, career attainment, and perceived career success. Career success has typically been measured with relatively objective measures such as salary and promotions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Scandura, 1992; Whitely et al., 1991). Researchers have argued, however, that definitions of career success should also incorporate individuals’ perceptions of their career success, which might not parallel objective measures (Collin & Young, 1986; Cox & Harquail, 1991; Hall, 1976). Therefore, heeding calls for the use of both objective and subjective career success measures (Collin & Young, 1986), we measured both respondents’ perceptions of their success and career attainment, defining the latter as salary and promotions. We expected that the mentoring individuals received would positively influence both their career attainment and perceived career success and that career attainment would positively influence perceived career success.

Hypothesis 3: The mentoring received by an individual will be related positively to his or her career attainment and perceived career success.

Hypothesis 4: Career attainment will be related positively to perceived career success.

Protégé gender. Because there are more men at high levels of organizations and therefore more potential male mentors than female ones, often a woman who desires a mentoring relationship must acquire a mentor of the opposite sex. Scholars have, however, suggested that women face many barriers to establishing cross-gender mentoring relationships, because women may be less likely than men to initiate mentoring relationships and others in an organization may view such relationships as sexual (Clawson & Kram, 1984; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Noe, 1988b; Ragins, 1989; Ragins & Cotton, 1991). We found no study that investigated gender differences in initiating mentor relationships, although some evidence indicates no differences between men and women in mentoring received (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Ragins & Cotton, 1991; Whitely et al., 1992). Making no specific predictions about protégé gender, we investigated whether it influences the initiation of mentoring and the amount of mentoring received.
METHODS

Respondents and Setting

We mailed surveys to 550 graduates of a large midwestern university who had obtained bachelor’s degrees in management during the years 1979 to 1988, obtaining addresses from the alumni association. For years in which the number of available addresses was less than 50, we mailed surveys to all the graduates, and for years in which the number of addresses was greater than 50, we mailed surveys to at least 52 graduates. The number of surveys mailed ranged from 42 to 61 across the years of data collection, and 94 percent of the available addresses were used. Of the 550 surveys mailed, 9 were undeliverable and 197 were returned, for a response rate of 36 percent. We eliminated individuals who reported working fewer than 35 hours per week, who were self-employed or worked in family-owned businesses, or who had missing data on any of the measures. The 147 respondents averaged 29 years of age; 49 percent were women (N = 72), and 64 percent were married.

Our respondents were representative of the individuals to whom we mailed surveys for gender and year of graduation: \( \chi^2(1, N = 541) = 1.85, p \geq .05 \) and \( \chi^2(9, N = 541) = 5.82, p \geq .05 \).

Variables

Locus of control. We heeded calls to use a domain-specific measure rather than Rotter’s (1966) general locus-of-control scale and measured locus of control using Spector’s (1988) work locus-of-control measure with a seven-point response scale. Spector (1988) presented reliability and validity data for the instrument; for the current data, this 16-item measure had a coefficient alpha of .79. Lower scores indicate higher internality.

Self-monitoring. Self-monitoring was measured with Snyder’s (1987) 18-items measured on seven-point response scales ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” (\( \alpha = .81 \)).

Emotional stability. Self-esteem and negative affectivity were used as indicators of emotional stability. Applicants’ global self-esteem was measured with ten items (\( \alpha = .82 \)) adapted from Rosenberg (1965) and measured on seven-point scales. Negative affectivity was measured with 21 items (\( \alpha = .87 \)) from Levin and Stokes (1989).

Initiation of mentoring relationships. Respondents indicated, on seven-point scales, the extent to which they had (1) sought to become acquainted with higher-level managers, (2) made personal efforts to have their work become visible to higher-level managers, (3) taken the initiative to seek counseling and advice from higher-level managers, and (4) taken the initiative to find mentors in their organizations. The mean of these items (\( \alpha = .82 \)) measured the extent to which respondents initiated mentoring relationships.

Mentoring received. Mentoring received was measured with 18 items from Dreher and Ash (1990) and introduced by the stem “Consider your career history since graduating from our program and the degree to which influential managers have served as your sponsor or mentor (this need not be
limited to one person).” We conducted a principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Application of the scree test and the eigenvalues-greater-than-1.0 criterion yielded three factors that accounted for 66 percent of the variance of the items. Scales were created as the means of items that had factor loadings greater than .40 for that factor only. The first factor, psychosocial mentoring, included nine items (α = .93) reflecting psychosocial functions; examples are “conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings you have discussed with him/her” and “conveyed feelings of respect for you as an individual.” The second factor, career-related mentoring, included four items (α = .88), such as “given or recommended you for assignments that required contact with managers in different parts of the company” and “given or recommended you for assignments that increased your contact with higher level managers.” Finally, the third factor, protection and assistance, included these two items (r = .48): “protected you from working with other managers or work units before you knew about their likes/dislikes, opinions on controversial topics, and the nature of the political environment” and “helped you finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete.”

Career attainment. Respondents reported the dollar amounts of their current salaries. In addition, we measured promotions as did Whitely and colleagues (1991), asking respondents to indicate the numbers of promotions they had received since graduation. In an attempt to verify our career attainment measures, we conducted phone interviews, approximately two and a half years after the surveys were completed, that asked a subgroup of the respondents their current salaries and the numbers of promotions they had received since graduation. We attempted to contact all respondents but did not have correct phone numbers for 79 of them. We were able to reach 33 of the remaining 68 respondents. We obtained promotion data from all 33 respondents, but for various reasons (a respondent was currently unemployed, in school, or the like), we obtained salary data from only 25. The correlation for promotions across the time period was .84, and for salary it was .80, both significant at the .0001 level. Such results provide evidence for the accuracy of the career attainment measures.

Perceived career success. Perceived career success was measured with these four items (α = .87): “How successful has your career been?” “Compared to your coworkers, how successful is your career?” “How successful do your ‘significant others’ feel your career has been?” and “Given your age, do you think that your career is on ‘schedule,’ or ahead or behind schedule?” The items we used, adapted from Gibson (1989), are similar to those used by Munson and Posner (1980). Further, Lawrence (1984) found that perceptions of being behind, on, or ahead of schedule were related to satisfaction with career progress and to work attitudes such as commitment.

Control variables. We controlled for seven variables thought to influence salary and promotions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Whitely et al., 1991). Education level was coded 1 for a bachelor’s, 2 for a master’s, and 3 for a doctoral degree; work history was coded 1 for noncontinuous and 2 for
continuous; years since graduation was the difference between the year a respondent received the bachelor’s degree and 1991; functional area (e.g., financial, sales-purchasing) was coded using five categories described by Whitely and colleagues (1991); and organization size was measured with eight categories ranging from 1–50 employees to 50,000+ employees. Finally, each respondent identified his or her gender (1 = man, 2 = woman) and marital status (1 = married, 2 = single).

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Method Variance Analyses

We conducted two analyses to investigate possible effects of method variance. First, we conducted a principal components analysis that included the initiation of mentoring, the mentoring received, and the perceived career success items to investigate the measures’ discriminant validity. Results indicated that the items measuring mentoring received loaded on the same three factors as when they were analyzed separately, the initiation-of-mentoring items formed a single factor, and the perceived-career-success items formed a single factor, providing some support for the discriminant validity of these measures. Additionally, using a procedure discussed by McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis, creating a single-factor model in which all our measures loaded on one factor, a method variance factor. The single-factor model did not fit the data as well as our theoretical model, as is discussed further below.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations of the variables. With the exception of the strong negative correlation between negative affectivity and self-esteem ($r = -.71$), the correlations among the personality measures were of low to moderate strength. The correlations among the three scales of mentoring received ranged from .30 to .52.

Gender Research Questions

The results of a $t$-test indicated that protégé gender was unrelated to initiating mentoring ($t_{45} = -.84$). Additionally, gender was not related to psychosocial mentoring ($t_{145} = -1.1$), career-related mentoring ($t_{145} = -1.4$), and protection and assistance ($t_{145} = -.26$). Such results indicate no differences between men and women in attempts to initiate mentoring relationships and in mentoring received. We therefore combined the data from men and women to investigate our hypotheses.

Structural Equation Model

We used structural equation modeling to investigate the proposed relationships among personality characteristics, initiation of mentoring, mentoring received, career attainment, and perceived career success. Structural equation modeling simultaneously investigates relationships and provides
| Variables                      | Means | s.d.  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   | 20   | 21   |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Education level            | 1.25  | 0.47  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Continuous work history    | 1.67  | 0.47  | -0.06|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Years since graduation     | 7.16  | 2.76  | 0.27 | 0.02 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Financial position         | 1.03  | 0.18  | 0.02 | -0.31| -0.01|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Sales-purchasing position  | 1.10  | 0.31  | -0.14| -0.08| -0.32| -0.07|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. Other professional position| 1.20  | 0.46  | 0.04 | -0.03| -0.04| -1.12| -0.22|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Technical position         | 1.05  | 0.21  | 0.15 | -0.05| -0.01| -0.04| -0.08| -0.14|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 8. Organization size          | 5.20  | 2.15  | 0.14 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.05 | -0.13| -0.14| 0.10 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 9. Gender                     | 1.49  | 0.50  | -0.03| -1.13| -1.17| 0.12 | -0.05| 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.08 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 10. Marital status            | 1.38  | 0.48  | -0.07| -0.01| -0.23| 0.02 | -0.19| -0.03| -0.06| 0.09 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 11. Locus of control          | 2.96  | 0.65  | -0.15| -0.03| -0.05| -0.07| -0.15| 0.02 | -0.07| 0.24 | 0.79 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 12. Self-monitoring           | 4.07  | 0.73  | 0.05 | -0.03| -0.07| -0.18| -0.07| -0.05| 0.08 | -0.15| -0.08| -0.07| -0.13| 0.81 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 13. Self-esteem               | 6.07  | 0.67  | 0.24 | -0.02| 0.01 | -1.10| -0.11| 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.12 | -0.03| -0.20| -0.40| 0.01 | -0.72|      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 14. Negative affectivity      | 2.91  | 0.69  | -0.21| -0.03| 0.04 | 0.10 | -0.06| -0.07| 0.06 | -0.06| 0.06 | -0.20| 0.39 | -0.10| -0.71| 0.87 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 15. Initiation of mentoring   | 4.23  | 1.27  | 0.17 | 0.05 | -1.12| -0.09| 0.02 | -0.03| 0.01 | 0.07 | -0.24| -0.21| 0.31 | 0.24 | -0.22| 0.82 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 16. Psychosocial mentoring    | 4.20  | 1.33  | 0.11 | -1.12| 0.10 | -0.09| -0.04| -0.16| 0.18 | -0.06| 0.09 | -0.06| -0.28| 0.13 | 0.20 | -0.13| 0.47 | 0.83 |      |      |      |      |
| 17. Career-related mentoring  | 4.58  | 1.32  | 0.24 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.05 | -0.21| -0.12| 0.23 | 0.18 | -0.12| -0.19| 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.14 | -0.19| 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.88 |      |      |
| 18. Protection and assistance | 2.67  | 1.29  | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.05 | -0.07| -0.01| 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.05 | -0.12| 0.21 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.42 | 0.45 | 0.30 | 0.64 |      |
| 19. Number of promotions      | 2.08  | 2.01  | 0.19 | 0.23 | 0.10 | -0.25| -0.16| 0.03 | 0.08 | -0.07| -0.05| 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.09 | -0.10| 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.30 | 0.06 |      |      |
| 20. Salary                    | 33,908| 13,536| 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.46 | -0.24| -0.13| 0.01 | 0.30 | -0.25| -0.18| -0.18| 0.13 | 0.10 | -0.16| 0.14 | 0.17 | 0.35 | 0.10 | 0.41 |      |
| 21. Perceived career success  | 4.96  | 1.10  | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.20 | -0.10| -0.11| -0.05| 0.10 | 0.08 | -0.04| -0.15| -0.38| 0.25 | 0.43 | -0.41| 0.33 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.14 | 0.39 | 0.51 | 0.87 |

* N = 147. The numbers in parentheses on the diagonal are coefficient alphas. Correlations greater than or equal to .16 are significant at the .05 level.
both an overall assessment of the fit of a hypothesized model to the data and tests of individual hypotheses. In order to estimate the latent variables measured with single indicators (locus of control, self-monitoring, initiation of mentoring, and perceived career success), we took into account the effects of random measurement error by setting the error variance at 1.0 minus alpha-squared times the variance of a given variable (Bollen, 1989; Hayduk, 1987). Additionally, we regressed salary and promotions on the seven control variables and saved the residualized values, each of which reflects an individual's salary and number of promotions after removal of the effects of the control variables. The structural equation modeling analyses were conducted using the covariance matrix with the residualized salary and promotions and the generalized-least-squares estimation technique.

Following procedures discussed by various authors, we estimated several models and compared them to a null model (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988). We estimated (1) a null model, which was used as a baseline model, (2) an uncorrelated-latent-variables model in which the manifest variables loaded on the latent constructs and there were no paths between the latent variables, (3) the theoretical model presented in Figure 1, and (4) the theoretical model with additional paths from the personality variables to mentoring received, which provided a test of whether the personality characteristics had direct effects on mentoring received above and beyond the indirect effects through initiation of mentoring. We assessed the overall fits of the models with chi-square, the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), the Bentler-Bonett (1980) normed-fit index (NFI), and the Tucker-Lewis (1973) index (TLI). In general, values for those three indexes range from 0.0 to 1.0, and although there are no absolute values considered to constitute an acceptable fit (Marsh et al., 1988), larger values indicate a better fit of a model to data.

As can be seen by examining Figure 1, all the personality constructs influenced initiation of mentoring in the directions predicted by Hypothesis 1. Additionally, in support of the first part of Hypothesis 2, initiation of mentoring influenced mentoring received. Mentoring received positively influenced career attainment and perceived career success, in support of Hypothesis 3. Finally, career attainment positively influenced perceived career success, providing support for Hypothesis 4. The theoretical model fit the data moderately well; although the chi-square was significant ($\chi^2_{[40, N = 147]} = 69.30, p \leq .0028$), the ratio of chi-square to the degrees of freedom, 1.73, was below the recommended 2.00, and the goodness-of-fit index was .91, the normed-fit index was .59, and the Tucker-Lewis index was .64. Although the latter two values were not large, the goodness-of-fit value and the chi-square-to-degrees-of-freedom ratio suggest the model does fit the data relatively well. Further, the theoretical model provided a significantly better fit than the null, uncorrelated-latent-variables, or one-factor models, and the fit indexes were considerably larger for the theoretical model than for the alternatives. For example, the results for the one-factor model ($\chi^2_{[45, N = 147]} = 132.6, p \leq .0001, GFI = .83, NFI = .21, TLI = .05$) indicate that
FIGURE 1
Structural Model

*Statistics are standardized path coefficients. All coefficients are significant at p < .05, one-tailed test.
the theoretical model provides a better fit to the data than a model that has all variables loading on a single factor. Results indicate that initiation of mentoring mediates the relationship between the personality characteristics and mentoring received. We added paths from the personality characteristics directly to mentoring received to test for effects beyond the mediation through initiating mentoring. The addition of these three paths did not lead to a better fit ($\chi^2[3, N = 147] = 3.35, p \geq .05$), suggesting that, in support of the second part of Hypothesis 2, initiation of mentoring completely mediates the relationship between these personality constructs and mentoring received.

**DISCUSSION**

Our results provide insight into the initial formation of mentoring relationships in organizations. Results indicate that protégés can influence the amount of mentoring they receive. Specifically, individuals with internal loci of control and high self-monitoring and emotional stability were more likely to initiate and therefore to receive mentoring. Additionally, mentoring received was related to both career attainment and perceived career success, and career attainment also influenced perceived career success. Finally, protégé gender was not related to initiating mentoring or to mentoring received.

Although much of the research on mentoring has assumed that mentors choose protégés, our results indicate that individuals who engage in proactive behaviors to initiate mentoring report receiving more mentoring. Further, our results suggest that certain personality characteristics are related to the proactive behavior of initiating mentoring relationships. The view of employees as proactive agents who attempt to influence their environments—here, by initiating relationships with prospective mentors—corroborates recent research in areas such as socialization (Morrison, 1993) and feedback-seeking behavior (Ashford & Cummings, 1983) that has also found that employees engage in proactive behaviors in attempts to control environments. Our results must be viewed with caution, however, because we obtained self-reports of attempts to initiate mentoring and mentoring received rather than measures of actual behaviors. Nonetheless, in our results individuals with certain personality characteristics reported more proactive behaviors in initiating mentoring and reported receiving more mentoring.

Our results suggest that protégés’ personality characteristics are important determinants of the amount of mentoring they receive through influencing their attempts to initiate mentoring relationships. Future research should identify and investigate additional protégé personality traits related to attempts to initiate mentoring experiences. Additionally, research should investigate whether mentors are more likely to seek out protégés with certain personality traits. For example, mentors may avoid employees high in negative affectivity. Another important question is the extent to which personality influences the desire to become a mentor. As those studying mentoring have noted (Ragins & Cotton, 1993), scholars know very little about the
formation of mentoring relationships, although this is an important research area, given the benefits of mentoring.

Our results suggest that personality characteristics have an indirect influence on career attainment through influencing initiation of mentoring and mentoring received. Such results extend Howard and Bray's (1988) findings that personality characteristics influence career success by describing one mechanism through which personality influences success. Clearly, however, personality influences success in ways other than through mentoring. Recent evidence indicates that personality is related to job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Day & Silverman, 1989). Additional research should investigate mechanisms through which personality influences job performance and career attainment.

Protégé gender did not influence either the initiation of mentoring or the mentoring received. Such results, although corroborating other recent findings of no gender effects for mentoring received (Dreher & Ash, 1990), are contradictory to propositions that women are less likely to initiate mentoring relationships or to obtain mentoring experiences (Noe, 1988b; Ragins, 1989). Therefore, although recent empirical evidence suggests that men and women do not differ in the extents to which they seek out or receive mentoring, future research might investigate whether the quality of mentoring relationships differs for men and women. For example, the intensity and dynamics of mentoring relationships may be different for the two.

In support of earlier evidence, we found a positive relationship between mentoring received and career attainment (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Scandura, 1992; Whitely et al., 1991). Additionally, we extended earlier research and found that mentoring received was positively related to perceived career success and that career attainment was positively related to perceived career success. Given the recent evidence for the benefits of mentoring, we now need to more closely examine how mentoring influences career success. For example, mentoring may influence success because mentors recommend their protégés for challenging and visible assignments or because mentors model, or demonstrate, behaviors that are important for the protégés' success.

We acknowledge certain limitations of our study. First, our respondents were management-major graduates of one university, and therefore the generalizability of the results is unknown. Further, our response rate was not as high as we would have liked, and although we found no evidence of response bias, we cannot rule out the possibility that our respondents were not representative of the population from which we sampled. Additionally, respondents may have inflated their salaries in order to appear successful. Although we found a correlation of .80 for salary across a two-and-a-half-year period, and Dreher (1977) found self-reports of salary were highly correlated ($r = .91$) with company records, we were unable to verify respondents' actual salaries. The initiation-of-mentoring items were developed specifically for this study and need additional psychometric analyses. Further, research is needed to replicate the three mentoring-received factors indi-
icated by the factor analyses. Although the psychosocial and career-related factors are recognized in the mentoring literature, the protection and assistance factor was new. Although mentors are thought to provide protégés with protection and assistance (Kram, 1985), replication of the factor analyses is necessary to corroborate that these mentoring functions form one factor.

Because the data were collected at one point in time with a single instrument, method bias may have inflated the relationships. Nonetheless, the factor analysis results indicating that the items measuring initiation of mentoring, mentoring received, and perceived career success all loaded on separate factors argue against method variance and provide some support for the discriminant validity of these measures. Additionally, using a technique described by McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), we found that a single-factor model did not provide a better fit to the data than our theoretical model. Finally, although we cannot discount common method variance, it seems unlikely that it is an alternative explanation for the pattern of relationships we found using structural equation modeling.

In summary, our results underscore the critical role protégés play in their receipt of mentoring and in their subsequent career success. Further, our results add to existing evidence suggesting that protégé gender is not an important determinant of the receipt of mentoring. Given the benefits of mentoring demonstrated by recent studies, we urge researchers to attempt to further specify the mentoring construct and to continue to develop measures of it. Additionally, researchers need to know more about how mentors and protégés choose one another. Researchers are beginning to investigate aspects related to willingness to mentor (Ragins & Cotton, 1993); however, very little is known about how mentors choose protégés. Mentoring is an important developmental activity for protégés and mentors. Future research should attempt to delineate aspects of mentoring relationships that are beneficial for both parties.
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